

File No. 170044

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 59.

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: February 28, 2017

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 – Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER

(Click the text below for a direct link to the document)

- Appeal Letter - SF Forest Alliance - January 5, 2017
- Appeal Letter - Wild Equity Institute - January 17, 2017
- Planning Appeal Response - February 17, 2017
- Wild Equity Appeal Supplement - February 16, 2017
- SF Forest Alliance Appeal Supplement - February 16, 2017
- Public Comment Letters Received up to noon, February 23, 2017
- NRMP FEIR - Link hosted on the sfbos.org Legislative Research Center
- Clerical Documents and Hearing Notice
- _____
- _____

Prepared by: John Carroll

Date: February 24, 2017

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____



To: Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Lisa Gibson, Planning Department, Environmental Review Officer

From: Dee Seligman, Interim President, San Francisco Forest Alliance
Rupa Bose, Vice President, San Francisco Forest Alliance
Tom Borden, Director, San Francisco Forest Alliance

Date: January 5, 2017

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 JAN -5 PM 1:33
BY [Signature]

Subject: Appeal to Board of Supervisors of EIR certification Planning Department Case 2005.091.2E

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 31.16, the SF Forest Alliance does hereby appeal the Planning Commission's Certification of the SNRAMP (Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan) EIR on December 15, 2016. A copy of the certification motion is attached. Per Section 31.16 (b) (6), we ask that, "The Board shall conduct its own independent review of whether the CEQA decision adequately complies with the requirements of CEQA. The Board shall consider anew all facts, evidence and issues related to the adequacy, accuracy and objectiveness of the CEQA decision including, but not limited to, the sufficiency of the CEQA decision and the correctness of its conclusions."

Based on the evidence accompanying this letter and additional materials to follow, we believe the Board will find the EIR does not comply with CEQA, including that it is not adequate, accurate and objective; that it is not sufficient as an informational document; that its conclusions are incorrect, and it does not reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the City.

This appeal is not about whether you prefer trees or grass, whether you want to preserve and expand our historic native habitat or accept the changes caused by man and nature. This appeal is about accountability and transparency. Does the EIR correctly identify the significant environmental impacts of the SNRAMP and have mitigation measures been identified to minimize or eliminate those impacts?

This appeal is before you because the EIR fails to identify significant impacts of the Plan's implementation, and, therefore, fails to define mitigation measures to address them. These unidentified impacts include significant greenhouse gas emissions and the closure of 23% of our total parkland to public access. Further, the EIR contains what we will politely call inaccuracies. They have no place in what should be an impartial evaluation of the Plan. Finally, the current EIR relies heavily on an unsupported premise: namely that removed trees will be replaced on a one-to-one basis within the project area.

What needs to be done? Send the EIR back to Planning so they can:

- properly identify the Plan's significant impacts;
- require mitigation/accountability measures for the added significant impacts;
- remove the incorrect statements;
- add a mitigation measure that introduces accountability for tree removal and replacement.

While this is happening, the Recreation and Parks Department should be restrained from continuing their implementation of the SNRAMP. The language of this restraint should be essentially the same as the language issued by the Board of Supervisors in 2002 in BOS Resolution 653-02. That is:

FURTHER RESOLVED, That until the Natural Areas Management Plan is completed and approved by the Board of Supervisors, the Natural Areas Program may continue to preserve and maintain genuine remnants of San Francisco's native flora and fauna so long as those activities do not include:

Removal of healthy trees that pose no safety hazards

Trail closures, or restrictions on access and recreation

Expansion of activities into areas that no longer support predominantly native flora and fauna

And yes, Rec and Park has been implementing the SNRAMP even as we waited for its EIR. They ignored your resolution and they violated CEQA.

Below are summarized failings of the EIR that demonstrate how the EIR is not adequate, nor accurate nor objective, the three criteria of CEQA. We will follow up with supporting documents that provide the facts and information sources that back up these assertions.

The EIR for the SNRAMP is neither adequate nor accurate. It presents false information; refuses to acknowledge significant negative impacts; fails to assess the actual intent of the SNRAMP; and makes unwarranted assumptions. An important mitigation measure is missing. See the link below for the full critique:

<https://sfforest.files.wordpress.com/2016/12/arguments-against-certification-of-snramp-eir.pdf>

1 . Greenhouse Gases

The EIR claims implementing the SNRAMP will result in an increase in stored carbon to reduce global warming. You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The result will be a huge release of stored carbon and a loss of future carbon sequestration. The emissions from the trucks and logging equipment needed for the Plan's implementation and maintenance are not accounted for. The greenhouse gas figures presented in the EIR are intentionally miscalculated. The greenhouse gas emissions run counter to San Francisco's 2008 Greenhouse Gas Ordinance and AB 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Therefore, the impact must automatically be deemed Significant since it, "Conflicts with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases."

(2016 CEQA Statute and Guidelines Page 285)

2. Tree Replacement

The EIR states the SNRAMP includes a 1:1 tree replacement policy, that every tree removed in the project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the project area. This is a false premise. No such commitment appears in the SNRAMP or in any City code governing the Plan. The EIR cites no documented policy to support this assertion, yet it makes the claim over and over again to support analyses of various Impacts. The only "documentation" presented is a Feb. 2012 memo from Rec and Park to Planning that makes a loosely stated claim that trees will be replaced. Note that this memo was sent 15 months after the DEIR was published.

The EIR claims trees planted as replacements would be trees. Where the SNRAMP does mention replacing trees, it says, "Although the removal of invasive trees would be noticeable, the trees in the San Francisco Natural Areas would be replaced with either native trees or other native vegetation, such as native scrub or grassland species.... in some locations, trees would be replaced by native scrub or grassland species...". There is no definition of what might qualify as a replacement "tree". Does a shrub qualify? Would the species planted ever grow large enough to be considered a tree?

In discussing tree replacement, the EIR states, "the proposed project would replace primarily dead, dying, and diseased trees". This is not true. Trees to be removed under the SNRAMP are not selected based on poor health, but rather to remove trees in specific areas to open up those areas to promote grasslands. This is one of the most fundamental intents of the SNRAMP.

Missing Mitigation Measure

A requirement to plant replacement trees in the Natural Areas must be added as a mitigation measure in the EIR. The measure needs to include a recording system to track the size, type, location, reason for removal and date of trees removed. At the same time it should track the size, type, location and date of trees planted. Planted trees should be monitored annually to assess survival rates. Failed trees must be replaced. This mitigation measure is critical to control negative impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology.

3. Loss of Public Access

The EIR fails to address the fact the Plan would close 95% of our wild parkland to public access. The SNRAMP discloses that the public would be restricted to on-trail use in MA-1 and MA-2 areas. The signs that the Natural Areas Program (NAP) installed in January 2015 make it illegal to go off-trail in any Natural Area, including those classified MA-3. The surface area of trails in the Natural Areas amounts to less than 5% the total acreage. Many of us commented on the draft EIR that limiting public use to on-trail only was a huge impact. Today we can roam our parks freely. Kids can explore nature, climb on rocks, see what's "over there". With SNRAMP implementation, our park use will be limited to walking on the NAP's "designated" trails. The EIR sweeps this issue under the carpet.

4. Trail Closures

The actual extent of intended trail closures is not disclosed in the SNRAMP and not evaluated in the EIR. In most of the parks where the NAP has violated CEQA and moved forward with implementation of the SNRAMP, trail closures have been much more extensive than disclosed in the SNRAMP. Consider parks where "improvement" projects have been completed by the NAP and "designated" trails have been specified. The SNRAMP indicates 22% of trails in those Natural Areas would be closed. In fact, the NAP has closed 53% of them. This is a significant environmental effect on recreation the EIR fails to recognize.

5. CEQA Violations

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification, which would be a violation of CEQA. However, the NAP has been closing trails and erecting access control fences in parks all over town. They have installed signs in virtually every natural area restricting us to their designated trails. These are all CEQA violations, which the writers of the EIR deny.

Implementation of the SNRAMP must be halted while this appeal is pending, the EIR is corrected, and finally re-certified by the Planning Commission.

6. Herbicides

The EIR claims there will be no increase in herbicide use when the plan is implemented. Why would the EIR say something that cannot be true? The Plan calls for cutting down 18,448 trees and treating the stumps with Tier 1 herbicides. This will require additional herbicide. The Plan calls for more native plantings and conversion of forest to open grassland. Obviously, if there are more plants and new open area to defend against "weeds" more herbicide will be required.

7. Bicycle Prohibition

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." And yet, the NAP has already installed signs in our Natural Areas prohibiting bike riding, or even bringing bicycles into the park areas managed under the program. People will not ride their bicycles to a park if they have to leave them at the park boundary. Why can't our children ride bikes on trails away from cars? This action flies in the face of Transit First, Green Connections and our Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights.

8. Fences Blight Landscapes

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP. The SNRAMP says, "If off-trail use continues in a particularly sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands), permanent fencing shall be considered as a last resort once all other options, including enforcement, have failed." In fact, the NAP has already installed vast quantities of fencing for public access control that have a significant environmental effect on Aesthetics. Parks particularly hard hit with fences are Corona Heights, Grandview and Glen Canyon where fences are now dominant features of the landscapes.

9. Incorrect "Facts"

Commenters on the DEIR complained about the removal of public amenities by the NAP. A bench on Mt Davidson was cited as an example. The EIR claims the bench was removed, "because it was rotting and unsafe for sitting." In fact the bench was removed, not because it was rotting and unsafe, but because it was popular with park users who were attracted to an area where the NAP wanted to restrict usage. Proof of this is contained in an email from Chris Campbell of the NAP.

<http://sfforest.org/2016/12/10/disturbing-story-of-mt-davidson-bench/>

A commenter on the DEIR noted that the Program was cutting off neighborhoods from their parks. The trail closed by the NAP in Glen Canyon between Silver Tree Camp and O'Shaughnessy Blvd. was cited. In an effort to hide the CEQA violation, the EIR claims the trail, "was closed prior to the commencement of the environmental review for the SNRAMP." The trail in question appears in the 2006 SNRAMP as a trail to be closed under the Plan. However, in fact, the EIR process was initiated in 2005 because the Planning case number is 2005.091.2E. Further, the trail continues to appear as a trail to be closed on the map for the Glen Canyon Trails Improvement Project published in 2011. A fence was constructed at the bottom of the trail in the course of that project.

Why are these misstatements incorporated into the EIR? Their inclusion shows the authors of the EIR had a strong bias in favor of the SNRAMP. These last couple of examples amount to nothing but a silly whitewash of the Plan's impacts. However, the miscalculations of greenhouse gas sequestration and the spurious "facts" created to support them take this misstatement to a higher level.

We respectfully request that our Supervisors, representing all San Francisco neighborhoods, will carefully review this Appeal letter and send this EIR back to Planning for further mitigations; accountability measures; removal of incorrect statements; and proper identification of the significant impacts.

Sincerely,



Dee Seligman, Interim President, San Francisco Forest Alliance

Rupa Bose, Vice President, San Francisco Forest Alliance

Tom Borden, Director, San Francisco Forest Alliance



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 JAN -5 PM 1:33

BY li

**Planning Commission Motion
NO. 19825**

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2016

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2005.0912E
Project Address: Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan¹
Zoning: N/A
Block/Lot: 31 Natural Areas in San Francisco and Pacifica (various parcels)
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
Stacy Bradley – (415) 575-5609
stacy.bradley@sfgov.org
Staff Contact: Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041
melinda.hue@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2005.0912E, the "Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan" (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on April 22, 2009.
 - B. The Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Project's environmental review.
 - C. On August 31, 2011, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning

¹ The Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, or SNRAMP, is now referred to as the Natural Resources Management Plan; however, to maintain consistency between the Draft EIR and the RTC document, the term SNRAMP will continue to be used.

Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.


- D. On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
 - E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011.
 3. On April 27, 2012, the Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice and to neighborhood groups registered with the Department at that time. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012.
 4. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 5. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.
 6. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
 7. On December 15, 2016, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 8. The project sponsor has indicated that the presently preferred alternative is the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan.

9. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2005.0912E: Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan reflects the independent judgement and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR that would require recirculation of the document pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

10. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the Environmental Impact Report and the project preferred by the project sponsor, described as the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan in FEIR would have the following significant unavoidable environmental impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:
 - A. A significant project specific and cumulative impact on Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource under CEQA, due to modification of golf holes for restoration activities;
 - B. A significant cumulative impact on recreation in dog play areas (DPAs) within Natural Areas due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the National Park Service's (NPS) Dog Management Plan within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA);
 - C. A significant cumulative impact on biological resources within Natural Areas DPAs due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the NPS Dog Management Plan within the GGNRA; and
 - D. A significant project-specific and cumulative impact on air quality from activities such as trail construction, hillside stabilization, erosion control, and tree removal.

11. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 15, 2016.


Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Richards
NOES: Moore
ABSENT: None
ADOPTED: December 15, 2016

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 JAN -5 PM 1:34

BY ll

SAN FRANCISCO FOREST ALLIANCE

1013

11-7650/3210

1-4-2017

Date

Pay to the
Order of

S.F. Planning Department

\$ \$578.00

five hundred seventy eight \$⁰⁰/100

Dollars



Security
Features
Details on
Back.



SF Fire Credit Union
3201 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94118-1903
(888) 499 FIRE www.sffirecu.org

For NRAMP EIR appeal

MP

Harland Clarke

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 JAN -5 PM 1:33
u

Application to Request a
Board of Supervisors Appeal Fee Waiver

CASE NUMBER:
For Staff Use only

APPLICATION FOR BY u Board of Supervisors Appeal Fee Waiver

1. Applicant and Project Information

APPLICANT NAME: Dee Seligman		
APPLICANT ADDRESS: 2094 Fell St. San Francisco, CA 94117	TELEPHONE: (415) 668-6308	EMAIL: deesel91@gmail.com
NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION NAME: San Francisco Forest Alliance		
NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION ADDRESS: P.O. Box 460668 San Francisco, CA 94146	TELEPHONE: (415) 297-6084	EMAIL: Sfforestnews@gmail.com
PROJECT ADDRESS: Natural Areas within San Francisco Recreation and Parks		
PLANNING CASE NO.: 2005.091.2E	BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NO.:	DATE OF DECISION (IF ANY): 12/15/2016

2. Required Criteria for Granting Waiver

(All must be satisfied; please attach supporting materials)

- The appellant is a member of the stated neighborhood organization and is authorized to file the appeal on behalf of the organization. Authorization may take the form of a letter signed by the President or other officer of the organization.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of an organization that is registered with the Planning Department and that appears on the Department's current list of neighborhood organizations.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of an organization that has been in existence at least 24 months prior to the submittal of the fee waiver request. Existence may be established by evidence including that relating to the organization's activities at that time such as meeting minutes, resolutions, publications and rosters.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of a neighborhood organization that is affected by the project and that is the subject of the appeal.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: _____

Date: _____

Submission Checklist:

- APPELLANT AUTHORIZATION
- CURRENT ORGANIZATION REGISTRATION
- MINIMUM ORGANIZATION AGE
- PROJECT IMPACT ON ORGANIZATION

- WAIVER APPROVED WAIVER DENIED



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6378**
FAX: **415.558.6409**
WEB: **<http://www.sfplanning.org>**

Planning Information Center (PIC)
1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6377**
*Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter.
No appointment is necessary.*

WILD Equity

INSTITUTE

*Building a healthy and sustainable global community for people
and the plants and animals that accompany us on Earth*

January 17, 2017

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: APPEAL OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND PROJECT APPROVAL FOR THE FOR THE SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCES AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN" (Case No. 2005.0912E)

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Wild Equity Institute and the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, Save the Frogs!, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Sequoia Audubon Society, and other interested individuals and organizations submit this appeal of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") certified by the Planning Commission and approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission and for the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project in the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan ("SNRAMP"), Case No. 2005.0912E.

San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Program was to be one of the great urban conservation programs in America. But in 2016, San Francisco released a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan ("SNRAMP") that will, if adopted, turn the program on its head.

The FEIR removes SNRAMP's original plan for Sharp Park's natural areas and replaces it with a project to redevelop Sharp Park Golf Course within the "recovery" area for two imperiled species, the San Francisco Garter Snake and the California Red-Legged Frog.



North America's Most Beautiful Serpent: the San Francisco Garter Snake




Twain's Frog: the California Red-legged Frog

Brent Plater, Executive Director • 474 Valencia St., Suite 295 • San Francisco, CA • 94103
O: 415-349-5787 • C: 415-572-6989 • bplater@wildequity.org • <http://wildequity.org>

Page 1 of 8

Sharp Park Golf Course is arguably San Francisco's greatest economic and ecological mistake. It loses hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, taking money away from San Francisco's neighborhood parks and community centers. It kills two endangered species as it operates, and its location along California's coast means that before long it will be flooded by sea level rise: already several links have been washed out to sea.

In February 2006 the Recreation and Parks Department and the Planning Department began a California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") process for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). The SNRAMP proposed projects in the City's Natural Areas, including Sharp Park's Natural Areas, but did not propose any changes to Sharp Park Golf Course.



The original plan's management boundary (depicted by areas shaded in brown) was limited to the natural lagoon at Sharp Park. No modifications to the golf course were proposed. Environmental groups unanimously supported this plan.


Separately in 2009 the Recreation and Parks Department conceded to the demands of golf purists by releasing a controversial proposal to redevelop Sharp Park Golf Course. Known as "A18," the

proposal was heavily criticized by environmentalists, budget hawks, and Bay Area scientists, who stated:

“It is our conclusion that the minimal habitat enhancement proposed by the Park Department in their preferred 18-hole alternative is inadequate to allow the recovery of the San Francisco garter snake and red-legged frog at the site, and is set up to fail with climate change and sea-level rise.”

When this criticism became public A18 appeared dead on arrival at City Hall. Indeed, shortly after A18 was criticized, the Recreation and Parks Department publicly stated:

“Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed [Significant Natural Areas Management Plan] project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.”



2. Scoping Comments


- The project team has clearly stated that the 18-hole course is not to be included in the plan. It is an important environmental goal to have the course removed from the site. The project team has also stated that the proposed 18-hole course is not to be included in the plan. It is an important environmental goal to have the course removed from the site.

EIR Recommendations

Propose redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course as a separate project being studied by SFRPD. It will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

- The project team has clearly stated that the 18-hole course is not to be included in the plan. It is an important environmental goal to have the course removed from the site.



Despite assurances that A18 (L) would never be inserted into the SNRAMP environmental review, the final EIR plan for Sharp Park (R) is indistinguishable from it.

Yet in November 2016 the Department released a SNRAMP FEIR that removed the original plan for Sharp Park and replaced it with A18, the Golf Course redevelopment project. Moreover, the FEIR declares the Golf Course an Historic Resource that CEQA must protect—even though the original design was washed away by ocean storms decades ago—and therefore refused to consider alternatives that would protect Sharp Park’s environment from this controversial project.

Sharp Park, arguably San Francisco’s most ecologically and biologically important natural area, would be devastated by implementation of A18, and in the seven years since A18 was first announced, many of the SNRAMP proposals for San Francisco’s 31 other natural areas have moved forward or implemented, because they either didn’t require environmental review or because they were incorporated into other park projects.

Nonetheless, to ensure that SNRAMP’s good proposals for the City’s other natural areas wouldn’t be affected by the disastrous proposal for Sharp Park, Wild Equity and an array of environmental and community supporters demanded that the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment plan be segregated out of SNRAMP and its environmental review process, so the golf course project could stand or more likely, fall on its own merits.

But these reasonable proposals have fallen on deaf ears. The Recreation and Parks Department has informed San Francisco's environmental community that we must sacrifice our most precious biological resource if we desire modest conservation gains in San Francisco's other natural landscapes.

Now Wild Equity, the Sierra Club, Surfrider Foundation, S.F. League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Sequoia Audubon and others all agree: the environmental benefits proposed by SNRAMP in other areas are far outweighed by the environmental destruction the golf course bailout would cause at Sharp Park.

In 2009, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously passed an ordinance ordering RPD to study restoration alternatives at Sharp Park. The report RPD ultimately released contained a radical new golf course redevelopment plan for Sharp Park guised as a "recovery" effort for listed species (TetraTech 2009).

After scientists criticized the plan's several significant flaws (Davidson et al. 2011, pp. 1-2), the City convened the fact-finding Sharp Park Working Group (Holland 2011, p. 4-5). When the Working Group released findings that adopted many of (ESA-PWA 2011) recommendations,¹ RPD announced it would abandon a core element of its golf course redevelopment plan—armoring Sharp Park's seawall—but continued to insist that Sharp Park's 18-hole golf course would remain in its historic footprint, even as it acknowledged that sea level rise will erode the seawall and force it inland, squeezing endangered species habitats in a narrow area between the golf areas and the advancing ocean (Holland 2011, pp. 4-5).

Contemporaneously the City was preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the City's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP").

However, when the DEIR was released in 2011 the PWA-based Laguna Salada plan had been replaced with the TetraTech golf course redevelopment plan.² This plan is now adopted in the FEIR. Under this plan, 60,000 cubic yards of material would be dredged from the Laguna Salada's wetland complex, creating 12,100,000 gallons of water storage capacity (RPD 2011, p. 99). Four golf links surrounding Laguna Salada would be raised by up to 3.5 feet, creating additional (although unquantified) water storage capacity in the lagoon system (TetraTech 2009, p. 43). Another link would be narrowed, and another removed³ (RPD 2011, Figure 3). It also calls for

¹ The penultimate draft of the Sharp Park Working Group's findings did not make any conclusion about Sharp Park Golf Course's integrity or compatibility with the site. However, shortly before its scheduled release, Dave Holland, then director of San Mateo County Parks, leaked a copy of the document to golf advocacy groups (Holland 2011, p. 1-3). These advocates demanded that Mr. Holland "insert something along the following line: 'None of the foregoing is incompatible with preservation of the historic 18 hole golf course that exits on the property.'" *Id.* Mr. Holland agreed to do so, and was able to insert a single line

² The plan was attached to the DEIR as Appendix I, and will be referred to throughout this document as (TetraTech 2009) or (RPD 2011) interchangeably.

³ Although Hole 12 will be removed at Sharp Park, the EIR requires the City to rebuild the link in another location at Sharp Park (RPD 2011, p. 28). The EIR proposes two locations for this link: west of Laguna

filling ½ acre of Sharp Park’s wetlands to create an island in Laguna Salada (RPD 2011, p. 99) and landfilling areas where California red-legged frogs breed to “prevent localized ponding” and “to allow more complete drainage to Laguna Salada” (RPD 2011, p. 377).

The FEIR’s golf course redevelopment project is interrelated with ongoing wetland drainage at Sharp Park. Both are designed to reduce golf course flooding, and depend upon each other to implement this larger action. The City’s larger plan to reduce golf course flooding is composed of (1) ensuring maximum pump rates are reliably achieved, (2) increasing water flow rates towards the pumps, (3) increasing water storage capacity by deepening lagoons and (4) increasing storage capacity by elevating the rim of the lagoon. If any one of these components fails or is not achieved, pumping rates will decrease and golf course areas will flood.

While there is some overlap, this project is primarily designed to accomplish the first and second elements of this plan, *see* (RPD, 2012, p. 6), while the EIR is primarily designed to implement the third and fourth elements of the plan. RPD 2011, p. 99. But the elements are expressly interlinked: the FEIR repeatedly states that the golf course redevelopment project is dependent on efficient pump operations (RPD 2011, pp. 146, 361, 374, 377), and further explains that the golf course redevelopment plan is designed to meet flood control objectives while reducing wear-and-tear on the pumps (TetraTech 2009, p. 43).

The City’s statement that the golf course redevelopment plan is wholly separate from pumping operations (Wayne 2011b, p. 2) is belied by its recent permitting strategy discussion with other agencies (Anonymous 2012, p. 1). The agenda from this discussion indicates the pumping and the golf redevelopment project are two temporal phases of a single management strategy. Effects from the later phases are classic indirect effects, because they are caused by the proposed action and are later in time, but still reasonably certain to occur. They also derive, either directly or indirectly from an interrelated element of the City’s larger flood management strategy. In either case, by law the City must review these effects during this CEQA process, regardless of the City’s colloquial assertion that the projects are separate.

The City’s proposal has already been approved by several oversight bodies, and in each case the City made clear that it would not review or consider restoration alternatives at Sharp Park. The City’s single-minded approach to Sharp Park and its completion of many steps in its approval process show that the golf course redevelopment project is reasonably certain to occur.

The City’s proposal to rebuild Sharp Park Golf Course’s original layout was endorsed by San Francisco’s Recreation and Parks Commission in December of 2009, to the exclusion of all other options for Sharp Park’s future (RPD 2011, p. 2). In the SNRAMP EIR, the City concluded that only an 18-hole Golf Course at Sharp Park was a feasible alternative for the property, and refused to consider other restoration options that would provide additional benefits to listed species (RPD 2011, p. 3). Moreover, the EIR contains a mitigation requirement that will force the City to rebuild

Salada, between the seawall and frog breeding areas, or east of Highway 1. The EIR suggests that surrounding Laguna Salada with golf links would have fewer significant impacts because it would retain historic integrity of the golf course, even though it would negatively affect wildlife and intrude on protected natural areas. However, the EIR defers the ultimate decision to subsequent environmental review.

a golf link in one of two places in subsequent environmental review (RPD 2011, p. 28). Thus, the City's existing approvals and contemporaneous permitting procedures create a binding requirement to implement the golf course redevelopment plan.

Furthermore, when the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance requiring the City to negotiate with the National Park Service to implement a restoration plan for the property, the Mayor vetoed the ordinance, (Lee 2011, p. 1), again indicating the City's intent to ensure the golf course redevelopment project occurs. And with the City's encouragement, San Mateo County passed a resolution calling for San Francisco to "maximize recreation opportunities" at Sharp Park by implementing the golf course redevelopment plan (San Mateo Co. 2011, p. 2).

These actions by the City are all that is necessary to show that the golf course redevelopment plan is reasonably certain to occur. While there may be some ambiguity about how the ultimate Golf Course design will turn out, the City's CEQA documents must give consideration of the effects of interrelated and interdependent activities whether or not all of the activities' impact is known.

Now the plan has added mitigation measures dealing with acidic soils that were not present in the 2011 DEIR released for public review. For example, M-BI-6a has been modified extensively to add several pages of mitigation related to acid sulfate and anoxic conditions during dredging. None of this has been available for public review during the public comment process for this CEQA process. When such large changes are made, recirculation is required. *See Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College District*, (2016) 1 Cal. 5th 937.

In addition, the FEIR fails to adequately analyze how mitigation measures at Sharp Park will impact the San Francisco garter snake as a fully protected species pursuant to Fish & G. Code § 5050, subd. (b)(1) in light of the holding in *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204. Here, the Court recognized that fully protected species are subject to stricter prohibitions than provided under the Endangered Species Act, including an express prohibition on taking or possessing a fully protected species as mitigation for a project under CEQA. The FEIR is in violation of this holding, because it's proposal to redevelop Sharp Park Golf Course is mitigated with several provisions that expressly demonstrate "take" of the San Francisco garter snake. For example, the project explains that "Impacts to San Francisco garter snakes could occur from construction activities involving vehicle traffic and the use of heavy equipment which could result in direct mortality of individuals," DEIR p. 322, and then explains that mitigation measure M-BI-6a specifically requires "an on-call specialty environmental monitor with a valid 10(a)(1)(A) permit to handle San Francisco garter snakes and relocate them." DEIR p. 323. This is simply not permissible under CEQA after *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*.

The FEIR does not comply with San Francisco's Sea Level Rise Action Plan, released in March of 2016. The Action Plan requires San Francisco to consider adaptation and retreat alternatives where lands are at risk from expected sea level rise impacts. While the FEIR recognizes that Sharp Park is one of two natural areas at risk from expected sea level rise impacts, it fails to consider any alternative that would protect Sharp Park's natural ecology from salinity intrusion or other impacts from sea level rise. This violates CEQA and San Francisco's own plans for sea level rise adaptation.

The FEIR selectively excludes alternatives without substantial evidence or sound logic. In a case like this where public concern and controversy is high, evidence of alternatives is widespread, and when massive take has occurred under existing protocols, the City cannot ensure that there will be no significant adverse environmental impacts without at least considering alternatives to the golf course redevelopment project.

In particular, (ESA-PWA 2011) contributed a restoration model for Sharp Park that is based on the best scientific data available at Sharp Park and addresses all of the above deficiencies in the project. For example, where the project suggests that both species are “conservation reliant” due to their isolation, the ESA-PWA proposal emphasizes connective habitat corridors across Sharp Park.

Where the project suggests it will continue to drain and fertilize Sharp Park’s wetlands on the one hand, and then dredge excessive tule and cattail growth on the other, PWA-ESA’s mitigation model constrains pumping so that water levels will rise high enough to drown excessive vegetation growth, and ensures that water levels rise and fall slowly so that Sharp Park’s entire wetland feature remains hydrologically connected and contains sufficient water for egg masses to develop into adult frogs.

Where the project ignores the fundamental changes climate change will bring to this landscape, ESA-PWA’s plan provides mitigation and recovery areas upland and inland from areas that will be immediately impacted by catastrophic flooding events, and then creates natural defenses around these areas by restoring wetlands and vegetative features between the rising sea and the restored habitats. These features will absorb and slow the rate of water if intrusion ever does occur.

Where the project blames the frog for an apparently indiscriminant breeding behavior and for laying eggs in ‘unsustainable’ habitats, ESA-PWA’s mitigation and restoration plan recognizes that the California red-legged frog can successfully breed under natural conditions at Sharp Park, so long as the velocity, rapidity, and scope of the wetland draining project implemented by San Francisco is curtailed.

All of these outcomes would provide greater conservation and public benefits than the project disclosed in the notification, yet the City does not seem prepared to consider alternatives to the project proposal. Such reluctance is inconsistent with sound environmental review and the strictures of CEQA.

The City’s rationale for rejecting the full restoration alternative based on possible impacts to historic resources associated with the golf course is not supported by substantial evidence or law. This is particularly true because RPD’s internal communications demonstrate that under its golf course redevelopment project:

- “Sea level rise will reduce the capacity of sharp park to function as a freshwater wetland that will support frogs and snakes”
- “Based on most conservative predictions of sea level rise, the majority of sharp park west of highway 1 will not support freshwater wetlands in the long term”
- “The wetland complex at sharp park is not expected to provide habitat in perpetuity.”

(Wayne, 2009). Yet the impacts caused by the redevelopment project are deemed of less import in the FEIR compared to maintaining a golf course on the property.

This conclusion is internally inconsistent with the FEIR. The FEIR makes clear that the only mitigation measure necessary for changes to the golf course are to document the golf course's landscape before changes—including the elimination of holes or links—are made. M-CP-7. Thus there is no limitation within the FEIR's own logic to exclude these other alternatives, and they must be considered by the City.

This letter and its references, along with all other documents submitted into the record for this project or related Sharp Park projects are incorporated herein by reference.

Sincerely,



Brent Plater

WILD Equity

INSTITUTE

*Building a healthy and sustainable global community for people
and the plants and animals that accompany us on Earth*

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Wild Equity is now, and has always been, a strong supporter of the City's Natural Areas and its Natural Areas Program. We believe that the preservation of San Francisco's Natural Areas is among the most pressing conservation issues of our time.

However, we have grave concerns about the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") review process for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). Indeed, we have consistently and repeatedly objected to the City's decision to insert a project known as "A18," the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, into the SNRAMP EIR process.

To date you have not taken any action to address this concern. This is perplexing, as our request is entirely consistent with the City's November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP CEQA process, which stated:

[b]ecause redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

We write today to reiterate that unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process, Wild Equity will oppose SNRAMP's approval. In contrast, if the City were to revert to the original SNRAMP project for Sharp Park—i.e., the project proposed in the 2006 Final Draft SNRAMP—Wild Equity will strongly support SNRAMP's adoption.

We have reached this conclusion after carefully weighing the SNRAMP's conservation benefits against the environmental harm that will be wrought by A18. It is clear that the proposed conservation benefits SNRAMP may bring to the City's other natural areas are greatly outweighed by the concrete harms that A18 will impose on Sharp Park.

A18 has been heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates in both 2009 and 2011 because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department. Wild Equity is not willing to sacrifice Sharp Park, unquestionably the Recreation and Park Department's most ecologically and biologically important natural area, to this ill-conceived project for a vague promise of conservation benefits in other areas. Yet this is what SNRAMP DEIR's preferred alternative

currently offers.

We therefore reiterate that we will oppose adoption of the SNRAMP DEIR unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brent Plater". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end of the name.

Brent Plater



Surfrider Foundation, San Francisco Chapter
3830 Noriega St. San Francisco, Ca 94122

11/20/14

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The mission of the San Francisco Chapter of Surfrider Foundation includes the preservation and enhancement of San Francisco's natural coastline.

We are writing to the Board to relay our grave concerns about the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") review process for the City's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRMAMP"). Specifically, we take issue with project known as "A18," the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, which is presently included into the SNRAMP EIR process.

Sharp Park golf course, while being an affordable recreational amenity to the public, also happens to be located on a coastal wetland. The preservation of the course layout relies upon the maintenance of a sea wall on the beach. The seawall prevents waves from filling the lagoon and thereby flooding the links. The problem is Pacifica has already lost most of its beach area to seawalls and rock revetments. In our view, to promote further beach loss in Pacifica (by continuing to invest in the operation of the golf course) is bad environmental policy. Coastal wetlands and lagoons such as the one at Sharp Park help purify water, and bring sand to our eroding beaches. Furthermore, our allies in the environmental community are correct in claiming that the golf course negatively impacts endangered species (San Francisco Garter snake and Ca red legged-frogs).

We write today to ask for the removal of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals (derived from A18) from the SNRAMP CEQA process. Coastal wetlands and beaches are significant natural areas. Wherever we have a chance to restore or protect them, we should embrace the opportunity. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill McLaughlin".

Bill McLaughlin

Surfrider Foundation, San Francisco Chapter

Restore Sharp Park Campaign Lead



San Francisco Bay Chapter

Serving Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Francisco Counties

July 22, 2014

John Rahaim, Director and Planning Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St #400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Sharp Park and the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) EIR

Dear Director Rahaim and Planning Commissioners:

The Sierra Club again urges you to remove from the SNRAMP CEQA process all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals that are a part of project A18, the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project. If the SNRAMP EIR is adopted with these elements the Sierra Club will have no choice but to oppose this EIR since it will violate CEQA and put endangered species (the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog) at risk.

We would do this with great reluctance since we are strong supporters of the San Francisco Natural Areas Program and wish to see it implemented as fully as possible. Unfortunately, project A18 would undermine the goals of the Natural Areas Program at Sharp Park since, as said above, it would impact endangered species and addresses a golf redevelopment project, not a natural areas project.

It is obvious to us that project A18 requires a distinct and separate CEQA process, not as a part of the SNRAMP EIR. We have made our concerns well known to you, as we have previously objected to inserting A18, into the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") review process for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRMAMP").

Your own analysis supports our position. The City's November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP CEQA process stated:

[b]ecause redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

Furthermore, the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, in contrast to the "program" level analysis of SNRAMP part of the DEIR, is analyzed at the "project" level and would therefore not require additional CEQA review before it is implemented even though it was not subject to all of CEQA's required review procedures and not a single alternative to A18 was considered in the DEIR.

A18 has been heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates in both 2009 and 2011 because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department.

While we strongly believe that the Natural Areas Program is critical to the future of San Francisco and its natural ecology, we do not believe it is appropriate or ethical for the City to attempt to seek acceptance of an environmentally disastrous project by inappropriately injecting it into the CEQA process of an otherwise strongly supported program.


We therefore reiterate that we will oppose adoption of the SNRAMP DEIR unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process.

Sincerely,



Arthur Feinstein
Conservation Chair

Cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors



San Francisco Tomorrow

Since 1970, Working to Protect the Urban Environment

September 17, 2014

John Rahaim, Director and Planning Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St #400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Sharp Park and the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) EIR

Dear Director Rahaim and Planning Commissioners:

San Francisco Tomorrow's goal of having a livable, sustainable and environmentally healthy city depends in great part upon the City employing a transparent and lawful planning process. Sadly, the present SNRAMP DEIR fails both tests.

The unjustified inclusion of project A18, the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, in the SNRAMP EIR clearly violates CEQA. We believe it obvious that project A18 requires a distinct and separate CEQA process since project A18 does not address a Natural Area project and, in fact, addresses a golf course project.

Your own analysis supports our position. The City's November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP CEQA process stated:

[b]ecause redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

SFT urges you to comply with the law and your department's own position and remove from the SNRAMP EIR process all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals. Otherwise, SFT will have no choice but to oppose this EIR since it will violate CEQA and put endangered species (the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog) at risk.

We want to emphasize that SFT strongly supports the City's Natural Areas Program and considers it a landmark and essential component of the City's General Plan. All the more reason to not jeopardize the integrity of the Natural Areas Program, and the City's planning process itself, which would be the

Will you want to live in San Francisco – tomorrow?

44 Woodland Ave
(415) 585-9489

San Francisco, CA 94117

result of the City's attempt to attach an inappropriate project into an otherwise strongly supported program seemingly to make it easier for that controversial project to get adopted. Please remove Project A18 from the SNRAMP EIR.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer Clary".

Jennifer Clary
President

cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors



Clerk, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

July 15, 2014

**RE: TENTATIVE OPPOSITION TO THE SIGNIFICANT NATURAL
RESOURCE AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Dear Clerk of the Board:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters (SFLCV) is now, and has always been, a strong supporter of the City's Natural Areas and its Natural Areas Program. We believe that the preservation of San Francisco's Natural Areas is among the most pressing conservation issues of our time.

However, we have grave concerns about the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRMAMP). Indeed, we have consistently and repeatedly objected to the City's decision to insert a project known as "A18," the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, into the SNRAMPEIR process.

To date you have not taken any action to address this concern. This is perplexing, as our request is entirely consistent with the City's November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMPEIR CEQA process, which stated:

[b]ecause redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMPEIR project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

We write today to reiterate that unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMPEIR CEQA process, SFLCV will oppose SNRAMPEIR's approval. In contrast, if the City were to revert to the original SNRAMPEIR project for Sharp Park—i.e., the project proposed in the 2006 Final Draft SNRAMPEIR—the SFLCV will strongly support SNRAMPEIR's adoption.

We have reached this conclusion after carefully weighing the SNRAMPEIR's conservation benefits against the environmental harm that will be wrought by A18. It is clear that the


proposed conservation benefits SRNAMP may bring to the City's other natural areas are greatly outweighed by the concrete harms that A18 will impose on Sharp Park.

A18 has been heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates in both 2009 and 2011 because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department. The SFLCV is not willing to sacrifice Sharp Park, unquestionably the Recreation and Park Department's most ecologically and biologically important natural area, to this ill-conceived project for a vague promise of conservation benefits in other areas. Yet this is what SNRAMP DEIR's preferred alternative currently offers.

We therefore reiterate that we will oppose adoption of the SNRAMP DEIR unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process.

Sincerely yours,

Amandeep Jawa, President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters



SEQUOIA
AUDUBON SOCIETY

P.O. Box 620292
Woodside, CA 94062

July 29, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

Resolution to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Design Project (Alternative A18) from the Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, and to oppose any final SNRAMP EIR that contains such proposals.

WHEREAS, the two-fold mission of the Recreation and Park Department's Natural Areas Program (NAP) is to "preserve, restore, and enhance remnant Natural Areas, and to develop and support community-based site stewardship of these areas"; and

WHEREAS, the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) is intended to guide management activities and site improvements in Natural Areas by the Recreation and Park Department for the next 20 years; and

WHEREAS, one of these natural areas, Sharp Park, has significantly different ecological and administrative issues because it is the only Natural Area that contains the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the threatened California red-legged frog, and is the only Natural Area located outside of San Francisco county; and

WHEREAS, the planning process for the SNRAMP began in 1995 and has included the input of multiple stakeholders including a Citizen Task Force and Green Ribbon Panel in 2002, a Citizens Advisory Committee in 2003, an ad hoc working group in 2004, and three independent scientific peer reviews and a public comment period on the 2005 public draft; and

WHEREAS, the SNRAMP Final Draft Plan was approved for environmental review in 2006 and has completed several steps in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, including the publication of a Notice of Preparation, distribution of an Initial Study, the conclusion of public scoping and comment periods, and the publication of a final Scoping Report by November of 2009; and
WHEREAS, Alternative A18, a conceptual alternative to redesign Sharp Park Golf Course, was separately proposed by the Recreation and Park Department in November 2009; and

WHEREAS, Alternative A18 did not complete several CEQA procedural requirements, including a discussion of Alternative A18 in a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study; review by or consultation with Responsible Agencies; or formal public comment and review of draft golf course designs; and

WHEREAS, Alternative A18 was heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department;

WHEREAS, in the November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP CEQA process, the Recreation and Park Department and the Planning Department jointly stated that "because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review;" and

WHEREAS, Alternative A18 was nonetheless inserted into the long-standing SNRAMP CEQA review process as a new, additional SNRAMP project when the SNRAMP DEIR was released in August 2011; and

WHEREAS, Sharp Park is the only Natural Area that the DEIR studies at the project-level, which means Alternative A18 will have completed its entire CEQA requirements if the SNRAMP DEIR is adopted as final, while the City's 31 other Natural Areas will require subsequent, project-specific environmental review before their proposed projects are implemented;

WHEREAS, with the exception of Alternative A18, all feasible alternative management regimes for Sharp Park were excluded from consideration in the DEIR because it characterizes the golf course as an historic resource for purposes of CEQA, despite the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission's contrary determination; and

WHEREAS, Alternative A18 should be subject to a separate and complete environmental evaluation;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Sequoia Audubon supports removing all Sharp Park Golf Course projects and management proposals derived from Alternative A18 from the SNRAMP EIR process, and if they are not so removed, Sequoia Audubon will oppose passage of the SNRAMP EIR.

Sincerely,



Sue Cossins
Administrative Assistant
For the Sequoia Audubon Society Board of Directors

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process, SAVE THE FROGS! will oppose SNRAMP's approval. We have reached this conclusion after carefully weighing the SNRAMP's conservation benefits against the environmental harm that will be wrought by A18. It is clear that the proposed conservation benefits SRNAMP may bring to the City's other natural areas are greatly outweighed by the concrete harms that A18 will impose on Sharp Park's amphibians.

This conclusion is based on, among other considerations, (a) the fact that the natural areas program, which we support in principle, already has authority to implement the DEIR's proposed conservation projects in most of the City's natural areas, and therefore adopting the SNRAMP DEIR as currently proposed will provide no additional conservation benefit to these areas; (b) the few areas where additional conservation gains would be authorized are analyzed only at the "program" level, which means some subsequent, significant environmental review document will be required before those projects move forward, making those projects subject to further delay, expense, and uncertainty; and (c) the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, in contrast, is analyzed at the "project" level and would therefore not require additional CEQA review before it is implemented: and yet A18 was not subject to all of CEQA's required review procedures and not a single alternative to A18 was considered in the DEIR.

A18 has been heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates in both 2009 and 2011 because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department. SAVE THE FROGS! is not willing to sacrifice Sharp Park, unquestionably the Recreation and Park Department's most ecologically and biologically important natural area, to this ill-conceived project for a vague promise of conservation benefits in other areas. Yet this is what SNRAMP DEIR's preferred alternative currently offers. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been destroyed; Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), an iconic amphibian that the Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea and their egg masses get stranded on dry land.

I therefore reiterate that SAVE THE FROGS! will oppose adoption of the SNRAMP DEIR unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process.

Sincerely,



Dr. Kerry Kriger

15-June-2014



Dr. Kerry Kriger
Executive Director
831-621-6215

2524 San Pablo Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94702 USA

E-mail: kerry@savethefrogs.com

savethefrogs.com



August 13, 2014

Phil Ginsburg
General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
McLaren Lodge-Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan St.
San Francisco, CA 94117

Re: Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan

Dear General Manager Ginsburg,

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) has been and continues to be a supporter of the City's Natural Areas and its Natural Areas Program, which is one component of a larger conservation strategy in the Bay Area that includes city, state and federal parks.

However, we have grave concerns about the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") review process for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). Indeed, we have consistently and repeatedly objected to the City's decision to insert a project known as "A18," the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, into the SNRAMP EIR process.

To date, the City has not taken any action to address this concern. This is perplexing, as our request is entirely consistent with the City's November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP CEQA process, which stated:

[b]ecause redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

We write today to reiterate that unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process the NPCA will oppose SNRAMP's approval. In contrast, if the City were to revert to the original SNRAMP project for Sharp

Park—i.e., the project proposed in the 2006 Final Draft SNRAMP—the NPCA will strongly support SNRAMP’s adoption.

We have reached this conclusion after carefully weighing the SNRAMP’s conservation benefits against the environmental harm that will be wrought by A18. It is clear that the proposed conservation benefits SRNAMP may bring to the City’s other natural areas are greatly outweighed by the concrete harms that A18 will impose on Sharp Park.

This conclusion is based on, among other considerations, (a) the fact that the natural areas program, already has authority to implement the DEIR’s proposed conservation projects in most of the City’s natural areas, and therefore adopting the SNRAMP DEIR as currently proposed will provide no additional conservation benefit to these areas; (b) the few areas where additional conservation gains would be authorized are analyzed only at the “program” level, which means some subsequent, significant environmental review document will be required before those projects move forward, making those projects subject to further delay, expense, and uncertainty; and (c) the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, in contrast, is analyzed at the “project” level and would therefore not require additional CEQA review before it is implemented: and yet A18 was not subject to all of CEQA’s required review procedures and not a single alternative to A18 was considered in the DEIR.

A18 has been heavily criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates in both 2009 and 2011 because of its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife and the economic sustainability of the Recreation and Park Department. NPCA is not willing to sacrifice Sharp Park, unquestionably the Recreation and Park Department’s most ecologically and biologically important natural area, to this ill-conceived project for a vague promise of conservation benefits in other areas. Yet this is what SNRAMP DEIR’s preferred alternative currently offers.

We therefore reiterate that we will oppose adoption of the SNRAMP DEIR unless all Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment projects and management proposals derived from A18 are removed from the SNRAMP CEQA process.

Sincerely,



Neal Desai
Pacific Region Field Director
National Parks Conservation Association



*inspiring people to protect
Bay Area birds since 1917*

April 10, 2015

Phil Ginsburg, General Manager
San Francisco Park & Recreation Department
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear Mr. Ginsburg:

Golden Gate Audubon would like to reiterate its opposition to elements of Sharp Park development and management which have been included in the Significant Natural Resources Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) and the associated SNRAMP Environmental Impact Review (EIR). We urge you to move forward with the excellent protection and programs under the SNRAMP for the originally indicated natural areas in the city, but urge you to remove the Sharp Park elements (Alternative A18) which merit further intensive review and vetting, as outlined below.

The SNRAMP is designed to guide management activities and improvement of dozens of important city-owned properties in San Francisco that include critical habitat fragments and special species. For decades, SNRAMP has been envisioned and developed with thoughtful guidance from many stakeholders, including SF RPD and the conservation community. However, the rather late inclusion of Alternative A18 (Sharp Park) has severely compromised what would otherwise be unambiguously strong support of the environmental community for SNRAMP.

Why Sharp Park is different and does not belong in SRNAMP:

- Sharp Park is not within the City and County limits of San Francisco and this area's management has repercussions for contiguous habitat parcels of other jurisdictions, who have not participated in review processes to date.
- Alternative A18 is primarily concerned with sustaining an artificial amenity: a golf course, rather than effectively managing for a coastal wetland ecosystem. As the operation the golf course is not consistent with the purpose of SNRAMP, including Sharp Park undermines SNRAMP's integrity.
- Sharp Park is the only parcel in SNRAMP EIR known to host native *vertebrate* species which are federally-listed under the Endangered Species Act. Two resident native vertebrate species: the threatened California Red-legged Frog and the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake are well known to be

GOLDEN GATE AUDUBON SOCIETY

2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite G, Berkeley, CA 94702

phone 510.843.2222 web www.goldengateaudubon.org email ggas@goldengateaudubon.org

experiencing perilous rates of decline throughout their ranges. The San Francisco Garter Snake has a quite limited and fragmented range due, in part, to the unfortunate history of draining coastal wetlands. Sharp Park is one of very few places where the San Francisco Garter Snake's survival as a species could be achieved with substantive focus on coastal wetland ecology. Sharp Park merits its own independent CEQA review for its unique conservation importance but also for the opportunity this San Mateo County property offers as a unique venue for the public to discover coastal wetland ecology and see rare animals. It would be shameful, and ironic, to say the least, if it were the City of San Francisco that effectively signed the death warrant for the beautiful snake sharing its namesake - by inadequately preserving habitat which serves as this particular endangered species last stronghold on Earth -- under the umbrella of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan EIR.

- Although SNRAMP planning has taken place since 1995, the Sharp Park Alternative A18 was not formally included until after 2009. As such, it has not received anything like equal or adequate environmental and public review.
- Because the project elements at Sharp Park have not been properly studied nor sufficiently vetted by all relevant stakeholders, it should not be approved without separate review and public input. Yet, adoption of the final DEIR could effectively fast track the implementation of irreversible destructive management practices at Sharp Park simply because A18 is considered at the Project Level. While the 31 other projects are only approved at the program level, each of those 31 other projects have received more careful review than A18. It suggests that the City's late inclusion of Alternative A18 effectively circumvented a truly comprehensive review process under CEQA for Sharp Park projects. This rightly raises suspicion among the environmental community and has invoked opposition to SNRAMP that would not exist if Option A18 were simply removed from the SNRAMP EIR.
- Because Sharp Park is managed primarily as a golf course, it is not in fact being managed as a natural resource area. Therefore, it does not, by definition, belong to the collection of properties contemplated by the SNRAMP EIR. Furthermore, the water buttressing impacts, severe draining regimens, and vegetation removal required for artificially sustaining the golf course are deeply disruptive for a coastal wetland ecosystem - and compromise crucial habitat for the San Francisco Garter Snake and the Red-Legged Frog.

Given the many concerns (presence of federally listed species, insufficiency in time, and substance and scope of review, mismatched management objectives for that property, and a divided conservation community, we urge you to REMOVE Sharp Park Alternative A18 from the SNRAMP-EIR. Doing so, will enable the City to earn back strong support from the conservation community for the rest of the projects contemplated under SNRAMP.

Our concerns about the A18 project element had been lodged separately, earlier, during the appropriate comment period. However, by insisting on the inappropriate inclusion of A18, the City has unwittingly broadened and strengthened opposition to SNRAMP and the entire Natural Areas Program. Without Alternative A18, SNRAMP may be deemed the most thoughtful and powerful urban conservation initiative anywhere in the world. Yet, the misguided inclusion of A18 undermines the integrity of SNRAMP and alienates support from environmental organizations that would otherwise be its champions. We urge you to remove A18.

Sincerely Yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cindy Margulis". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Cindy Margulis, Executive Director

CC: San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee
SF Board of Supervisors



*inspiring people to protect
Bay Area birds since 1917*

December 12, 2016

Mark Buell, Commission President
Recreation and Parks Commission
Recpark.Commission@sfgov.org

Rodney Fong, Commission President
Planning Commission
Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

RE: Natural Areas Program EIR

Dear Commissioners:

Our thousands of Audubon members enjoy birdwatching, wildlife viewing, nature study, ecology, citizen science, volunteering, habitat restoration, stewardship, etc. — all opportunities that the Natural Areas Program offers. For 15 years, SNRAMP has been envisioned and developed to protect natural areas within the city and make them accessible to people. SNRAMP is meant to **guide management activities that will improve dozens of important San Francisco properties that include critical habitat fragments, special native species, and even critically endangered species.**

While most of the city landscape is concrete, buildings, roads, and other urban development, the Recreation and Park Department manages approximately 230 parks of various sizes, totaling about 3,500 acres. Only 1,100 acres confined to 31 of these parks are deemed to contain *significant natural areas*, which are the unique natural heritage of San Francisco. This is less than 3.6% of the total city area that must do the job of preserving the many species of plants and animals that struggle to persist in our city.

San Francisco has a stunningly beautiful and unique biological history and heritage. City-managed lands host differing weather regimes and soils, and we have diverse communities of plants and animals ranging from SF Bay coastline to live oak woodland, mature forest, vernal pool and prairie, to coast chaparral. Our native plants and animals have evolved over millions of years to thrive under distinct sets of conditions. To survive, they need us to notice them, learn about them, appreciate them, and ultimately commit to preserving them. Having this beauty and biological diversity within a 48-square-mile city is truly a very rare treasure! This amount of diversity is a public value that deserves diligent and dutiful stewardship. Future generations will grow up exploring and loving these natural areas, and this will create our future stewards for the unique natural heritage of San Francisco.

While we support the intention of the SNRAMP plan and its relevant projects for numerous city parks, we are profoundly troubled by the inclusion of the Sharp Park Golf Course, which conspicuously fails to cohere to the fundamental objectives of the overall SNRAMP plan. Alternative A18 (Sharp Park), which was added very late in the long-standing effort to draft SNRAMP and was added in direct contradiction of the promises of the City to consider that project separately, is principally just a very costly Golf Course

GOLDEN GATE AUDUBON SOCIETY

2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite G Berkeley, California 94702

phone 510.843.2222 fax 510.843.5351 web www.goldengateaudubon.org

5050

redevelopment plan. There are many reasons why this does not belong in the SNRAMP EIR – not the least of all that it is to be re-developed and managed *primarily* as a golf course (not as a natural area)! The Golf Course is **not free to the public** to be widely enjoyed (it'll only be open to paying golfers). Redeveloping and maintaining this particular golf course requires management practices, including **draining the natural wetland and constant mowing which severely negatively impact two critically endangered vertebrate species** on this property located in San Mateo County: the SF Garter Snake and California Red-legged Frog. This Golf Course will continue to use pesticides at levels not appropriate in other Natural Areas. **Pretending that environmentally responsible redevelopment of this particular Golf Course would be possible -- in this era of increasing knowledge of sea-level rise and rates of coastal erosion -- is folly.** Surely, San Francisco officials are smart enough to recognize that expensive efforts to keep this Golf Course are woefully short-sighted and may have permanently damaging consequences for these endangered species' survival. The City should remove the Golf Course elements to ensure this EIR is true to its stated purpose: **preserving this city's natural areas.**

Including the area to be redeveloped as the Sharp Park Golf Course contradicts the conservation objectives of the Natural Areas plan and compromised what would otherwise be unambiguously strong support from the environmental community. Furthermore, in the near future it will be critical to raise money for numerous SNRAMP projects, which are not yet funded. We believe that fundraising for authentic conservation cannot be achieved if the city intends to use those very same funds to support an expensive-to-renovate and increasingly expensive-to-operate golf-course which poses a persistent threat to two endangered species.

Golden Gate Audubon is committed to advocating for the SNRAMP plan in SF's city parks, which we view as a significant commitment to maintaining native biodiversity in this city. But we strenuously object to the inclusion of Sharp Park Golf Course elements, which really are not "natural area conservation" and are not even located within the City of San Francisco. **We hope that you will certify the SNRAMP EIR *excluding* the functional Golf Course areas at Sharp Park and, instead, adopt the SNRAMP plan for the protection of the genuine natural areas of San Francisco.**

Sincerely,



Cindy Margulis
Executive Director

December 15, 2016

John Rahaim, Director and Planning Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St #400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Sharp Park and the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan
(SNRAMP) EIR

Dear Director Rahaim and Planning Commissioners:

Audubon California¹ writes to strongly urge the San Francisco Planning Department to remove the Sharp Park Golf course redevelopment and management project from the San Francisco Significant Natural Areas Management Program (SNRAMP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The golf course project is directly at odds with the purpose and goals of the SNRAMP, creates greater threats to the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog populations, and its inclusion threatens the entire program.

San Francisco considers itself one of the greenest cities in the United States. The SNRAMP program is, on the whole, worthy of support and recognition. However, despite broad and persistent opposition from the conservation community, San Francisco continues to include a redevelopment project for a golf course that threatens two endangered species in a program specifically dedicated to protecting and enhancing local biodiversity.

We remind you that in the November 2009 Scoping Report for the SNRAMP process stated:

Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, **they would undergo a separate regulatory review**, including CEQA environmental review. (emphasis added)

The decision to depart from the 2009 Scoping Report appears to be a tacit acknowledgement by the Recreation and Parks Department that the controversial golf course redevelopment program would not pass muster under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if

¹ These comments are submitted on behalf of Audubon California, the state office of the National Audubon Society. Separate comments have already been submitted and/or will be submitted by Sequoia Audubon Society and Golden Gate Audubon Society, which are independent chapters of National Audubon, each with their own policies and positions related to Sharp Park. The National Audubon Society and its chapters should not be confused with "Audubon International", which is a separate entity funded in part by the U.S. Golf Association and that collects fees to "certify" developments such as golf courses and resorts as "bird-friendly" despite frequent opposition from conservation organizations.

analyzed on its own. Therefore, Sharp Park was included as part of the SNRAMP to push it through as part of a broader package that would reduce opposition to the project.

Now more than ever, San Francisco should lead by example in developing environmental policy and protecting local biodiversity. The Natural Areas Program is an excellent example of that leadership. It should not be diminished and potentially derailed by a cynical attempt to ram an expensive and environmentally-harmful golf course project through the CEQA process.


Therefore, Audubon California opposes certification of the SNRAMP Draft EIR unless the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment and management projects are removed. Please help the SNRAMP process continue unhindered and let the Sharp Park proposals be evaluated on their own merits in a separate CEQA process.

Thank you for consideration of our comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at mlynes@audubon.org.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Lynes
Director of Public Policy
Audubon California



(415) 310-5109

Peter R. Baye, Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist
33660 Annapolis Road
Annapolis, California 95412



baye@earthlink.net

California Coastal Commission
Stephanie Rexing, Coastal Planner
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94015

January 5, 2016

SUBJECT: Observations of apparent major long-term patterns of salinity intrusion indicators, north-western Sharp Park; relationship to modification of authorized drainage of Laguna Salada, Pacifica, San Mateo Co. (CDP 2-012-014)

Dear Ms. Rexing:

I would like to provide you with some observations of large-scale, conspicuous, and ecologically significant salinity intrusion indicators in vegetation and soil at Sharp Park. I am submitting these for your consideration in ongoing regulatory management of Sharp Park. Salinity intrusion patterns evident at the surface soil and vegetation are relevant to pumping and drainage of Laguna Salada that lowers Sharp Park groundwater elevations relative to the saline beach groundwater lens that is “pumped” by wave runup on the beachface.

Attached are annotated photos of greatly expanded dieback zones (apparently more than 2 acres) of irrigated turfgrass, and patches of salt-tolerant weeds (halophytes) in November 2015, and previous direct evidence of capillary efflorescence of salts in turfgrass depressions and flats dating from 2010 (soon after they became conspicuous). Most of the turfgrass landward of the barrier beach at the northwest end of Sharp Park exhibited mass dieback this year. This acute dieback contrasted sharply with adjacent turfgrass at slightly higher elevation, or slightly or landward of zone of apparent shallow brackish groundwater influence.

The 2010 observations of incipient salinity intrusion provide direct evidence of salt efflorescence at the soil surface in depressions where the dieback zones initiated, as well as rapid colonization by non-native halophytes (salt-tolerant weeds) that replaced barrens left by dead turfgrass. As you know, turfgrass is physiologically unable to cope with soil salt levels so high that they visibly accumulate as crystalline salt crusts at the soil surface between rains or irrigation episodes. These patterns are not consistent with any other mechanism of salt transport, such as salt spray deposition (minimized in lee of a barrier, and at the ground surface).

As sea level rises, wave runup and beach elevations rise relative to the water surface elevation of Laguna Salada. Thus, groundwater gradients between the sandy barrier beach (underlying the artificial earthen berm) should be expected to steepen towards Laguna Salada as long as it is

Peter R. Baye
Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net

pumped to elevations lower than beach groundwater. The lower the lagoon is pumped relative to beach groundwater levels, the steeper the saline groundwater gradient is likely to become – along with the magnitude of salinity intrusion impacts. The dramatic localized expansion of the turfgrass dieback from local depressions in 2010, to mass dieback of the entire western turfgrass zone in 2015, is consistent with a significant long-term adverse increase in salinity intrusion from shallow brackish groundwater flow from the beach toward the drained low lagoon. The details of the patterns of dieback gradient and salt efflorescence along the historical footprint of the sand barrier beach are also consistent with a pattern of shallow brackish groundwater intrusion from the beach, expressed as a zone of capillary rise of soil salts in low elevation areas. This pattern is probably magnified and revealed by the drought, which has reduced dilution of beach groundwater salts.

The fringing marsh (wetlands) at some western the Laguna Salada shoreline segments is also apparently exhibiting localized patterns of dieback consistent with increased salinity intrusion. The eastern shore marsh of Laguna Salada exhibits no salt dieback patterns (just low water level vegetation indicators), but there is unprecedented dieback of bulrush, rush, and stunting of tules, along with expansion of saltgrass, on the south lobe of the relict washover fan. This is consistent with increased salt stress in wetland vegetation, which I have not observed in past droughts. These are obviously not simply drought patterns of physiological wetland vegetation stress, because they are highly asymmetric across the lagoon.

Salinity intrusion at Sharp Park is a long-term management problem for wetland management, water quality, and turfgrass maintenance feasibility. Prof. Rosemary Knight (Stanford University, GEM – Center for Groundwater Evaluation and Management <https://gemcenter.stanford.edu/>) has developed efficient and definitive imaging methods (Electrical Resistivity Tomography) for measuring salinity intrusion in shallow coastal groundwater in Central California and elsewhere. I recommend that the Commission fully consider requiring monitoring of groundwater and salinity intrusion with such methods in order to constrain impacts of lagoon drainage (pumping) as sea level rises. In addition, as the Commission modifies the Coastal Development Permit conditions for Sharp Park related to pumping, I would recommend requiring well-distributed year-round sampling (multiple transects) of soil salinity and vegetation, from the soil surface to groundwater capillary fringe, across the backbarrier zones exhibiting long-term patterns of turfgrass dieback.

Thank you for your consideration and efforts to balance public interest in wetland conservation, water quality, and coastal recreation in your administration of the Sharp Park CDP.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter R. Baye, Ph.D.

Cc:

Peter R. Baye
Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net

John Dixon, California Coastal Commission
Nancy Cave, California Coastal Commission
Bob Battalio, Chief Engineer, ESA, San Francisco
Greg Kamman, KHE Hydrology, San Rafael
(Attachment)

ATTACHMENT

Peter R. Baye
Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net

Observations of salinity intrusion patterns evident in turfgrass dieback, halophyte (salt-tolerant plant) colonization, and salt efflorescence at Northwestern Sharp Park, 2010-2015.


1. Sharp Park northwestern turfgrass dieback patterns: 2015



Northwestern Sharp Park turfgrass exhibiting almost complete dieback in topographic lows (flats and swales close to groundwater level indicated by lagoon water surface; C) behind barrier beach. Note contrasting green turfgrass on landward mounds in background (A) and seaward depressions colonized by salt-tolerant weeds (B). Iceplant (*Carpobrotus edulis x chilensis*) in foreground. November 25, 2015.



Nearly complete dieback of turfgrass landward of Salada barrier beach and dike (C). Green vegetation in lowest depressions (B) is composed of salt tolerant weeds identified in 2010, including spurrey (*Spergularia* spp.) and staghorn plantain (*Plantago coronopus*) rather than turfgrass species. November 25, 2015.




Nearly complete dieback of turfgrass landward of Salada barrier beach and dike (C). Green vegetation in lowest depressions (B) is composed of salt tolerant weeds identified in 2010, including spurrey (*Spergularia* spp.) and staghorn plantain (*Plantago coronopus*) rather than turfgrass species. November 25, 2015.



Contrast: green turfgrass flats at similar elevation range, north and northeast of Laguna Salada, landward of salinity intrusion zone. November 25, 2015.



Green turfgrass landward and above salinity intrusion zone (A - sand trap topographic highs, background) and yellow-green salt-tolerant weeds in lowest, most saline depressions (A – foreground). Matrix: (C) salt-killed brown-gray turfgrass litter. November 25, 2015.



Green turfgrass landward and above salinity intrusion zone (A - sand trap topographic highs, background) and yellow-green salt-tolerant weeds in lowest, most saline depressions (A – foreground). Matrix: (C) salt-killed brown-gray turfgrass litter. November 25, 2015.

Peter R. Baye
 Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net



Conspicuous narrow transition zone between salinity intrusion (turfgrass dieback, capillary transport of salt from shallow brackish groundwater, C) and drained, non-saline turfgrass on rolling topography (higher elevation) landward of salinity intrusion zone (A). November 25, 2015.



Corresponding wetland vegetation impacts of salinity intrusion, western central shore of Laguna Salada: dieback of rushes and bulrushes (*Juncus lescurii*, *Schoenoplectus pungens*) and stunted tules (*S. californicus*) on seaward fringing marsh. Green low vegetation at emergent bed of low lagoon includes rapidly growing salt-tolerant saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*). November 25, 2015.

2. Incipient salinity intrusion patterns at NW Sharp Park prior to drought: 2010




Depressions in turfgrass flats landward of the barrier beach are the first areas to exhibit acute salinity symptoms in 2010: acute recent dieback of turfgrass with sharp boundaries related to topography and drainage, salt efflorescence at surface of soil and leaf litter, and initial colonization of barrens by salt-tolerant weeds. Surrounding matrix of turfgrass remains green above depressions; no contrast between landward and seaward turfgrass dieback outside depressions. Incipient dieback (browning) of turfgrass is evident in shallower depressions. March 27, 2010.




Sharp boundaries and surface expression of capillary rise and efflorescence of salt from shallow groundwater in depressional topography of northwest golf course. White surface is salt efflorescence on dead grass litter and soil. Light brown is dead turfgrass litter; darker brown is prostrate broadleaf weedy

Peter R. Baye
Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net

vegetation intolerant of salt, accumulated prior to expansion of populations of salt-tolerant weed species. March 27, 2010.



Sharp boundaries and surface expression of capillary rise and efflorescence of salt from shallow groundwater in depression topography of northwest golf course. White surface in foreground is salt efflorescence on dead grass litter and soil. Light brown is dead turfgrass litter; darker brown is prostrate broadleaf weedy vegetation intolerant of salt, accumulated prior to expansion of populations of salt-tolerant weed species. March 27, 2010.



Surface expression of capillary rise and efflorescence of salt from shallow groundwater in depression at northwest golf course. White surface in foreground is salt efflorescence on dead grass litter and soil. Light brown at edge of dieback zone is dead turfgrass litter; darker brown in center is prostrate broadleaf weedy vegetation intolerant of salt, accumulated prior to expansion of populations of salt-tolerant weed species. March 27, 2010

Peter R. Baye
Coastal Ecologist
baye@earthlink.net




Detail of salt efflorescence (fine crystalline crust) on soil surface and leaf litter of barren area in depressional turfgrass dieback zone. March 27, 2010




Establishment of salt-tolerant weeds in salt efflorescence patches within turfgrass dieback zone – seedlings and mature rosettes of staghorn plantain (*Plantago coronopus*), only patchy in turfgrass dieback barrens in 2010. March 27, 2010. Later expansion of this and other salt-tolerant weed populations in depressions reversed the green/dieback pattern in 2015, apparently restricting green to the salt-tolerant weeds of the depressions where salt and moisture concentrate, and leaving dead turfgrass in new areas reaching lethal soil salt levels.



Establishment of salt-tolerant weeds in salt efflorescence patches within turfgrass dieback zone: spurrey (*Spergularia* sp., likely *S. bocconii*), in early stages of colonization in barrens in 2010. March 27, 2010.



Persistence of localized depressional turfgrass dieback areas in 2010, within matrix of irrigated turfgrass. June 10 2010.



(415) 310-5109

Peter R. Baye, Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist
33660 Annapolis Road
Annapolis, California 95412



baye@earthlink.net

MEMORANDUM

To: Stephanie Rexing, California Coastal Commission – North Central Coast

Date: April 16, 2015

SUBJECT: Sharp Park Project Project, 2-12-014, California Coastal Commission staff report and addendum: formulation and assessment of feasible alternatives to wetland dredging; technical clarifications.

Dear Ms. Rexing:

After reviewing the Staff Report (April 3, 2015) and Addendum (April 15, 2015) for the Sharp Park Infrastructure project, I would like to provide some clarifications regarding some major and minor technical issues regarding wetland ecology and management. I hope this will help correct some apparent confusion regarding formulation and assessment of feasible alternatives to dredging marsh as a means of increasing open water/marsh edge habitat, and reversing progressive spread of tules and cattail marsh into shallow open water habitats at Laguna Salada.

I am submitting the comments below not as an opponent or proponent of the project, nor on behalf of other project opponents or proponents. My main aim is to help clarify what a potentially feasible alternative to wetland dredging actually would be and how it would work, so that it can be meaningfully assessed for Coastal Act policy compliance (including conflict resolution procedures). I think I can outline a very simple, scientifically sound and feasible alternative to dredging based on modest seasonally timed (winter-spring-early summer) increases in mean lagoon water levels on the order of only 1 to 2 feet above current target levels, which are *feasible* (water levels not associated with golf course closure in recent years), even though they may not be the applicant's *preferred* alternative.

1. Alternatives to dredging marsh to maintain open water/marsh edge

The version of the water level management alternative assessed in the staff report has become distorted as a “straw-man” alternative, needlessly burdened with an infeasible premise of excessively high water levels (near 12 ft NAVD) that have not actually been proposed, even in a wetland restoration context.

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

...water levels required for such a process would be up to three to four feet **higher than the very highest winter/spring flooding ever recorded** to have occurred at the Golf Course (see above, 12 feet NAVD88 inundation line on Figure 1), effectually closing down the entire Golf Course for a longer duration of time. Staff Report p. 24; bold added for emphasis)

Please note that this description of the water management alternative, which raises water levels 3-4 ft above the *highest* flood levels above the *upper lagoon wetland edge*, is inconsistent with the Staff Report's account of the water management alternative on page 34, which raises water levels *above the submerged lagoon bed* at the *lower edge of marsh vegetation* to reach a minimum submergence depth of 4 feet. This confusion about the upper and lower reference positions for water level changes completely distorts the alternative.

2) Flooding of the Vegetation

Project opponents suggest "conventional" water depth management of the marsh and ponds. This entails raising the amount of water **around the lower edges of tules and cattails** from 2 to 4 feet deep **to a minimum of 4 feet deep**. The alternative also calls for amphibious equipment to mow tules and cattails to stumps before the winter flooding and frog breeding season begins. Opponents assert the submerged tule and cattail stumps will die off due to the lack of oxygen, solving the problem of emergent vegetation. (Staff Report p. 34)

I know of no scientific justification for assuming a 4-5 ft increase in lagoon water levels to 12 ft NAVD to achieve reduction of tule and cattail spread. Raising lagoon water levels to 12 ft NAVD would not only be physically infeasible over the summer, it would submerge even the uppermost marsh in about 3 feet of water, which is near the limit of tule and cattail flooding tolerance. That would constitute an absurd "overkill" straw-man alternative that would drown most of the existing Laguna Salada marsh into open water – an alternative designed to fail and cause unjustifiable impacts while overshooting the aim of increasing open water area commensurate with the proposed marsh dredging.

Instead, to achieve a modest increase of open water habitat and retreat of lower marsh edges commensurate with (or moderately greater than) proposed marsh dredging, a 1 to 2 ft rise in target winter-early summer water levels by reducing pumping, with inevitable gradual summer drawdown (due to natural seepage outflow and evapotranspiration, not pumping), should be considered. This would mean target water levels triggering pumping to rise to only about 8-9 ft NAVD, not 12 ft, during winter, spring, and early summer.

To drown out the edge of tules and cattails along the lower (deepest) end of the depth gradient they can tolerate near the open water edge under existing conditions, there is simply no need to maintain a super-elevated 12 ft NAVD constant lagoon water level all year or even part of the year. Tule and cattail "drowning" in the wetland zone now near their limit of tolerance – 3-4 ft deep water zones during the wet winter season and much of the

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

growing season -- could occur by raising water levels only 1-2 ft deep, making the same zone 4-5 ft deep over winter and spring. This would exceed their limits of tolerance for high survivorship (regrowth), even if drawdown of water levels below limits of submergence tolerance later occur by mid-summer.

This drowning-dieback management method – flooding out cattails and tules by controlled episodes of excessive water levels for part of the year – is a conventional marsh habitat management method that predates wetland ecology as a science. It also emulates natural processes of among-year and between-season fluctuations in non-tidal lagoon water levels, which naturally keep dominant low marsh species like tules and cattails in check. Thus, it does not matter if shallow water conditions occasionally occur in drought years or multi-year droughts, as long as occasional wet years with prolonged high water stands around 8-9 ft during the winter and growing season occur.

The longer periods of deeper submergence along the lagoon depth gradient is what holds tules and cattails in check. All coastal lagoons usually draw usually down gradually during the summer evaporation period. They tend to equilibrate or “bottom out” as they approach the elevation of beach groundwater as freshwater inflows from groundwater and streams decline. But *starting* the marsh growing season at the bottom (shallow lagoon low stand, late summer-like low water) even at the start of growth in earliest spring – unleashes the progressive tule spread that the applicant is trying to address with dredging instead of managing them with naturalistic seasonally higher fluctuating water levels

As for aquatic mowing of low marsh near the open water edge (cutting tule and cattail shoots at their bases in fall, prior to rains and frog breeding), this technique is only a potential supplemental action to maximize physiological stress on cattail and tule roots and rhizomes during periods of deep submergence. In contrast with dredging to maintain open water in shallows that would otherwise support marsh, it would be a one-time event coordinated with initial raising of winter-spring lagoon water levels.

The functional basis for aquatic mowing to control tules and cattails at depth near their limits of tolerance (3-4 ft) is as follows. Submerged cattail and tule roots and below-mudline buds “breathe” through air passages in both live and dead standing shoots above the water surface. When these above-waterline shoots are cut or submerged, roots and rhizomes deplete limited reserves of oxygen, and are exposed to natural sediment toxins like sulfides, which are otherwise neutralized by low levels of oxygen diffusing from roots. The only way the mown plants can reconnect roots to oxygen pathways to roots is by elongating new shoots above the waterline. Submergence by 3-4 feet of water or more severely limits the ability of roots to resume normal metabolism, compared with intact plants with standing shoots above the waterline. Aquatic mowing of marsh arguably has significantly less wetland impact (equipment mobilization, sediment disturbance, biogeochemical and water quality effects) than dredging marsh sediment.

There is another major difference between the water level management alternative and proposed dredging with regard to the spatial pattern of open water and marsh, and marsh drainage and pumping, and it relates to the contrasting basic purposes of flood control versus habitat enhancement. Moderately raised lagoon water levels (1-2 ft above existing baseline near 7 ft NAVD) would not produce a large, deep linear ditch aimed at the pump intake forebay, with maximum efficiency for drainage and pumping (*i.e.*, floodwater conveyance), as dredging a canal would. The remnants of the old ditch are apparently infilled with vegetation and the young peat (organic substrate) it produced, so it is uncertain whether raising water levels would re-open shallow water over the old ditch alignment significantly, if at all.

In contrast, raising lagoon water levels by 1-2 ft would very likely open more water habitat next to the lowest elevation marsh at the existing open water/marsh edge, along a depth gradient controlled by bathymetry of the lagoon. This difference discriminates between the basic project purpose as flood control for recreation land use, and the (incidental or fictitious) purpose of increasing open water/marsh habitat edge. But if the basic purpose is really to increase open water/marsh habitat and reverse progressive spread of marsh into open water (caused by long-term marsh pumping and drainage to stable shallow summer-like water levels most of the year), then a properly designed water management alternative would be more effective and environmentally superior (higher short-term and long-term benefit/lower impact).

I agree with the Staff Report conclusion that dredging is at most a very short-term, *temporary* solution to the problem of progressive marsh spread into open water:

By analogy, clearing of the vegetation and sediment is a *temporary* action to maintain the existing capacity of the pumps.” [Staff Report p. 23].

...shallow water, which in one sense, benefits egg laying by the CRLF because the frogs prefer warmer waters, also promotes the growth of cattails and tules, causing the encroachment of emergent vegetation within LS and HSP. This spread of emergent vegetation not only compromises the pumping operations, but also leads to loss of open water habitat needed by CRLF.13 SFRPD has explained that the *current project activities proposed in this CDP application consist of a short-term solution to an ongoing problem*. SFRPD is currently considering long-term solutions... Staff report p. 22

In addition, the project represents a *temporary solution to an existing problem* that may be already aggravated by the ongoing maintenance activities at the Golf Course. Specifically, ongoing pumping activities at the Golf Course, which will continue as a result of the infrastructure improvements and replacement pumps, may continue to maintain low water levels that all parties agree aggravate the spread of emergent vegetation which compromises open water breeding habitat for CRLF. So, while this

project proposes a temporary feasible management *solution, the ongoing pumping may continue to exacerbate the problem in the long-term.* Staff report p. 25:

These statements appear to be inconsistent with Staff Report findings on page 2, which appear to be unexplained and without citation:

Additionally, clearing sediments and vegetation from Horse Stable Pond *will maintain the long-term functional capacity* of the wetland complex and *may eventually increase such capacity* consistent with Coastal Act Section 30233(c).

As long as the lagoon is maintained artificially shallow most of the year, the marsh will re-occupy all shallow water within its limits of submergence tolerance. Maintenance of perpetually low summer-like water levels most of the year also implies *permanent, perpetual dredging cycles*, probably on the order of 5 years, to maintain open ditches. It also inevitably implies *permanent (cyclic) impacts* of marsh maintenance dredging. Is this foreseeable ongoing, cumulative dredging impact to wetlands assessed in the staff report? Or is the project treated as a one-time event? I know of only one other coastal wetland in California occupied by federally listed endangered species where regulatory agencies approve of routine dredging of marsh as maintenance activity: “grandfathered” (century-old) vast areas of managed waterfowl marshes of Suisun Marsh, where routine non-tidal ditch maintenance has relatively low-level impacts to one widespread listed wildlife species, for which applicants have substantial compensatory mitigation obligations.

The Staff Report also infers that raising water levels would increase water level fluctuations that adversely impact breeding of California red-legged frogs. This matter requires careful analysis, and I believe it is basically incorrect. The water level fluctuations actually should decrease, not increase, as the target water level is raised, because with less deviation between target threshold levels triggering pumping and flood levels, pumps (should activate less often during flood periods. Thus, rapid, abrupt drawdown of lagoon levels during the frog breeding season should decrease in both frequency and magnitude.

I can find no documented evidence that Sharp Park golf recreation is now significantly impaired by shallow flooding of wetland and golf turf margins around elevation 9 ft NAVD in 2015. I observed shallow flooding of mown turf areas around holes 14-15 (approximately 9 ft elevation, dead reckoning by topographic maps; I did not conduct elevation surveys of water levels). Even in this drought year, on April 2 and March 7, Sharp Park golf course was open and busy (many players even near sunset). See photos below, taken from Sharp Park Boulevard. Both golf players and ducks were present side-by-side along the flooded edges of the northeast corner of the golf course. Is it the applicant’s burden to demonstrate that golf is actually “infeasible” at approximately 9 ft water levels, rather than merely not the applicant’s preferred alternative?

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,

baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109



April 2, 2015



March 7, 2015



March 7, 2015

2. Historical Ecology of Sharp Park

The Staff Report Addendum on page 5 states, "...in regards to the historic ecology of Sharp Park staff does not see a significant area of disagreement between what has been presented in the staff report and what was presented by the project opponents". The Staff Report is inconsistent in its statements regarding historical ecology of Laguna Salada, possibly due to citation of different sources and inadvertent misinterpretation. The problematic statement of historical ecology occurs on page 34 of the Staff Report, where it reiterates local lore:

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

Sharp Park is unusual in that natural conditions are not necessarily the best conditions for the sensitive species in question here. Under completely natural conditions, without the berm and with no pumping, CRLF would probably not exist at the site as the water would be too brackish. The CRLF began surviving at the site after the water became less salty....[Staff Report p. 34]

This statement above is not consistent with Staff Report statements citing Dr. John Dixon's memo (Exhibit 7), which is substantially correct and agrees with statement of "opponents" that the lagoon was normally non-tidal, and only intermittently tidally influenced through an unstable and ephemeral tidal inlet:

The watershed is too small for runoff to maintain on open inlet or regularly breach the barrier beach, but the lagoon was probably **intermittently and briefly connected to the ocean through an outlet channel** and it periodically received sea water that overtopped the sand berm adjacent to the beach. **These hydrological characteristics probably resulted in a salinity gradient from brackish near the beach to fresh at the landward edge.** (Staff Report Exhibit 7, April 2 Dixon memo; bold added for emphasis)

In their letter of April 13, 2015 the project opponents claim that contrary to the staff report findings, "Sharp Park was historically a backbarrier lagoon/beach ecosystem, and was not influenced by *daily* tides."

To clarify, there is a huge ecological difference between "influenced by daily tides" and "intermittently and briefly connected to the ocean through an outlet channel". Daily tides occur through permanently open tidal inlets, like those of swell-sheltered south-facing tidal lagoons such as Bolinas Lagoon, Drakes Estero, or Bodega Harbor, or jetty-maintained inlets like Moss Landing. The relevant significant point here is that overwhelming physical process and historical ecological evidence supports the hypothesis that Laguna Salada supported fresh-brackish wetland gradient with tule, cattail, and bulrush marsh, long before the berm or golf course. This is not consistent with the Staff Report's causal attribution of fresh-brackish wetlands to the berm on page 7: "*As a result of the berm*, the wetlands found within the Golf Course transitioned from historically tidally influenced saltwater wetlands that were brackish near the beach, to modernly freshwater wetlands (see Dr. John Dixon's Memo)."

Natural fresh-brackish lagoon wetland gradients are typical of coarse-grained, west-facing barrier beaches and the lagoons they enclose in the North Central Coast region. These fresh-brackish natural lagoon wetland ecosystems support California red-legged frogs, western pond turtles, and garter snake subspecies in the absence of artificial dikes, berms, or golf courses. Many examples with supporting analysis are provided in the appendices of the peer-reviewed ESA-PWA (2011) report on Laguna Salada, which is substantially consistent with Dr. Dixon's memo. <https://www.savethefrogs.com/actions/sharp-park/images/Sharp-Park-Report.pdf>

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

The historical Laguna Salada, prior to Sharp Park construction, supported fringing marshes with cattails and bulrushes that were intolerant of high salinity. Laguna Salada was ... a brackish to fresh-brackish wetland like other seasonal or nontidal coastal lagoons in the region.”... We conclude that Laguna Salada in its pre-disturbance state was a backbeach lagoon that was predominantly non-tidal and primarily formed by rainfall runoff pooling behind the beach ridge. The coarse-grained beach was built and maintained by strong wave action and adequate sediment supply. Our analysis indicates that the lagoon was not big enough to maintain a tidal opening against the large waves that would close it off. However, waves were (and are) large enough to overwash the beach and bring in salt water. Therefore, we conclude that salinity was controlled by fresh runoff but was variable fresh-brackish (low salinity) due to wave overwash and brief tidal incursions following breaching

We conclude that fresh-brackish CRLF and SFGS wetland habitat existed at Laguna Salada before the golf course was constructed, when the site was modified for agriculture. We also conclude that pre-agricultural conditions could have, and likely did, include CRLF and SFGS habitat. (ESA-PWA 2011).

Again, the importance of this point is that the origin and maintenance of fresh-brackish wetland gradients and listed species did not depend on golf or artificial berms. Fresh-brackish lagoon wetlands naturally occur throughout the region, and there is unambiguous evidence of cattail-tule fresh-brackish marsh at the landward end of Laguna Salada prior to the golf course.

3. Scenic coastal views. (Staff Report p. 2, 3, 18)

The analysis of scenic views at Sharp Park is related to topography and vegetation of the beach, berm (“seawall”), and golf course, as well as public access constraints like the new fence along the berm. I do not claim expertise on scenic views, but I would like to clarify some basic confusion in the Staff Report related to views on p. 18:

Sharp Park is a public park that provides recreational opportunities for all people. In addition to the golf course, it offers breathtaking views to hikers, runners, cyclists, and due to the easy access by car and on foot, to visitors who may only have a short time available to see the ocean. Sharp Park qualifies as a sensitive coastal resource area due to its significant recreational value and because it is a highly scenic area.

The scenic coastal views of the ocean, beach, and lower Mori Point cliffs from the golf course itself are obscured by the berm/seawall, which has a crest elevation about 6 ft or more above the beach crest, which ranges around 17-18 ft elevation or higher. Most of the golf course lies in the depression of partly filled Laguna Salada at elevations well below the berm crest. Even from Sharp Park Boulevard, above the golf course, the beach is not visible

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

across the berm. The spectacular views described are possible only from the berm/seawall and beach, which is separated from the golf course by a new/recent fence. In addition, relict Monterey cypress groves (dead standing snags and live trees) further obscure coastal vistas from the golf course itself. Therefore, the scenic view qualities described and extolled in the Staff Report are features of the berm, not the golf course in its current form. The original Alister MacKenzie golf course design apparently allow for open coastal views, but that came at the cost of excessive vulnerability to coastal storms which eventually destroyed the western part of the golf course, in an obvious storm overwash hazard zone.

4. Monitoring methodology and sampling strategy. In order to generate interpretable, analyzable data, conditions for monitoring must include requirements for the spatial sampling plan (distribution of sampling locations on landward and seaward portions of the lagoon, and in transects spanning the lagoon/marsh gradients). In addition, vegetation data must include position data (GIS or ground survey) data on the lower edge of marsh/water edge vegetation, in order to interpret horizontal marsh retreat/advance responses to water level changes over time. Aggregate “cover” area estimates will not be sufficient for this purpose. In addition, disturbance-free (exclosure) transects including the upland/marsh edge will be necessary to determine the accurate position of the wetland boundary and buffer zones. This will also necessitate accurate identification of grasses, including *Agrostis stolonifera* (creeping bentgrass, a widespread wetland grass also occurring in some golf turf; distinct from *Poa* (bluegrass) species).

5. Chronology of earthen berm incremental construction. The Staff Report (p. 12) states that the golf course was “separated from the beach by a berm built in 1941 to keep the ocean from flooding the course”, and then jumps to the description of the recent armored condition: “This earthen berm, with a rock revetment on its western side..”. This chronology is inconsistent with historical aerial and ground photography of Salada Beach and Laguna Salada. I would recommend that staff rigorously examine the available historical aerial and ground photography available to develop an accurate chronology of the berm. Robert Battalio (ESA) did this for the ESA-PWA report on Laguna Salada (2011), and concluded that:

While dune building and stabilization in the 1920s to 1940s altered the natural beach berm morphology, a significant coastal structure did not exist until decades later. A review of historical photographs and documents indicates that the existing levee was not constructed until the 1980s. The majority of the coastal levee/seawall was constructed in 1989-1990. A review of available photos prior to 1983 shows an earth embankment at the north and south ends of the shore, with no embankment in the middle third. The embankments are not as large as the existing levee and proposed seawall structures, and do not extend the full length of the shore. (ESA-PWA 2011 p. 15; and Appendices)

6. Conclusions. Without prejudice to permit issuance or denial, I recommend that staff rigorously re-examine the premises and conclusions of the alternatives analysis, particularly

Peter R. Baye Ph.D.
Coastal Ecologist, Botanist,
baye@earthlink.net
(415) 310-5109

with regard to accurate, objective feasibility thresholds and hydrologic-ecological thresholds. Scientifically sound analysis of wetland management alternatives is critically important in context of wetland dredging policies and conflict resolution procedures, and evaluation of reasonable public interest trade-offs between recreation policy priorities and coastal wetland or ESHA resource conservation priorities.

7. Summary statement of qualifications (coastal wetland ecology expertise).

I have over 35 years' experience as a professional coastal ecologist, including senior wetland regulatory analysis for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers San Francisco District, and endangered species recovery planning focused on coastal wetland ecosystems of California, with specialization in ecology of coastal lagoons, tidal marshes, beaches, and dunes. I have closely observed coastal lagoons from Marin to Santa Cruz for over two decades, and my professional wetland consulting work includes restoration, enhancement guidance for multiple coastal lagoons managed and owned by California State Parks and National Park Service. I co-authored a detailed and comprehensive assessment of modern and historical ecology of Laguna Salada with ESA-PWA (now ESA) in 2010.

WILD Equity

INSTITUTE

*Building a healthy and sustainable global community for people
and the plants and animals that accompany us on Earth*

The Wild Equity Institute is working to build a new public park at Sharp Park in Pacifica, CA. With our partners at the NPCA, the Neighborhood Parks Council, the National Japanese American Historical Society, and many other organizations, we have proposed to close the course and partner with the National Park Service to restore the land and interpret its hidden history, including the former WWII internment camp and prehistoric artifacts that have been found on the site.

Perhaps in response to this idea and litigation, **for the first time San Francisco is proposing to landmark Sharp Park Golf Course. This proposal is not well informed.** Below you will find background information about this proposal.

Although Alister MacKenzie, the original architect of Sharp Park Golf Course, has made some important golf courses, there is significant disagreement about (a) the quality of the original architectural design at Sharp Park and whether it is a reflection of Mackenzie's signature design, and (b) its current integrity. **Every history written about this course before the restoration proposal we are advancing was announced concluded that the original MacKenzie design no longer exists at Sharp Park today.**

Some contemporary golf advocates have suggested that these previous assessments were based on misinformation or bad data. They have gone as far as suggesting that several of the links at Sharp Park remain consistent with Sharp Park's original design. As a preliminary matter, **golf courses are not simply a collection of links: they are a course, and to suggest that because a few golf links remain in the places Alister MacKenzie placed them does not answer the question about the historic integrity of the course as a whole.**

But more importantly, these assessments are directly contradicted by assessments made away from the heat of this dispute, and not conducted by individuals with a stake in the outcome. **Indeed, the only individuals who have asserted that Sharp Park is historic are associated with the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance—a golf activist organization that is not qualified to provide these assessments, and has an inherent conflict in doing so regardless.**

Therefore, the previous assessments are more likely to be unbiased and accurate: even if the historians who wrote them would prefer the original course be restored, instead of than the natural areas upon which the course was built.

Some of MacKenzie's courses should be considered for recognition. But Sharp Park is simply not the place to start. There is not a single Alister MacKenzie golf course presently listed on the California or federal registers of historic places, and most everyone would agree that Sharp Park is not one of the greatest examples of his work. Indeed, **the litany of problems the golf course faces—from chronic annual flooding, to the killing of endangered species, to the low grades given the course by its own golfers, to the chronic financial instability of the course, to the inevitable loss of the site to sea level rise as our climate changes—all indicate that this particular course does not exemplify the work of a master implementing his art.**

Moreover, the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance has distributed false information to the Planning Department and to the Historic Preservation Commission arguing that Sharp Park Golf Course itself has been designated an historic landmark by the City of Pacifica. **This is not true: indeed, to the extent any historic preservation has been provided to Sharp Park, it has been equally provided to the trees, lagoon, and marsh on the property,** as will be shown below. Indeed, a proposal to try and landmark the golf course was tabled indefinitely by Pacifica's Planning Commission in 2009.

The Pacifica General Plan (as updated August 2005) Historic Preservation Element. This section includes a "list and map of all of the sites and structures felt to be of historic significance in Pacifica."

With regards to Sharp Park, the Pacifica Historic Sites list includes:

- Number 18. Laguna Salada & Marsh**
- Number 19. Sharp Park Golf Course & Clubhouse**
- Number 20. Trees in Sharp Park**

However, this section also states that "the element would be implemented by an Historic Ordinance which would establish a Pacifica Historic Sites Advisory Committee to review proposed changes to sites and structures designated on the Historic Sites Map and advise the Planning Commission and City Council of the appropriateness of the proposal." **No such Historic Ordinance or Advisory Committee was ever created: instead Pacifica implemented this through its zoning code.**

Title 9 of Pacifica's Zoning Code, Chapter 7 covers Historic Preservation. Section 9-7.208 of the Code lists Pacifica's designated Historic Sites:

Sec. 9-7.208. - Final designations.

The following structures, having been approved by the Planning Commission and Council for designation as historic landmarks pursuant to the procedures of this article, are hereby given final landmark designation:

- (a) Sanchez Adobe;
- (b) Sharp Park Golf Course Clubhouse;**
- (c) Little Brown Church;
- (d) San Pedro Schoolhouse;
- (e) 185 Carmel Avenue;
- (f) Vallemar Station, 2125 Cabrillo Highway;
- (g) Anderson's Store, 220 Paloma Avenue;
- (h) 165 Winona Avenue; and
- (i) Dollaradio Station.

(§ 1, Ord. 482-C.S., eff. May 27, 1987, as amended by § 1, Ord. 533-C.S., eff. September 27, 1989, § 1, Ord. 534-C.S., eff. September 27, 1989, and § 2, Ord. 569-C.S., eff. July 10, 1991, § II, Ord. No. 770-C.S., eff. May 26, 2010)

As you can see, only the golf course clubhouse has been designated historic by Pacifica. **Laguna Salada itself, along with the golf course, are 'potential' historic resources according to the general plan, but because these potential resources were never finalized into actual landmarks, they are not so protected.**

Only Sharp Park Golf Course's clubhouse is listed as an historic landmark in Pacifica, an uncontroversial finding that is not impacted in any way by the restoration proposals we have all pursued. However, **to rely on Pacifica's general plan as reason to landmark the golf course takes one only so far, because the marsh, lagoon and trees—all directly threatened by the course, are provided the same level of so-called protection as the course itself.**

San Francisco's own Historic Preservation Commission, the City's agency responsible for identifying and designating landmarks, disagreed with this assessment. **On September 21, 2011, the Commission ordered staff to prepare comments stating that they do not concur in the Recreation and Parks Department's position that Sharp Park retains historic integrity.**

There is good reason for this determination:

- The Recreation and Parks Department's Historic Resources Evaluation provides **insufficient information and evidence to support its conclusion that Sharp Park retains historic integrity.**
- The evaluation also **lacks a proper analysis of the historic landscape**, and thus there isn't an appropriate baseline to judge integrity.
- The Evaluation also **fails to consider a range of mitigation measures**, and thus precludes restoration of endangered species habitat. Historic preservation and natural resources protection are not exclusive – Crissy Field and Muir Woods restoration are examples of natural resource restoration projects where historic resources existed.
- The National Park Service has asked to play a role in any historic resource evaluation of the golf course – per their 2009 statement – because the course is within their historic boundary and they are undertaking a multi-million dollar wildlife habitat restoration project adjacent to Sharp Park, yet the City has not engaged the Park Service. **The Park Service is considered the most respected expert in historic resource preservation.**

Attached to this memo are previous statements by the National Park Service and the City of San Francisco opposing landmarking the golf course in Pacifica; written histories about how the course no longer retains integrity; and a link-by-link assessment of what has been lost at the golf course.

WILD Equity

INSTITUTE

*Building a healthy and sustainable global community for people
and the plants and animals that accompany us on Earth*

Sharp Park today bears no resemblance to Alister MacKenzie's original design. **Every link has been changed at Sharp Park—in many cases radically, and many holes have been lost completely.** It is misleading to claim that any historical integrity exists at the course.


- The water features on five MacKenzie holes east of Laguna Salada, original holes 1, 9, 15, 16, & 17, have been culverted, eliminating crucial water hazards essential to his design.
- Five holes west of Laguna Salada, including original holes 3, 4, 6, 7, & 8 were destroyed completely by massive coastal storm surges and the subsequent construction of the berm.
- Two others, original holes 2 & 5, were severely damaged and modified to eliminate additional water features and other elements of their design. Now the site of hole 12, the original hole 2 was shortened by 60 yards and a stroke while the strategic features—including its proximity to a much larger Horse Stable Pond than exists currently—are almost completely irrelevant to the hole's play today. Hole number 5, which was considered by Jack Fleming to be "one of the most interesting holes on the course, similar to Dr. MacKenzie's 'ideal golf hole,'" is now the current site of hole 17, but other than occupying the same space the hole bears absolutely no resemblance to the original hole 5: a tee shot over Laguna Salada has been removed, and dual fairways have been combined into one, eliminating strategy alternatives integral to MacKenzie's design.
- Original holes 10 and 11, now the location of holes 14 and 15, have likewise been modified with changed greens and fairways that bear no resemblance to MacKenzie's layout. Indeed, Daniel Wexler argued that the original hole 10 was perhaps the course's best link, but its essential feature—a double fairway—no longer exists.
- Original hole 12, now the location of hole 18, has had sand traps removed from the design. In addition, original hole 13 (now 3), and original holes 14 and 15 (now the location of holes 8 and 2) described by Wexler as "not among the layout's finest" to begin with, have likewise had hazards reconfigured, as has the final original hole, 18 (now the location of hole 10).
- In addition, the theory of the course—the creation of a links-type, seaside course—was entirely upended when the berm was built separating the course from the ocean.

THE MISSING LINKS


America's Greatest Lost Golf Courses & Holes

MISSING LINKS

DANIEL WEXLER



SHARP PARK																					
400	274	423	120	338	168	383	398	538	3042	392	142	483	345	143	330	363	471	443	3112	6154	
4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	35	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	36	71	



1943 aerial survey reveals a number of MacKenzie's original holes still intact, plus four newer ones built to the east. (National Archives)

SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE

PACIFICA, CA

Opened in 1931 / 6,154 yards Par-71

As today, some 65 years after his death, Dr. Alister MacKenzie remains perhaps the most celebrated golf architect in history, it is truly remarkable that two public courses he laid out in major American metropolises could have been so short-lived and poorly documented. Yet Bayside, as we have seen, labored in (and vanished into) almost complete obscurity—and it cannot even begin to compare with the briefly-lived legacy of San Francisco's Sharp Park.

MacKenzie's Sharp Park layout is surely one of golf architecture's most enduring mysteries. Owing to the fact that it was built in 1931, then washed into oblivion by a coastal storm shortly thereafter, its original design was seen firsthand by very few. Nor was this initial version in any way adequately recorded, with few photographs of any kind known to remain in existence. Further, a visit to today's 6,299-yard facility offers little; this vastly-altered layout serving mostly to make one wonder if a vintage MacKenzie design ever *could* have existed upon this site.

But the Doctor's original, located very much upon this same land, was all that its tantalizing prospects have suggested, a marvelous golf course featuring seaside holes, two double fairways, a large lake, and a cypress-dotted setting fairly reminiscent of Monterey. It was, in short, a municipal masterpiece.

Located just 10 miles south of downtown San Francisco, the site given to MacKenzie was uncommonly fine for a public facility, including a nearly 1,000-yard oceanfront stretch along Salada Beach. For a county whose public course facilities at Harding and Lincoln Parks were among the busiest in the nation, the development of Sharp Park was a godsend, but this wonderful property was not without its drawbacks.

For one thing, a fair amount of the land required shoring up with massive quantities of dredged sand in an expensive, Lido-like operation. Second, the site was partially divided by a small county road, a circumstance dictating that three of MacKenzie's back-nine holes be separated from their 15 brethren. Years later this road would be rerouted, though by that time the storm-driven reconfiguration of the golf course would still leave four newer holes separated, about the only commonality between MacKenzie's work and the course in play today.

The 1931 layout began with a dogleg-right par-4 of 400 yards, a strong but not especially memorable opener. But things changed quickly at the second, a 274-yard par-4 with alternate tees situated on either side of the first green. In what today might be referred to as "risk/reward" style, this nearly-driveable hole featured a large bunker front-right of the putting surface and a lake to the left of the fairway, creating the wonderful question of just how near the water one dared to venture in pursuit of an easier angle for his second.

The third was a long two-shotter of 423 yards, playing directly north along the beachfront. Again the risk/reward question was laid before us: play safely down the middle and deal with a front-right greenside bunker or aggressively skirt the beach in pursuit of an open second? Seaside winds generally affected play at Sharp Park greatly, bringing those most unlikish of obstacles—trees—into play along the right side as well.

Following the short fourth, a precise pitch played along the lake's westward shoreline, one reached the first of the dual-fairway holes, the 338-yard fifth. Here the player's options were numerous with a "safe" left-side route leaving the most difficult second-shot, a dangerous lakefront fairway opening up a more direct line, or the all-out blast over everything leaving a mere pitch from a wide-open angle. As at the second hole, a second tee positioned left of the previous green served to create additional angles and variety.

The 385-yard seventh was the course's second and last seaside hole, playing directly south to a long, narrow green flanked on either side by sand. The slight angling of the putting surface again tempted one to drive close to the beach (particularly if the pin was cut back-left), but the lesser presence of trees at least made this tee shot a bit more forgiving.

The 398-yard eighth, though built with only one fairway, offered two very distinct lines of play. A drive aimed safely left was simple enough but set up a nearly all-carry approach across two front-left greenside bunkers. For the man capable of controlling a long fade, however, there was the option of skirting the treeline, a shot which, if brought off successfully, again yielded a more favorable approach.

Though one hesitates to name a best hole among so many good ones, the 392-yard 10th did

a fine job of nominating itself. Here was the double fairway concept played out to the fullest, the right side providing ample safety but a bunker-obscured second, the left requiring a gutsy tee shot to a water-guarded fairway but yielding a straight-on approach. Yet again, dual tee boxes varied the challenge from day to day, making the 10th a truly great hole—but an intimidating prospect for anyone hoping to slip past the starter and begin play on the back nine.

Following the 142-yard 11th came the long 12th, a 493-yarder distinctly reachable in two, provided one avoided several prominent trees and the out-of-bounds which ran down the entire left side.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the three holes exiled across the county road were not among the layout's finest, the 345-yard 13th being the best of the bunch with out-of-bounds also threatening its more-favored left side.

With the routing having returned to the clubhouse for a third time, one set out again at the 363-yard 16th, a par-4 following much the same path as today's first hole. Here a large mound punctuated the fairway some 175 yards off the tee, offering several different angles of play. The more difficult drive was the one aimed down the right side, close to a clump of trees. Naturally this choice also provided the better approach angle to a deep, narrow putting surface.

MacKenzie closed out Sharp Park with a pair of long finishers beginning with the 471-yard 17th. Though not a particularly difficult hole, this short par-5 often faced a strong sea breeze and featured out-of-bounds left, two bunkers, a meandering brook and a green laid precariously close to a rough, marshy depression. The 18th, by contrast, was a bit of a monster, its 443 yards requiring more brute strength than finesse, though the ability to draw one's tee shot would obviously have come in handy.

It was indeed unfortunate for Sharp Park that so many of its best holes fell along the property's ocean side, for it was this flank which took the brunt of any incoming storms. Following the early 1930s deluge that washed several of these gems out to sea, a massive berm was constructed (largely upon land once occupied by holes three and seven) to prevent history from repeating itself. The subsequent rerouting of the county road and reconfiguring of the lakeside holes has further muddled things so that today only a handful of holes run consistent with MacKenzie's originals, and no appreciable trace of his strategy remains in play.

How Sharp Park Would Measure Up Today

Oceanfront holes, double fairways, MacKenzie bunkering, marvelous scenery...

Any way you look at it, even at only 6,154 yards, Sharp Park would have to stand well out in front as America's finest municipal golf course.

Restoration anyone?

SHARP PARK

Being that the City had come by the lots at Sharp Park so cheaply (free in fact) they decided to bring in one of the world's foremost golf architects, Dr. Alister Mackenzie. The fact that Mackenzie and his assistant at that time, Jack Fleming, were able to design a golf course along the San Mateo County coast line was quite an accomplishment in itself. They managed to accomplish this difficult feat by dredging for fourteen months in order to build up the fairways.


On May 15, 1930 Robert Hunter, Jr. was appointed the superintendent of construction for Sharp Golf Course at a fee of \$750 for ten month's work. Four and a half months later on October 2, 1930 Willis Polk and Company was authorized to prepare plans and specifications for the starter's house at the golf course. The original cost of playing golf was \$2.00 per month and a card good for all three courses became available in May 1932 for \$5.00.

The courses's opening in 1932 was twice delayed due to wet conditions. The golf course officially opened April 1, 1932. Perhaps the fact that even the opening of the course had to be delayed twice due to winter rains should have warned of the drainage problems this site would always face. Normally a golf course will welcome the rest and revitalization the winter rains bring. In Sharp Park's case the winter rains brought about the annual flooding of Laguna Salada out on to playable portions of the golf course. This problem still persists 47 years later even though a 4,000 gallon water pump has been installed. Two factors contribute to the poor drainage problem at the Sharp Park site. First and foremost

is the fact that the course is built at sea level and thus was susceptible to changing tides. The second factor was the annual flooding of Laguna Salada itself.

The golf course that opened on April 1, 1932 was becoming increasingly popular until it was severely damaged by high tides in a storm during the winter of 1938. The holes constructed on or near the beach were unindated by the unchecked tides of the storm. This resulted in severe damage to the beach holes - Numbers 2 through 8. The course, generally considered one of the best tests of golf in Northern California would never be the same. The beach holes had to be abandoned and reconstruction was forced across the Coast Highway up into what is now referred to as "The Canyon Holes". The effect was much the same as taking a house with a beach view and turning it 180 degrees to face a mountain slope. This was the most drastic architectural change the Sharp Park layout would ever face. Even the State Highway construction in the early 1960's that wiped out one par three hole would not have as damaging effect as nature.

Sharp Park remains very busy to this day drawing players both from the City and from down the peninsula. During the winter, however, as the water table rises, the course becomes less playable and suffers a significant drop in play - more so than other municipal courses during the winter. One winter in the early 1970's flooding was so thorough that the unchecked water nearly reached the clubhouse.



September 1, 2009

Honorable Julie Lancelle
Mayor, City of Pacifica
City of Pacifica City Hall
170 Santa Maria Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044

Michael Crabtree, Planning Director
City of Pacifica
Planning Department
1800 Francisco Blvd.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Re: Proposed Designation of Sharp Park Golf Course as a Pacifica City Landmark

Dear Mayor Lancelle and Director Crabtree,

I am writing in regard to the City of Pacifica's application to designate the Sharp Park Golf Course a Historic Landmark under Pacifica Municipal Code, Chapter 7. We think this action is both inappropriate and unnecessary. Under California law, the City of Pacifica cannot regulate land use at Sharp Park which is owned by the City and County of San Francisco. (See, Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53090, et seq., *Akins v. County of Sonoma*, 67 Cal. 2d 185 (1967).) Therefore, any designation of the Sharp Park Golf Course as a historic landmark by the City of Pacifica will have no legal effect and, frankly is not helpful in furthering a legitimate public policy debate here in San Francisco.

We certainly recognize that Sharp Park Golf Course is used and enjoyed not just by many San Franciscans, but also by the residents of Pacifica, and that your City is concerned about any potential changes to it, and particularly to the golf course. As you may know Sharp Park is approximately 400 acres -- 237 of those acres are included in the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP). This Plan is currently undergoing environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act. We appreciate the historic and cultural value of the golf course, and an evaluation of the effects of the SNRAMP on the golf course as a potential historical resource will be included in the SNRAMP EIR.


As you also likely know, the area around the Sharp Park Golf Course contains habitat that support two special status species: San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*), listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act, and classified as a fully protected species under California Fish and Game Code § 5050; and the California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act and a state species of special concern. Under federal and state law, the City and County of San Francisco must ensure that the golf course operation does not endanger or harm either of these species. Recently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors enacted legislation directing the Recreation and Park Department to develop a plan for



restoring the habitat for the garter snake and red-legged frog in conformance with federal and state law. Currently, we are preparing option plans, including schedules and costs for presentation to the public and to the Board which we hope to have preliminarily completed in October 2009.

We take our stewardship responsibilities at Sharp Park very seriously. In a very difficult financial climate, we must manage the recreational, cultural and biological uses of the park in a manner that best balances legitimate recreational needs with our fiduciary and legal responsibility to protect the habitat. We will continue to include the City of Pacifica in our discussions as we evaluate plans Sharp Park's future.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Philip A. Ginsburg', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Philip A. Ginsburg
General Manager

cc: Mayor Gavin Newsom
Members of the Board of Supervisors
City Attorney Dennis Herrera
Members of the Recreation and Park Commission



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123

IN REPLY REFER TO:

L1415 (GOGA-PLAN)

July 20, 2009

Mr. Michael Crabtree
Planning Director
170 Santa Maria Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044

Re: Proposed Historic Landmark Designation for Sharp Park Golf Course. HLD-6-09

Dear Mr. Crabtree:

Enclosed is our statement regarding the proposed action above. Please make this part of the July 20, 2009 City of Pacifica Planning Commission hearing. If you have any questions, contact Nancy Hornor at (415) 561-4937.

Sincerely,

Frank Dean
Acting General Superintendent

Enclosure:



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123

IN REPLY REFER TO:

NPS Statement on Pacifica Landmark Designation for Sharp Park

July 20, 2009

We learned of the City of Pacifica's proposal to designate Sharp Park Golf Course as a Pacifica Historic Landmark when we received the public hearing notice. We were not notified of this proposal through the Pacifica GGNRA Advisory Committee, which was set up by the Pacifica City Council to discuss items pertinent to both bodies.

As you know, Sharp Park is within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and adjacent to lands that we manage at Sweeney Ridge and Mori Point. We are currently completing a multi-year restoration project at Mori Point, to protect the Endangered San Francisco Garter snake and the threatened Red-legged frog and provide for compatible recreation and community stewardship and educational activities. Therefore, we have an interest in the future of Sharp Park.

Although we concur that the golf course and club house, as well as the remains of the WWII internment camp, should be evaluated, we request that you not make a landmark designation without a professional assessment of the significance and integrity of the property. We can assist with such an evaluation and would like to work with City of Pacifica and the City of San Francisco to define an appropriate process that includes all stakeholders.

October 27, 2011

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
City of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Ste 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

RE: Sharp Park Golf Course – Historic Resource Evaluation

Dear Mr. Wycko,

I have reviewed Appendix C of the DEIR for the *Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan: Sharp Park Golf Course* and question the determination of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP). On page 5-4 the author suggests that Sharp Park Golf Course has historic significance under Criterion A and C under the NRHP and Criterion 1 and 3 for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Criterion C/3 requires that “a property embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values”. Based on the number and extent of alternations that have taken place since the period of significance (1929 – 1932) I question the validity of finding Sharp Park eligible as a historic resource.

*Bulletin 18 “How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes,”*¹ states “As defined by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the National Register criteria, to be eligible for the National Register a designed historic landscape must possess significance and integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship feeling and association.” Sharp Park Golf Course lacks integrity.

The *Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER)* prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. describes many alterations made to the course since 1932. Comparing the course layouts depicted in the two exhibits included in the Evaluation Report² one finds very few similarities between how the course was designed and how it exists today.

¹ National Park Service, “How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes,” *National Register Bulletin No. 18*, p. 6.

² The original Sharp Park Golf Links plan prepared by Mackenzie, Hunter & Egen (Figure 3) and the aerial of the Existing Golf Course (Figure 2).

Chris Cathy Christopher
Pattillo Garrett Kent

444 - 17th Street Oakland CA 94612
Tel 510.465.1284 Fax 510.465.1256

1. The original hole 1 (now hole 11) was a long, straight shot. The reconfigured hole doglegs to the right.
2. The original hole 2 (now hole 12) was a dogleg that wrapped around the south end of the course. Hole 12 is now a lot shorter with no dogleg.
3. The original holes 3, 4, and 8 were destroyed in a big storm and not replaced.
4. The original hole 5 offered multiple fairway options – a unique design feature of Mackenzie. Hole 17 which replaced 5 is a single straight shot.
5. The original hole 6 that ran east-west at the north boundary no longer exists.
6. The original hole 7 appears to be similar to current hole 16 identified on Figure 2 as having been built after 1941, after the period of significance.
7. The original holes 9 and 10 each offered double fairways. The replacement holes 13 and 14 eliminated these special features.
8. The original hole 11 – a short run - appears to be similar to current hole 15.
9. The original hole 12 was a long straight shot. It has been replaced by hole 18 that is longer with a dogleg.
10. The original holes 13, 14 and 15 were on the east side of the county road and generally paralleled the road running north-south. Today this area has four holes that all run east-west.
11. The original hole 16 was a dogleg left replaced by hole 3 a straight shot.
12. The original hole 17 ran east-west and was a long shot with a dogleg. Hole 8, a short, straight fairway replaced it.
13. The original hole 18 was a dogleg. This hole has been replaced by hole 2, a straight shot.

In summary only hole 11 (now hole 15) is similar to the original design. The layout of the remainder of the course has been substantially altered. The change to the order of how the holes are played is significant as it materially alters the sequence and nature of views the player experiences making it unlike what was intended by the designer. Other major changes implemented since the period of significance include:

- A. Elimination or reconfiguration of several sand traps.
- B. Construction of a seawall in 1941 to prevent flooding of the golf course. This eliminated views to the beach and Pacific Ocean and the essence of the links design concept.
- C. Filling a portion of the lagoon as part of the reconfiguration of hole 10.
- D. Installation of concrete golf cart paths along the back nine holes in 1996 where none existed previously.
- E. Culverting of water features on five holes and the elimination of water hazards – an important component of the original design.
- F. Installation of a 4000-gallon pump to help with annual flooding of Laguna Salada.
- G. Alternations made between 1985 and 1994 to accommodate female players such as shortening of the fairways.

Adding together all of these alterations it is apparent that Sharp Park Golf Course lacks sufficient integrity to qualify as a historic resource under criterion C/3. The course no longer reflects the work of Alister Mackenzie. The land use remains a golf course but otherwise there are few similarities between the course that existed during the period of significance and what remains today.

The Evaluation Report notes that Alister Mackenzie attained status as a master golf course architect. Appendix C on page 4-7 notes, "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." Regrettably, today nothing remains of Mackenzie's unique routing. He continues to explain that his work "was known for its original and distinctive bunkers, with irregular shapes and each with its own design." And "Distinctive bunkering, the use of small hillocks around greens, and exciting hole locations were Mackenzie's trademark".

Another of Mackenzie's trademarks was his talent for working with natural landform and subtly integrating his courses with a site's topography to take full advantage of the unique qualities of each site. Quoting from the HRER, "Mackenzie felt that the success of golf course construction depended entirely on making the best use of natural features and devising artificial ones indistinguishable from nature." The HRER continues with, "..... while many architects try to create a special course, Mackenzie could figure out how best to fit holes into 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."

In summary, defining characteristics of Mackenzie's design style included unique course routing, a talent for adapting a course to fit the land, an ability to offer challenge to players of varying skill levels, distinctively designed bunkers, and inclusion of multiple fairway options – offering advantage to those to took greater risks in their play. The vast majority of these features have been eliminated from the course. According to Wexler, in a recently published article "no appreciable trace of his strategy remains in play."³

Unfortunately, Sharp Park Golf Course began to fail even before the course opened in 1932 because Mackenzie failed to fully understand the forces of nature at this site. Page 4-3 of the Evaluation Report notes that the opening was delayed twice due to "drainage problems on the course due to winter rains." Shortly after the course opened a major storm washed out a large portion of the course and necessitated construction of the seawall in 1938 intended to prevent similar damage in the future. This type of damage has continued – as recently as 1982 a major storm wiped out several holes. In 1990 another breach killed many of the cypress trees on the course. Few of the golf courses designed by Alister Mackenzie remain intact today. It would be ironic and misplaced if this course – one that represents a failure in design – became a lasting representative of his life's work by being officially designated as a historic property.

³ Dr. Alister Mackenzie, "Sharp Park Golf Course", Pacifica, CA page 113

The determination of historic significance is tied to a site's level of integrity. According to *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques*⁴ "The historic integrity of a cultural landscape relates to the ability of the landscape to convey its significance." And "Historic integrity is assessed to determine if the landscape characteristics and associated features, and the spatial qualities that shaped the landscape during the historic period of significance, are present in much the same way as they were historically." Emphasis added.

The guide continues, "Historic integrity is determined by the extent to which the general character of the historic period is evident, and the degree to which incompatible elements obscuring the character can be reversed". In the case of Sharp Park Golf Course the changes to the course were not the result of the normal evolution of a living landscape – maturing trees and other plantings, but rather major changes that were forced to solve functional problems that resulted from flaws in the original design – a failure to fully understand the power of nature and its ability to wreak havoc. The changes made to Sharp Park Golf Course cannot be reversed because doing so would recreate the conditions that necessitated that the alterations be made in the first place.

Page 5-2 of the HRER notes, "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."


In essence for a site to meet the criteria of historic significance most of the designed features must look as they did during the period of significance. This may be true for the Clubhouse and maintenance building which are not addressed here, but it is not the case at Sharp Park Golf Course and no doubt explains why "None of the state or national registers identified Sharp Park Golf Course as a historical resource" as noted on page 4-1 of the HRER.

By making the finding that the existing golf course represents a historic resource under criterion C/3 it seems that Tetra Tech failed to appreciate not only the subtleties of golf course architecture but its essential features. Just because there was a golf course present in 1932 the fact that there is still a golf course present today, does not qualify the current course as a historic resource.

⁴ *A Guide To Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process and Techniques* by Robert R. Page, Cathy A. Gilbert, and Susan A. Dolan, US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, 1998.

Sharp Park Golf Course lacks integrity. While a golf course at this site is consistent with the historic land use, that fact is insufficient evidence for a finding of historic significance. Failure to demonstrate significance voids eligibility for historic resource status. I urge you to consider this as you plan for the future use of Sharp Park.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chris S. Pattillo". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Chris Pattillo, ASLA
Historic Landscape Architect
President, PGAdesign^{inc}

CHRIS PATTILLO

HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

PGAdesign^{inc}, 1979 to present

EDUCATION - REGISTRATION

Master of Landscape Architecture, 1975, UC Berkeley

Bachelor of Arts, 1972, UC Berkeley

California Landscape Architect, #1925

ASSOCIATIONS

Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS), No. California Chapter, Co-Founder 2004, Chair 2004-2009 & Vice Chair 2010

American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), Member

ASLA Historic Preservation Professional Practice Committee, National Chair & Vice Chair 2006-2009

California Genealogy Society, Vice President & Board member 2010

Garden Conservancy, Member

California Preservation Foundation, Member

National Trust, Member

Oakland Heritage Alliance, Member

Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Member

Oakland Chamber of Commerce Economic Develop Committee

Open Space, Conservation & Recreation Elements (OSCAR), Advisory Committee

AWARDS

Oakland Chamber of Commerce: "Small Business of the Year" 1995

Oakland Chamber of Commerce: "Woman Owned Business of the Year" 2000

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Badger Pass Ski Area CLR, Yosemite Natl. Park, CA

Doyle Drive in San Francisco Presidio HALS, San Francisco, CA

Atchison Village HSR, Richmond, CA

Meyers Estate Garden Master Plan & Maintenance Guidelines, Union City, CA

Roeding Park HALS, Fresno, CA

Sakai-Oishi Nurseries HALS, Richmond CA

William Land Park Cultural Landscape Survey & Evaluation, Sacramento

Berkeley City Club Gardens HALS, Berkeley, CA

PUBLICATIONS

"Preparing a Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) History: Brief Guide to Identifying and Documenting HALS Sites," co-author, *National Park Service, US Dept of the Interior*, Washington DC, August 2010

"Doyle Drive: Using Innovation HALS Methodology," SF Heritage News, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, Summer 2010

"Innovation HALS Methodology Developed for SF Presidio Project," CPF News, Summer 2009

PRESENTATIONS

Documenting our Heritage, Annual ASLA conference, San Diego, California, October 2011

Historic American Landscapes Survey – An Introduction, for ASLA Chapter Presidents, October 2011

Exploring Cultural Landscapes through Case Studies, California Preservation Foundation (CPF), August 2010

Historic American Landscapes Survey – An Overview, American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), July 2010

Doyle Drive HALS at the Presidio of San Francisco, CPF, May 2010

Landscape Within The Historic Context, American Institute of Architects (AIA) Historic Resources Committee, San Francisco, CA, June 2009

Historic American Landscapes Survey – Tools of Preservation, UC Berkeley Extension, Landscape Architecture Program, May 2009

Alviso Adobe Park: History & Design Process – Opening Remarks, Pleasanton, CA, October 2008

Historic American Landscape Survey – A Panel Discussion, ASLA Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA, October 2007

Olmsted in the East Bay – tour leader & speaker, ASLA Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA, October 2007

Oakland Waterfront Parks – tour speaker, ASLA Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA, October 2007

Historic American Landscapes Survey – An Overview, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA), Oakland, CA, Summer 2007

Historic American Landscapes Survey – An Overview, Town & Gown Club, Berkeley, CA Spring 2007

Cleveland Cascade – Rehabilitation of a Howard Gilkey Landscape, OHA, Oakland, CA, March 2007

Making a Splash: Preservation of Pools and Fountains, CPF Conference, Sacramento, CA, April 2006

Peralta Hacienda Historical Park – Planning and Design, Friends of Peralta Hacienda, Oakland, CA, December 2005

Kaiser Roof Garden and the Gardens of the Museum of California: Comparing Two Mid-Century Modern Roof Gardens, OHA, Oakland, CA, July 2005

Planning and Public Policy: The Urban Planning Process, Department of City & Regional Planning, UC Berkeley, April 1983

HISTORIC AMERICAN LANDSCAPES SURVEY (HALS) NOMINATION FORMS

Anderson Marsh State Historic Park, Lake County, 2011
Berkeley Women's City Club, Berkeley, 2011
Bidwell Mansion, Chico, 2011
Bidwell Park, Chico, 2011
Boyd Memorial Park, San Rafael, 2010
California Nursery Company Historic Park, Niles, 2008
Call Ranch at Fort Ross State Park, Jenner, 2009
Captain Fletcher's Inn & Manager's House, Navarro, 2009
Centerville Pioneer Cemetery, Fremont, 2008
Children's Fairyland, Oakland, 2009
China Camp State Park, San Rafael, 2009
Fern Dale (Shaw House), Ferndale, 2009
Forest Theater, Carmel, 2010
Henry H. Meyers Garden, Union City, 2010
La Mirada Adobe, Monterey, 2010
Marin Art and Garden Center, Ross, 2009
McConaghy Estate, Hayward, 2009
Meek Mansion & Carriage House, Hayward, 2009
Mendocino Woodlands Demonstration Recreation Area, Mendocino, 2009
Micke Grove Park, Lodi, 2009
Mountain View Cemetery, Oakland, 2010
Point Arena Cove, Point Arena, 2010
Point Arena Lighthouse, Point Arena, 2010
Point Cabrillo Lighthouse, Casper, 2009
Rancho Higuera Adobe Historical Park, 2008
Ravenswood Estate, Livermore, 2009
Robson-Harrington Park, San Anselmo, 2009
Shibata Japanese Garden (Mount Eden Nursery), Hayward, 2010
Shinn Historical House & Arboretum, Fremont, 2008
Sun House, Ukiah, 2009
Tor House, Carmel, 2010
Wassama Village, 2010



- [Brent Plater's Workspace](#)
- [Log out](#)
- Search:

[Donate](#)

[About Us](#)

[Wild Equity Store](#)

[Restore Sharp Park](#)

[Wild Quest Bay Area](#)

[Antioch Dunes](#)

[GGNP Endangered Species Big Year](#)

[Park Equity Project](#)

[Lost Manzanita Found](#)

[Pale Male Petition](#)

[Calendar](#)

[News](#)

[Action Alerts](#)

- [Action Alert: Hearing at the California Coastal Commission!](#)
03/31/2015 08:03:14
- [Wild Equity Bands with Allies to Challenge Sharp Park Pumphouse Project](#)
03/31/2015 07:56:50
- [Wild Equity Secures Challenge to Lower Court Opinion](#)
03/31/2015 07:56:36
- [Read 343 more items...](#)
-  [Subscribe to RSS Feed](#)

Wild Equity Institute

[Home](#) » [News](#) » SF Historic Preservation Commission: Sharp Park Golf Course Lacks Historic Integrity

SF Historic Preservation Commission: Sharp Park Golf Course Lacks Historic Integrity


06 October 2011 - 22:38

[Permalink](#) |  [Share Item on Facebook](#)

See also:

- [Restore Sharp Park — Latest News](#)

In a stunning rebuke to golfers grasping to keep San Francisco subsidizing suburban golf in San Mateo County, on September 21, 2011 San Francisco's Historic Preservation Commission stated that it does not concur that Sharp Park Golf Course is an historic resource.



Watch this annotated audio excerpt of the Historic Preservation Commission hearing.

Sharp Park Golf Course has been losing money and killing endangered species for many years. In September Supervisor John Avalos introduced legislation to transform Sharp Park into a new national park, while providing Sharp Park's current golfers with additional access to affordable golf courses in San Francisco.

But golf privatization groups who oppose national parks convinced San Francisco's Recreation and Parks Department to make-up a case that Sharp Park Golf Course should be protected as an historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act. As part of this process, the Department asked the Historic Preservation Commission to rubber-stamp its proposal.

However, the Commissioners reviewed the proposal and raised several objections to the Recreation and Parks Department proposal. Led by Commissioner Alan Martinez—who explained that the existing golf course is “a fragment of what it once was”—the Commission could not reach consensus on the golf course's integrity, and unanimously voted that “the commission did not concur on the integrity of the golf course.”

The Wild Equity Institute is working with dozens of community, environmental, and history organizations to ensure that the California Environmental Quality Act and San Francisco's historic preservation laws aren't abused by golf privatization groups. The next step in this process is to ensure that the Planning Commission evaluates Sharp Park separately from other natural areas in San Francisco that are undergoing environmental review. Keep your eyes and ears peeled for more updates in the coming weeks.

[Edit](#)

Comments

There are no comments so far.

Add a Comment

|

Need info on our programs? Contact info@wildequity.org | Have technical questions about our site?
Contact webmaster@wildequity.org

Copyright © [Wild Equity Institute](#), 2009-13 | 474 Valencia St., Suite 295 | San Francisco, CA 94103 | P:
[415-349-5787](tel:415-349-5787)



- [Brent Plater's Workspace](#)
- [Log out](#)

• Search:

[Donate](#)

[About Us](#)

[Wild Equity Store](#)

[Restore Sharp Park](#)

[Wild Quest Bay Area](#)

[Antioch Dunes](#)

[GGNP Endangered Species Big Year](#)

[Park Equity Project](#)

[Lost Manzanita Found](#)

[Pale Male Petition](#)

[Calendar](#)

[News](#)

[Action Alerts](#)

- [Action Alert: Hearing at the California Coastal Commission!](#)
03/31/2015 08:03:14
- [Wild Equity Bands with Allies to Challenge Sharp Park Pumphouse Project](#)
03/31/2015 07:56:50
- [Wild Equity Secures Challenge to Lower Court Opinion](#)
03/31/2015 07:56:36
- [Read 343 more items...](#)
-  [Subscribe to RSS Feed](#)

Wild Equity Institute

[Home](#) » [News](#) » [Historic Photos, Field Notes Show Sharp Park Has Always Been Habitat for Herps--and the Golf Course is Harming Them](#)

Historic Photos, Field Notes Show Sharp Park Has Always Been Habitat for Herps--and the Golf Course is Harming Them

19 July 2010 - 18:58

See also:

- [Restore Sharp Park — Latest News](#)

Rediscovered [historic photos of Sharp Park](#), along with [field notes](#) stored at [UC Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology](#), indicate that Sharp Park was once excellent habitat for the [San Francisco garter snake](#) and the [California red-legged frog](#): and that Sharp Park Golf Course is the primary threat to both species at the site.

This undated photo of Sharp Park shows Laguna Salada before the golf course was built, with Mori Point Ridge in the background.



In this photo, the lagoon is clearly fringed with cattails, vegetation that can't grow in saline environments. This indicates that Laguna Salada was not a "salt lake" as golf privatization advocates have argued, but a fresh lagoon where the [San Francisco garter snake](#) and the [California red-legged frog](#) could thrive.

At least until Sharp Park Golf Course was built. The earliest systematic biological surveys of San Mateo County were conducted by Dr. Wade Fox—the man who would eventually scientifically describe the San Francisco garter snake—when he was a graduate student at UC Berkeley. Although he died in his prime, Dr. Fox's field notes have been preserved at the UC Berkeley Museum of Vertebrate Zoology. These notes have finally been digitized, and they show that in 1946 Dr. Fox found a dead San Francisco garter snake at Sharp Park, which he concluded was "probably killed by golfers—they probably die frequently in this manner." Presaging the species precipitous decline, Dr. Fox also noted that the only secure area remaining for the species at Sharp Park was in the wet grasses near the lagoon: the surrounding golf links were deadly to the species.

Thamnophis sirtalis

April 18 Sharp Park, San Mateo Co., Calif.
 The narrow banks of grass and sedge plants along the edge of the lake is the only really weedy place on the 200-acre site bounded on three sides, probably killed by gaspers. They probably die frequently in this manner.

April 18 Miller Beach, Marin Co., Calif.
 Today I found no cuttle around the small pond in the pasture. The strong, cold wind coming in from the ocean was probably the call for them. None were in sight, nor were any found under surface objects around the pond even though there was several salicoides to be found there. Up the stream from the pond I found a very small cuttle & several salicoides which came out. But this was probably from the wind and recedence in the stream. Up on the hill I saw a large cuttle swim out on the water - while moving it swam underneath beneath the surface. Then it immediately swam into the head end of the water. On the sandy bank south of the cottage at the beach cuttles were active. Here again they were sheltered from the wind, and were facing the sun so that they could receive at least some of the radiation from the sun.

The San Francisco garter snake is now on the brink of extinction, and is probably the most imperiled vertebrate species on the San Francisco Peninsula. Yet since the 1940s Sharp Park Golf Course has been killing this species, and more recently the Golf Course has been found killing both the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. We can do better: let's restore Sharp Park and build a better public park on the property. Find out how you can help restore Sharp Park [here](#).

[Edit](#)

Comments

There are no comments so far.

Add a Comment

[Preview](#) | [Save](#)

Need info on our programs? Contact info@wildequity.org | Have technical questions about our site? Contact webmaster@wildequity.org

Summary for recommending A 18

Karen Swaim to: Munro, David

12/08/2009 09:31 AM

Cc: Lisa Wayne, Dawn Kamalanathan, Jeff Mitchell, Tammy Lim

History: This message has been forwarded.

Comments?

Munro, David wrote:

> See a few comments below.

>

>

> From: Lisa Wayne [mailto:Lisa.Wayne@sfgov.org]

> Sent: Monday, December 07, 2009 7:56 PM

> To: Dawn Kamalanathan

> Cc: kswaim@swaimbio.com; Munro, David

> Subject: notes on 30+

>

>

> No disputing sea level rise and salt water intrusion will occur on time frame of 30+ years (confirm year)

>

> Sea level rise will reduce the capacity of sharp park to function as a freshwater wetland that will support frogs and snakes and may not be conducive to golf either.

>

> The main limiting factor for sfgs under sea level rise is a reduction in the amount and quality of freshwater habitat that provides a critical food source for the snake.

>

> Based on most conservative predictions of sea level rise, the majority of sharp park west of highway 1 will not support freshwater wetlands in the long term .

>

> Therefore must think and work regionally (not just sharp) about opportunities to create secure freshwater wetlands on the 30+ year time scale. For exmaple GGNRA land and Calera Creek.

>

> 30 years = approxiamte life of capital improvements including golf course and sea wall. Also the planning horizon for the Alternatives Report. The alternatives report was not intended to assess the integrity of the sea wall. This study is being done under separate contract. For the purposes of the recovery action, it had to be assumed that the sea wall was either in good enough shape to hold for the planning horizon, or it would be modified as needed to last for the planning horizon.

>

> Now

>

> Species are at risk of local extinction now. Planning for creating wetlands eastward of the current location would likely be a long process and very difficult from a permitting standpoint and would not meet the goals of connecting habitat to Mori Point. There might also be legal challenges associated with moving the sea wall. Meanwhile, the population of the SFGS would continue to decline.

>

> Must do what we can with what is available now to bolster snake populations immediately. The best opportunity to augment snake population quickly is to

make Laguna Salada a functioning system for the snake.

>
> Once thriving population of snake in region, next step to buffer
> against physical changes to sites (i. e., climate change, sea level rise,
> salt water intrusion)

>
> The wetland complex at sharp park is not expected to provide habitat in
> perpetuity.

>
>
>
> Lisa Wayne
> San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
> Natural Areas Program / Neighborhood Service Area 10
> 831-6326

>
> 30+ Notes

>
>

--

Karen Swaim
President/Herpetologist

Swaim Biological, Inc
4435 First Street, PMB # 312
Livermore, CA 94551-4915

925.455.8770 phone
925.455.6106 fax



Attachment 4- 1928 Pre-golf aerial photo.pdf



A18 Recommendation.docx



Attachment 2-Mori Sharp Park Linkage Width.pdf



Attachment 3- WDB Habitat Linkages.pdf

Financial Appraisal of Sharp Park Golf Course 2005 - 2015


Executive Summary

- Revenue levels over the last ten years have been volatile and it is questionable whether even significant investment in Sharp Park Golf Course would result in revenue growth.
- Sharp Park Golf Course has been loss making for nine out of the last ten years. This has resulted in over \$1.1 million of loss for the City of San Francisco.
- Documentation provided in support of expenses for Sharp Park, indicate that there could be significant inaccuracies in the financial reporting of operating expenses on the Revenue and Expenditure Reports.
- Since 2005 \$7.9 million has been spent on water and irrigation projects for Sharp Park Gold Course. It does not appear that the depreciation for these expenditures has been included in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports. On this basis, it would appear that a major expense may have been omitted in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports.

Operating Revenue Review

- As illustrated in the graph and table below, operating revenues over the last ten years have highly been volatile.
- The volatility of the revenue makes it challenging to predict whether any investment in the Sharp Park would result in a significant increase in revenue.
- For the purposes of this analysis, revenue from golf green fees, concessions and golf resident cards was included. Interest income and income from the General Fund was excluded as these were not considered to be operating revenue streams.

Financial Year Ending	Sharp Park Operating Revenue
2005	\$ 1,035,919
2006	842,895
2007	1,253,087
2008	1,284,381
2009	1,356,712
2010	1,234,844
2011	968,735
2012	1,133,396
2013	1,151,451
2014	1,271,908
2015	\$ 1,094,569



Profitability Review

- The Sharp Park Golf Course is not profitable. As shown in the table below, Sharp Park has been loss making for nine out of the last ten years and has resulted in \$1,147,064 of loss for the City of San Francisco.
- As discussed above, it is unclear whether any additional investment would increase revenue and return the park to profitability.
- We note that expenses such as 'Equipment' appear to be very low and may be understated in the reports provided by Recreation and Park Department.
- For the purposes of this analysis, we utilized data from the Revenue and Expenditure Reports provided by the Recreation and Park Department.

Description	FY 04/05	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	Total
ACTUAL REVENUES:												
Golf Green Fees	\$ 893,152	\$ 708,852	\$1,088,192	\$1,128,498	\$1,202,113	\$1,080,889	\$ 839,215	\$1,008,232	\$1,013,548	\$1,128,801	\$ 963,939	\$ 11,055,431
Concessions	142,767	134,043	164,895	155,883	113,568	94,457	76,180	73,048	79,294	89,280	84,587	1,208,001
Golf Resident Card					41,031	59,498	53,340	52,116	58,609	53,827	46,043	364,465
Total Revenue	1,035,919	842,895	1,253,087	1,284,381	1,356,712	1,234,844	968,735	1,133,396	1,151,451	1,271,908	1,094,569	12,627,898
OPERATING EXPENDITURE:												
Salaries	535,254	546,411	603,005	719,891	643,193	595,412	450,135	536,277	451,926	551,587	583,187	6,216,278
Fringes	128,461	148,124	162,151	183,411	167,128	179,854	169,829	224,919	190,582	235,694	254,736	2,044,889
Overhead	227,966	230,738	281,366	290,313	282,684	336,433	229,954	260,105	224,002	220,011	221,817	2,805,388
Professional & Special Services	1,193	62,522	4,800	59,114	54,486	49,253	58,238	48,233	58,973	56,207	37,169	490,188
Maintenance Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	42,819	36,432	43,753	29,888	32,576	185,468
Rent/Leases Equipment	99	-	-	-	-	1,154	1,182	1,713	2,176	1,945	1,651	9,920
Other Expenses	10,194	22,209	35,678	51,823	62,005	45,893	17,652	18,941	29,720	17,830	18,395	330,341
Materials & Supplies	39,785	50,727	94,857	64,582	56,404	74,092	64,357	81,992	67,731	74,777	67,181	736,484
Equipment	-	-	40,670	-	-	30,137	-	-	-	-	-	70,807
Services of other Departments	45,975	39,787	36,736	35,989	32,827	39,344	70,563	96,874	108,907	107,642	114,988	729,613
TOAL OPERATING EXPENDITURE	988,929	1,100,518	1,259,262	1,405,122	1,298,727	1,351,572	1,104,729	1,305,486	1,177,771	1,295,582	1,331,680	13,619,378
OTHER EXPENDITURE												
Facilities Maintenance	86,969	30,039	32,440	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	149,448
Audit	174	164	347	348	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,032
Controller Adjustment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,104	-	-	-	5,104
TOTAL OTHER EXPENDITURE	87,143	30,203	32,787	348	-	-	-	5,104	-	-	-	155,584
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	1,076,072	1,130,721	1,292,049	1,405,470	1,298,727	1,351,572	1,104,729	1,310,590	1,177,771	1,295,582	1,331,680	13,774,962
Operating Profit / (Loss)	\$ (40,153)	\$ (287,826)	\$ (38,962)	\$ (121,090)	\$ 57,985	\$ (116,727)	\$ (135,994)	\$ (177,193)	\$ (26,319)	\$ (23,674)	\$ (237,111)	\$ (1,147,064)
Notes:												
1 Golf Resident Card revenue and expenses were apportioned to each course according to that course's % contribution to golf fund allocated revenues and allocated operating expenditures, respectively.												
2 General Fund Support was removed from revenue.												
3 Interest earned was removed from revenues as it does not represent an operating revenue												
4 Repayment to Open Space Fund was eliminated.												
Source: San Francisco Recreation & Park Dept. Golf Revenue & Expenditure Reports												

Accuracy of Expenses

- We requested documentation from the Recreation and Park Department to verify operating expenses included in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports. We were provided with payroll documentation for 2014 and 2015 in support of Sharp Park payroll costs. We were not provided with adequate documentation to review the reliability of other expenses.
- The supporting payroll documentation provided indicated that payroll expenses may have been significantly understated in the financial year 2014/2015. As shown in the table below, annual salary costs were listed as \$583,187, however, the payroll data indicates that actual costs were \$982,495.
- As inaccuracies have been observed in the presentation of payroll expenses, it is possible that other operating expenses included in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports have also been understated.

- On this basis, it is possible that the losses generated by Sharp Park may have been significantly understated and the cost to the City of San Francisco of operating Sharp Park may be higher than stated on the Revenue and Expenditure Reports.

Month	Salary	Fringe
Jul-14	\$ 45,867	\$ 21,100
Aug-14	384,816	157,758
Sep-14	48,393	20,904
Oct-14	50,669	21,661
Nov-14	45,898	20,963
Dec-14	48,022	20,855
Jan-15	47,887	23,058
Feb-15	73,803	27,378
Mar-15	61,460	24,806
Apr-15	48,153	21,259
May-15	45,247	21,641
Jun-15	82,279	36,588
Total	\$ 982,495	\$ 417,971
Per 2014/2015 Budget Reports	\$ 583,187	\$ 254,736
Source: Payroll report provided by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department		

Accounting for Capital Expenditure

- Data extracted from the Monthly Capital Reports generated by the Recreation and Park department, show that since 2005, \$7.9 million has been spent on capital water and irrigation projects for Sharp Park Gold Course (see the table below).
- Per GASB Statement No. 34, capital assets should be depreciated over their 'useful life'. As a result, we would expect to see an amount for depreciation included in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports to account for the capital expenditures on water and irrigation systems.
- As depreciation for these expenditures does not appear to have been included in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports, it is possible that a major expense may have been omitted in the Revenue and Expenditure Reports.

Fiscal Year	Capital Plan Project Name	Budget	Expended
2005-2006	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	\$ 620,977	\$ 620,977
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,391	746,391
2006-2007	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,977	620,977
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,391	746,391
2007-2008	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,390	746,390
2008-2009	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,390	746,390
2009-2010	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,390	746,390
2010-2011	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,390	746,390
2011-2012	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
		746,390	746,390
2012-2013	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	125,414	125,414
	Sharp Park Recycled Water Project	343,939	332,465
		1,962,133	1,950,659
2013-2014	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	133,170	131,358
	Sharp Park Recycled Water Project	343,939	343,909
	Sharp Park Golf Course Irrigation Retrofit	200,000	
	Sharp Park Infrastructure and Pumphouse	359,638	259,729
		1,657,723	1,355,972
2014-2015	Lincoln and Sharp Irrigation	620,976	620,976
	Sharp Park Water Tank	133,170	131,358
	Sharp Park Recycled Water Project	343,939	343,909
	Sharp Park Golf Course Irrigation Retrofit	549,000	490,578
	Sharp Park Infrastructure and Pumphouse	1,209,684	400,880
	Sharp Park Pump Replacement	850,000	507,896
		3,706,769	2,495,597
Grand Total		\$ 12,551,357	\$ 11,026,960
Less: Lincon Park Allocation (50% of Irrigation Costs)		\$ (3,104,881)	\$ (3,104,881)
Total Sharp Park Expenditure		\$ 9,446,476	\$ 7,922,079

Author Credentials

- I am an Associate member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales (UK equivalent to CPA) with five years of experience in forensic accounting and international financial litigation.
- I have significant experience in:
 - Assessing and critiquing the reasonableness of financial forecasts and business projections by reviewing financial accounts, internal accounting data, budgets and industry data,
 - Investigating insurance losses by analyzing financial records and accounting documentation,
 - Investigating fraud and corruption claims.

Limitations

- This analysis is based on documentation provided by the Wild Equity Institute and the Recreation and Park Department. This analysis does not represent an audit of the Recreation and Park Department's financial statements in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. This report is dependent on the accuracy of the information provided by Wild Equity Institute and the Recreation and Park Department.



Hannah Dingley



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
2017 JAN 17 AM 9:36

BJ

DRAFT Planning Commission Motion NO. M-XXXXX

HEARING DATE: December 15, 2016

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Hearing Date: December 15, 2016
Case No.: 2005.0912E
Project Address: Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan¹
Zoning: N/A
Block/Lot: 31 Natural Areas in San Francisco and Pacifica (various parcels)
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
Stacy Bradley – (415) 575-5609
stacy.bradley@sfgov.org
Staff Contact: Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041
melinda.hue@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2005.0912E, the "Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan" (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on April 22, 2009.
 - B. The Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Project's environmental review.
 - C. On August 31, 2011, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning

¹ The Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, or SNRAMP, is now referred to as the Natural Resources Management Plan; however, to maintain consistency between the Draft EIR and the RTC document, the term SNRAMP will continue to be used.

Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.

- D. On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
 - E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011.
 3. On April 27, 2012, the Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice and to neighborhood groups registered with the Department at that time. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012.
 4. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 5. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.
 6. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
 7. On December 15, 2016, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 8. The project sponsor has indicated that the presently preferred alternative is the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan.

9. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2005.0912E: Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan reflects the independent judgement and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR that would require recirculation of the document pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
10. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the Environmental Impact Report and the project preferred by the project sponsor, described as the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan in FEIR would have the following significant unavoidable environmental impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:
 - A. A significant project specific and cumulative impact on Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource under CEQA, due to modification of golf holes for restoration activities;
 - B. A significant cumulative impact on recreation in dog play areas (DPAs) within Natural Areas due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the National Park Service's (NPS) Dog Management Plan within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA);
 - C. A significant cumulative impact on biological resources within Natural Areas DPAs due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the NPS Dog Management Plan within the GGNRA; and
 - D. A significant project-specific and cumulative impact on air quality from activities such as trail construction, hillside stabilization, erosion control, and tree removal.
11. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 15, 2016.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:

ATTACHMENT 1

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS: FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF
MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION

December 15, 2016

I. PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the Natural Resources Management Plan (“Project” and “Management Plan”) as described in Section II.A, Project Description, below, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission (“Commission”) makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding the Project, and mitigation measures, and alternatives based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”), the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (“Chapter 31”).

This document is organized as follows:

Section II provides a description of the proposed Project, Project objectives, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records;

Section III identifies impacts of the Project found not to be significant as well as the Project’s potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies significant project-specific and cumulative impacts that cannot not be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section V identifies the Project alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the project and the rejection as infeasible of alternatives, or elements thereof, analyzed;

Section VI sets forth the Commission’s Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as Attachment 2 to Motion No. _____. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project (“Final EIR”) that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. The MMRP also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in the MMRP.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact

Report (“Draft EIR” or “DEIR”) or the Responses to Comments document (“RTC”), which together constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR” or “FEIR”) are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

a. Project Description

The project sponsor, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (“SFRPD”) proposes to adopt the Natural Resources Management Plan (“NRMP”). The Project area encompasses 32 Natural Areas that are scattered mostly throughout the central and southern portions of San Francisco and constitute approximately four percent of the total city area; one natural area is in Pacifica. The areas range in size from less than one acre to almost 400 acres and include such popular locations as Twin Peaks and portions of Glen Canyon Park. The Management Plan will guide activities on properties owned or maintained by the SFRPD through its Natural Resources Program.

The Natural Areas include the following areas in San Francisco: Balboa; Bayview Park; Bernal Hill; Billy Goat Hill; Brooks Park; Buena Vista Park; Corona Heights; Dorothy Erskine Park; Duncan-Castro; Edgehill Mountain; Everson/Digby; Fairmount Park; Glen Canyon and O’Shaughnessy Hollow; Golden Gate Heights; Golden Gate Park Oak Woodlands; Grandview Park; Hawk Hill; India Basin Shoreline Park; Interior Greenbelt; Kite Hill; Lake Merced; Lakeview/Ashton Mini Park; McLaren Park; Mount Davidson; Palou-Phelps; Pine Lake; Rock Outcrop; Tank Hill; Twin Peaks; and 15th Avenue Steps. Sharp Park in Pacifica is also a Natural Area.

Fragments of unique plant and animal habitats within San Francisco and Pacifica, known as Natural Resource Areas (Natural Areas), have been preserved within the parks that are managed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD). In the late 1990s, the SFRPD initiated a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage these Natural Areas. Over the course of several years, the SFRPD developed the Natural Resources Management Plan, with the final draft plan published in February 2006. The NRMP contains detailed information on the biology, geology, and trails within 32 Natural Areas, 31 in San Francisco and one (Sharp Park) in Pacifica. The NRMP 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 Management Plan delineates the acreage within each Natural Area into management area categories based on the management priority. The NRMP prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and management activities specific to each Natural Area. The NRMP identifies a number of goals with respect to conservation and restoration, education, research, stewardship, recreation, and monitoring goals. Recommended actions identified for each Natural Area are intended to meet the overall goals of the NRMP and may include, but are not limited to, habitat restoration, removal of invasive species, tree removal, erosion control, trail closure, relocation or creation, and closure or reduction of dog play areas. Individual Natural Areas may be identified as an entire park or only a portion of the park. Unless otherwise specified in the NRMP or the Draft EIR, management actions apply only to the geographic boundary of the Natural Area.

The Management Plan identifies a number of objectives and goals of the Natural Areas Program. For the purposes of CEQA, the project objectives are as follows:

- To identify issues and impacts adversely affecting ecosystem functions and biological diversity;
- To identify, prioritize, and implement restoration and management actions designed to promote the functioning of San Francisco's native ecosystem, including the maintenance and enhancement of native biodiversity;
- To identify and prioritize monitoring of natural resources to support an adaptive management approach;
- To provide guidelines for passive recreation compatible with San Francisco's natural resources;
- To provide guidelines for education, research, and stewardship programs; and
- To restore the Laguna Salada wetland complex for the benefit of special status species.

b. Environmental Review

On April 22, 2009, the Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation.

The Planning Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Project's environmental review.

On August 31, 2011, the Planning Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department's list of persons requesting such notice.

On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.

Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011.

The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011.

On April 27, 2012, the Planning Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department's list of persons requesting such notice. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012.

The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on

November 16, 2016, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Planning Department.

The FEIR was prepared by the Planning Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.

The FEIR is both a project-level and a programmatic EIR. A project-level EIR is generally the most common type of EIR, and it examines the environmental impacts of a specific project. This level of CEQA review focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from a project and examines all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168). Project-level review has been selected as the appropriate level of CEQA review for the NRMP's routine maintenance activities and the Sharp Park restoration activities. These components of the NRMP have been developed to a sufficient level of detail to allow project-level environmental review.

Program-level CEQA review is used in environmental analyses for a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project because they are logically related. The series of actions can be related geographically, or be logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions. Program-level review is used in connection with the issuance of rules, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program. Programmatic review is also appropriate for individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulator authority, that have generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168). Program-level review has been selected as the appropriate level of CEQA review for the NRMP's large-scale projects because these projects are long-term projects that have not been fully developed to enable project-level environmental review. Once funding is available for long-term projects, additional design and development of the project would commence, allowing for a greater understanding of project-level environmental impacts.

Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Planning Commission, the Commission, and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.

On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Planning Commission certified the FEIR as adequate, accurate, and complete.

c. Commission Actions

The Commission is currently considering various actions ("Actions") in furtherance of the Project, which include, but are not limited to the following:

- Approval of the Natural Resources Management Plan.

d. Location of Records

The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the adoption of the Project are based include the following:

- The FEIR, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Commission relating to the FEIR, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project, and the alternatives set forth in the FEIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the FEIR, or incorporated into reports presented to the Planning Commission;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the Project or the FEIR;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations presented to the City by the Project sponsor and its consultants in connection with the Project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the Project and the FEIR;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP); and
- All other documents comprising the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Final EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco. The Planning Commission Secretary is the custodian of these documents and materials. The Library Commission Secretary is the custodian of Project documents and materials on file at the SFPL Main Library. The Recreation and Park Commission Secretary is the custodian of Project documents and materials on file at the Recreation and Park Department Headquarters in Golden Gate Park.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the DEIR, the RTC or the Final EIR are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

In making these findings, the opinions of the Planning Department and other City staff and experts, other agencies and members of the public have been considered. These findings recognize that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the Final EIR preparers and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, are hereby ratified, adopted and incorporated in these

findings, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

III. LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Res. Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091). As more fully described in the Final EIR and based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, it is hereby found that implementation of the Project would not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation: Land Use and Land Use Planning, Aesthetics, Wind and Shadow, and Agriculture and Forest Resources.

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible. As more fully described in the Final EIR and based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, it is hereby found that implementation of the Project would result in certain identified significant impacts, but that adoption of mitigation measures would avoid or substantially lessen these impacts with regard to: Cultural & Paleontological Resources, Recreation, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Air Quality.

The findings in this section concern mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR, presented in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), and attached as Attachment 2 to these Findings, which are hereby adopted and incorporated as conditions of Project approval. The Final EIR includes a series of mitigation measures that have been identified that would eliminate or reduce to a less-than-significant level the NRMP's potential environmental impacts of the Project listed in this section. All of the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR that are needed to reduce or avoid these significant adverse environmental impacts are contained in Attachment 2. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is nevertheless hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measure in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the numbers contained in the Final EIR.

The Commission finds that the mitigation measures, as set forth in the Attached Exhibit 1 to this Resolution, are feasible and adopts these measures as conditions of Project approval. In no instance are the conclusions of the Final EIR, or the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR for the Project, being rejected.

a. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Architectural Resources

Impact CP-1: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical architectural resources, including historic landscapes.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-1: Consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measure is feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on architectural resources and landscapes to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against significant impacts to potential architectural resources and landscapes that may exist on the project site(s).

Archaeological Resources

Impact CP-10: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources in Natural Areas of high archaeological sensitivity.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-10: Archaeological Monitoring Program for Programmatic Projects in Natural Areas with High Archaeological Sensitivity, Routine Maintenance Activities at Tank Hill and Lake Merced, and the Sharp Park Restoration Project

Impact CP-11: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources in Natural Areas of moderate and low archaeological sensitivity.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-11: Accidental Discovery

Impact CP-12: Implementation of routine maintenance under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources in any of the Natural Areas, with the exception of Lake Merced and Tank Hill Natural Areas.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-11: Accidental Discovery

M-CP-12: Annual Archaeological Sensitivity Training for Natural Areas Program Staff Involved with Routine Maintenance Activities in all Natural Areas

Impact CP-13: Implementation of routine maintenance under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources in the Lake Merced and Tank Hill Natural Areas.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-10: Archaeological Monitoring Program for Programmatic Projects in Natural Areas with High Archaeological Sensitivity, Routine Maintenance Activities at Tank Hill and Lake Merced, and the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-CP-12: Annual Archaeological Sensitivity Training for Natural Areas Program Staff Involved with Routine Maintenance Activities in all Natural Areas

Impact CP-14: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration efforts under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-10: Archaeological Monitoring Program for Programmatic Projects in Natural Areas with High Archaeological Sensitivity, Routine Maintenance Activities at Tank Hill and Lake Merced, and the Sharp Park Restoration Project

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on archaeological resources and landscapes to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against material damage to potential underground cultural resources that may exist on the project site(s).

Paleontological Resources

Impact CP-15: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would directly or indirectly destroy paleontological resources or unique geological formations.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-15: Coordination with EP Regarding Paleontological Resources Prior to Implementation of Programmatic Projects

Impact CP-16: Implementation of routine maintenance under the NRMP would directly or indirectly destroy paleontological resources or unique geological formations.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-16: Avoidance of Surface Bedrock in Routine Maintenance Activities

Impact CP-17: Implementation of Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would directly or indirectly destroy paleontological resources or unique geological formations.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-17: Paleontological Training Program and Alert Sheet for the Sharp Park Restoration Project

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against material damage to potential paleontological resources that may exist on the project site(s).

Human Remains

Impact CP-18: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would disturb human remains.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-18: Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.

Impact CP-19: Implementation of routine maintenance under the NRMP would disturb human remains.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-18: Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.

Impact CP-20: Implementation of Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would disturb human remains.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-18: Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measure is feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction related to human remains to a less-than-significant level because the measure, which is adopted as a condition of project approval, provides adequate protection against material damage to potential human remains that may exist on the project site(s).

b. Recreation

Impact RE-6: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on the physical characteristics of existing recreation facilities.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-RE-6: Restoration of the Sharp Park Golf Course to 18 Playable Holes

- c. The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measure is feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction related to recreation to a less-than-significant level through the restoration of Sharp Park Golf Course to 18 Playable Holes. This measure is adopted as a condition of project approval.

Biological Resources

Special Status Species

Impact BI-1: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects proposed under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on special status plant species.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat

M-BI-1b: Protection of Locally Significant Plant Species during Implementation of Programmatic Projects

Impact BI-2: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on special status bird species.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat

Impact BI-3: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on other protected terrestrial wildlife species (other than bird species).

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat

Impact BI-4: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on protected aquatic species.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat

Impact BI-5: Implementation of routine maintenance activities under the NRMP would result in a substantial adverse effect on special status species.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-5: Protection of Special Status Species during Routine Maintenance

Impact BI-6: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on special status species.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-6a: Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-6b: Protection of Protected Species during Maintenance of the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on special status species to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against any significant impact to special status species.

Sensitive Natural Communities

Impact BI-7: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat.

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measure is feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on sensitive natural communities to a less-than-significant level because the measure, which is adopted as a condition of project approval, provides adequate protection against any significant impact to sensitive natural communities.

Wetlands

Impact BI-10: The NRMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat

Impact BI-12: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-12a: Protection of Wetlands during the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-12b: Laguna Salada Restoration Project Wetland Mitigation Plan

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on wetlands to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against any significant impact to wetlands.

Fish and Wildlife Movement, Migratory Corridors, and Nursery Sites

Impact BI-15: Implementation of Sharp Park restoration activities under the NRMP would have a substantial adverse effect on fish and wildlife movement, migratory corridors and nursery sites.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-6a: Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-6b: Protection of Protected Species during Maintenance of the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-12a: Protection of Wetlands during the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-12b: Laguna Salada Restoration Project Wetland Mitigation Plan

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on fish and wildlife movement, migratory corridors, and nursery sites to a less-than-significant level because the measure, which is adopted as a condition of project approval, provides adequate protection against any significant impact to fish and wildlife.

d. Hydrology and Water Quality

Water Quality

Impact HY-1: Implementation of programmatic projects under the NRMP would violate water quality standards or otherwise degrade water quality.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials

Impact HY-2: Implementation of routine maintenance activities under the NRMP would violate water quality standards or otherwise degrade water quality.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HZ-14: General Emergency Response Plan for Routine Management Activities Using Gasoline- or Diesel-Powered Equipment

Impact HY-3: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would violate water quality standards or otherwise degrade water quality.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-BI-6a: Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-12b: Laguna Salada Restoration Project Wetland Mitigation Plan

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on water quality to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as condition of project approval, provide adequate protection against any significant impact to water quality.

Erosion and Siltation

Impact HY-7: Implementation of the programmatic projects under the NRMP would result in substantial erosion or siltation.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

Impact HY-9: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measure is feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on erosion and siltation to a less-than-significant level because the measure, which is adopted as a condition of project approval, provides adequate protection from significant impacts related to erosion and siltation.

Stormwater Runoff

Impact HY-13: Implementation of the programmatic projects under the NRMP would affect stormwater runoff quantity or quality.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

Impact HY-15: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would affect stormwater runoff quantity or quality.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures

M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials

M-BI-12a: Protection of Wetlands during the Sharp Park Restoration Project

M-BI-12b: Laguna Salada Restoration Project Wetland Mitigation Plan

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on erosion and siltation to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection from significant impacts related to stormwater runoff.

e. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazardous Material Accidents

Impact HZ-13: Implementation of the programmatic projects under the NRMP would not create significant hazard to the public or the environment through accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials

Impact HZ-14: Implementation of the routine maintenance activities under the NRMP would not create significant hazard to the public or the environment through accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

M-HZ-14: General Emergency Response Plan for Routine Management Activities Using Gasoline- or Diesel-Powered Equipment

Impact HZ-15: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would not create significant hazard to the public or the environment through accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential hazardous material accidents to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection from significant impacts due to hazardous material accidents.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials

f. Air Quality

Fugitive Dust

Impact AQ-1: Programmatic projects under the NRMP would result in substantial fugitive dust emissions.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-AQ-1: Fugitive Dust Reduction

Impact AQ-3: The Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would result in substantial fugitive dust emissions.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-AQ-1: Fugitive Dust Reduction

The Commission finds that the foregoing mitigation measures are feasible and will mitigate the potential impacts of project construction on water quality to a less-than-significant level because the measures, which are adopted as conditions of project approval, provide adequate protection against any significant impacts to water quality.

IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Commission finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the Final EIR. It is further found, however, that certain mitigation measures in the Final EIR, as described in this Section IV, or changes, have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, which may lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less-than-significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the Project that are described below. Although all of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), attached as Exhibit 1, are adopted, for some of the impacts listed below, despite the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

It is further found, as described in this Section IV below, based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, that because some aspects of the Project could cause potentially significant impacts for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. It is also recognized that although mitigation measures are identified in the Final EIR that would reduce some significant impacts, certain measures, as described in this Section IV below, are uncertain or infeasible for reasons set forth below, and therefore those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

Thus, the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, are unavoidable. As more fully explained in Section VIII, below, under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, it is found and determined that legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impacts of the Project for each of the significant and unavoidable impacts described below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

a. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Project-Level Impact (Sharp Park Restoration) - Architectural Resources

Impact CP-7: Implementing restoration activities to close Hole 12 of the Sharp Park Golf Course would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the golf course, a historic resource under CEQA.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-7: Documentation of the Sharp Park Golf Course

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-7 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but documentation alone would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No other feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Impact CP-9: Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration activity that requires modification of the Sharp Park Golf Course to create upland habitat on the east side of the lagoon and shorten or narrow Holes 10 and 13 would be a substantial adverse change in the significance of the golf course, a historic resource under CEQA.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-CP-7: Documentation of the Sharp Park Golf Course

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-7 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but documentation alone would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No other feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Cumulative Impact

Impact CP-21: The proposed project, in combination with other planned and foreseeable future projects, would have a cumulatively considerable significant impact related to cultural and paleontological resources due to the identified significant on Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource under CEQA, due to modification of golf holes for restoration activities.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-RE-6: Restoration of the Sharp Park Golf Course to 18 Playable Holes

Although Mitigation Measure M-RE-6 would require the SFRPD to coordinate with a golf course consultant with expertise in historic golf course renovation to restore the playability of the Sharp Park Golf Course, while documenting and preserving the historic character-defining features of the course, the project's contribution to a cumulatively considerable impact to cultural resources due to the modification of golf holes would remain significant and unavoidable and no other feasible mitigation measures are available.

b. Recreation

Cumulative Impact

Impact RE-7: The proposed project, in combination with other planned and foreseeable future projects, would result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact related to recreation, due to a significant cumulative impact on recreation in dog play areas within Natural Areas due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the National Park Service's (NPS) Dog Management Plan within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). As set forth in the Final EIR, no feasible mitigation measures are available at this time to reduce this impact to less-than-significant. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

c. Biological Resources

Cumulative Impact

Impact BI-19: The proposed project, in combination with other planned and foreseeable future projects, would result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact related to biological resources within Natural Areas dog play areas due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the NPS Dog Management Plan within the GGNRA. As set forth in the Final EIR, no feasible mitigation measures are available at this time to reduce this impact to less-than-significant. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

d. Air Quality

Criteria Air Pollutants - Programmatic Impact

Impact AQ-4: Programmatic projects under the NRMP such as trail construction, hillside stabilization, erosion control, and tree removal would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and would result in a net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-AQ-4: Construction Contract Specification to Reduce Construction Vehicle Emissions

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 would reduce NOx emissions, but may not reduce emissions to below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District significance threshold due to uncertainty regarding the level of construction required for programmatic projects and the effectiveness of the mitigation measure to reduce criteria air pollutants. No other feasible mitigation measures are available, and therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Criteria Air Pollutants - Project-Level Impact (Sharp Park Restoration)

Impact AQ-6: The Sharp Park restoration under the NRMP would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and would result in a net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard.

The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-AQ-4: Construction Contract Specification to Reduce Construction Vehicle Emissions

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 would reduce NOx emissions, but such emissions would remain above the Bay Area Air Quality Management District daily significance threshold. No other feasible mitigation measures are available, and therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-10: Implementation of the proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity would result in cumulatively considerable significant air quality impacts.

The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR, and the attached MMRP, and will be implemented as provided therein.

M-AQ-4: Construction Contract Specification to Reduce Construction Vehicle Emissions

M-AQ-10: Cumulative Health Risk Analysis for Programmatic Projects

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 would reduce NOx emissions, but may not reduce emissions to below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District significance threshold. Additionally, due to uncertainty regarding the boundaries of individual construction projects for programmatic activities and the concomitant uncertainty that Mitigation Measure M-AQ-10 would be effective in reducing cumulative health risk impacts, this impact remains significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation measures are available.

V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Section describes the reasons for approving the Project and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives as infeasible. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or the project location that substantially reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a “No Project” alternative. Alternatives provide the decision maker with a basis of comparison to the proposed Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the proposed Project.

The Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below based upon substantial evidence in the record, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described in Section VI below, which are hereby incorporated by reference, that make these alternatives infeasible. In making these determinations, the Commission is aware that CEQA defines “feasibility” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15364.) Under CEQA case law, the concept of “feasibility” encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is “desirable” from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

Alternatives Analyzed in the FEIR

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the project sites would remain in their existing conditions. The SFRPD would continue with management activities authorized under the 1995 management plan, which includes activities similar to those outlined for the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative differs from the proposed project in that programmatic projects would not occur. Habitat restoration and invasive tree and vegetation removal would likely be smaller in scale. Fewer trails would be closed and no new trails created. The No Project Alternative would not close or reduce the size of dog play areas. Over time, this alternative likely would result in Natural Areas with characteristics largely similar to those under the proposed project; however, restoration and enhancement actions would be smaller in scale under the No Project Alternative. Activities at Laguna Salada in the Sharp Park Natural Area would be limited to removing accumulated sediment and tules by hand or other low-impact means. Laguna Salada would not be dredged.

The Commission rejects the No Project Alternative because it would not meet the project objectives because it would not implement a comprehensive program for managing the Natural Areas to maintain and enhance biodiversity and provide appropriate recreation opportunities. Moreover, the No Project Alternative would not restore Laguna Salada, as stated in the project objectives. Compared to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would involve moderately less invasive tree and vegetation removal and closure of fewer trails. The No Project Alternative would not result in new trails because routine maintenance would be limited.

Maximum Restoration Alternative

The Maximum Restoration Alternative seeks to restore native habitat and convert nonnative habitat to native habitat wherever possible throughout the Natural Areas, including all management areas. The SFRPD would restore native habitat and convert nonnative habitat to native habitat wherever possible throughout the Natural Areas, including all management areas. The Maximum Restoration Alternative prioritizes activities related to endangered species protection and recovery and maximum enhancement of biodiversity. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative emphasizes the restoration of native habitat over recreational uses and nonnative habitat. As this alternative would prioritize habitat restoration over recreation, this alternative would close additional trails, and no new trails would be created. The Maximum Restoration Alternative would further reduce the amount of dog play area acreage, as compared to the proposed project; this alternative would not add any new dog play areas to the Natural Areas.

The Maximum Restoration Alternative includes more extensive habitat restoration at the Laguna Salada wetland complex than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would extend restoration outside the Natural Area boundary but also would restore up to an additional five acres of habitat for the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake.

The Commission rejects the Maximum Restoration Alternative because it would result in additional restrictions on public use and access of the Natural Areas; therefore, the Maximum Restoration Alternative does not meet the objective related to recreation, as the Maximum Restoration Alternative would provide additional restrictions on public use and access of the Natural Areas.

Maximum Recreation Alternative

The Maximum Recreation Alternative seeks to restore and improve recreational access to the Natural Areas wherever it does not interfere with the continued existence of native species and federally or state-listed sensitive species. Over time, less habitat identified by the NRMP would be restored, while all or most of the recreation-related projects, such as trail network improvement, would be implemented. As such, the Maximum Recreation Alternative includes substantially less invasive tree and vegetation removal, thereby resulting in a long-term increase in the presence of nonnative species and a reduction in native habitat. Tree and vegetation removal would be limited to that necessary to meet the Natural Areas Program tree maintenance health and safety goals and those trees required to be removed for trail creation or other projects providing additional recreation facilities (picnic areas and playgrounds).

The Maximum Recreation Alternative would close fewer informal and social trails and includes moderately more trail creation in MA-2 and MA-3 areas than the proposed Project and would also allow mountain biking and horseback riding where those uses would not conflict with special status species and their habitats. The Maximum Recreation Alternative would not close or reduce dog play areas, but no new dog play areas would be created in the Natural Areas.

The Maximum Recreation Alternative includes restoration of the wetland complex at Laguna Salada. However, restoration would differ from the proposed project in that it would be limited to the geographic limits of the Natural Area; restoration would not encroach on the golf course operations, except as required for temporary construction. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in less edge and upland habitat for the San Francisco garter snake.

The Commission rejects the Maximum Recreation Alternative because it would result in an overall decrease in habitat restoration and management of the Natural Area's resources as compared to the proposed Project. The Maximum Recreation Alternative would only include restoration/enhancement of Laguna Salada within the geographic limits of that Natural Area, rather than both restoring the Laguna Salada and increasing habitat access by adding habitat corridors, as with the proposed Project. This would provide more limited benefits to special status species, as compared to the proposed Project.

Maintenance Alternative

The Maintenance Alternative seeks to maintain the current distribution of native and nonnative habitat and species throughout the Natural Areas. Under this alternative, there would be no conversion of nonnative habitat to native habitat; other features of the Natural Areas also would be retained.

Under the Maintenance Alternative the general components of the SNRAMP, the SFRPD would implement best management practices (BMPs), adaptive management, integrated pest management (IPM), and the monitoring plan, which are detailed in Chapter III of the DEIR. Under this alternative, the SFRPD would maintain the current distribution of native and nonnative habitat and species throughout the Natural Areas. There would be no conversion of nonnative habitat to native habitat, and other features of the Natural Areas also would be retained. There would be less habitat restoration and less invasive tree and vegetation removal compared to the proposed project. Over time, this alternative likely would result in Natural Areas with habitat and recreation characteristics similar to those currently present.

The Maintenance Alternative would preserve the current trail system; it would not close trails or

create new trails. The Maintenance Alternative would not close or reduce dog play areas; however, no new dog play areas would be created in the Natural Areas.

Activities at Laguna Salada in the Sharp Park Natural Area would be limited to removing accumulated sediment and tules by hand or other low-impact means during the dry season. Laguna Salada would not be dredged, and during the rainy season Natural Areas Program staff would continue monitoring for the California red-legged frog, in compliance with the state and federal Endangered Species Acts. The Maintenance Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative in the FEIR.

The Commission rejects the Maintenance Alternative because it would not result in restoration projects that address the issues that may adversely affect the ecosystem functions and biological diversity in the Natural Areas. The Maintenance Alternative meets some, but not all of the project objectives. Specifically, the Maintenance Alternative does not meet the objectives related to enhancement of the native ecosystem and biodiversity and restoration of the Laguna Salada wetland complex. The Maintenance Alternative would not result in restoration projects that address the issues that may adversely affect the ecosystem functions and biological diversity in the Natural Areas. Furthermore, the Maintenance Alternative would not provide additional recreation opportunities compatible with San Francisco's natural resources.

Alternatives Considered, Rejected, and the Reasons for Rejection

During the scoping process, public comment was received proposing a Sharp Park restoration alternative that included a model of natural flood control, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and endangered species recovery. This alternative would involve full restoration of the entire Sharp Park property, including the elimination of the golf course. This proposal was rejected as an individual alternative because it is not compatible with the 18-hole layout of the historic golf course. This alternative would, through the elimination of the Sharp Park Golf Course, result in greater significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural and recreational resources and therefore is not required to be analyzed under CEQA.

In addition, as part of the Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report, the SFRPD proposed restoration alternatives that would be compatible with either a nine-hole layout at the Sharp Park Golf Course or with removal of the golf course entirely. These alternatives have been rejected because they are not compatible with the existing 18-hole layout of the historic golf course.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, is the Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the NRMP as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the NRMP. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the NRMP. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, this determination is that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the Final EIR and the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the administrative record, as described in Section I.

The Commission finds that, notwithstanding the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, significant impacts related to Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Biological Resources, Air Quality, and Recreation will remain significant and unavoidable and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b)(2)(B), such remaining impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described below. In accordance with CEQA guidelines Section 15093, CEQA Section 21081(b), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Commission hereby finds that each of the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations, and the benefits of the Project separately and independently outweigh these significant, adverse impacts. The remaining significant adverse impacts identified are acceptable in light of each of these overriding considerations.

The Management Plan would:

- enhance over 1,000 acres of natural open spaces under the jurisdiction of San Francisco Recreation and Park Department through recommended management actions specific to each of the 32 Natural Areas;
- identify and prioritize monitoring of natural resources to support an adaptive management approach to appropriately prepare and react to any foreseeable hazards to public safety;
- provide guidelines for education, research, and stewardship programs to promote city residents of all ages to connect to the natural world despite living in an urbanized city;
- promote the functioning of San Francisco's native ecosystem through maintenance and enhancement of native biodiversity to ensure San Francisco is resilient and adaptable towards climate change;
- improve trail infrastructure and access to Natural Areas to encourage City residents to utilize their parks system for physical exercise and relaxation;
- ensure the sustained and increased populations of the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the threatened California red-legged frog, both protected under the Endangered Species Act, through the Laguna Salada restoration at Sharp Park;
- protect and enhance beautiful natural and sustainable landscapes of San Francisco for future generations to enjoy.

Having considered the information included above as well as information in these Findings and elsewhere in the administrative record, the Commission finds, determines, and concludes that the project benefits of the Management Plan Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

Attachment 2: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1: Consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department: SFRPD would coordinate with the San Francisco Planning Department's Historic Preservation Planners and would submit plans before constructing stabilizing and erosion control measures that require installation of structures, such as gabions, near potentially eligible resource. Should it be determined that a Historic Resource Evaluation is required, that evaluation shall be completed by a qualified professional landscape architectural historian. The Planning Department would assist in determining if any proposed construction or other activities would impact identified historic resources under CEQA on a site-by-site basis; if such impacts may occur, the project would be required to be redesigned to avoid significant impacts to historic architectural resources. The Planning Department would also assess potential impacts on any historic landscapes that are present.</p>	<p>San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD)</p>	<p>Before any construction of structures near potentially eligible resource—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with SF Planning Department • Submission of plans • Possible redesign of project if necessary 	<p>San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-7: Documentation of the Sharp Park Golf Course The SFRPD would retain a consultant with expertise in historic golf course renovation and with specific expertise, if possible, in golf courses designed by Alistair McKenzie to document and preserve the historic character-defining features of the Sharp Park Golf Course before wetland restoration activities take place. The National Park Service has published guidance for preserving 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 the Treatment of Historic Properties Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. The appropriate level of documentation would be selected by a qualified professional landscape architectural historian 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).</p>	<p>SFRPD</p>	<p>Pre-activity—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain a consultant with appropriate expertise 	<p>SFRPD</p>	<p>Considered complete when qualified consultant has been retained / Pre-activity</p>

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-CP-7: The documentation would consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full sets of measured drawings depicting existing or historic conditions of the Sharp Park Golf Course; • Digital photographs of the Sharp Park Golf Course; • A written history and description of the Sharp Park Golf Course and its alterations. <p>The professional landscape architectural historian would prepare the documentation and submit it for review and approval by a San Francisco Planning Department Preservation Specialist. The documentation would be disseminated to the San Francisco Library History Room and the SFRPD Headquarters.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to wetland restoration at Sharp Park— Documentation with drawings, photographs, written history and description.	SFRPD with help of qualified archaeological consultant	Considered complete when SF Planning approves documentation / Pre-activity
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-10: Archaeological Monitoring Program for Programmatic Projects in Natural Areas with High Archaeological Sensitivity, Routine Maintenance Activities at Tank Hill and Lake Merced, and the Sharp Park Restoration Project</p> <p>The following archaeological monitoring program mitigation measure is required in order to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged archaeological or historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c), as a result of NRMP programmatic projects in Natural Areas of high archaeological sensitivity and routine maintenance activities at Tank Hill and Lake Merced. In addition, based on a reasonable potential that archaeological resources may be present within the C-APE of the Sharp Park restoration project, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the Sharp Park restoration on archaeological resources.</p>	SFRPD	Before implementation of plan and Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create Archaeological Monitoring Plan 	SFRPD with help of qualified archaeological consultant	Considered complete upon ERO approval of the Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) and distribution of copies.

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-CP-10: Before implementation of NRMP and the Sharp Park restoration project, the SFRPD shall retain a qualified archaeological consultant from the San Francisco Planning Department's pool of qualified archaeological consultants, as provided by the Department's archaeologist. The archaeological consultant will prepare one or multiple AMPs that each address one of the following impacts on archaeological resources: 1) programmatic projects in Natural Areas with high archaeological sensitivity, 2) routine maintenance activities in Tank Hill and Lake Merced Natural Areas, and 3) the Sharp Park restoration project.</p> <p>All plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Any AMP and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend NRMP activities covered under this mitigation measure for up to four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension were the only feasible means to reduce impacts to a less than significant level on a significant archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p>	SFRPD	Before implementation of NRMP and Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retain a qualified archaeological consultant Preparation of one or multiple AMPs Submission of plans and reports to ERO for review and comment 	SFRPD, archaeological consultant	Considered complete upon submission of plans and reports to the ERO for review and comment; final approval by the ERO.
<p>M-CP-10: Archaeological monitoring program. The AMP will minimally include the following provisions:</p> <p>The archaeological consultant, SFRPD, and ERO will meet and consult on the scope of each AMP reasonably before implementation of the NRMP. The ERO, in consultation with the Project Archaeologist, will determine what programmatic projects in which high-sensitivity Natural Areas and what routine maintenance activities in Tank Hill and Lake Merced Natural Areas shall be archaeologically monitored.</p>	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant, ERO	Before implementation of NRMP and Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SFRPD, ERO and archaeological consultant joint meeting to design an archaeological monitoring plan. 	SFRPD, archaeological consultant	Considered complete upon agreement of programmatic projects and routine maintenance activities in Tank Hill, Lake Merced Natural Areas.

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-CP-10: Additionally, the ERO and Project Archaeologist will determine which activities and portions of the Sharp Park restoration project will be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any ground-disturbing activities, such as demolition, excavation, grading, utilities installation, site remediation, etc. shall require archaeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context.	SFRPD	Before implementation of NRMP and Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ERO and Project Archaeologist to determine which activities and portions of the Sharp Park restoration project will be archaeologically monitored. 	SFRPD, archaeological consultant	Considered complete upon agreement among SFRPD, ERO and Project Archaeologist of which activities or portions of Sharp Park project will be archaeologically monitored / Pre-activity
M-CP-10: The archaeological consultant will advise all project contractors and Natural Areas Program staff to be on the alert for evidence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of discovery of an apparent archaeological resource. A standard EP ALERT Sheet will be issued to participating project contractors and Natural Areas Program staff. Additionally, Natural Areas Program staff will advise all project volunteers of the potential for archaeological resources;	SFRPD	Before implementation of NRMP and Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological consultant to advise all project contractors and NAP staff • SFRPD will issue EP ALERT Sheet. • NAP staff to advice all project volunteers. 	SFRPD, archaeological consultant	Pre-activity
M-CP-10: The archaeological monitors will be on the project site according to a schedule agreed on by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determined that project construction would have no effects on significant archaeological deposits; The archaeological monitor will record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material warranted for analysis.	SFRPD	As-needed on a project basis— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological monitors on project site until ERO determines that project construction would have no effect on significant archaeological deposits. 	SFRPD, archaeological consultant	Considered complete when ERO, in consultation with archaeological consultant, determines that project construction would have no effects on significant archaeological deposits / Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-CP-10: If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit should cease. The archaeological monitor will be empowered to temporarily redirect project activities and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. The archaeological consultant will immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. After making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, the archaeological consultant will present the findings to the ERO.	Archaeological consultant, ERO	As-needed on a project basis if an intact archaeological deposit is encountered	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant	Considered complete when consultant notifies and presents findings to ERO / Ongoing, as-needed basis
M-CP-10: If the ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that it could be adversely affected by the project, at the discretion of the SFRPD, the situation shall be resolved by one of the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource, or An archaeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO were to determine that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive value than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource were feasible. 	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant, ERO	If a significant archaeological resource is present	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant	Considered complete when project is either redesigned or archaeological data recovery program is implemented / Ongoing, as-needed basis.
M-CP-10: If the ERO requires an archaeological data recovery program to mitigate for adverse effects on the significant archaeological resource, it shall be conducted in accordance with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archaeological consultant, SFRPD, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP and submit it to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain; that is, the ADRP would identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods were practical. The ADRP shall include the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations; 	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant, ERO	If ERO requires an archaeological data recovery program to mitigate for adverse effects on the significant archaeological resource	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant	Considered complete when ADRP is drafted / Ongoing, as-needed basis.

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures; Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies; Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and unintentional damage; Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results; and Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for curating any recovered data having potential research value, identifying appropriate curation facilities, and summarizing the accession policies of the curation facilities. 				
<p>M-CP-10: Final Archaeological Resources Report. The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods used in the archaeological monitoring or data recovery program. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once the FARR is approved, copies shall be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One copy to the NWIC with a copy of the transmittal sent to the ERO; and Three copies to the EP division of the San Francisco Planning Department; EP shall also receive one unlocked, searchable PDF copy of the FARR on a CD or DVD, along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above. 	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant, ERO	If ERO requires an archaeological data recovery program to mitigate for adverse effects on the significant archaeological resource	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant	Considered complete after draft FARR is reviewed and approved by ERO / Ongoing, as-needed basis

ATTACHMENT 2:				
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-11: Accidental Discovery</p> <p>Prior to any ground disturbing activity resulting from implementation of the NRMP, including Natural Areas of moderate and low archaeological sensitivity, a copy of EP's standard archaeological alert sheet will be issued to project staff. The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the involved Natural Areas Program staff and volunteers, project prime contractor, any project subcontractors (including, but not limited to, demolition, excavation, grading, etc. firms), and any utilities firm involved in ground-disturbing activities. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor (or Natural Areas Program staff for projects without contractors) is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the "ALERT" sheet.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to any ground disturbing activity from implementation of NRMP	SFRPD	Complete when "ALERT" sheet is circulated and SFRPD provides the ERO with a signed affidavit from responsible parties / Ongoing
<p>M-CP-11: Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or SFRPD shall immediately notify the ERO and immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</p>	SFRPD, ERO	If any indication of any archaeological resource is encountered	SFRPD	Considered complete when SFRPD notifies ERO and suspends any soils disturbing activities / Ongoing, as-needed basis
<p>M-CP-11: If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, SFRPD shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific, historical, or cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by SFRPD. Measures might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation in situ of the archaeological resource; • An AMP; or • An archaeological testing program. 	SFRPD, ERO	<p>If ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within project site—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain services of archaeological consultant • Consultant to advise ERO of significance of archaeological resource 	SFRPD, Archaeological consultant	Considered complete when archaeological consultant recommends an action, if any. If so, SFRPD to implement specific additional measures required by ERO / Ongoing, as-needed basis

ATTACHMENT 2:				
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-CP-11: If an AMP or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the EP division guidelines for such programs and as described above under M-CP-10. The ERO may also require that SFRPD immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p>	<p>SFRPD, Archaeological consultant, ERO</p>	<p>If an AMP or archaeological testing program is required</p>	<p>SFRPD</p>	<p>Considered complete when AMP or archaeological testing program is consistent with EP division guidelines (M-CP-10), and if required, when SFRPD implements a site security program / Ongoing, as-needed basis</p>
<p>M-CP-11: The project archaeological consultant shall submit a FARR to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the AMP and/or ADRP. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR and associated items (i.e. site record forms) shall be distributed in the same numbers and to the same recipients outlined in M-CP-10.</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant, ERO</p>	<p>If an AMP or archaeological testing program is required</p>	<p>SFRPD</p>	<p>Considered complete when FARR is review and approved by ERO / Ongoing, as-needed basis.</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-12: Annual Archaeological Sensitivity Training for Natural Areas Program Staff Involved with Routine Maintenance Activities in all Natural Areas SFRPD staff working within the Natural Areas will be trained by a qualified archaeologist regarding the potential for archaeological resources within the Natural Areas and how to identify such resources. The training will also include a review of penalties for looting and disturbance of these resources. At a minimum, the training will include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assigned archaeological sensitivity level of each Natural Area; • A discussion of the potential to encounter archaeological resources; • Instructions for how to identify archaeological resources; • Instructions for reporting observed looting, disturbances of known archaeological resources, or the presence of a previously unidentified archaeological site; • An overview of the AMP for routine maintenance activities and accidental discovery procedures in the Natural Areas (see M-CP-10 and M-CP-11, respectively); and • An overview of M-CP-18, Treatment of Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. </p>	<p>SFRPD, Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Annual training for Natural Areas Program staff</p>	<p>SFRPD, Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Considered compliant after every annual training of Natural Areas staff / Ongoing on an annual basis</p>

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-CP-12: It shall be the responsibility of SFRPD Natural Areas Program staff, at the beginning of any management activities involving persons outside of the Natural Areas Program, to educate volunteers or other personnel on the potential to encounter archeological resources and instructions for reporting the presence of potential resources to SFRPD Natural Areas Program staff.	SFRPD	At the beginning of any management activities involving persons outside of the Natural Areas Program— Ongoing education of volunteers/other personnel regarding archaeological resources in Natural Areas	SFRPD	Considered compliant after any archaeological resources volunteer/other personnel training by Natural Areas staff / Ongoing, as-needed basis
Mitigation Measure M-CP-15: Coordination with EP Regarding Paleontological Resources Prior to Implementation of Programmatic Projects To mitigate the potential for the NRMP to affect paleontological resources, this mitigation measure will apply to programmatic projects. The SFRPD shall coordinate with EP prior to conducting any programmatic projects that would result in ground disturbance. In such instances, EP shall review the proposed activities to determine if ground-disturbing activities could occur at or near bedrock or other geologic features of CEQA significance. If such features exist and could be affected by project activities, a training program will be conducted and an alert sheet will be disseminated to all field personnel.	SFRPD, EP	Prior to conducting any programmatic projects that would result in ground disturbance.	SFRPD	Considered complete when EP reviews proposed activities; if significant features exist or could be affected, SFRPD to conduct training program and to disseminate alert sheet to field personnel / Ongoing, as-needed basis
M-CP-15: Any paleontological training will be conducted by a qualified paleontologist and will discuss the potential for such resources to exist in the Natural Area(s) and how to identify such resources. The training will also include a review of penalties for looting and disturbance of these resources. Alert sheets will be issued for all such projects and will include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion of the potential to encounter paleontological resources; • Instructions for reporting observed looting of a paleontological resource; and • Instructions that if a paleontological deposit were encountered within a project area, all ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease and the ERO shall be notified immediately. 	SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant	If significant paleontological resources may be affected by proposed activities— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain a qualified paleontologist consultant • Consultant to conduct training • Alert sheets will be issued. • Alert ERO if paleontological deposit is encountered. 	SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant	Considered complete when training is conducted and if any identified resources are reported to ERO / Ongoing, as-needed basis

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-CP-15: When unanticipated paleontological resources are encountered during programmatic project activities, all project activities shall stop, and a professional paleontologist shall be hired to assess the find and its significance. The findings shall be presented to the ERO who would decide the additional steps to be taken before work in the vicinity of the deposit is authorized to continue.	SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant	When unanticipated paleontological resources are encountered during programmatic project activities— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain professional paleontologist to assess the find and its significance Present findings to ERO and follow additional steps. 	SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant	Considered complete when findings are presented to ERO and if necessary and required by ERO, when any additional steps are taken / Ongoing, as-needed basis.
Mitigation Measure M-CP-16: Avoidance of Surface Bedrock in Routine Maintenance Activities To mitigate the potential for the NRMP to affect paleontological resources the following mitigation measure will apply to routine maintenance activities. Natural Areas Program staff and volunteers will avoid ground-disturbing activities in areas where surface bedrock exists. If routine maintenance activities cannot avoid bedrock, SFRPD will implement M-CP-15, discussed above	SFRPD	When working near potentially affected paleontological resources— Avoid ground-disturbing activities where surface bedrock exists.	SFRPD	Considered compliant when SFRPD staff/volunteers avoid ground-disturbing activities where surface bedrock exists; Also considered compliant if SFRPD implements M-CP-15 if bedrock cannot be avoided / Ongoing basis

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-17: Paleontological Training Program and Alert Sheet for the Sharp Park Restoration Project</p> <p>To mitigate the potential for the Sharp Park restoration project to affect paleontological resources, the SFRPD shall arrange for a paleontological training by a qualified paleontologist regarding the potential for such resources to exist in the restoration area and how to identify such resources. The training shall also include a review of penalties for looting and disturbance of these resources. An alert sheet shall be issued and will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion of the potential to encounter paleontological resources; • Instructions for reporting observed looting of a paleontological resource; and • Instruct that if a paleontological deposit were encountered within a project area, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease and the ERO would be notified immediately. <p>If an unanticipated paleontological resource is encountered during project activities, all project activities shall stop, and a professional paleontologist shall be hired to assess the find and its significance. The findings shall be presented to the ERO who would decide the additional steps to be taken before work in the vicinity of the deposit was authorized to continue.</p>	<p>SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant, ERO</p>	<p>If Sharp Park restoration project has potential to affect paleontological resources—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain a qualified paleontologist • Arrange a paleontological training • If unanticipated paleontological resource is found, paleontologist consultant to present findings to ERO • Follow additional steps required by ERO as needed. 	<p>SFRPD, Paleontologist consultant</p>	<p>Considered complete if paleontologist is retained, trains staff, and reports any found resources to ERO, and any required additional steps are executed. / Ongoing, as-needed basis</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-18: Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</p> <p>The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any ground-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco (or San Mateo County Coroner if found at Sharp Park) and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, SFRPD, and Most Likely Descendant shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.</p>	<p>SFRPD, Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>If any human remains or funerary objects are discovered during any ground-breaking activity—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comply with applicable State and Federal Laws 	<p>SFRPD, Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Ongoing, as-needed basis</p>

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Recreation				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-RE-6: Restoration of the Sharp Park Golf Course to 18 Playable Holes</p> <p>The SFRPD would coordinate with a golf course consultant and would restore the playability of the Sharp Park Golf Course, which would involve replacing Hole 12 either on the west (Option 1) or east (Option 2) side of Highway 1. Replacing the hole on the west side of Highway 1 may also require moving an additional hole west of the highway to retain playability and flow of the course, thereby increasing the number of holes west of the highway to 15 and decreasing to three the number of holes to the east. Creating a new hole east of Highway 1 would decrease the number of holes west of the highway to 13 and increase to five the number of holes to the east. The determination of where the replacement hole is constructed and whether additional holes need to be moved would require additional environmental review.</p>	SFRPD	<p>During implementation of Sharp Park restoration project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with golf course consultant; • Replacement of Hole 12 • Additional environmental review. 	SFRPD	<p>Considered complete when agreed upon design of golf course consultant is constructed</p>
Biological Resources				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a: Protection of Protected Species and Riparian and Wetland Habitat</p> <p>Where there is potential for protected species or their habitats (plants, birds, terrestrial, and aquatic species) or other protected habitats, namely riparian and wetland habitat (as protected by California Department of Fish and Game, California Coastal Commission, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or US Army Corps of Engineers) to be affected directly or indirectly by a programmatic project, the SFRPD will prepare and provide for ERO review a compliance plan that details the proposed project, whether any protected species, protected species habitat, riparian habitat, or wetland habitat exists, the appropriate life histories of such resources (as applicable to special status species), and how the project will achieve compliance with this mitigation measure, including details as to how the SFRPD will first avoid, then minimize and if necessary restore, and/or compensate for any impacts to protected species and/or their habitats or other regulated habitats. Where there is potential for impacts to protected species and/or riparian and wetland habitats that are regulated by state, federal and/or local agencies, the compliance plan shall identify those agencies, and the SFRPD shall coordinate with all applicable resource agencies to obtain the appropriate permits and/or consultation as required by state or federal law. This mitigation measure requires SFRPD to implement the following, subject to modification through the regulatory approval processes required for an individual project.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Where there is potential for protected species or their habitats may be affected by programmatic project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of a compliance plan • Implementation of plan • Ongoing review • Application for necessary permits. 	SFRPD	<p>Ongoing</p>

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-1a: To avoid disturbance to protected species, their habitats, and riparian or wetland habitat, the following measures will be implemented by the SFRPD:</p> <p>For protected species, a qualified SFRPD biologist shall survey for suitable habitat within the project area before the project begins, according to US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game protocol for the protected species having the potential to occur. If no protocol exists, surveys shall be conducted according to generally accepted survey methods. If individuals were found or if it is determined that the potential exists for protected species to be present, the SFRPD shall redesign the proposed project to avoid impacts on protected species. Avoidance/minimization measures shall include conducting project activities during periods of the species lifecycle when the species would not be affected or may be minimally affected by project activities. If it is infeasible to avoid disturbance of protected species, the SFRPD will contact the US Fish and Wildlife Service or California Department of Fish and Game and undertake appropriate consultation according to the California Endangered Species Act or Endangered Species Act (unless an existing Biological Opinion is already in place and the proposed activities fall under the actions of that Biological Opinion, as may be the case for impacts to the mission blue butterfly at Twin Peaks). Any additional requirements agreed to during consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game, or other regulatory agencies, to protect the species would be implemented, including restoration and compensation, where required.</p> <p>Where there is potential for wetland or riparian areas to be affected by programmatic activities, the SFRPD shall coordinate with California Department of Fish and Game, California Coastal Commission, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, US Army Corps of Engineers and/or other applicable agencies to determine the jurisdictional boundaries of protected riparian and wetland habitat. SFRPD shall apply for all appropriate permits for effects to riparian areas and wetlands (including, but not limited to, US Army Corps of Engineers 404 permits, California Department of Fish and Game Section 1602 permits, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 401 Water Quality Certifications, and coastal development permits). Any additional requirements to protect riparian and wetland habitat resulting from the regulatory approval processes would be implemented, including restoration and compensation, where required.</p> <p>As discussed in Section III.E.5, new trails would be designed to avoid sensitive species habitat and riparian and wetland habitat. Where habitat for protected species or riparian and wetland habitat cannot be avoided, the programmatic project would be required to restore and/or compensate for habitat losses in accordance with measures 4 and 5 of this mitigation measure. Restoration and/or compensation shall be required at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio of habitat affected to habitat restored and/or compensated.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Where there is potential for protected species or their habitats may be affected by programmatic project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of compliance plan • Implementation of Plan • Ongoing review • Application for any necessary permits 	SFRPD	Ongoing and as-needed

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-1a: To minimize disturbance to protected species, their habitat, and wetland and riparian habitat, as a result of programmatic projects, the following minimization measures will be implemented by SFRPD, as applicable.</p> <p>Post signs or install flagging and temporary fencing around protected species habitats and riparian and/or wetland habitats that are not being directly restored. No activities shall be allowed within fenced areas, including moving equipment, storing materials, or temporarily stockpiling soils. All exclusion fencing will be removed when work in the project area is completed.</p> <p>Where stream crossings are necessary, temporary stream crossings will be located in previously disturbed areas lacking riparian vegetation, pools, side ponds or other sensitive habitats unless otherwise permitted by natural resource agencies for habitat improvement activities or hazard abatement. At a minimum, all temporarily impacted areas shall be restored to their previous condition.</p> <p>In or near riparian or wetland habitat, programmatic project activities shall be limited to the dry season (generally April 15 to October 15) and include protective practices such as the use of geotextile cushions and other materials if heavy equipment will result in rutting or soil displacement (i.e. timber pads, prefabricated equipment pads, thick vegetative slash, geotextile fabric) and/or vehicles with balloon tires shall be employed.</p> <p>Where protected species are potentially present, a biological monitor shall be required (as determined after appropriate consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game) during implementation of the proposed project. The biological monitor shall survey for protected species to ensure avoidance of those species, wherever feasible; where avoidance is not feasible, the monitor would relocate any species throughout implementation of the programmatic project, as permitted by natural resource agencies. The exact relocation sites and requirements for relocation shall be determined through consultation/coordination with US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Where there is potential for protected species or their habitats may be affected by programmatic project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting of signs and installation of flagging and temporary fencing as necessary • Limiting of construction and maintenance to the dry season. Employment of protective practices as necessary 	SFRPD	Ongoing and as-needed

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-1a: Where disturbance of protected species, their habitat, or riparian or wetland habitat cannot be avoided or sufficiently minimized, the SFRPD shall restore the habitat functions and services of areas that are subject to disturbance during programmatic project activities at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio, in accordance with a detailed restoration plan or plans prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist and would be consistent with all required permits. Final restoration plans would include the following: Detailed work descriptions for the restoration actions; and b. Ecologically based criteria that shall be used to determine whether the restoration project(s) were achieving identified performance objectives. A schedule for monitoring and reporting on monitoring results shall be included, as agreed upon in coordination with applicable permitting agencies, and as needed to verify whether the vegetation is fully established. The final restoration plan may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed description of restoration activities; • Restoration goals; • Restoration work plan; • Management and maintenance plan; • Success criteria and performance indicators; • Monitoring plan; and • Site protection measures. 	SFRPD	<p>Where disturbance of protected species, their habitat, or riparian or wetland habitat cannot be avoided—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible implementation of monitoring plan • Ongoing restoration activity 	SFRPD	Ongoing and as-needed
<p>M-BI-1a: Where avoidance and minimization measures are not sufficient to prevent a programmatic project from permanently removing protected species habitat, riparian, and/or wetland habitat and on- or off-site restoration or enhancement is not practicable, SFRPD shall provide compensatory mitigation for the impacts created at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio, unless otherwise determined by natural resources agencies. Examples include mitigation banking, in-lieu funds to parks for their restoration, or off-site preservation. Such activities would be evaluated in subsequent environmental reviews.</p>	SFRPD	Compensatory mitigation for impacts as needed.	SFRPD	Ongoing and as-needed

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-1b: Protection of Locally Significant Plant Species during Implementation of Programmatic Projects</p> <p>Where there is potential to impact locally significant plant species and SFRPD has not substantially enhanced the habitat for that species through restoration activities implemented by the NRMP already, SFRPD shall undertake the following measures to avoid and minimize impacts to locally significant plant species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A qualified SFRPD biologist shall survey suitable habitat within the project area before the project begins. If locally significant plant species are found, the SFRPD shall redesign the proposed project to avoid or minimize impacts on locally significant plant species. • Where impacts to locally significant plant species cannot be avoided, SFRPD shall harvest the seeds of, or salvage, the affected species and use collected plants or seeds to enhance and/or restore similar habitat within the Natural Areas or outside of the Natural Areas, if necessary. To the extent feasible, habitat enhancement or restoration shall take place at sites already planned for other mitigation for the project or as part of other restoration activities carried out by SFRPD; if habitat is not suitable at those sites, habitat enhancement or restoration shall be carried out at appropriate nearby sites through strategies such as transplantation, relocation or seed harvest. Enhancement and/or restoration of locally significant plant species habitat shall be designed to meet a minimum of a 1:1 ratio of affected plants/habitat to enhanced and/or restored habitat. 	SFRPD	If necessary, SFRPD shall harvest the seeds of, or salvage, the affected species and use collected plants or seeds to enhance and/or restore similar habitat within the Natural Areas or outside of the Natural Areas.	SFRPD	Ongoing and as-needed

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-5: Protection of Special Status Species during Routine Maintenance</p> <p>The SFRPD shall avoid disturbance to biological resources by undertaking the following measures during routine maintenance activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Areas Program staff and/or SFRPD staff engaged in routine maintenance activities as part of the NRMP shall receive annual training on the special status species that occur within the Natural Areas. The training shall identify the special status species that occur within the Natural Areas, their life history, measures to be implemented to avoid impacts to those species, and the proper protocol for encountering special status species. The SFRPD shall confirm that all SFRPD staff engaged in routine maintenance activities as part of the NRMP has been trained appropriately. An education program for other field personnel (e.g. volunteers) shall be conducted by the SFRPD staff before field activities begin at a new site that has the potential to contain special status species. The field education program will consist of a brief presentation by persons knowledgeable in the applicable special status species and will include identifying the locations of protected species and locally significant plant species and an explanation of the measures being taken to avoid these species. The SFRPD shall confirm that all workers and volunteers have been trained appropriately. <p>Disturbance of special status plant species shall be avoided. SFRPD staff shall conduct a reconnaissance survey of maintenance areas prior to undertaking routine maintenance activities to ensure that no special status plant species are present. If such species are found to be present, activities in those areas would be relocated or modified so as to avoid potentially affecting those species. SFRPD staff shall ensure that all volunteers and others involved in maintenance or restoration activities follow protection protocols. Vehicle operators shall use existing access roads and would remain outside of habitat supporting protected species to the extent feasible. All vehicles shall be brought in clean and free of weeds to prevent the spread or introduction of invasive plant species.</p>	SFRPD	<p>To prevent disturbance to any biological resources—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Areas staff to receive annual training SFRPD staff to conduct education program for other field personnel SFRPD staff to conduct a reconnaissance survey of special status plant species in maintenance areas. 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-5: California Red-Legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake: These species both potentially occur at the Sharp Park upper canyon. The following measures shall apply to this Natural Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To avoid disturbance of these species, maintenance work shall not occur in the vicinity of ponds and wetlands between November 15 and April 15, the breeding season for California red-legged frog and the season when San Francisco garter snakes are inactive in their winter burrows. If maintenance cannot be avoided during the abovementioned time period, the SFRPD staff will conduct reconnaissance surveys of maintenance areas prior to undertaking maintenance work to ensure that no California red-legged frogs or San Francisco garter snakes are present. Vegetation in all maintenance areas will be progressively cleared by hand equipment to a height of 4 inches and checked for the presence of snakes prior to disturbance and prior to equipment or vehicles entering the sites. Once vegetation is cleared, an additional pre-activity survey for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog shall be conducted in the maintenance area. In the event that a California red-legged frog or San Francisco garter snake is encountered, all field work shall immediately stop. Field personnel shall notify the onsite SFRPD staff member who will confirm the species has moved outside of the work zone, or the work zone shall be adjusted to avoid the species. SFRPD staff shall provide verbal notification to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or to the local California Department of Fish and Game warden or biologist (as applicable) within one working day of the encounter. The SFRPD shall follow up with written notification to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game (as applicable) within five working days. Maintenance activities in the location of the encounter would be prohibited until SFRPD has contacted and properly consulted with US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game. Field personnel shall submit all observations of protected species to the California Natural Diversity Database. 	SFRPD	<p>When working at Sharp Park— CRLF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid construction during breeding season Install flagging and temporary fencing around frog habitat Restore habitat when necessary On-site biological monitor during project activities to advise and to relocate species as necessary <p>SFGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement best management practices Schedule activities outside of hibernation season Install temporary fencing and flagging as needed. 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-5: Western Pond Turtle: This species occurs at Lake Merced and Sharp Park and may occur at Pine Lake. The following measures shall apply to these Natural Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To avoid disturbance of this species, routine maintenance work shall be avoided within wetlands, ponds and adjacent uplands, between May 15 and July 15, the nesting season for western pond turtles. If maintenance work cannot be avoided during the abovementioned time period, the SFRPD staff shall conduct reconnaissance surveys of maintenance areas prior to undertaking maintenance work to ensure that no western pond turtles or their nests are present. In the event that a western pond turtle is encountered, all field work shall immediately stop. Field personnel shall notify the onsite SFRPD staff member who will confirm the species has moved outside of the work zone, or the work zone shall be adjusted to avoid the species. SFRPD staff shall provide verbal notification to the local California Department of Fish and Game warden or biologist (as applicable) within one working day of the encounter. The SFRPD shall follow up with written notification to California Department of Fish and Game within five working days. Maintenance activities in the location of the encounter would be prohibited until SFRPD has contacted and properly consulted with California Department of Fish and Game. Field personnel shall submit all observations of protected species to the California Natural Diversity Database. 	SFRPD	When working at Sharp Park, Lake Merced, or Pine Lake— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate species from Pine Lake to Lake Merced on an as-needed basis. 	SFRPD	Ongoing
<p>M-BI-5: San Francisco Dusky-Footed Woodrat: This species occurs in the Sharp Park upper canyon. The following measure shall apply to this Natural Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SFRPD staff will conduct reconnaissance surveys of maintenance areas prior to undertaking maintenance work to identify locations of woodrat middens. To avoid disturbance of the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat, no vegetation shall be cleared within a 10-foot buffer of an active or potentially active woodrat middens. 	SFRPD	When working at Sharp Park— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct reconnaissance surveys Avoid disturbance 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-5: Western Red Bat: If an occupied or active roost is identified during maintenance activities, the roost shall not be disturbed. No maintenance work within 150 feet of the potentially occupied roost shall occur until it has been determined that bats are no longer using the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the event that a western red bat is encountered, all field work shall immediately stop. Field personnel shall notify the onsite SFRPD staff member who shall confirm that the species has moved outside of the work zone, or the work zone shall be adjusted to avoid the species. SFRPD staff shall provide verbal notification to the local California Department of Fish and Game warden or biologist (as applicable) within one working day of the encounter. The SFRPD shall follow up with written notification to California Department of Fish and Game within five working days. Maintenance activities in the location of the encounter would be prohibited until SFRPD has contacted and properly consulted with California Department of Fish and Game. Field personnel shall submit all observations of protected species to the California Natural Diversity Database. 	SFRPD	<p>If a Western Red Bat is identified—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roost shall not be disturbed. All field work to stop immediately. Notify CDFG. 	SFRPD	Ongoing
<p>M-BI-5: Mission Blue Butterfly: This species occurs at Twin Peaks and Sharp Park. The following measures shall apply to these Natural Areas: To avoid impacts to this species, SFRPD shall adhere to the long-term management and monitoring guidelines as described in the Recovery Action Plan for the Mission Blue Butterfly at Twin Peaks Natural Area and the corresponding Biological Opinion and as agreed to with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. These guidelines include conducting vegetation removal by manual, mechanical and chemical treatments that would be applied consistent with the SFRPD Integrated Pest Management program, such as hand pulling, cutting and grubbing. To avoid impacts from trampling of host plants by recreational users, the SFRPD shall continue to conduct regular maintenance on the existing trail network including trimming trailside vegetation and replacing trail base materials.</p>	SFRPD	<p>To avoid impacts to Mission Blue Butterfly at Twin Peaks and Sharp Park—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adhere to long-term management and monitoring guidelines as described in Recovery Action Plan for Mission Blue Butterfly at Twin Peaks Natural Area and corresponding Biological Opinion (USFW) 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a: Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park Restoration Project</p> <p>The SFRPD shall implement the following, subject to modification during the required regulatory approval processes:</p> <p><u>Avoidance Measures:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of access routes, the size of staging areas, and the total area of activity would be the minimum necessary to achieve the project goals and to the extent feasible access routes shall be located in upland areas; • Vehicle and equipment operators would use existing access roads and would remain outside of wetlands and riparian areas that are not integral to the restoration project; • The construction documents for the Sharp Park restoration project would identify construction staging areas, access corridors, and work zones that are least impactful to biological resources, as well as golf play and operations. Avoidance of wetlands and other biological resource areas, however, would take precedence over avoidance of golf play areas, such that golf play and operations would be impacted rather than biological resources; • After surveying the construction site for special -status species in accordance with this mitigation measure, silt fencing or exclusion fencing would be placed around the project and staging areas to reduce the potential for animals to enter the construction site. Fencing will be monitored throughout construction to ensure no San Francisco garter snakes, California red-legged frogs, or western pond turtles enter the area; fencing will meet CDFG specifications so as to avoid impacts to species potentially getting trapped in the fence. • No restoration and construction shall occur between November 15 and April 15, the breeding season for California red-legged frog and the season when San Francisco garter snakes are inactive in their winter burrows, although shrubs and willow posts may be planted by hand after the first rains, and weeds may be removed within 15 feet of aquatic areas during these times; • Before moving any vehicles that remain stationary for longer than 30 minutes, the biological monitor would inspect those vehicles to ensure that no animals had crawled beneath them for cover; • During project activities, all trash that could attract nonnative predators would be properly contained, removed from the work site, and disposed of regularly. Following project completion, all trash and construction debris would be removed from work areas. 	SFRPD	During implementation of Sharp Park restoration project— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow avoidance measures 	SFRPD	Pre-activity and ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Pre-Construction and Construction Activities</p> <p>Prior to commencement of any on-site work related to the proposed removal of sediment and emergent vegetation in the Laguna Salada wetland complex, which includes the Horse Stable Pond and the connecting channel and culverts that link Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada, additional sediment core sampling tests shall be conducted, as necessary, in the manner specified in this mitigation measure to determine whether there are elevated concentrations of sulfides or other soil characteristics that would render the soils unsuitable for supporting the desired vegetation.</p> <p>The results of the sediment core sampling tests shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFW for review prior to commencement of any on-site remediation work or sediment/vegetation removal work at Horse Stable Pond or the connecting channel and culverts.</p> <p>If remediation measures are required based on the results of the sediment core sampling tests, the SFRPD shall submit a remediation and monitoring plan (prepared by a qualified biological/hydrological consultant) to all applicable resource agencies for review prior to implementation of the remediation measures. Alternatively, the soils could be placed in a nonsensitive location. Copies of all correspondence with the resource agencies shall be submitted to the ERO. The sediment core sampling tests shall include the following elements: Work Plan, Sampling of Sediment Cores, Analysis of Sediment Cores and Estimation of the Potential for Formation of Acid Sulfate Soils, Toxics Pathway Analysis, Remediation.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Prior to commencement of any on-site work—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct sediment core sampling tests • Submit sampling tests results to USFWS and CDFW prior to any on-site remediation work or sediment/vegetation removal work at Horse Stable Pond. • Submit a remediation and monitoring plan to all applicable resource agencies prior to implementation of remediation measures. 	SFRPD	Pre-activity
<p>M-BI-6a: Work Plan</p> <p>A Work Plan for sediment core sampling tests shall be prepared by a qualified SFRPD biological/hydrological consultant and submitted to the USFWS and CDFW for review. The Work Plan shall describe, at a minimum, compliance with Tasks 2 through 5 of this part of the mitigation measure, as well as the "During and Post-Construction pH Monitoring" requirement (see following section). Copies of all correspondence with the responsible agencies shall be submitted to the ERO.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Prior to commencement of any on-site work—</p>	SFRPD	Pre-activity

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Sampling of Sediment Cores</p> <p>The locations of any additional sampling shall be determined pursuant to the work plan developed in accordance with Task 1, above. Sample sediment cores shall include the soils between the current surface sediment level and approximately two to three feet below the current surface. This depth shall be at least one foot below the proposed depth of the future sediment-water interface.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work—	SFRPD	Pre-activity
<p>M-BI-6a: Analysis of Sediment Cores and Estimation of the Potential for Formation of Acid Sulfate Soils</p> <p>The sediment cores shall be analyzed every five centimeters over the first 20 centimeters of core depth and then every 10 centimeters, or as appropriate based on field conditions, for the remainder of the core length for the following components: Total Organic Carbon (TOC), carbonate/bicarbonate, sulfate, sulfide, sulfites, pH, calcium, sodium, iron, aluminum, chloride, conductivity, redox potential, refractory organics, organic nitrogen, total phosphorus, ammonia, nitrate+nitrite nitrogen, soluble reactive phosphorus, organic phosphorus, loosely-sorbed phosphorus, iron-phosphorus, iron-phosphorus, aluminum-phosphorus, and calcium-phosphorus. Sediment core chemistry shall be analyzed to assess the potential reduction of sulfate to form hydrogen sulfate, iron sulfides, and reduction buffering capacity relative to acid-neutralizing capacity.</p> <p>In addition, sediment oxygen demand (SOD) in the sediment cores shall be measured. Results shall be compared to the total oxidizable organic material, which would be estimated from the difference of TOC and refractory organic carbon (labile carbon). These results shall be used in the analysis of potential for formation of anoxic conditions within the Laguna Salada Wetlands Complex.</p> <p>Sediment cores shall be analyzed based on Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) from the USEPA and Screening Quick Reference Tables (SQuIRT) from the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration. A draft summary of potential toxics shall be provided to the USFW, CDFW, and ERO for review and, if needed, revision will be made to the toxicity ranges appropriate for use in analyzing the sediment cores.</p> <p>The potential for formation of acid sulfate soils and anoxic conditions in the water column shall be estimated based on this analysis and in coordination with the USFWS and CDFW. If this analysis determines that acid sulfate soils could be present in this location, the SFRPD shall perform a toxic pathway analysis to determine the appropriate remediation measures. The analysis results and determination shall be submitted to the USFWS, CDFW, and ERO.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work—	SFRPD	Pre-activity

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Toxics Pathway Analysis</p> <p>Should the potential for acid sulfate soils and anoxic conditions be present, a toxics pathway analysis shall be conducted for potential risks and toxicities to species that may be affected by localized increases in acidity, hypoxia, or dissolved metals concentration. During this Task, toxicity standards shall be established in coordination with the USFWS, CDFW, and ERO based on the results of Tasks 2 and 3 above, site-specific hydrologic conditions including water exchange and dissolved oxygen levels, the species that are known to be present, and literature review. The results of this task shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFW and any applicable responsible agencies for review and comment. Copies of all correspondence with the responsible agencies shall be submitted to the ERO.</p> <p>Should the results of the sediment core tests reveal that there has been an appreciable increase in the amount of nitrogen and related compounds in the sediment cores, any necessary measures to remediate such compounds shall be undertaken in accordance with Task 5, below. The SFRPD shall hire a qualified biological/hydrological consultant to prepare a remediation and monitoring plan which shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFW for review and approval. Copies of all correspondence with the resource agencies shall be submitted to the ERO for review.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work	SFRPD	Pre-activity

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Remediation</p> <p>If results of the sediment core chemistry analysis reveal the potential for reduction of sulfate to form hydrogen sulfate, iron sulfides, and its reduction in buffering capacity relative to acid-neutralizing capacity, or if the toxics pathway analysis indicates that their presence could potentially result in substantial stress to special-status species, the SFRPD shall implement remediation measures.</p> <p>Remediation measures could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of lime to neutralize any acid that exists or which may form during the sediment removal process; • Injection of sodium nitrate to oxidize the sediments, thereby satisfying the sediment oxygen demand; or • Use of suction hydraulic sediment removal that reduces re-suspension of any form of sediments. <p>Depending on the severity of the condition (e.g., hypoxia), the remediation measure selected for implementation would be the least intensive beginning with Item a, when signs of hypoxia are present, to the most intensive with Item c, when hypoxia is persistent and/or widespread. The SFRPD shall select the remediation measure in consultation with the USFWS and CDFW. The remediation measure shall be selected based on immediate threats to species and sensitive life stages present during occurrence of the hypoxic condition.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work	SFRPD	Pre-activity
<p>M-BI-6a: A worker education program shall be implemented to familiarize workers, including all vehicle operators, of the importance of avoidance of harm to special-status species and the proper protocol should a protected species be encountered. The training shall include a discussion of the importance of maintaining speed limits and respecting exclusion zones. The SFRPD and its construction contractor shall confirm that all workers have been trained appropriately.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work	SFRPD	Pre-activity and ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Two weeks prior to the commencement of work activities and immediately prior to commencement of work, a qualified biologist will survey aquatic habitat that is suitable for the California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, and western pond turtle that would be affected by the project. If individuals in any life stages of these species are found, the biologist will contact the USFWS and/or CDFG to determine whether relocating any life stages is appropriate. Collection of California red-legged frogs, San Francisco garter snakes, and western pond turtles would be done with hand nets, and shall be relocated to areas of appropriate habitat;</p> <p>Upland vegetation in all construction areas will be progressively cleared by hand equipment to a height of 4 inches and checked for the presence of protected species prior to disturbance and prior to construction equipment or vehicles entering the sites. Once vegetation is cleared, an additional pre-activity survey for the San Francisco garter snake, western pond turtles, and California red-legged frogs will be conducted in the impact area.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Two weeks prior to commencement of any on-site work—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biologist to survey aquatic habitat • Contact USFWS and/or CDFG 	SFRPD	Pre-activity
<p>M-BI-6a: Prior to construction near wetlands or ponds, all rodent burrows in the construction area will be hand excavated until the burrows terminate or to a maximum depth of 30 centimeters in areas where soil or fill will be removed or placed.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Prior to construction near wetlands or ponds—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand excavate all rodent burrows in construction area. 	SFRPD	Pre-activity

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-BI-6a: Biological Monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A biological monitor familiar with the identification and life history of California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, western pond turtle, and other potentially present protected species, and with the appropriate agency authorization, shall be designated to periodically inspect onsite compliance with all mitigation measures. The biological monitor shall perform a daily survey of the entire project area during construction activities. During these surveys, the monitor shall inspect the exclusion fencing for individuals trapped within the fence and determine the need for fence repair. Throughout the duration of the project, the monitor shall continue to perform daily fence surveys and compliance reviews at the project site. The monitor shall be designated prior to project implementation and shall have at least one specialty environmental monitor on call, with a valid 10(a)(1)(A) permit to handle listed species. The specialty monitor shall direct all personnel in regards to interactions with protected species, perform authorized species relocations, and supervise all reporting on such species. Bullfrog monitoring will occur and egg masses detected shall be removed. 	SFRPD	Prior to commencement of any on-site work and during construction activities	SFRPD	Pre-activity and ongoing
<p>M-BI-6a: During and Post Construction pH Monitoring: During sediment and vegetation removal in the Laguna Salada Wetland Complex, pH levels immediately above the sediment shall be monitored by the SFRPD to ensure that implementation of the proposed project would not adversely affect special-status species. To ensure that residual acid sulfates in the water column would not adversely impact special-status species, pH levels in Horse Stable Pond and the connecting channel shall be monitored by the SFRPD for a period of six weeks after the proposed sediment and vegetation removal is completed. A remediation measure, such as addition of lime or injection of sodium nitrate, shall be implemented if the monitoring warrants such a remediation measure to protect special-status species based on the toxicity standards that are established in accordance with Task 4 above.</p>	SFRPD	During construction activities and post construction— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor pH levels immediately above the sediment Monitor pH levels in Horse Stable Pond and connecting channel for a period of six weeks after proposed sediment and vegetation removal is completed. 	SFRPD	Post-construction

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-6b: Protection of Protected Species during Maintenance of the Sharp Park Restoration Project</p> <p>The SFRPD shall implement the following, subject to modification during the required regulatory approval processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To avoid disturbance of the San Francisco garter snake, California redlegged frog and western pond turtle, maintenance work shall not occur in the vicinity of ponds and wetlands between November 15 and April 15, the breeding/nesting season for California red-legged frog and the season when San Francisco garter snakes are inactive in their winter burrows. If maintenance cannot be avoided during the abovementioned time period, the Natural Areas Program will conduct reconnaissance surveys of maintenance areas prior to undertaking maintenance work to ensure that no California red-legged frogs, western pond turtles or San Francisco garter snakes are present. Heavy equipment would remain outside of wetlands to the extent feasible. If it is infeasible to avoid wetlands, no heavy equipment shall be used within wetlands between October 15 and April 15. In the event that a California red-legged frog, western pond turtle or San Francisco garter snake is encountered, all work shall immediately stop. Field personnel shall notify the onsite SFRPD staff member who will confirm that the species has moved outside of the work zone, or the work zone shall be adjusted to avoid the species. SFRPD staff shall provide verbal notification to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or to the local California Department of Fish and Game warden or biologist (as applicable) within one working day of the encounter. The SFRPD shall follow up with written notification to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game (as applicable) within five working days. Maintenance activities in the location of the encounter would be prohibited until SFRPD has contacted and properly consulted with US Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game. Field personnel shall submit all observations of protected species to the California Natural Diversity Database. 	SFRPD	<p>During maintenance of Sharp Park Restoration Project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No maintenance work to occur between November 15 and April 15 No heavy equipment shall be used within wetlands between October 15 and April 15. 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-12a: Protection of Wetlands during the Sharp Park Restoration Project</p> <p>The SFRPD shall obtain all applicable permits from San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Commission, US Army Corps of Engineers, and California Department of Fish and Game for impacts to wetland habitat. Measures identified in these permits shall be applied, in addition to the following measures, unless otherwise specified by resource agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Except for those areas directly being restored, a minimum 100-foot buffer surrounding all wetlands, ponds, streams, drainages, and other aquatic habitats located on or within 100 feet of the project site shall be clearly designated on the final project construction plans and marked on the site with orange construction fencing or silt fencing. If the area is on a slope, silt fencing or other comparable management measures will be installed to prevent polluted runoff, as well as equipment, from entering the buffer area. Signs shall be installed every 100 feet on or adjacent to the buffer fence that read, "Environmentally Sensitive Area – Keep Out." Fencing and management measures shall be installed and inspected prior to project implementation and maintained throughout the restoration period. No equipment mobilization, grading, clearing, storage of equipment or machinery, vehicle or equipment washing, or similar activity, may occur until a representative of the SFRPD has inspected and approved the fencing and/or management measures installed around these features; • Vehicle and equipment operators would use existing access roads and would remain outside of wetlands and riparian areas that are not directly associated with habitat restoration. Project construction and staging areas would be delineated with construction fencing and shall avoid wetland habitat to the maximum extent feasible; • All vehicles would be brought in clean and free of weeds to prevent the spread or introduction of invasive plant species. Vehicles and equipment would be fueled, maintained, and parked at least 100 feet from wetlands. Each morning, operators would inspect all equipment that requires the use of fuel or fluids for leaks; • Silt barriers, such as sand bags, silt fences/curtains, or basins, would be installed before the project begins; 	SFRPD	<p>Prior to and during implementation of Sharp Park Restoration Project—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-activity establishment of success criteria and monitoring program • Ongoing establishment of 100-foot riparian habitat buffer using silt fencing and construction fencing 	SFRPD	Pre-activity

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wet sediments taken from the wetlands would be stockpiled so water could drain or evaporate before removal. Stockpiles would be placed in upland areas with the perimeters protected by best management practices to avoid polluted runoff; All soil stockpiles shall be protected against wind and rainfall erosion at all times. Plastic sheeting or other similar material shall be used to cover soils and would be securely anchored by sandbags or other suitable means. At no time would any stockpiled materials be allowed to erode into any water body or drainage facility or onto any roadway; and Ground disturbing construction and maintenance activities shall be avoided during the rainy season and consistent with Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a. 				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-12b: Laguna Salada Restoration Project Wetland Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Consistent with the requirements for a Section 401 water quality certification permit, the SFRPD shall prepare a mitigation plan. Additionally, because this is a restoration project, the California Coastal Commission may require an objective performance evaluation to determine project success which would include a monitoring program and methods for evaluating performance, which could be accomplished through implementation of the wetland mitigation plan. The wetland mitigation plan shall include, at a minimum, a description of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed project's physical and biological impacts; Mitigation goals; Mitigation work plan; Management and maintenance plan; Success criteria and performance indicators Monitoring plan; and Site protection measures. <p>The components of the above mitigation plan may be altered, supplemented, or deleted during the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's review process, as the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board has final authority over the terms of the water quality certification.</p>	SFRPD	<p>Prior to Laguna Salada Restoration Project implementation—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of mitigation plan 	SFRPD	Required to obtain water quality certification
Hydrology and Water Quality				

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-HY-1: Implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Measures</p> <p>Construction projects that do not drain to San Francisco's combined sewer system and involve one or more acres of land disturbance are required to obtain coverage under the NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. In accordance with the NPDES General Permit requirements, the SFRPD or its contractors would submit a notice of intent to the SWRCB's Division of Water Quality, would develop a SWPPP, and would implement site-specific BMPs to prevent discharges of nonpoint source pollutants in construction-related stormwater runoff to storm drains and water bodies. As required by the NPDES General Construction Permit, trained and certified persons would prepare the SWPPPs and would conduct inspections to ensure the effectiveness of the BMPs.</p> <p>Listed below are BMPs that would be implemented at the Natural Areas to meet the minimum requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit. These measures may be altered, supplemented, or deleted during the SFBRWQCB's review process, as it has final authority over the terms of the SWPPP.</p> <p>Other programmatic projects shall implement the following measures, where applicable to a project, unless other equally or more effective measures are determined to be necessary during future project-specific environmental review. These projects are those on less than one acre and that do not require a NPDES General Construction Permit or that drain to San Francisco's combined sewer system and are regulated by the SFPUC.</p>	SFRPD	For the implementation of Best Management Practices— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of SWPPP documents 	SFRPD and trained certified SWPPP reporter/inspector, SFBRWQCB	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-HY-1: Schedule to Avoid or Minimize Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule construction to minimize ground disturbance during the rainy season; • Sequence construction activities to minimize the amount of time that soils remain disturbed; • Stabilize all disturbed soils as soon as possible following the completion of ground-disturbing work in any area of the project site; • Provide plans to stabilize soil with vegetation or physical means in the event rainfall is expected; and • Install erosion and sediment control best management practices prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities. 	SFRPD	Adherence to schedule to avoid or minimize impacts	SFRPD	Ongoing
<p>M-HY-1: Erosion and Sediment Controls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve existing vegetation in areas where no construction activity is planned or where construction activity will occur at a later date; • Stabilize and revegetate disturbed areas as soon as possible after construction with planting, seeding, and/or mulch (e.g., straw or hay, erosion control blankets, hydromulch, or other similar material), except in actively cultivated areas; • Install silt fences, coir rolls, and other suitable measures around the perimeter of the construction zone, staging areas, storm drains, temporary stockpiles, spoil areas, stream channels, swales, downslope of all exposed soil areas, and other locations determined necessary to prevent off-site sedimentation; • Install temporary slope breakers during the rainy season on slopes greater than 5 percent where the base of the slope is less than 50 feet from a water body, wetland, or road crossing, at spacing intervals required by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board; • Use filter fabric or other appropriate measures to prevent sediment from entering storm drain inlets; and • Detain and treat stormwater and water produced by construction site dewatering using sedimentation basins, sediment traps (when water is flowing and there is sediment), baker tanks, or other measures to ensure that discharges to receiving waters meet applicable water quality objectives. 	SFRPD	Implementation of Erosion and Sediment Controls	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-HY-1: Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Store all equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants away from waterways and in secured locations; • Check equipment for leaks regularly; • Wash construction equipment in a designated enclosed area regularly; and • Refuel all vehicles and equipment at least 100 feet from any water bodies 	SFRPD	Implementation of Housekeeping measures	SFRPD	Ongoing
M-HY-1: Waste Management and Hazardous Materials Pollution Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove trash and construction debris from the project area daily; • Locate sanitary facilities a minimum of 300 feet from water bodies; • Maintain sanitary facilities regularly; • Maintain spill containment and cleanup equipment onsite and properly label and dispose of wastes; • Locate waste collection areas close to construction entrances and away from roadways, storm drains, and water bodies; • Inspect trash receptacles and other waste and debris containers regularly for leaks and remove and properly dispose of any hazardous materials and liquid wastes placed in these containers; and • Train construction personnel in proper material delivery, handling, storage, cleanup, and disposal procedures. 	SFRPD	Implementation of Waste Management and Hazardous Materials Pollution Control Measures	SFRPD	Ongoing
M-HY-1: Best Management Practices Inspection, Maintenance, and Repair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspect all best management practices regularly to confirm proper installation and function; • Inspect all stormwater best management practices daily during storms; • Inspect sediment basins, sediment traps, and other detention and treatment facilities regularly throughout the construction period; • Provide sufficient devices and materials (e.g., silt fence, coir rolls, and erosion blankets) throughout project construction to enable immediate repair or replacement of failed best management practices; and • Inspect all seeded and revegetated areas regularly for failures and remediate or repair them immediately. 	SFRPD	Implementation of BMP Inspection, Maintenance and Repair Measures	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-HY-1: Post-construction Best Management Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revegetate all temporarily disturbed areas as required after construction; • Remove any remaining construction debris and trash from the project site and area on project completion; • Phase the removal of temporary best management practices as necessary to ensure stabilization of the site; • Maintain post-construction site conditions to avoid any unintended drainage channels, erosion, or areas of sedimentation; and • Correct post-construction site conditions as necessary to comply with the stormwater pollution prevention plan and any other pertinent San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. 	SFRPD	Implementation of Post-Construction BMPs	SFRPD	Ongoing
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-HZ-13: Emergency Response Plan for Accidental Releases of Hazardous Materials</p> <p>To reduce impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials, the SFRPD shall prepare an emergency response plan for the Sharp Park restoration and each programmatic project that uses gasoline- or diesel powered equipment before the project began. The plan shall include emergency procedures for hazardous materials releases. These procedures shall include requirements for the necessary personal protective equipment, spill containment procedures, and worker training to respond to accidental spills and releases. The plan shall also require equipment to be refueled at least 100 feet from any streams or water bodies. During the implementation of programmatic projects, all hazardous materials, including any hazardous wastes, shall be used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal hazardous materials regulations. Developing and implementing the plan will ensure the proper storage and use of hazardous materials, proper response to accidental releases, and worker training, all of which will minimize contamination from hazardous materials.</p>	SFRPD	Prior to Sharp Park restoration— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare emergency response plan if necessary 	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-HZ-14: General Emergency Response Plan for Routine Management Activities Using Gasoline- or Diesel-Powered Equipment To reduce impacts from accidental releases of hazardous materials, the SFRPD shall prepare a general emergency response plan to address routine management activities that use gasoline- or diesel-powered equipment. The plan shall include emergency procedures for hazardous materials releases with requirements for the necessary personal protective equipment, spill containment procedures, and worker training to respond to accidental spills and releases. The plan shall also require equipment to be refueled at least 100 feet from any streams or water bodies. During routine maintenance, all hazardous materials, including any hazardous wastes, shall be used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal hazardous materials regulations. Developing and implementing the plan will ensure the proper storage and use of hazardous materials, proper response to accidental releases, and worker training, all of which will minimize contamination from hazardous materials.</p>	SFRPD	Prepare a general emergency response plan to address routine management activities that use gasoline- or diesel-powered equipment.	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Air Quality				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Fugitive Dust Reduction The SFRPD would implement the requirements of the Dust Control Ordinance for all programmatic projects that are outside of San Francisco to reduce fugitive dust emissions. For projects less than half an acre, the SFRPD would comply with the general dust control requirements listed in Section 106.3.2.6.3(c) of the San Francisco Building Code, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction areas sufficiently to prevent dust from becoming airborne. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water must be used if required by Article 21, Section 1100 et seq. of the San Francisco Public Works Code. If not required, reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. • Provide as much water as necessary to control dust (without creating runoff) in any area of land clearing, earth movement, excavation, drillings, and other dust-generating activity. • During excavation and dirt-moving activities, wet sweep or vacuum the streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections where work is in progress at the end of the workday. • Cover any inactive (no disturbance for more than seven days) stockpiles greater than ten cubic yards or 500 square feet of excavated materials, backfill material, import material, gravel, sand, road base, and soil with a 10 mil (0.01 inch) polyethylene plastic or equivalent tarp and brace it down or use other equivalent soil stabilization techniques. • Use dust enclosures, curtains, and dust collectors as necessary to control dust in the excavation area. 	SFRPD	Compliance with Dust Control Ordinance for projects less than half an acre	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-AQ-1: For projects greater than half an acre, in addition to the general dust control requirements above, the SFRPD would prepare a site-specific dust control plan that requires the project sponsor to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit a map to the director of the San Francisco Department of Public Health, showing all sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the site; • Wet down areas of soil at least three times per day; • Provide an analysis of wind direction, and install upwind and downwind particulate dust monitors; • Record particulate monitoring results; • Hire an independent third party to conduct inspections and keep a record of those inspections; • Establish shutdown conditions based on wind, soil migration, and other factors; • Establish a hotline for surrounding community members who may be affected by project-related dust; • Limit the area subject to construction activities at any one time; • Install dust curtains and windbreaks on the property lines, as necessary; • Limit the amount of soil in hauling trucks to the size of the truck bed, and secure the load with a tarpaulin; • Enforce a 15-mile per hour speed limit for vehicles entering and exiting construction areas; • Sweep affected streets with water sweepers at the end of the day; • Install and use wheel washers to clean truck tires; • Stop construction activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour; • Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas; and • Sweep off adjacent streets to reduce particulate emissions. 	SFRPD	Compliance with Dust Control Ordinance for projects greater than half an acre	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted, Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Construction Contract Specification to Reduce Construction Vehicle Emissions</p> <p>The SFRPD will consult with EP before implementing each programmatic project. Under EP's direction, the SFRPD will either conduct a refined air quality analysis prior to project implementation, or EP will provide a list of all feasible mitigation measures to incorporate into the construction specifications to reduce construction vehicle emissions. If SFRPD were to conduct a refined air quality analysis and find that construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions would be below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District thresholds, SFRPD would not be required to incorporate mitigation measures into the project's construction specifications. The following mitigation measures are examples of mitigation measures that EP might direct the SFRPD to incorporate into construction specifications for the Sharp Park restoration project or the programmatic projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For programmatic projects between 2011 and 2015, use Tier 3 equipment with best available control technology where feasible. For programmatic projects conducted after 2015, use Tier 4 equipment or interim Tier 4 equipment equipped with best available control technology where such equipment exists. • Use temporary power provided by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company instead of diesel generators; where it is not possible to plug into the electric grid, use Tier 3 diesel generators and air compressors. • Use concrete batched from local plants to limit concrete trucks' travel time and the amount of diesel exhaust emitted. • Minimize idling times by either shutting equipment and vehicles off when not in use or limiting the maximum idling time to five minutes or less (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Provide clear signage of idling rules for construction workers at all access points. • Use on-road haul trucks model year 2007 or later. • Maintain and properly tune construction equipment in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Have all equipment checked by a certified mechanic to determine that equipment is running in proper condition prior to operation. 	SFRPD	During any construction— Reduce construction vehicle emissions per agreement with EP	SFRPD	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-AQ-10: Cumulative Health Risk Analysis for Programmatic Projects As part of the environmental review for all programmatic projects, the SFRPD will conduct a cumulative site-specific health risk analysis to determine if nearby sensitive receptors would be affected by those projects in combination with other known sources (e.g., roadway sources and permitted stationary sources) and existing construction projects within 1,000 feet. Based on the results of those analyses, EP would determine the need for and the scope of additional measures to reduce health risk impacts from construction activities. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related health risks could include those listed under M-AQ-4.</p>	SFRPD	Ongoing, environmental review for all programmatic projects— Site-specific health risk analysis to be conducted by SFRPD	SFRPD	Ongoing
Improvement Measure from the Initial Study				
<p>Mitigation Measure I-ME-1 Consistent with the 2005 California Energy Action Plan II priorities for reducing energy use, the SFRPD would ensure that energy-efficient equipment is used to the extent practicable during project implementation.</p>	SFRPD	Adherence to 2005 California Energy Action Plan 2 Guidelines	SFRPD	Ongoing

SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. XXXXX

RESOLUTION ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN.

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department manages 32 Natural Areas that are scattered mostly throughout the central and southern portions of San Francisco and constitute approximately four percent of the total city area; one natural area is in Pacifica; and

WHEREAS, The Natural Areas managed by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department ("SFRPD") range in size from less than one acre to almost 400 acres and include such popular locations as Twin Peaks and portions of Glen Canyon Park; and

WHEREAS, In the late 1990s, the SFRPD initiated a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage these Natural Areas; and

WHEREAS, The SFRPD recognizes the need for a Management Plan to guide activities on properties owned or maintained by the SFRPD through its Natural Resources Program; and

WHEREAS, Over the course of several years, the SFRPD developed the Natural Resource Management Plan ("NRMP" or "Project"), with the final draft plan published in February 2006; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP contains detailed information on the biology, geology, and trails within 32 Natural Areas, 31 in San Francisco and one (Sharp Park) in Pacifica; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP is intended to guide natural resource protection, habitat restoration, trail and access improvements, other capital projects, and maintenance activities over the next 20 years; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP delineates the acreage within each Natural Area into management area categories based on the management priority; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and management activities specific to each Natural Area; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP identifies a number of goals with respect to conservation and restoration, education, research, stewardship, recreation, and monitoring goals; and

WHEREAS, Recommended actions identified for each Natural Area are intended to meet the overall goals of the NRMP and may include, but are not limited to, habitat restoration, removal of invasive species, tree removal, erosion control, trail closure, relocation or creation, and closure or reduction of dog play areas; and

WHEREAS, On April 22, 2009, the Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed NRMP and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the proposed Project's environmental review; and

WHEREAS, On August 31, 2011, the Planning Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department’s list of persons requesting such notice; and

WHEREAS, On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse; and

WHEREAS, Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR; the period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, On April 27, 2012, the Planning Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department’s list of persons requesting such notice. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Planning Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Planning and Recreation and Park Commissions and the public, and these files are available for public review at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and certified the FEIR as adequate, accurate, and complete; and

WHEREAS, The Recreation and Park Commission has reviewed and consider the FEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), (attached hereto as Attachment 2); now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission adopts the CEQA findings, including a statement of overriding considerations, (attached hereto as Attachment 1) as though fully set forth herein; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission adopts the MMRP and imposes all mitigation measures contained therein as conditions of Project approval; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission approves the NRMP, which prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and management activities specific to each Natural Area, including, but not limited to habitat restoration, removal of invasive species, tree removal, erosion control, trail closure, relocation or creation, and closure or reduction of dog play areas.

Approved on December 15, 2016

Recreation and Park Commission Secretary

BY BJ

2017 JAN 17 AM 9:36

RECEIVED
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

WILD EQUITY INSTITUTE
474 VALENCIA ST. SUITE 295
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

1479

11-8166/3210
09

DATE 1/17/17

PAY TO THE ORDER OF SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT \$ 578.00

FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY EIGHT & 00/100 DOLLARS



FIRST REPUBLIC BANK
41 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94104
Ph (415) 392-3888 / (800) 392-1407 (24hr Cust Serv)

FOR SHADY PARK GOLF COURSE/SURAMIT
FETR APT 202

[Handwritten Signature]

MP

CASE NUMBER:
For Staff Use only

2017 JAN 17 AM 9:36

APPLICATION FOR Board of Supervisors Appeal Fee Waiver

1. Applicant and Project Information

APPLICANT NAME: Brent Plater	
APPLICANT ADDRESS: 474 Valencia St., Suite 295, San Francisco, CA 94103	TELEPHONE: (415) 349-5787 EMAIL: bplater@wildequity.org

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION NAME: Wild Equity Institute	
NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION ADDRESS: 474 Valencia St., Suite 295, San Francisco, CA 94103	TELEPHONE: (415) 349-5787 EMAIL: info@wildequity.org

PROJECT ADDRESS: Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan		
PLANNING CASE NO.: 2005.0912E	BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NO.:	DATE OF DECISION (IF ANY): 12/15/16

2. Required Criteria for Granting Waiver

(All must be satisfied; please attach supporting materials)

- The appellant is a member of the stated neighborhood organization and is authorized to file the appeal on behalf of the organization. Authorization may take the form of a letter signed by the President or other officer of the organization.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of an organization that is registered with the Planning Department and that appears on the Department's current list of neighborhood organizations.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of an organization that has been in existence at least 24 months prior to the submittal of the fee waiver request. Existence may be established by evidence including that relating to the organization's activities at that time such as meeting minutes, resolutions, publications and rosters.
- The appellant is appealing on behalf of a neighborhood organization that is affected by the project and that is the subject of the appeal.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: _____

Date: _____

Submission Checklist:

- APPELLANT AUTHORIZATION
- CURRENT ORGANIZATION REGISTRATION
- MINIMUM ORGANIZATION AGE
- PROJECT IMPACT ON ORGANIZATION
- WAIVER APPROVED WAIVER DENIED



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

Central Reception

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6378**
FAX: **415.558.6409**
WEB: <http://www.sfplanning.org>

Planning Information Center (PIC)

1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6377**

*Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter.
No appointment is necessary.*

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 12:00 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggass@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com; bo@slotelaw.com; richard@sfpublishgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: APPEAL RESPONSE - SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017

Good morning,

Please find linked below the appeal response received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the Planning Department, concerning the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report Appeal for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project (SNRAMP). Also linked below is a reference copy of the SNRAMP FEIR.

[Planning Appeal Response - February 17, 2017](#)

[Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan FEIR](#)

Please also note that we received supplemental materials to the SF Forest Alliance letter received February 16, 2017. You may review the updated document with new Appendix listing and Appendix A-1 linked below.

[SF Forest Alliance Supplemental Appeal Letter - February 16, 2017 - LARGE FILE](#)

The appeal hearing for this matter is scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on February 28, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all

members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.



Appeal of Final Environmental Impact Report Natural Resources Management Plan

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DATE: February 17, 2017

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Lisa M. Gibson, Acting Environmental Review Officer – (415) 575-9032
 Jessica Range, Senior Environmental Planner – (415) 575-9018
 Melinda Hue, Environmental Coordinator – (415) 575-9041

RE: File No. 170044, Planning Case No. 2005.0912E
 Appeal of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Natural Resources Management Plan (formerly the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan)

HEARING DATE: February 28, 2017

ATTACHMENTS: Attachment A: December 15, 2016 EIR Errata
 Attachment B: Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1612-012
 Attachment C: Planning Commission Motion 19825

PROJECT SPONSOR: San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department

APPELLANT: Brent Planter, Wild Equity Institute
 Dee Seligman, Rupa Bose, and Tom Borden, San Francisco Forest Alliance

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum and the attached documents are a response to two letters of appeal submitted to the Board of Supervisors (the “Board”) regarding the Planning Department’s (the “Department”) issuance of a Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA Determination”) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (the “Project”).¹ The Final EIR (provided on a CD) was certified by the Planning Commission (the “Commission”) on December 15, 2016. The Recreation and Parks Commission approved the project on December 15, 2016. Two appeals of the Final EIR to the Board were filed.

The first appeal to the Board was filed by Dee Seligman, Rupa Bose, and Tom Borden of the San Francisco Forest Alliance (the “SF Forest Alliance Appellant”) on January 5, 2017. The SF Forest Alliance Appeal

¹ The Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (or SNRAMP) is now referred to as the Natural Resources Management Plan (or NRMP) as the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department has updated the name of the Plan.

Letter is part of Board of Supervisors File No. 170044 and can be accessed here: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4924313&GUID=0421B939-FD4D-4137-999D-045B5FD7BB42>.

The second appeal was filed by Brent Plater of the Wild Equity Institute on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society (the "Wild Equity Appellant") on January 17, 2017.² The Wild Equity Appeal Letter is part of Board of Supervisors File No. 170044 and can be accessed here: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4924316&GUID=6CA60239-9847-404D-A193-B3CBC9D82A65>.

The decision before the Board is whether to uphold the Planning Commission's decision to certify the Final EIR and deny the appeal, or to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to certify the Final EIR and return the proposed project to the Planning Department for staff to conduct additional environmental review.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (the "SFRPD") developed the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP) to identify management actions that would preserve, restore, and enhance 32 Natural Areas, 31 in San Francisco and one (Sharp Park) in Pacifica. The 31 Natural Areas in San Francisco are scattered mostly throughout the central and southern portions of San Francisco and constitute approximately four percent of the total city area; the Sharp Park Natural Area is located on the western side of Pacifica. Natural Areas range in size from less than one acre to almost 400 acres and include such locations as Twin Peaks and portions of Glen Canyon Park. Many of these areas support sensitive plant and animal species and their habitats and most are used as recreational open spaces by residents and visitors.

As envisioned by the SFRPD, the NRMP would provide the framework for long-term management of the Natural Areas. The NRMP 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 NRMP delineates Natural Areas into management area categories, depending on the level of resources and habitat present, and prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and activities specific to each Natural Area. Restoration actions would be undertaken based on adaptive management, which is a flexible learning-based approach to managing complex ecosystems, and monitoring would determine the success of those actions and influence future actions.

The activities planned for the Natural Areas can generally be divided between routine maintenance and programmatic projects. In the EIR, routine maintenance is addressed at a project level because sufficient detail is known about these activities and their potential impacts to conduct meaningful project-level environmental review. In contrast, the programmatic projects, which have not yet been designed and planned at a level that would support more detailed, project-level review, are addressed

² Save the Frogs! did not submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report or submit comments at a public hearing on the EIR. For this reason, Save the Frogs! did not meet the requirements of Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code to appeal the certification of the Final EIR to the Board of Supervisors.

“programmatically.” Generally, programmatic environmental review is used when a series of actions are related geographically, as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, in connection with rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or when individual activities are carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and have generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(a).) CEQA contemplates that such programmatic projects may undergo additional environmental review, as appropriate and as required by CEQA, at the time they are proposed. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c).) The EIR also analyzed the Laguna Salada Restoration Project at Sharp Park, as described below, at the project-level because sufficient detail regarding the proposed actions at Sharp Park was known during preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (the “Draft EIR”).

Program-Level Activities

Programmatic projects would include the following:

- Rerouting or constructing trails, using heavy equipment (such as bobcats, backhoes, and excavators) at a typical grading depth of two feet. This activity is typically conducted by contractors.
- Stabilizing hillsides, using erosion control measures that require heavy equipment and grading and possible installation of structures, such as gabions. This activity is typically conducted by contractors.
- Undertaking initial invasive weed or tree removal projects that typically exceed half an acre (or on average 20 trees) at any one time. Trees would be removed manually and limb-by-limb, as described more fully in the Draft EIR Project Description on pp. 92-93. This activity can be conducted by contractors or SFRPD staff.

While the NRMP may identify additional types of programmatic projects, the environmental effects of those projects are anticipated to be similar to or less than the above categories of program-level projects.

Project Level Activities

Routine Maintenance

Routine maintenance would include the following:

- Removing invasive weeds by hand, either as follow-up on a previously treated site or as initial treatment in small areas (less than half an acre). This activity mostly involves the use of hand tools and volunteers, with some use of power equipment by SFRPD staff, such as brush blades or chainsaws. Ground disturbance from this activity is typically within the top inch or so of ground around the root zone.
- Installing plants using hand tools and plants in one-gallon containers or smaller. In addition to planting, volunteers also may assist Natural Resources Division staff with installation of erosion control materials, including coir rolls, straw bales, wattles, jute netting, and straw matting. These materials are installed with pins or two- to three-foot-long wooden stakes. This activity typically disturbs up to 12 inches of surface soil.

- Removing invasive trees (mostly eucalyptus), as well as overhanging tree limbs. This activity typically occurs in places where trees are expanding into or threatening a native habitat or presenting a safety concern. Following removal, stumps are left in place, resulting in little, if any, ground disturbance. Typically, no more than 20 trees (or half an acre) are treated at one time. This removal covers saplings and any tree over 15 feet high. Trees over six inches at diameter-at-breast-height (dbh) are typically removed by tree crews at a rate of one to a few trees at a time. Trees would be removed manually and limb-by-limb, as described more fully in the Draft EIR Project Description on pp. 92-93.
- Maintaining trails, which include clearing deposited soil from steps, replacing or installing steps or trail edging, and rerouting and benching trails. Ground disturbance for this activity is usually six inches or less.
- Maintaining catchment basins and sediment dams through hand removal of accumulated materials.

Laguna Salada Restoration Project at Sharp Park

As stated in the Draft EIR project description on p. 97, as part of the Sharp Park restoration activities, the following project-level activities from the NRMP would be implemented. The full set of Sharp Park NRMP measures are presented in the Draft EIR project description on p. 144 and include additional measures that may fall under either programmatic projects or routine maintenance.

- SP-4a—Implement improvements to protect and enhance the habitat for the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake at Laguna Salada, including the following:
 - Create upland mounds for foraging, resting, and escape cover for the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake;
 - Dredge excess sediments and accumulated organic matter, including stands of encroaching tules, to maintain open water and fringe habitat in the wetlands complex and use appropriate dredged material on site to create or enhance upland habitat or to increase the elevation of certain golf course fairways;
 - Continue monitoring for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes; and
 - Install and maintain signs and barriers to prevent disturbance of sensitive habitat in Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada by dogs or other possible nuisances.
- SP-4b—Construct upland mounds in the area directly south and southeast of Laguna Salada and plant with native grasses and herbs to provide snake and frog basking sites, and to provide nesting habitat for riparian birds; and
- SP-9b—Establish a vegetation management plan for the canal connecting Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond that would allow channel maintenance without affecting the forktail damselfly, California red-legged frog, or San Francisco garter snake

The improvements to protect and enhance the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake at Laguna Salada under measure SP-4a are focused on restoring the marsh complex and associated

uplands to establish conditions that more closely resemble previous conditions, which will contribute to the recovery of these species, and to reduce the potential recurrence of the conditions that negatively affect the wetland complex and habitat for these species.

Draft EIR Figure 3 (as updated per the December 15, 2016 EIR Errata, Attachment A to this Appeal Response) shows the conceptual plan for restoring these areas. Although the primary restoration features discussed in the Final EIR are not likely to change, some modification may occur during consultation with the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) pursuant to the state and federal Endangered Species Acts and during other regulatory approval processes, such as with the California Coastal Commission.

The restoration is designed to achieve recovery of the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake populations and the main components are as follows:

- Dredging up to 60,000 cubic yards of material to remove sediment, encroaching plant species, and decaying vegetation in Laguna Salada, Horse Stable Pond, and the channel that connects the two water bodies, resulting in the conversion of freshwater marsh, willow scrub, and wet meadow wetland habitat to open water habitat;
- Recontouring freshwater marsh wetland and ruderal (disturbed) habitat along the Laguna Salada, Horse Stable Pond, and channel shorelines to create shallow water wetland habitat;
- Creating an upland and wetland habitat corridor between Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada;
- Converting about half an acre of wet meadow/freshwater marsh wetland to upland habitat, creating an upland refuge in the middle of Laguna Salada to provide snakes and frogs with refugia from feral cats and other terrestrial predators, and creating about an acre of replacement wetland along the northern and western edges of the lagoon in place of coastal scrub habitat; and
- Constructing up to four acres of upland mounds on landscaped grass on the east side of the lagoon and between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond. These mounds would be placed in the area currently occupied by part of the Hole 13 fairway, which would be narrowed and reconfigured.

SFRPD developed 30 percent design plans for the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, enabling project-level CEQA review.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

1995 Natural Resources Management Plan

In the late 1990s, the SFRPD developed a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage Natural Areas for the natural and human values they provide. The Natural Areas Program mission is to preserve, restore, and enhance the Natural Areas and to promote environmental stewardship of these areas. On January 19, 1995, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission approved the first Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (the “1995 Management Plan”). See Appendix E of the Draft EIR for a copy of the 1995 Management Plan.

Natural Resources Management Plan Update

Over the course of several years, the SFRPD embarked on a Plan update process that involved meetings with over 3,000 members of the public, task forces, advisory groups, independent technical advisers, consultants, and decision-making bodies to study, consider, and propose updates to the 1995 Management Plan, followed by independent scientific review. Ultimately, the SFRPD updated and expanded the level of detail in the 1995 Management Plan, as well as incorporated the comments from scientific reviews, resulting in a new NRMP. The San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission approved the Final Draft Plan for CEQA evaluation in August 2006 (the “2006 NRMP”).

Development of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project at Sharp Park

In 2009, the Board of Supervisors approved Ordinance No. 85-09 which required the SFRPD to develop a plan for restoring Sharp Park for the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake; in response to this, the SFRPD began to refine the activities proposed for Sharp Park in the 2006 NRMP. As part of the refinement, the SFRPD initiated the preparation of the Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report (the “Restoration Report”) which was completed in September 2009. (See Draft EIR Appendix I.)

The Restoration Report provided decision makers with information on how to further define the restoration activities for Laguna Salada at Sharp Park. The report developed and analyzed three project proposals for the Laguna Salada restoration that would affect existing golf course operations: 1) restoration while continuing the operation of an 18-hole golf course (A18), 2) restoration while continuing golf course operations, albeit with a 9-hole golf course (A9), and 3) restoration while ceasing existing golf course operations. The project proposals in the Restoration Report were not CEQA Alternatives developed pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, but rather initial project proposals for restoration that could be undertaken by the SFRPD.

These project proposals were derived from programmatic elements identified in the 2006 Natural Resources Management Plan. The Restoration Report on p. 4 concluded that “All three [proposals] will achieve the habitat goals.... [F]rom a wetland habitat restoration standpoint, converting uplands immediately adjacent to the wetland areas would result in greatest net benefit to the [San Francisco Garter Snake] per acre of enhanced habitat.”

In 2009, the Recreation and Park Commission endorsed the recommendation of the General Manager to proceed with developing a proposal that would expand the footprint of the habitat area into what is currently part of the landscaped golf course, restoring 19 acres of the golf course to upland habitat around wetland areas and providing a habitat corridor between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond (the “Laguna Salada Restoration Project”). This proposal would act as recovery plan for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog and preserve an 18-hole golf course at Sharp Park.

The SFRPD submitted the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project to the Planning Department for analysis of environmental effects in the Draft EIR. This change to the 2006 NRMP, and update to the project description, was documented by the SFRPD in an August 21, 2011 memorandum to the Planning Department and is included in Draft EIR Appendix J. SFRPD continued to refine the details of the Laguna

Salada Restoration Project through consultation with the appropriate resource agencies, including the CDFW and USFWS.³

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

In compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Department prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study,⁴ which was sent to more than 2,400 interested parties on April 22, 2009, including the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR, or State Clearinghouse), other governmental agencies, organizations and persons interested in the proposed project. On that date, an environmental review notice associated with the NOP was published in the San Francisco Examiner and Pacifica Tribune. During a 30-day public scoping period that ended on May 26, 2009, the Planning Department accepted comments from agencies and interested parties identifying environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR. In addition, two public scoping meetings were held (May 12, 2009, in the County Fair Building Auditorium in Golden Gate Park, and on May 14, 2009, at the Pedro Point Firehouse in Pacifica) to receive oral comments on the scope of the EIR. The Planning Department considered the comments made by the public and agencies in response to the NOP in preparing the Draft EIR for the proposed project. The NOP and Initial Study, with a summary of comment letters received in response to the NOP is included in Draft EIR Appendix A.

Draft EIR

The Draft EIR⁵ was published on August 31, 2011, and circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for a 45-day public review period that was later extended for two weeks by the San Francisco Planning Commission, resulting in a 61-day public review period that began August 31, 2011, and continued through October 31, 2011. In addition, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft EIR on October 6, 2011, and Commissioners, organizations, and individuals made oral comments at that hearing. A second public review comment period, during which written comments were once again invited, was provided from April 27, 2012, to June 11, 2012, for a total of an additional 46 days. A Public Notice of the additional comment period was sent to over 300 neighborhood organizations and individuals through direct mailing and was also posted in the following locations: SFRPD's McLaren Lodge, the Planning Department, and the San Francisco County Clerk's office. Between the two public review periods, a total of 107 days were available to provide written public comment on the Draft EIR.

³ In 2012, the USFWS issued a Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement for the Sharp Park Safety, Infrastructure Improvement, and Habitat Enhancement Project (the "Pumphouse Project"), golf course operations, and pumping, with the understanding that the SFRPD is committed to moving forward with the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project.

⁴ A copy of the NOP and Initial Study may be accessed here: <http://sf-planning.org/environmental-planning>.

⁵ Ibid.

Responses to Comments

The Planning Department prepared a Responses to Comments (RTC)⁶ document that includes responses to comments on environmental issues received at the Draft EIR public hearing that was held on October 6, 2011, and in writing during the combined 107-day public review period for the Draft EIR. In addition, the Responses to Comments document included text changes (or text revisions) that were proposed in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period and that represent a refinement or clarification to the text of the EIR. The Responses to Comments document did not identify any new significant environmental impacts; a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft EIR; or any new mitigation measures. None of the conclusions in the Draft EIR changed, and no new significant new information that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR under CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15088.5) was identified.

The RTC document was published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the Draft EIR, and made available to others upon request at Department offices. While CEQA requires the Responses to Comments to be released a minimum of 10 days prior to certification of the EIR, the Planning Department released the document 30 days prior to the EIR Certification hearing on December 15, 2016, due to the length of the RTC document and the number of comments received.

Errata

Following publication of the RTC document, the SFRPD proposed modifications to the Project Description with respect to proposed actions at the Sharp Park Natural Area with the intent of emphasizing the preferred use of soil spoils for habitat restoration purposes and identifying the other disposal sites required for excess spoils as equal disposal options. The revisions to the Project Description removed specific reference to use of the spoils to raise the elevation of certain golf course holes and to clarify potential re-use locations. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department issued the December 15, 2016, Errata to the Environmental Impact Report (Attachment A to this Appeal Response) that analyzed the proposed revisions to the Project Description and determined that the proposed modifications would not result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary. Further, these modifications to the project description and additional revisions to the EIR do not change any of the conclusions in the Draft EIR and do not constitute significant new information that requires recirculation of the Draft EIR under CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15088.5).

Project Impacts

The EIR concludes that the NRMP would result in the following significant and unavoidable environmental impacts even where feasible mitigation measures were identified:

⁶ Ibid.

- Significant unavoidable impacts to the historic integrity of with Sharp Park Golf Course from closing Hole 12 and modifying Holes 10 and 13;
- Significant unavoidable project-level and cumulative impacts from nitrogen oxide (NO_x) criteria pollutant emissions, which could exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) daily threshold;
- Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts related to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities resulting from increased dog use due to the implementation of the NRMP and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Dog Management Plan; and
- Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts related to special status plant and wildlife species from increased dog use due to the implementation of the NRMP and the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

All other impacts are either less than significant or can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

EIR Certification

On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission held a hearing to consider certification of the Final EIR, which consists of the Draft EIR and appendices, RTC and appendices, and Errata. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and found that the Final EIR reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco. The Planning Commission found that the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, and that the RTC document contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR. The Planning Commission certified the Final EIR in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

The EIR is an “informational document” intended to inform public agency decisionmakers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project proposal, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe feasible alternatives to the project to reduce or eliminate those significant effects. Certification of an environmental document does not, in this case, constitute a project approval of any kind.

CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations

As described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, if the Final EIR identifies significant effects for a proposed project, but the effects are not avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level (i.e., significant and unavoidable impacts), whichever decisionmaker approves the project must find that any such unavoidable significant effects are acceptable due to overriding financial, technological, social, or other policy considerations. This is known as a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In making these findings, the decisionmaker must balance the prescribed types of benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks. If the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093).

Because the Recreation and Park Commission has sole authority to approve the NRMP, it was the decisionmaker, under CEQA, that was required to adopt CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Consideration when it approved the project. Thus, following Planning Commission certification of the EIR on December 15, 2016, the Recreation and Park Commission approved the project and adopted findings as part of its approval action, in Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1612-012 (see Attachment B of this Appeal Response).

CEQA GUIDELINES

The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, as established under the Public Resources Code 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines (a part of the California Code of Regulations), and local CEQA procedures under Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The purpose of the Final EIR is to disclose any potential impacts on the physical environment resulting from implementation of the proposed project and time for public review and comment before decisionmakers decide to approve or deny the project.

STANDARDS OF ADEQUACY FOR CERTIFICATION OF AN EIR

On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR at a duly noticed public hearing and certified the Final EIR for the proposed project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31. (See Attachment C of this Appeal Response.)

Under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.16(c)(3), the grounds for appeal of an EIR shall be limited to whether the EIR complies with CEQA, including whether:

“it is adequate, accurate and objective, sufficient as an informational document, correct in its conclusions, and reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and whether the Planning Commission certification findings are correct.”

The standards for adequacy of an EIR are set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151, which provides:

“An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisionmakers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.”

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.16(b)(6) provides that in reviewing a CEQA decision on appeal, the Board of Supervisors "shall conduct its own independent review of whether the CEQA decision adequately complies with the requirements of CEQA. The Board shall consider anew all facts, evidence and issues related to the adequacy, accuracy and objectiveness of the CEQA decision, including, but not limited to, the sufficiency of the CEQA decision and the correctness of its conclusions."

APPELLANT ISSUES AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES

The concerns raised in the January 5, 2017 SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter and the January 17, 2017 Wild Equity Appeal Letter, are summarized below and are followed by the Department's responses.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter included comments that the EIR presents an inaccurate project description, specifically regarding the proposed one-to-one tree replacement, the number of trees proposed for removal, and the forest management objectives; the EIR did not consider environmental justice impacts from NRMP activities at McLaren Park and Bayview Hill; and the EIR did not adequately disclose trail closure and trail use limitations, the amount of herbicide/pesticide use resulting from NRMP activities, and aesthetic impacts of fences. The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter also included comments about the actions of the SFRPD in light of Board of Supervisor Resolution 653-02 and alleged CEQA violations by the SFRPD.

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter included comments on the merits of the project; preference for full restoration of Sharp Park and removing the Sharp Park Golf Course; failure of the EIR to evaluate a full restoration alternative; failure of the EIR to evaluate the "golf course redevelopment project;" disagreement that Sharp Park golf course is a historic resource; failure of the EIR to evaluate the impacts of sea level rise on the project; failure of the EIR to evaluate the existing operations of Sharp Park; failure of the EIR to analyze the impacts of Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a, Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park Restoration Project; and an assertion that the Draft EIR should have been recirculated as a result of amendments made to M-BI-6a.

Neither of the appeal letters or their attachments contain any new information that was not already addressed in the RTC document or that would change any of the conclusions reached in the EIR. The Planning Department finds the Appellants' arguments to be without merit.

Issue 1: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the Final EIR misstates the NRMP's one-to-one tree replacement policy and requests a mitigation measure to require such replacement. Additionally the SF Forest Alliance Letter includes an attachment that asserts that the Final EIR erroneously reports the projected number of trees to be removed because it does not consider saplings and misstates the Forest Management Objectives in the NRMP by stating that the NRMP would focus on dead, dying or diseased trees.

Response 1: The Final EIR correctly cites the NRMP's one-to-one tree replacement, which is part of the NRMP project description and, therefore, does not necessitate a mitigation measure. The Final EIR also correctly estimates the projected number of trees to be removed, assesses the impacts of sapling removal, and correctly summarizes the Forest Management Objectives in the NRMP.

One-to-one Tree Replacement

As stated in Draft EIR Chapter III, Project Description, p. 92, invasive trees that are removed in San Francisco would be replaced with native tree species at a ratio of roughly one-to-one, although not necessarily at the same location or within the same Natural Area. The provision of replacement trees is a component of the NRMP project, rather than a mitigation measure. This tree replacement information

was documented in an August 24, 2011 Memorandum⁷ provided by the SFRPD to the Planning Department that clarified changes to the NRMP project description, and is included Draft EIR Appendix J.

Page 3 of the August 24, 2011 Memorandum states:

Tree Removal and Replacement. Invasive trees removed in San Francisco would be replaced with native tree species at a ratio of roughly one-to-one, although not necessarily at the same location or within the same Natural Area.

Additionally, a memorandum provided by Lisa Wayne, Open Space Manager, SFRPD, to Jessica Range, Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department,⁸ provides additional detail on tree removal and replacement practices pursuant to the NRMP and SFRPD Natural Resources Division's current practices. In this memorandum, the SFRPD indicated that each year, the Natural Resources Division propagates and plants over 10,000 plants in restoration sites throughout the city, with at least 200 of those plants being trees. Therefore, planting replacement trees in Natural Areas at a one-to-one ratio, as proposed, is both feasible and has been demonstrated.

Tree Removal

General Recommendation GR-15c indicates that tree removal would focus on dead or dying trees, trees with disease or insect infestations, storm-damaged or hazardous trees, and trees that are suppressed because of overcrowding (see Draft EIR p. 112, Project Description). However, as discussed on RTC p. 4-459, there may be instances where other trees are removed in order to achieve broader restoration goals. In terms of the size of trees, diameter-at-breast-height (dbh), a common metric for assessing trees, is measured as the diameter of a tree at 4.5 feet above ground level on the uphill side of a tree. While a larger dbh is generally associated with taller trees, there is no specific, mathematical correlation between dbh and the height of a tree in general. For documentation purposes, the NRMP defines a tree as any plant having a dominant vertical trunk that is over 15 feet tall,⁹ while the NRMP EIR considers trees less than 15 feet tall seedlings or saplings. Seedlings and saplings are not included in the calculation of the number of trees to be removed within the Natural Areas, because they are not considered trees. SFRPD staff could remove seedlings and saplings that have a dbh of six inches or less (or a height of 15 feet or less), but the SFRPD arborist would be consulted in the evaluation of the removal of trees. The removal of saplings is addressed throughout the EIR as invasive vegetation removal or vegetation removal, which includes shrubs, saplings, and other species of less than 15 feet in height.

⁷ Dawn Kamalanathan, Director of Capital and Planning Division, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, "Clarification of Changes to the SNRAM Project Description" memorandum to Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, August 24, 2011.

⁸ Lisa Wayne, Open Space Manger, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, "Tree Removal and Replacement," memorandum to Jessica Range, Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, November 27, 2012.

⁹ This standard consistent with those in the Forest Inventory and Analysis Glossary maintained by the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Accessed: <https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/fia/data-tools/state-reports/glossary/default.asp> on February 14, 2017.

Forest Management Objectives

Draft EIR p. 112 shows that General Recommendation GR-15c indicates that tree removal would focus on dead or dying trees, trees with disease or insect infestations, storm-damaged or hazardous trees, and trees that are suppressed because of overcrowding. This recommendation can be found on page 5-19 of the NRMP.

“Recommendation GR-15c: To promote forest health, removal of trees shall focus on the removal of dead or dying trees, trees with disease or insect infestations, storm-damaged or hazardous trees, and trees that are suppressed because of overcrowding.”

While it is acknowledged that in some locations trees may be removed that are not dead, dying, or infested, the NRMP and the EIR project description is clear that those that are dead, dying, or infested would be the focus of tree removal activities. In conclusion, the one-to-one tree replacement is part of the NRMP project analyzed in the EIR and is clearly stated on Draft EIR p. 92. Furthermore, the EIR project description consistently indicates and accurately states that trees in San Francisco would be replaced at a one-to-one ratio, although not necessarily in the same location or same natural area. The EIR accurately presents NRMP objective GR-15c, which states that the NRMP would focus tree removal on replace dead, dying and diseased trees. Therefore, the items that the SF Forest Alliance claims are errors in the EIR are very much part of the project description and are accurately presented in the EIR.

Issue 2: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the Final EIR did not consider environmental justice impacts resulting from the removal of trees and decrease in public access in McLaren Park and Bayview Hill.

Response 2: The remaining trees and trails at Bayview Park and McLaren Park following implementation of the NRMP over the 20-year period would not be disproportionately low compared to other Natural Areas and the Appellant has not provided evidence that the NRMP would result in an economic or social effect that would in turn cause a significant impact on the environment.

The goals of the NRMP, as articulated on NRMP p. 2-2, are to provide opportunities for passive recreational uses compatible with conservation and restoration goals and to improve and develop a recreational trail system that provides the greatest amount of accessibility while still protecting natural resources. At Bayview Park, the NRMP would result in the removal of 511 of the 6,000 invasive trees, the closure/relocation of 1,439 feet of social trails, and the creation of 1,020 feet of trails, all over a 20-year period. At Bayview Park, 8,077 feet of trails would remain. At McLaren Park, the NRMP would result in the removal of approximately 809 of the 19,500 invasive trees and the closure/relocation of 15,681 feet of social trails, all over a 20-year period. At McLaren Park, 43,504 feet of trails would remain. The remaining trees and trails at Bayview Park and McLaren Park would not be disproportionately low compared to other Natural Areas.

CEQA does not require the analysis of environmental justice impacts (although it is required under the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e), economic and social changes caused by a proposed project are not themselves treated as significant effects on the environment. However where a physical change in the environment is caused by an economic or social impact of a project, that physical change may be regarded as a significant impact on the environment in the same manner as any other physical change caused by the project. Alternatively,

economic and social effects of a physical change may be used to determine that the physical change is a significant effect on the environment. If the physical change causes adverse economic or social effects on people, those adverse effects may be used as a factor in determining whether the physical change is significant. The SF Forest Alliance Appellant does not provide any evidence that the NRMP at Bayview Park and McLaren Park would result in economic or social impact that would in turn cause a significant effect on the environment. The environmental effects related to trail modifications, access and tree removal are addressed throughout the EIR.

Issue 3: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the Final EIR did not adequately disclose the extent of trail closures resulting from the proposed project and these closures would result in significant recreation impacts.

Response 3: The Final EIR adequately analyzes the impacts of trail closures and appropriately concludes that such closures would result in less-than-significant recreation impacts.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter claims that the extent of intended trail closures is not disclosed in the NRMP and not evaluated in the EIR, and that the trail closures would result in a significant environmental effect on recreation. The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter includes a table that provides alternative data and includes maps indicating additional trails that have been closed per NRMP.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-152, the trail lengths presented in Table 5 of the Draft EIR refer only to designated primary, secondary, and social trails; it does not include streets or sidewalks. Further, the data contained in Table 5, including the length of the trails, was generated using a Geographic Information System (GIS), which also produced the Soils, Land Features, and Trails maps contained in the NRMP. GIS is a computer system used for capturing, storing, checking, and displaying data related to positions on the Earth's surface. Each of the individual Natural Areas maps provided in the NRMP indicates the source data used in the GIS map and who created and revised the GIS map and on what date. The information provided in Table 5, and on the maps provided in the NRMP, represents the existing conditions at the time work on the EIR commenced.

In regards to the assertion that the NRMP illustrates fewer trails to be decommissioned than have been proposed or undertaken, social trails are not developed by SFRPD; instead, they result from unauthorized travel by park users and change over time as unauthorized use changes over time. Social trails are defined as undesigned and redundant pathways that have developed through use of a Natural Area, and they are not maintained by the SFRPD. As such, it is impossible for the SFRPD to maintain an inventory of all social trails. The NRMP identified anticipated social trails to be decommissioned, as well as improvements to authorized trails. At the time the SFRPD develops trail restoration plans for specific projects, the SFRPD conducts a survey to develop the trail restoration plan using the most up-to-date information about social trails and the preferred alignment for authorized trails. For this reason, the Primary, Secondary, and Closed trails illustrated in the NRMP are similar to, but not necessarily identical to, the illustrations provided by the Appellant.

As discussed on Draft EIR pp. 259 to 260, one of the objectives of the NRMP is to provide guidelines for recreational uses compatible with San Francisco's natural resources. These guidelines are intended to promote passive recreation, including improving and developing a recreational trail system within the

Natural Areas. As such, the NRMP calls for the creation of 5,897 feet (1.1 miles) of new trails and the closure or rerouting of 54,411 feet (10.31 miles) of trails. However, trail access would be maintained in all Natural Areas. Creating new trails and closing some existing social trails could enhance the recreation experience offered by the Natural Areas by upgrading trails to be more user friendly through increased accessibility and improved trail conditions. As a result, the proposed project would not limit access to, or result in the physical deterioration of the Natural Areas or any other recreation facilities. Therefore the Draft EIR concluded that this impact of the NRMP on recreational resources would be considered less than significant. The Appellant has not submitted any evidence that a significant recreation impact would occur from the proposed trail closures.

Please see Response 7 regarding alleged CEQA violations.

Issue 4: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the Final EIR did not adequately disclose that herbicide use would increase with the NRMP given the number of trees proposed for removal.

Response 4: Herbicide use under the NRMP is expected to be similar to current levels of use because existing routine maintenance activities would continue and tree removal would occur gradually over a 20-year period.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter asserts that the EIR's conclusion that herbicide use following the implementation of the NRMP would not substantially increase is false and that the removal of the number of trees proposed by the NRMP would necessitate an increase in the use of herbicides.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-536, the CEQA analysis provided in the Draft EIR compares the baseline (or existing conditions) at the project site, with the potential environmental impacts that would result from the proposed project; it does not analyze the impacts of current practices, except where they may appropriately be considered in a cumulative impact analysis. Pesticide use under the NRMP is expected to be substantially similar to the current use of pesticides in Natural Areas because the NRMP would apply herbicides in accordance with the City's Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program and tree removal would occur gradually over the course of 20 years.

Herbicides are applied in accordance with the City's IPM Program, which is discussed in detail on Draft EIR pp. 90 to 91. The City's IPM program, codified as an Ordinance, provides the optimal integration of management methods to control pests with the least possible hazard to people, property, and the environment. As stated on Draft EIR p. 296, to minimize the potential impacts of herbicide application, the SFRPD would adhere to the City's IPM Program, in which pesticide use in the Natural Areas would be as little as possible to achieve the desired results and carefully monitored. Also, as discussed on RTC p. 4-537, the use of herbicides has substantially declined since 2003, where all four types of herbicides being used by the SFRPD are at levels of less than 4 pounds per year each (with two types of these herbicides are being used at levels of less than 1 pound per year each).

The EIR evaluated the environmental effect of pesticide use. While the Appellant expressed general concern about the proposed use of herbicides, they do not present any evidence that the proposed project would result in significant impacts with respect to the use of pesticides and herbicides.

Issue 5: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the Final EIR did not adequately analyze the aesthetic impacts of fences in the natural areas.

Response 5: As detailed in the EIR, the NRMP proposes fencing to restrict access to sensitive habitat areas only under certain circumstances and the installation of fencing would not result in a substantial demonstrable change to aesthetic conditions.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter asserts that the installation of fences as part of the NRMP would have a significant environmental effect in regards to aesthetics. The Appeal Letter included an attachment that had a list of fencing that have been installed at Bayview Hill, Corona Heights, Glen Canyon, and Grandview and photos of split rail fencing in these locations to support their claim. The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter also asserts that installation of this fencing was a CEQA violation as they were installed before CEQA review of the NRMP was completed.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-339, the NRMP does not propose restricting access to trails with fencing as the primary means. Rather, fencing would only be required to protect visitor safety and sensitive habitat. The type of permanent fencing that typically would be used is a three-foot high rustic split-rail fence, similar to those depicted in the SF Forest Alliance attachment. While aesthetic effects are somewhat subjective, the photographs provided by the SF Forest Alliance further demonstrate that any such split-rail fencing would not result in a substantial, demonstrable negative change in aesthetic conditions. Therefore, the Draft EIR appropriately concludes on pp. 191 to 195 that the installation of fencing would result in less-than-significant aesthetic impacts.

Please see Response 7 for discussion regarding alleged CEQA violations.

Issue 6: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant states that Board of Supervisors Resolution 653-02 restricts the SFRPD from implementing the NRMP.

Response 6: Board of Supervisors Resolution 653-02 established a Board of Supervisors Citizens Advisory Committee for the development of NRMP which sunseted on December 1, 2003 and did not restrict the SFRPD from approving and implementing the NRMP.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter asserts that the SFRPD is prohibited from implementing the NRMP by Board of Supervisors Resolution 653-02.

Consistent with Board of Supervisors Resolution 653-02, the SFRPD established a Natural Areas Program Citizen Advisory Committee to guide the development of the NRMP, which, pursuant to the requirements of the Resolution, sunseted in 2003. The Appellant's concerns regarding SFRPD's compliance with Resolution 653-02 do not raise any issues regarding the adequacy or accuracy of the Final EIR, and as such are not ground for finding it inadequate under CEQA.

Resolution 653-02 did not purport to restrict the Recreation and Park Commission's ability to approve the NRMP. Rather, it anticipated that the Recreation and Park Commission would do exactly that. The Recreation and Park Commission's approval of the NRMP is not before the Board, and this comment does not raise any issues regarding the adequacy or accuracy of the Final EIR.

Issue 7: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant alleges multiple CEQA violations by the SFRPD, claiming that NRMP activities were being implemented before CEQA review of the NRMP was completed. Additionally, the Appellant alleges that one such violation, the installation of signs requesting the public to stay on designated trails and restricting and/or prohibiting bicycle use, would result in significant recreation impacts not disclosed in the NRMP EIR.

Response 7: Management of the Natural Areas is currently operating under the 1995 Management Plan and any actions taken are either authorized by the 1995 Management Plan or considered a separate project from the NRMP. The management of trail use is an existing SFRPD practice that would not change substantially with the NRMP.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter asserts that the SFRPD has acted in violation of CEQA by performing many of the actions proposed in the NRMP prior to certification of the EIR and approval of the project. The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter included an attachment that presented examples of such actions, which can be grouped into three categories: trail closure; the installation of fences; and installation of signs at some locations requesting users stay on designated trails and prohibiting or restricting the use bicycles.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter also claims that the installation of signs that request that the public stay on designated trails and restricts or prohibits bicycle use in some Natural Areas was not evaluated in the EIR and that this restriction would result in a significant environmental effect on recreation. To support the claim regarding restrictions to on-trail use and prohibition of bicycles in Natural Areas, the SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter includes a photo of a sign at a Natural Area that directs users to "Stay on Designated Trails. No Bicycles."

Most of these concerns, some of which were raised during the public review period of the Draft EIR, relate to previous actions of the Natural Resources Division, which are separate and independent from the NRMP. These concerns do not do not relate to the adequacy or accuracy of the information contained in the EIR. Nonetheless, the RTC provided a response to some of these concerns for informational purposes. Further, as with all of the comments provided on this Draft EIR, they were forwarded to the SFRPD staff and Commission for review and consideration.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-20, the Natural Resources Division is currently operating under the 1995 Management Plan. Any action the Natural Resources Division is currently undertaking is either under the authorization of the 1995 Management Plan or a separate project from the NRMP. The alleged violations cited in the Appellant's Letter, while independent of the NRMP, may include projects funded by the 2008 and 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Bond.

The 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond was a general obligation bond for improvements to parks owned and/or operated by the SFRPD and the Port of San Francisco. The 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, which is also a general obligation bond, builds on that precedent by delivering voter-approved parks and open-space recreation projects owned and/or operated by SFRPD or the Port of San Francisco. The projects identified in the 2008 and 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood

Parks Bond are separate and independent from the NRMP.¹⁰ The 2008 General Obligation Bond (2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Parks Bond) underwent CEQA review as part of Planning Department Case File No. 2007.1013E. The 2012 General Obligation Bond (2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Parks Bond) underwent CEQA review as part of Case File No. 2011.1359E.

Trail Closures and Installation of Fences

Appellant expressed two concerns in regards to trail closures and installation of fencing. As examples, Appellant cited actions at Glen Canyon. As discussed on RTC p. 4-20, the Glen Canyon Trail Restoration Project, referenced in the Appellant's attachment, was largely funded from the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, which underwent CEQA review under Planning Department Case File Nos. 2007.1247E and 2010.0870E, and is separate and independent of the NRMP. As discussed on RTC p. 4-21, the Glen Canyon Restoration Project, which is now substantially complete, repaired existing trails and steps, provided fencing for public safety, protected sensitive habitat areas, provided erosion control measures, restored native plants, and provided wayfinding signage.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-214, in regards to the trail closure in Glen Canyon, referenced in the Appellant's attachment, the trail (at the entry to the park from O'Shaughnessy Blvd.) was closed prior to the commencement of the environmental review for the NRMP. This unofficial path was deemed unsafe, due to a significant presence of poison oak. A low post-and-cable fence was installed near Silver Tree camp and day care center to discourage use. This trail closure is not part of the NRMP project.

Installation of Signs Requesting On-Trail Use and the Prohibition/Restriction of Bicycles

As discussed in the Project Background section above, the first Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan was approved in 1995. As presented on Draft EIR pp. 78 to 79, the 1995 Management Plan (Attachment E to the Draft EIR) included the following policies and management actions that pertain to trail management:

- Vegetation
 - Maintain and promote indigenous plant species,
 - Protect species listed as rare, threatened, or of special concern,
 - Preserve habitat that supports wildlife;
- Geotechnical/Soils
 - Minimize erosion along roads and trails,
 - Minimize access on unstable slopes,
- Public Use

¹⁰ In the case of the 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, some of the bond money is set aside for Citywide Parks improvements, which includes improvements to Golden Gate Park, McLaren Park, and Lake Merced Park. It is possible that some of these monies could be used for management actions and improvements proposed under the NRMP, but NRMP projects could not be accomplished until after NRMP EIR certification and project approval.

- Develop guidelines for pathways and trails and for interpretive signs
- Control dirt bike and off-road use

The NRMP does not substantially change the SFRPD's approach to trail management. The SFRPD posts signs restricting or prohibiting activities that would either be inappropriate (e.g. the trail is too narrow or not constructed to support biking activity) – or – potentially destructive (e.g. creating land erosion conditions, compaction, endangering sensitive natural habitat). As discussed in Response 3 above, the proposed project would not significantly limit access to, or result in the physical deterioration of the Natural Areas or any other recreation facilities. Therefore the Draft EIR concluded that this impact of the NRMP on recreational resources would be considered less than significant.

As discussed on RTC p. 4-145, in terms of bicycle use, bicycles are currently allowed on paved areas in some of the Natural Areas (if trails are designated accordingly). Further, since the NRMP Draft EIR was written and circulated for public review, the SFRPD has added designated multi-use earthen trails which allow bicycle use in portions of McLaren Park, Oak Woodlands, and Twin Peaks, and the entirety of Interior Greenbelt.

In regards to posting signs managing trail usage, the SFRPD does post signs requesting users stay on designated trails and restricting or prohibiting bicycle riding on trails at specific park sites. The SFRPD's authority for the posting of these signs is Park Code 3.02 which states "No person shall willfully disobey the notices, prohibitions or directions on any sign posted by the Recreation and Park Commission or the Recreation and Park Department." This Park Code section was enacted in 1981 and has been in force since then.

In conclusion, the SF Forest Alliance Appellant's list of alleged CEQA violations relate either to activities allowed under the 1995 Management Plan or separate projects from the NRMP. The alleged CEQA violations related to other projects, even if true, does not pertain to the adequacy of the EIR for the NRMP.

Issue 8: The SF Forest Alliance Appellant asserts that the greenhouse gas (GHG) calculation methodology in the EIR results in miscalculations of GHG sequestration, partially from project description errors regarding tree removal and replacement and types of trees to be removed. The SF Forest Appellant also claims that the quantification of GHGs does not account for emissions from vehicles and equipment that would be used for the NRMP and that the vegetation sequestration analysis does not account for the carbon that would be released from the removal of approximately 12,000 saplings.

Response 8: The EIR accurately presents tree removal and replacement quantities (See Response 1 above). The EIR evaluated the significance of potential GHG emission impacts primarily based on a qualitative assessment of compliance with the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, and disclosed additional quantitative analysis based on accepted methodologies and protocols. The quantification of GHG emissions does account for emissions from vehicles and equipment and removal of saplings.

The SF Forest Alliance Appeal Letter claims:

1. The Final EIR assumes trees will be replaced on a one-to-one basis in the project area, but this one-to-one replacement is not part of the NRMP. (See Response 1 above.)

2. The Final EIR assumes removed trees will be replaced with trees, while the SF Forest Alliance claims they will be replaced with shrubs and grasslands. (See Response 1 above.)
3. The Final EIR misstates the forest management objectives. (See Response 1 above.)
4. The GHG quantification in the Final EIR does not account for removal of approximately 12,000 saplings.
5. The Final EIR fails to account for GHG emissions from vehicles and equipment used for the project.
6. The Final EIR relies on a GHG calculation methodology that results in miscalculations of GHG sequestration.

In response to concerns 1 through 3 the one-to-one tree replacement, types of trees used as replacement, and Forest Management Objectives, Response 1 above explains that the Final EIR correctly cites the NRMP's proposed one-to-one tree replacement and types of trees to be replaced, which is part of the NRMP project description. The Final EIR also correctly estimates the projected number of trees to be removed and correctly summarizes the Forest Management Objectives in the NRMP.

GHG Analysis

SF Forest Alliance Appellant claims that the GHG quantification does not account for emissions from vehicles and equipment used for the project and that the vegetation sequestration analysis does not account for the carbon that would be released from removal of approximately 12,000 saplings. The Appellant also asserts that the EIR uses its own GHG calculation methodology.

Overview of EIR Analysis

As discussed in the Project Description section above, the Final EIR analyses of the NRMP includes the following general actions:

1. Routine Maintenance
2. Programmatic Projects
3. Laguna Salada Restoration Project at Sharp Park

The EIR contains both a programmatic level of analysis and project-level analysis. Routine maintenance activities and the Laguna Salada Restoration Project are addressed at a project-level, while programmatic activities are addressed at a program level of review. Routine maintenance activities and their associated GHG emissions are expected to be very similar to existing activities undertaken by the Natural Resources Division and would not substantively change with approval of the NRMP (see Draft EIR starting on p. 96 for further details and EIR assumptions regarding routine maintenance). The Laguna Salada Restoration Project is fully described on Draft EIR pp. 97 to 104. Program level activities are large scale capital improvements. These projects have not been developed to a point where project-level environmental review can occur. Additional analysis may occur when a specific programmatic project is proposed and information sufficient for project-level analysis becomes available.

As discussed starting on Draft EIR p. 446, the proposed project's GHG impact was analyzed in the Initial Study for the NRMP. In response to scoping comments received on the Initial Study, the Draft EIR contained additional discussion related to greenhouse emissions. The Draft EIR assessed the proposed project's GHG emissions for the NRMP activities in San Francisco (within 31 of the 32 Natural Areas) qualitatively. The qualitative analysis included a determination of whether the NRMP activities in San Francisco comply with San Francisco's qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, titled *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*. The Draft EIR found the proposed project to be consistent with the GHG Reduction Strategy and the GHG emissions within the 31 Natural Areas in San Francisco were determined to be less than significant. No comments were received in regards to the qualitative assessment of compliance with the City's GHG Reduction Strategy, which is the City's standard approach to evaluating a proposed project's GHG impacts. For the Sharp Park Natural Area, GHG emissions resulting from the Sharp Park restoration activities were modeled quantitatively and were found to be less than significant. In response to public comments received on the Draft EIR, the RTC included further quantitative analysis primarily to address concerns related to how GHG emissions were quantified.

GHGs from Vehicles and Equipment

The EIR included a quantitative analysis of GHGs that would be emitted as a result of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, concluding that these emissions would total 1,630 MT CO₂E. This analysis evaluated GHG emissions from the entire construction of the Laguna Salada Restoration project, including vehicles and equipment. With regards to GHG emissions from programmatic projects, as stated on Draft EIR p. 455, the Laguna Salada Restoration Project is expected to be representative of the largest programmatic project that RPD would undertake as part of the NRMP and therefore quantification of GHGs from vehicles and equipment associated with the Laguna Salada Restoration Project would represent a conservative (worst-case) assessment of GHG emissions from large-scale programmatic projects. Further, as stated above, the EIR assessed large-scale capital projects, other than the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, at a programmatic level of environmental review and may require additional analysis pursuant to CEQA when a specific project is proposed. As stated on Draft EIR p. 455, routine maintenance activities would be similar to current activities and thus would not result in a net increase in GHG emissions.

Removal of Saplings

With respect to routine maintenance, removal of saplings during routine maintenance is an existing condition and part of the current practices of the Natural Resources Division. Routine maintenance is expected to remain similar to existing conditions and would, therefore, not represent a change from existing, baseline conditions.

With respect to large-scale programmatic projects, the EIR provides a quantitative analysis of carbon sequestration that would be lost from tree removal activities. This analysis was conducted primarily to address concerns raised in the Initial Study and Draft EIR. The Appellant contends this analysis is faulty because it does not account for carbon sequestration that could be lost from removal of saplings. It is possible that large-scale programmatic projects could include removal of saplings; however, at this point, no specific project is proposed and a specific inventory of saplings that could be removed as part of programmatic projects is unknown. Once a specific programmatic project is proposed, that project may

require additional environmental review. However, as discussed above, the significance of the project's impact on GHG emissions was not based solely on a quantitative analysis, and no such analysis is required by CEQA. Instead, consistent with how the Planning Department evaluates a project's impact with respect to GHG emissions, the project was evaluated for consistency with the GHG Reduction Strategy and found to be consistent with this strategy.

GHG Calculation Methodology

The standard metric typically employed in environmental documents with respect to GHG emissions is to report GHGs emitted on an annual basis (in other words, reported as a sequestration or emission rate), not total amount of carbon sequestered. This metric is consistent with how GHG emissions are quantified under CEQA as recommended by the BAAQMD and other Air Districts in California. The SF Forest Alliance Appellant's claim that by assessing changes in carbon sequestration rates, the EIR does not accurately report the total amount of carbon sequestration that would be lost through tree removal activities. While it may be true that the total amount of sequestered carbon in trees at the end of the 20 year project horizon may be lower than existing levels as a result of replacing large trees of greater biomass with smaller trees, it is important to note that carbon sequestered in trees would not instantaneously be released into the atmosphere, but rather the tree would degrade over time, releasing carbon. Depending upon whether trees are removed offsite and chipped or left in place, the rate at which that carbon would be released into the atmosphere would vary substantially. For example, a tree that is left in place may degrade slowly and some of the carbon would be taken up by other animals and organisms and released into the atmosphere upon degradation of those organisms. It is also important to note that tree removal activities would take place gradually, over the 20 year project horizon and would not occur all at once. Furthermore, tree removal activities would focus on trees that are dead, dying or diseased and consequently are no longer actively sequestering meaningful amounts of carbon. Therefore, carbon that is already sequestered in these trees would likely be released into the atmosphere as part of natural processes, irrespective of the NRMP tree removal activities.

The methods used to quantify GHG sequestration rates from vegetation are based on standard methodology and protocols from expert sources including the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Forest Service, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and an emissions estimation model, called CalEEMod.

In conclusion, the EIR analyzed the impacts of the NRMP as they relate to GHG emissions based primarily on a qualitative assessment of compliance with the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, and disclosed additional quantitative analysis based on accepted methodologies and protocols. Assuming that the Appellant's contentions are correct, represent that of an expert, and are based on other accepted methodologies and protocols, the differences in how GHGs from the project are reported (sequestration rates versus total amount of carbon sequestered) is a disagreement among experts in regards to the specific quantitative information provided. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151, assuming that the comments express the view of a qualified expert, "[d]isagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness and a good faith effort at full disclosure."

An EIR is considered adequate if substantial evidence in the record supports the agency's decision that the EIR is adequate, even if there is substantial evidence to the contrary. The Appellants raise no concerns in regards to the qualitative assessment of GHGs in the Final EIR, primarily that the plan is consistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, which is the threshold for the determination of a less than significant impact from GHG emissions in the Draft EIR.

Issue 9: The Wild Equity Appellant provides comments on the merits of the project, expressing a preference for the full restoration of Sharp Park, in lieu of the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project analyzed in the Final EIR and approved by the Recreation and Park Commission. The Wild Equity Appeal Letter also included attachments that request the removal of the Sharp Park Laguna Salada Restoration Project from the EIR.

Response 9: The Wild Equity Appellant's preference for full restoration of Sharp Park is a comment on the merits of the project itself, not on the adequacy of the Final EIR. The question before the Board is whether the Final EIR adequately analyzes the environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the project sponsor, in this case, the SFRPD. Under CEQA, the Final EIR must analyze the project as proposed by the project sponsor – here SFRD. The Final EIR does not dictate what project is brought forth for environmental review by the SFRPD.

The Wild Equity Appellant expresses a preference for the full restoration of Sharp Park. This concern is similar to those received during the public review period for the Draft EIR, and as discussed on RTC p. 4-168, these comments regard the merits of project itself, not on the adequacy of the Final EIR. Certification of the Final EIR by the Planning Commission was not a project approval of any kind and did not preclude the Recreation and Parks Commission from taking another action with respect to Sharp Park or the NRMP. The Recreation and Parks Commission approved the project, including the Laguna Salada Restoration Project on December 15, 2016. Please see Response 10 for a discussion regarding the analysis of a full restoration alternative in the Draft EIR.

While not cited in the Wild Equity Appeal Letter itself, an attachment was included of an April 16, 2015 memorandum to the California Coastal Commission submitted by Peter Baye regarding formulation and assessment of feasible alternatives to wetland dredging. This memorandum pertained to the Pumphouse Project, and is not a comment on the impacts of the proposed project or the adequacy of the EIR. Please see Response 10 for a discussion regarding the analysis of a non-dredging alternative in the Draft EIR.

The Wild Equity Appellant requests to remove Sharp Park from the NRMP Final EIR and included as attachments letters from various organizations supporting such a request. As discussed on RTC page 4-168, the Planning Department is responsible for analyzing the environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the project sponsor, in this case, the SFRPD. Although the lead agency is charged with proposing modifications to a project—in the form of mitigation measures—to reduce or eliminate the project's potential significant impacts, it is not appropriate for a lead agency to propose changes to the project description itself, such as removing the Laguna Salada Restoration Project from the NRMP, and therefore, from the Draft EIR.

As discussed on page 4-168 of the RTC, between the release of the NRMP in 2006 and the development of the EIR, the restoration project at Sharp Park progressed such that it could be reviewed at a project-level rather than a programmatic level. There are policy and operational reasons for including a project-level

analysis of the environmental impacts of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project. As detailed in both the NRMP and the NRMP EIR, habitat improvements at Sharp Park are an integral part of the NRMP itself – they implement all of the general recommendations (GR) that would occur elsewhere within the Natural areas, including, but not limited to, the protection of sensitive species and habitats, typically through the control of invasive plants (GR-1), and also, in the case of Sharp Park, by restricting dogs from habitat for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog (GR-8c), as well as the management of sensitive species and vegetation series of limited distribution (GR-2). In addition, one of the project objectives, as identified on Draft EIR p 82, is specifically “restore the Laguna Salada wetland complex for the benefit of special status species.” Another project objective, as also identified on Draft EIR p. 82, is to “identify, prioritize, and implement restoration and management actions designed to promote the functioning of San Francisco’s native ecosystem, including the maintenance and enhancement of native biodiversity.” If the Sharp Park component of the NRMP project were to be removed, one of the CEQA project objectives would not be achieved (i.e., restoring the Laguna Salada wetland complex), and the other objective would be achieved to a lesser extent (i.e., implementing restoration activities).

CEQA prohibits piecemealing, or dividing, one project into two or more projects, which can lead to an underestimation of the project’s impacts on the environment. But CEQA contains no prohibition against analyzing two related projects in one EIR. In fact, CEQA provides that “[w]here one project is one of several similar projects of a public agency, but is not deemed a part of a larger undertaking or a larger project, the agency may prepare on EIR for all projects, or one for each project...” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15165.) Thus, it is up to the public agency to determine whether including multiple related, but separate, projects in one EIR is appropriate. The only requirement is that “in either case [the EIR must] comment upon the cumulative effect[s]” of the projects. (*Id.*) Here, combining the analysis of the project-level Laguna Salada Restoration Project with the programmatic analysis of other NRMP activities is consistent with and helps inform the analysis of the NRMP project as a whole.

In conclusion, the Final EIR appropriately analyzed the project proposed by the SFRPD, which included a description of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project. Because the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project developed to a level of detail that allowed project-level environmental review, the EIR appropriately analyzed it at a project level. This level of analysis informs public agency decisionmakers and the public of the significant environmental effects of this project, identifies possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describes feasible alternatives to the project to reduce or eliminate those significant effects. While the Wild Equity Appellant provides reasons why Appellant prefers full restoration to the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, the comments on the merits of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project are not evidence that the Final EIR is inadequate.

Issue 10: The Wild Equity Appellant asserts that the Final EIR failed to evaluate a full restoration alternative.

Response 10: The Final EIR considered a full restoration alternative, and determined that such an alternative is not required to be analyzed.

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter asserts that the Final EIR excludes alternatives, namely a full restoration alternative, and that there is no basis for not including a full restoration alternative. And while not cited in the Wild Equity Appeal Letter itself, an attachment was included of an April 16, 2015 memo to the California Coastal Commission submitted by Peter Baye regarding formulation and assessment of

feasible alternatives to wetland dredging. This memorandum pertained to the Sharp Park Pumphouse Project, and is not a comment on the impacts of the proposed project or the adequacy EIR. A response is provided below for informational purposes.

As described under the Project Background section above, the Recreation and Park Commission endorsed the recommendation of the General Manager to proceed with a project proposal that would expand the footprint of the habitat area into what is currently part of the landscaped golf course, thereby converting 19 acres of the golf course to create restored upland habitat around wetland areas and a habitat corridor between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond. The SFRPD submitted this Laguna Salada Restoration Project to the Planning Department to be analyzed in the Draft EIR, as documented in the August 24, 2011 Memorandum (Draft EIR Appendix J Summary of Changes to the NRMP). As discussed in Response 9 above, the Planning Department, as the lead agency, is responsible for analyzing the environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the project sponsor, in this case, the SFRPD.

Full Restoration Alternative

As discussed on RTC p. 4-565, the Draft EIR considered an alternative to the proposed project that would include restoration of all of Sharp Park (essentially removing the golf course), in Draft EIR Section VII.F, Alternatives Considered but Rejected, pp. 526 to 527. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, "... alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" and "alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the project."

Draft EIR p. 526 states that while a public comment on the NOP was received proposing an alternative that would involve full restoration of the entire Sharp Park property, including the elimination of the golf course, it was rejected as a "CEQA alternative" because it is not compatible with the 18-hole layout of the historic golf course. This alternative would, through the elimination of the Sharp Park Golf Course, result in greater significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural and recreational resources and therefore is not required to be analyzed under CEQA.

The Draft EIR did analyze a Maximum Restoration Alternative for Sharp Park that includes more aggressive restoration of the Laguna Salada wetland complex as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would restore an additional five acres of habitat for the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake, for a total of approximately 24 acres of restored habitat. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in additional upland habitat on the northeast edge of Laguna Salada and additional dredging of the Laguna Salada wetland complex water bodies. The Draft EIR (pp. 525-526) determined that the Maximum Recreation and Maintenance Alternatives are the environmentally superior alternatives because they have fewer unmitigated significant impacts than either the proposed project or the Maximum Restoration Alternative.

It should be noted that one of the reasons that both the Maintenance Alternative and Maximum Recreation Alternative would result in less environmental impacts than the proposed project is because these alternatives would not provide a habitat corridor between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond or provide the same degree of upland habitat as the proposed project and Maximum Restoration Alternative. While these features would be beneficial to the San Francisco garter snake and California

red-legged frogs, the construction of the habitat corridor and upland refuge would require augmenting the Sharp Park Golf Course, resulting in further significant and unavoidable impacts to the golf course as a historic resource and a significant impact to the golf course as a recreational resource.

Non-Dredging Alternative

While not cited in the Wild Equity Appeal Letter itself, an attachment was included that suggested a non-dredging project proposal, including water-level management of the lagoon and construction of a low berm or levee bordering the upland side of the lagoon's wetland-upland transition zone, but appears to be a comment on the Pumphouse Project. A similar comment for the Laguna Salada Restoration Project was submitted on the Draft EIR and responded to in the RTC. As stated on RTC page 4-601, the creation of a berm and the maintenance of higher water levels at the lagoon would eliminate more areas of the golf course, which would create additional impacts related to historic resources and recreation. Further, the Maximum Restoration Alternative was designed to maximize restoration activities while allowing the golf course to operate, which would not be achieved with a non-dredging project proposal.

In conclusion, the comments do not raise new issues related to the adequacy of the Final EIR's analysis of CEQA alternatives, and the Final EIR meets the standards for adequacy of an EIR, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151.

Issue 11: The Wild Equity Appellant asserts that NRMP activities at Sharp Park constitute a "golf course redevelopment project" and the Final EIR failed to analyze the redevelopment of the golf course.

Response 11: The Final EIR analyzed the impacts of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project on the Sharp Park golf course and determined that the restoration activities would result in a significant impact on the golf course as recreational resource and required a mitigation measure that would relocate one of the affected golf course holes. A specific design of the golf course to accommodate the hole relocation has not been developed and may require additional environmental review. Because design of the golf course is not proposed at this time, analysis of activities would be speculative and is not required under CEQA.

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter asserts that the proposed project is a "golf course redevelopment" project that was identified as A18 in the Restoration Report, and the Final EIR failed to analyze the impacts of this "golf course redevelopment project." The Wild Equity Appeal Letter supports this claim by stating that the Laguna Salada Restoration Project would result in modifications to the golf course, which were not presented in the 2006 NRMP. An attachment to the Wild Equity Appeal Letter expressed concern that the operation of the golf course threatens the endangered San Francisco garter snake.

As described above in the "Development of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project at Sharp Park" section, the SFRPD refined the activities proposed for Sharp Park in the 2006 SNRAMP and developed the Laguna Salada Restoration Project in order to restore habitat for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog. As stated on p. 260 of the Draft EIR, the Laguna Salada Restoration Project would restore about 19 acres of the Sharp Park Golf Course for habitat. A portion of the golf course is located on the western side of Highway 101, which bisects Sharp Park, and restoration would primarily affect the layout of the golf course holes, including Holes 10, 12, 14, 15, and 18 on the eastern edge of Laguna Salada. The proposed habitat corridor between Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada also would be constructed requiring Holes 10 and 13 to be slightly shortened or narrowed and Hole 12 to be closed.

The Draft EIR determined that the closure of Hole 12 as a result of the wetland restoration would result in significant recreation impacts, and Mitigation Measure M-RE-6, to restore the playability of the 18-hole golf course, was identified to reduce recreation impacts to a less-than-significant level (refer to Draft EIR p. 261 and pp. 264 to 269). The Draft EIR also determined that the closure of Hole 12 would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the golf course, a historic resource under CEQA. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-7 which requires documentation of the Sharp Park Golf Course before restoration activities would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but would not sufficiently reduce it to a less than significant level.

The environmental impact of mitigation measure M-RE-6 (restoration of the playability of the 18-hole golf course) was analyzed in the Draft EIR on pp. 264 to 269. It was determined that the significant historic resource impact of Mitigation Measure M-RE-6, regarding the placement of Hole 12, could be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the replacement hole is located west of Highway 1.

Mitigation Measure M-RE-6 requires the SFRPD to coordinate with a golf course consultant with expertise in historic golf course renovation and with specific expertise, if possible, in golf courses designed by Alister MacKenzie to restore the playability of the Sharp Park Golf Course, which would also help reduce historic impacts.

At this time, the SFRPD has not yet retained a golf course consultant to prepare a golf course design that addresses the relocation of Hole 12, in accordance with Mitigation Measure M-RE-6. When a golf course design pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-RE-6 is developed, it may be subject to further review as required by CEQA. Therefore, Wild Equity's claim that the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project is a golf course redesign is factually incorrect. The only golf course modifications proposed are those disclosed in the EIR to accommodate the Laguna Salada Restoration Project and those agreed to by SFRPD in compliance with Mitigation Measure M-RE-6. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D), the environmental impacts of M-RE-6 is disclosed in Draft EIR pp. 264 to 269. Therefore, any such analysis of a golf course redesign would be speculative at this point and is not required per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.

An attachment to the Wild Equity Appeal Letter expressed concern that the operation of the golf course threatens the endangered San Francisco garter snake. The Final EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of the NRMP by comparing the existing physical environmental conditions against the potential physical effects of the proposed project. The existing baseline conditions at Sharp Park include the existing and currently operational Sharp Park Golf Course, and the Final EIR analyzes the impacts of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project on the existing Sharp Park Golf Course and its surroundings. Continued operation of the golf course is an existing, separate activity and, accordingly, is not evaluated in this EIR.

Issue 12: While not cited in the Wild Equity Appeal Letter itself, attachments were included that express disagreement with the EIR's conclusion that the Sharp Park Golf Course retains adequate integrity to be determined a historic resource.

Response 12: The Sharp Park Golf Course was evaluated and determined eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)) as a designed historic landscape. Disagreement among experts regarding the eligibility of the Sharp Park Golf Course as an historic resource does not make the Final EIR inadequate.

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter included a summary of and attachment of a letter from Chris Pattillo of PGA design, Landscape Architects from October 27, 2011 (Pattillo Attachment). This same letter was submitted to the Planning Department during the public review period for the proposed project and is fully addressed in the RTC document. The Pattillo Attachment expressed disagreement with the EIR's conclusion that the Sharp Park Golf Course retains adequate integrity to be determined a historic resource for purposes of environmental impact evaluation under CEQA. The Pattillo Attachment asserts that the golf course no longer reflects the work of Alister Mackenzie and there are few similarities between the course that existed during the period of significance and what remains today.

The Wild Equity Appellant also included as an attachment a link to the Historic Preservation Commission's meeting for the HPC to discuss whether to comment on the adequacy and accuracy of the Draft EIR, noting that two Historic Preservation Commissioners did not agree with the Department's determination that the Sharp Park Golf Course retains sufficient integrity to qualify as an historic resource under CEQA.

As discussed on RTC p. 246, the Planning Department acknowledges that two of the seven members of the San Francisco HPC disagreed with the historic eligibility determination for the Sharp Park Golf Course. The assessment of potential impacts to historic resources at Sharp Park, as presented in the EIR, are based on the analysis and conclusions of the Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) and the Historical Resources Evaluation (HRE) conducted for the proposed project. HRE Section 5.2 (included in EIR Appendix C) provides a full analysis of the historic nature of the Sharp Park Golf Course, including the integrity of the resource and the impacts of the proposed project on the golf course as a historic resource.

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), historical resources shall include the following:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:
 - (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code [PRC] sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

The golf course and its associated structures (such as the clubhouse) were evaluated using the criteria for identifying historical resources under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(2)–(3), which provide the criteria from California PRC Section 20524.1. The evaluation was also conducted using the National Park Service (NPS) National Register Bulletin 18, “How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes.”

As part of the analysis conducted for the HRE, a records search was conducted of the Northwest Information Center, the National Register of Historic Places, and the California Register of Historical Resources. The HRE states that the Sharp Park Golf Course was not listed on any federal or state registers; this does not indicate that the course is not eligible for listing, rather it indicates that the golf course had not yet been evaluated for historical significance and eligibility for listing on federal or state registers prior to the preparation of the HRE and the EIR.

In conjunction with this EIR, the Sharp Park Golf Course was evaluated and determined eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)) as a designed historic landscape for the reasons detailed in the HRE and described on Draft EIR pp. 207 to 209.

The HRER and EIR acknowledge that alterations to the Sharp Park Golf Course have occurred over time, as is expected with landscape cultural resources. With respect to whether the Sharp Park Golf Course retains historic integrity, the HRE finds: “[a]lthough 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. [Alister] 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 HRE, HRER and Draft EIR analysis relative to the Golf Course’s designation as a historic resource provides the required substantiation and documentation, and it was prepared by the City’s Historic Preservation Specialists. It should be noted that the Planning Department received numerous comments both in support of and opposition to the designation of the Sharp Park Golf Course as an historic resource

(see RTC pages 4-232 to 4-249). As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151, assuming that the comments express the view of a qualified expert, “[d]isagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness and a good faith effort at full disclosure.” RTC pages 4-246 through 4-249 provides a full summary of the main points of disagreement in regards to the historic designation of the Sharp Park Golf Course.

Issue 13: The Wild Equity Appellant asserts that the Final EIR does not adequately analyze how the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project may be affected by future sea level rise and that the Final EIR does not comply with San Francisco’s Sea Level Rise Action Plan because it fails to consider adaptation and retreat alternatives to the proposed project.

Response 13: The Final EIR adequately analyzes the effects of the project on the environment as required by CEQA. There is no requirement for an EIR to consider policy-based alternatives.

The Appellant states that the Final EIR does not comply with San Francisco’s Sea Level Rise Action Plan because it fails to consider adaptation and retreat alternatives and fails to consider an alternative that would protect Sharp Park’s natural ecology from salinity intrusion or other impacts from sea level rise. Additionally the Appellant asserts that the Final EIR did not adequately analyze the impacts to the project from sea level rise.

As stated on page 4-493 of the RTC, the purpose of an EIR is to provide public agencies and the public with detailed information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment (PRC Section 21061). CEQA defines “environment” as the “physical conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise, objects of historical or aesthetic significance” (PRC Section 21060.5). Furthermore, “... [an] EIR shall also analyze any significant environmental effects the project might cause by bringing development and people to the area affected. For example, an EIR on a subdivision astride an active fault line should identify as a significant effect the seismic hazard to future occupants of the subdivision. The subdivision would have the effect of attracting people to the location and exposing them to the hazards found there. Similarly, the EIR should evaluate any potentially significant impact of locating development in other areas susceptible to hazardous conditions (e.g., floodplains, coastlines, wildfire risk areas)” (CEQA Guidelines Section 151262). The above CEQA requirements are valid only to the extent that the project exacerbates the hazardous condition (*California Building Industry Association v. BAAQMD*, 62 Cal.4th 369 (2015)). The proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project is intended to restore the marsh complex and associated uplands to protect and enhance the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake habitat; the project would not result in significant environmental effects that would exacerbate sea level rise. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential of attracting people to any existing or future hazardous conditions related to sea level rise.

Cumulative Sea Level Rise Effects

As stated on RTC p. 4-494, the Draft EIR addresses the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, on the proposed project. Because global climate change is a cumulative impact (it is the result of impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects on the environment), the secondary impacts

of global climate change, including sea level rise are addressed in the cumulative impact discussion (Impact HY-16, Draft EIR pp. 380 to 382). Figure 7, Potential Sea Level Rise near Sharp Park, Draft EIR p. 359, illustrates the potential effects of sea level rise at Sharp Park. Draft EIR pp. 381 to 382 also analyzes cumulative effects due to sea level rise.

As discussed on Draft EIR p. 382, at Sharp Park, sea level rise would increase the base level elevations of Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond. Fresh water must continue to discharge to the ocean underground, and in order for this to happen, the elevation of the water table would rise in proportion to the rise in sea level. The freshwater/saltwater interface, which is a zone of mixing, would move inland somewhat. Salinity in Laguna Salada may increase, especially during dry periods when outflow of fresh groundwater from the watershed above Sharp Park is lowest. The magnitude of sea level rise during the project planning period would probably be too small to result in significant erosion of the sea wall, but the effects are difficult to predict.

Salinity Conditions with Sea Level Rise

The Appellant asserts that the EIR fails to consider an alternative that would protect Sharp Park's natural ecology from salinity intrusion resulting from sea level rise. While not cited in the Wild Equity Appeal Letter itself, an attachment was included of a January 5, 2016 Memorandum to the California Coastal Commission submitted by Peter Baye regarding observations of salinity intrusion at the north-western part of Sharp Park resulting from the modification of authorized drainage of Laguna Salada in light of sea level rise. This memorandum addresses salinity intrusion that may be occurring as a result of ongoing pumping operations at Laguna Salada and it is not a comment on the impacts of the proposed project or on the adequacy of the EIR. However, information regarding salinity conditions at Laguna Salada with respect to sea level rise was provided in the RTC and is summarized below.

As summarized on RTC p. 4-495 to 4-496 and as discussed on Draft EIR p. 382, it is expected that the stable fresh water elevation in Laguna Salada would rise in response to a rising sea level, since this is necessary to maintain a positive flow of groundwater to the ocean. This may lead to a number of changes over time, including increased salinity in Laguna Salada. Impact HY-16 (on Draft EIR pp. 381 and 382) addresses the cumulative impacts on salinity conditions with sea level rise and concludes that the proposed project is not expected to contribute in a cumulatively considerable way to any significant cumulative impacts on water resources and sea level rise. While the specific effects of sea level rise on the Laguna Salada Restoration Project are uncertain, because the effects of sea level rise are expected to occur gradually over time and because the NRMP proposes to employ an adaptive management approach, SFRPD would continue to evaluate the environmental conditions at Sharp Park and make management decisions in the future based on those conditions. Although the Final EIR concludes there could be significant impacts from sea level rise on the project, the proposed project would not itself result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative effects of climate change, and this is the key question under CEQA. The Final EIR concludes that the proposed project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to sea level rise impacts and this conclusion is supported by substantial evidence in the EIR and supporting documents.

San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan

San Francisco released its Sea Level Rise Action Plan (the “Action Plan”) in March 2016. The San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan is the first step towards the development of the Citywide Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan. The Action Plan identifies a citywide vulnerability and risk assessment as part of the next steps of developing an Adaptation Plan. Vulnerability and risks assessments of the City’s parks and open space have not yet been conducted.

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), an “EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.” An EIR only needs to discuss inconsistencies with applicable plans; it need not develop project alternatives that avoid such inconsistencies, as suggested by the Appellant. The Action Plan is not an adaptation plan and it is unknown at this point what strategies would be proposed in a future adaptation plan and whether or not they would be applicable to Sharp Park. The strategy for managing Natural Areas is based on adaptive management, which is a flexible learning-based approach to managing complex ecosystems so as the adaptation plan is developed, the SFRPD may incorporate any relevant measures into the NRMP in the future. Certification of the EIR does not preclude decisionmakers from taking other actions in the future with respect to Sharp Park that could include sea level rise adaptation and retreat actions.

As discussed on Draft EIR p. 151, policy conflicts do not, in and of themselves, indicate a significant environmental effect within the meaning of CEQA, in that the intent of CEQA is to determine physical effects associated with a project. To the extent that physical environmental impacts of a proposed project may result from conflicts with one of the policies related to a specific resource topic, such physical impacts are adequately analyzed in the EIR within each topic section as required under CEQA.

Issue 14: The Wild Equity Appellant asserts that the Final EIR does not adequately analyze the ongoing pumping operations of Sharp Park with the “golf course redevelopment” project.

Response 14: The ongoing pumping operations are part of the baseline conditions at the project site and would not change with the Laguna Salada Restoration Project or NRMP. There is no “golf course redevelopment project” (See Response 11).

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter asserts that the “golf course redevelopment plan” is not a separate project from ongoing pumping operations and, therefore, the EIR needs to analyze the ongoing pumping operations as part of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project. The Wild Equity Appeal Letter cites to “Anonymous 2012, p. 1” to support this claim, but this was not included as an attachment to the Appeal Letter.

The CEQA analysis provided in the Draft EIR compares the baseline (or existing conditions) at the project site to the potential environmental impacts that would result from construction and implementation of the proposed project. The existing and ongoing pumphouse operations are part of the baseline conditions at the project site and are not a part of the proposed project. Thus, although the existing pumphouse operations inform the project setting and are part of the baseline conditions against which the proposed project’s impacts are measured, the EIR does not and should not evaluate the existing and ongoing operation of the pumphouse in the project-related impact analysis for the proposed project.

The pumphouse operations received a Biological Opinion from USFWS on October 2, 2012. Currently, under existing conditions, the pumps manage water levels in Horse Stable Pond to maintain California red-legged frog habitat, which is also a goal of the proposed project, and to reduce the frequency of flooding of the golf course. This ongoing pumping is part of the baseline conditions and whether or not the Laguna Salada Restoration Project and NRMP are approved and implemented, the SFRPD would continue to use the pumps to manage water levels in Horse Stable Pond.

See Response 11 regarding the Wild Equity Appellant's characterization of the project as a golf course redevelopment project.

Issue 15: The Wild Equity Appellant asserts that the EIR through Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a, Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park [Laguna Salada] Restoration Project, improperly relies on "take" of the San Francisco Garter snake to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the Wild Equity Appellant asserts that the EIR fails to analyze the impacts of M-BI-6a on the San Francisco Garter Snake. The Wild Equity appellant asserts that changes to Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a, addressing acid sulfate soils required recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Response 15: The Laguna Salada Restoration Project is intended as a recovery action for the San Francisco garter snake and while Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a focuses on avoidance measures, "incidental take" may be allowed during the regulatory approval process. Additionally, as stated in the EIR, this mitigation measure may be altered by resource agencies during the permit review process, as they deem necessary to protect the species. Thus, Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a would not result in significant adverse impacts on the San Francisco Garter Snake. Additionally, changes to Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a did not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

The Wild Equity Appeal Letter asserts, in the citation of a court case, that the EIR could not rely on a mitigation measure that authorized the take of a fully protected species under the California Fish and Game Code. Additionally, the Wild Equity Appeal Letter asserts that the EIR did not analyze the impacts of Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a and changes to this mitigation measure that added language addressing acid sulfate soils following the publication of the Draft EIR required recirculation of the Draft EIR.

The case cited by the Appellant involved a large-scale residential development project in northern Los Angeles County and the Court concluded that for such a project, an agency could not authorize incidental take of a fully protected species as a means of mitigating a project's impacts. It was concluded that Fish and Game Code Section 5515 permits the taking of a fully protected species for "scientific research" and that it allowed for the trapping and translocation of a fully protected species as part of a species recovery program, but not as a development project mitigation.

As stated on Draft EIR p. 293, the purpose of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project is to enhance the Laguna Salada wetland complex to provide higher quality habitat for the fully protected San Francisco garter snake and one of its primary food sources, the California red-legged frog. As such, the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, consistent with the California Fish and Game Code, is intended as a recovery action for the San Francisco garter snake. Thus, the trapping and translocation of a fully protected species as part of a species recovery program, such as the Laguna Salada Restoration Project, is allowed, unlike for a private development project.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a would ensure that measures are taken to avoid impacts to San Francisco garter snakes during construction by the use of silt fencing or exclusion fencing around the project and staging areas and all onsite restoration activities. This measure would reduce temporary construction impacts by avoiding and minimizing impacts to San Francisco garter snakes to the maximum extent feasible. Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a also includes pre-construction activities such as a pre-activity survey to identify snakes and snake habitat. It also includes a worker education program to train all workers on how to identify and avoid harm to San Francisco garter snakes. Prior to construction equipment or vehicles entering the site, vegetation will be cleared by hand equipment to a height of 4 inches and checked for the presence of snakes. Additionally, prior to construction near wetlands and ponds, rodent burrows in the construction areas will be hand excavated in order to ensure absence of snakes and frogs.

No restoration activities would occur between November 15 and April 15 (the breeding season for California red-legged frog and the season when San Francisco garter snakes are inactive in their winter burrows), and a biological monitor would be present during construction activities, in addition to an on-call specialty environmental monitor with a valid 10(a)(1)(A) permit to handle San Francisco garter snakes and relocate them to an area consisting of suitable habitat if needed and if authorized by USFWS and CDFW. Any relocation efforts would be coordinated with the appropriate agency to minimize any adverse effects. With implementation of M-BI-6a, the short-term impacts of the Laguna Salada Restoration Project on the San Francisco garter snake would be less than significant. This mitigation measure may be altered by resource agencies during the permit review process, as necessary.

Prior to implementing the proposed Laguna Salada Restoration Project, the SFRPD would consult with CDFW and USFWS and prepare a Biological Assessment and would need to obtain a Biological Opinion and incidental take permit from the USFWS and CDFW pursuant to the California and federal Endangered Species Acts. If an incidental take permit is not granted, the project may not be able to move forward as proposed.

The EIR concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant unavoidable biological resources impacts related to California red-legged frogs or San Francisco garter snakes. The Appellant fails to show that the extent of incidental take anticipated to result from the proposed project would result in any significant biological resources impact related to California red-legged frogs or San Francisco garter snakes that cannot be mitigated by the proposed mitigation measures.

Acid Sulfate Soils

As discussed on RTC p. 4-369, on November 22, 2013, Fugro Consultants (Fugro) collected shallow sediment samples from four locations (one on the west side of Laguna Salada, two at Horse Stable Pond, and one in the connecting channel). The purpose of the sediment sampling and analyses was to evaluate the potential for acid sulfate soil conditions in advance of planned soil and vegetation removal. The sediment samples collected by Fugro were then analyzed by Tetra Tech for the Pumphouse Project. Page 3 of the Tetra Tech memorandum concluded that "There is no indication that acid sulfate soils are found within the upper 3 feet of sediments, which is the depth proposed for sediment and vegetation removal. The sulfate concentrations found near the surface of the sediment cores in all cases reflect sources from the surrounding land use activity." Page 3 further concludes that "Nothing in the sediment analysis showed any naturally-occurring biological reason that excavation of sediments could cause elevated pH

levels, therefore if elevated pH levels do occur they would likely be evidence of an artificial deposit of material that can elevate pH if allowed into the water column.” These reports were provided to the USFWS and CDFW. A representative for USFWS reviewed the information submitted and concurred with the methods and conclusions of the report.

As stated in RTC p. 4-369, in an abundance of caution due to the unlikely event that anoxic conditions materialize, to ensure potential impacts to California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes are mitigated to a less-than-significant level, pertinent aspects of the Sharp Park Pumphouse Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (FMND) Mitigation Measure M-BIO-2b, Protection of Special-Status Species and Water Quality from Acid Sulfate Soils and Other Components, p. 124, have been incorporated into Draft EIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a, Protection of Protected Species during Implementation of the Sharp Park [Laguna Salada] Restoration Project, p. 326. This modification to the mitigation measure was made between the publication of the Draft EIR and the publication of the RTC document, and such modifications and refinements to both project descriptions and mitigation measures are not only common during the environmental review process, but are encouraged to reduce the impacts of a proposed project following public review.

Here, with the revisions to the mitigation measure, Pumphouse FMND Mitigation Measure M-BIO-2b and NRMP EIR Mitigation M-BI-6a are now consistent with one another, which further support a consistent implementation effort. Recirculation of an EIR after the close of a Draft EIR comment period is only required when new information shows that new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft EIR will result, when an EIR is “so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded” or where a “feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, *but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) (emphasis added)). Here, the changes to Mitigation Measure M-BI-6a do not change any of the conclusions in the Draft EIR and do not constitute significant new information that requires recirculation of the Draft EIR under CEQA (California PRC Section 21092.1) or the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15088.5). — Further, and most importantly, the changes improve the efficacy and consistency of the mitigation measure with the Pumphouse Project, and the Recreation and Park Commission adopted them as a condition of project approval. Thus, recirculation was not required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

CONCLUSION:

The Appellants have not raised any new issues relative to the project’s physical environmental impacts that were not previously addressed in the Draft EIR and/or in the Responses to Comments document or at the EIR certification hearing, and as discussed above, the analysis and conclusions of the Final EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record. Moreover, Appellants have not provided substantial evidence in support of their own arguments regarding the adequacy and accuracy of the Final EIR. Argument and speculation alone are not substantial evidence under CEQA. Even if the Appellants had provided substantial evidence that contradicts the analysis and conclusions of the Final EIR, the agency’s adequacy determination remains valid when the EIR is based on substantial evidence in the record. The Final EIR and supporting documents provide such substantial evidence.

For the reasons stated above, the Planning Commission's certification of the EIR complies with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Department, therefore, recommends that the Board uphold the Commission's decision to certify the EIR and deny the appeal.

Attachment A: December 15, 2016 EIR Errata



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: December 15, 2016
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Melinda Hue and Jessica Range, Environmental Planning
RE: Errata to the Environmental Impact Report for the Natural Resources Management Plan (formerly the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan) Planning Department Case No. 2005.0912E

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Following publication of the Response to Comments document for the Natural Resources Management Plan, the Recreation and Parks Department proposed modifications to the Project Description with respect to proposed actions at the Sharp Park Natural Area with the intent of emphasizing the preferred use of soil spoils for habitat restoration purposes and identifying the other disposal sites required for excess spoils as equal disposal options. The revisions to the Project Description remove specific reference to use of the spoils to raise the elevation of certain golf course holes and to clarify potential re-use locations. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department has analyzed the proposed revisions to the Project Description and determined that the proposed modifications to the Project Description would not result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary. Further, these modifications to the project description and additional revisions to the EIR as shown below, do not change any of the conclusions in the Draft EIR and do not constitute significant new information that requires recirculation of the Draft EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15088.5).

The following are additional Staff-initiated text changes that will be added to Chapter 5.B, Staff-Initiated Changes, and incorporated into the Final EIR. Deletions are marked with ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are noted with double underline.

The text on Draft EIR pp.99-102, last paragraph, has been changed as follows:

Some areas that are currently open water within Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond would be deepened by one to three feet, and parts of the eastern portions of the lagoon and pond shorelines, as well as the connector channel, would be excavated 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. Excavation of accumulated sediments and encroaching wetland plants would result in the conversion of vegetated wetlands to open water habitat. This deepening would be conducted using excavating equipment positioned along the shore of the two water bodies. Up to 60,000 cubic yards of

material would be excavated; of this, approximately 40,000 cubic yards would be used on-site and approximately 20,000 cubic yards would be stockpiled or spread at the Sharp Park rifle range site or disposed of at the Sharp Park organic dump. Excavated dredge spoils appropriate for use as golf course substrate materials would be used on-site to raise the elevation of Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 and to create the upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Prior to on-site use of dredged material, the sediments to be removed as part of the wetland restoration project would be tested for elevated concentrations of sulfides and other characteristics to determine whether the sediments would serve as soils suitable for supporting desired vegetation. If the sediment proves unsuitable, it would be placed in a ~~nonsensitive~~ non-sensitive location or treated to render it capable of supporting the desired vegetation. Treatment may include spreading and mixing the dredged material with native soil to avoid concentrating acidic soils or adding lime to neutralize acidic soils. Excavated dredged soils appropriate for on-site re-use would be used to create upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Any additional sediment would be re-used at non-sensitive locations, which include the Sharp Park Rifle Range, the Sharp Park green waste facility, and the Sharp Park golf course in locations where the character-defining features of the course would not be adversely impacted. Excavation of the eastern portions of the lagoon, pond and the connector shoreline would convert up to six acres of freshwater marsh, willow scrub, and wet meadow wetland habitat to open water habitat.

Figure 3 of the Draft EIR p. 101 has been modified to emphasize that on-site sediment from Laguna Salada will be used to create upland habitat proposed by the project, remove reference to raising certain golf course fairways, and to include the location of the Green Waste Facility and Rifle Range (both proposed locations for sediment re-use) within the extent of the figure. These modifications are shown in hatched yellow and yellow call-outs on the attached revised Figure 3.

The text on Draft EIR pp. 221-222, last paragraph has been changed as follows:

Impact CP-6. Implementation of the Sharp Park restoration activities that include raising holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource under CEQA. (less than significant)

As discussed in Section V.D.2, Sharp Park Golf Course meets the criteria for listing on the NRHP and CRHP for its significance under Criteria A and C for listing on the CRHR under Criteria 1 and 3. At Sharp Park, excavated dredged spoils appropriate for use as golf course substrate materials ~~would~~ may be used on-site to raise Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 and to create upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada.

The text on Draft EIR p. 453, in Table 19, has been changed as follows:

**Table 1
Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project**

Regulation	Project Requirement
Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (Environment Code, Chapter 19)	Minor quantities of solid waste and recyclable material would be generated during the management of the Natural Areas. Unless it can be used to create wildlife habitat, all large woody debris generated by the Natural Areas Program would be composted in Golden Gate Park; vegetation debris from Sharp Park would be disposed of at the Sharp Park organic dump <u>green waste facility</u> . The wood chips may be used to suppress understory invasive vegetation or could be used as beneficial mulch on other revegetation projects in the Natural Areas. Also, large tree trunks may be left on site if they provide habitat value, or they may be used for recreational or maintenance purposes within the Natural Area.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Minor quantities of solid waste and recyclable material would be generated during the management of the Natural Areas.
San Francisco Clean Contractors Ordinance (Ordinance 70-07)	Clean Contractors on public works construction projects that take 20 days or more to complete must reduce vehicle emissions that contribute to GHG accumulation by (1) using a blend of at least 20 percent biodiesel in off-road vehicles and construction equipment and (2) using construction equipment with engines that meet Tier 2 standards or use best available control technology.

Attachment:

- Letter from San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department re. Modification to Natural Areas Management Plan Project Description and Figure 3 in the Draft Environmental Review Document, Planning Department Case No. 2005.0912E

Attachment:

**Letter from San Francisco Recreation and Parks
Department re. Modification to Natural Areas Management
Plan Project Description and Figure 3 in the Draft
Environmental Review Document, Planning Department
Case No. 2005.0912E**



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

Date: December 14, 2016

To: Melinda Hue and Jessica Range, Environmental Planning
San Francisco Planning Department

From: Stacy Bradley, Deputy Director of Planning

Subject: Modification to Natural Areas Management Plan Project Description and Figure 3 in the Draft Environmental Review Document, Planning Department Case No. 2005.0912E

Following publication of the Response to Comments document for the Natural Resources Management Plan, we have proposed modifications to the Project Description with respect to proposed actions at the Sharp Park Natural Area with the intent of emphasizing the preferred use of soil spoils for habitat restoration purposes and identifying the other disposal sites required for excess spoils as equal disposal options. Specifically, the revisions listed below to the Project Description remove specific reference to use of the spoils to raise the elevation of certain golf course holes and clarify potential re-use locations.

The text on Draft EIR pp. 99-102, last paragraph, has been changed as follows:

Some areas that are currently open water within Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond would be deepened by one to three feet, and parts of the eastern portions of the lagoon and pond shorelines, as well as the connector channel, would be excavated 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. Excavation of accumulated sediments and encroaching wetland plants would result in the conversion of vegetated wetlands to open water habitat. This deepening would be conducted using excavating equipment positioned along the shore of the two water bodies. Up to 60,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated; ~~of this, approximately 40,000 cubic yards would be used on-site and approximately 20,000 cubic yards would be stockpiled or spread at the Sharp Park rifle range site or disposed of at the Sharp Park organic dump.~~ Excavated dredge spoils appropriate for use as golf course substrate materials would be used on-site to raise the elevation of Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 and to create the upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Prior to on-site use of dredged material, the sediments to be removed as part of the wetland restoration project would be tested for elevated concentrations of sulfides and other characteristics to determine whether the sediments would serve as soils suitable for supporting desired vegetation. If the sediment proves unsuitable, it would be placed in a ~~nonsensitive~~ non-sensitive location or treated to render it capable of supporting the desired vegetation. Treatment may include spreading and mixing the dredged material with native soil to avoid concentrating acidic soils or adding lime to neutralize acidic soils. Excavated dredged soils appropriate for on-site re-use would be used to create upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Any additional sediment would be re-used at non-sensitive locations, which include the Sharp Park Rifle Range, the Sharp Park green

waste facility, and the Sharp Park golf course in locations where the character-defining features of the course would not be adversely impacted. Excavation of the eastern portions of the lagoon, pond and the connector shoreline would convert up to six acres of freshwater marsh, willow scrub, and wet meadow wetland habitat to open water habitat.

We also propose to change Figure 3 of the Draft EIR p. 101 to emphasize that on-site sediment from Laguna Salada will be used to create upland habitat proposed by the project, remove reference to raising certain golf course fairways, and to include the location of the Green Waste Facility and Rifle Range (both proposed locations for sediment re-use) within the extent of the figure. These modifications are shown in hatched yellow and yellow call-outs on the attached revised Figure 3.

Please contact me to let me know if you need future clarification.


Attachment:

Modified Version of Figure 3 in DEIR



R:\NEW\19598\Layouts\Laguna Salada_rev.mxd 08/11/11 - YE

Laguna Salada Restoration Features



Pacifica, California

Attachment B: Recreation and Park Commission Resolution

No. 1612-012

RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION
City and County of San Francisco
Resolution No. 1612-012

RESOLUTION ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department manages 32 Natural Areas that are scattered mostly throughout the central and southern portions of San Francisco and constitute approximately four percent of the total city area; one natural area is in Pacifica; and

WHEREAS, The Natural Areas managed by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (“SFRPD”) range in size from less than one acre to almost 400 acres and include such popular locations as Twin Peaks and portions of Glen Canyon Park; and

WHEREAS, In the late 1990s, the SFRPD initiated a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage these Natural Areas; and

WHEREAS, The SFRPD recognizes the need for a Management Plan to guide activities on properties owned or maintained by the SFRPD through its Natural Resources Program; and

WHEREAS, Over the course of several years, the SFRPD developed the Natural Resource Management Plan (“NRMP” or “Project”), with the final draft plan published in February 2006; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP contains detailed information on the biology, geology, and trails within 32 Natural Areas, 31 in San Francisco and one (Sharp Park) in Pacifica; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP is intended to guide natural resource protection, habitat restoration, trail and access improvements, other capital projects, and maintenance activities over the next 20 years; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP delineates the acreage within each Natural Area into management area categories based on the management priority; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and management activities specific to each Natural Area; and

WHEREAS, The NRMP identifies a number of goals with respect to conservation and restoration, education, research, stewardship, recreation, and monitoring goals; and

WHEREAS, Recommended actions identified for each Natural Area are intended to meet the overall goals of the NRMP and may include, but are not limited to, habitat restoration, removal of invasive species, tree removal, erosion control, trail closure, relocation or

creation, and closure or reduction of dog play areas; and

WHEREAS, On April 22, 2009, the Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) was required under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed NRMP and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the proposed Project’s environmental review; and

WHEREAS, On August 31, 2011, the Planning Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department’s list of persons requesting such notice; and

WHEREAS, On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse; and

WHEREAS, Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR; the period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, On April 27, 2012, the Planning Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Planning Department’s list of persons requesting such notice. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Planning Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received

during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Planning and Recreation and Park Commissions and the public, and these files are available for public review at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and certified the FEIR as adequate, accurate, and complete; and

WHEREAS, The Recreation and Park Commission has reviewed and consider the FEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), (attached hereto as Attachment 2); now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission adopts the CEQA findings, including a statement of overriding considerations, (attached hereto as Attachment 1) as though fully set forth herein; and be it


FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission adopts the MMRP and imposes all mitigation measures contained therein as conditions of Project approval; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Recreation and Park Commission approves the NRMP, which prescribes both general management activities that apply to all Natural Areas and management activities specific to each Natural Area, including, but not limited to habitat restoration, removal of invasive species, tree removal, erosion control, trail closure, relocation or creation, and closure or reduction of dog play areas.

Adopted by the following vote:

Ayes	5
Noes	0
Absent	1

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at the Joint meeting of the Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission held on December 15, 2016.


Margaret A. McArthur, Commission Liaison

Attachment C: Planning Commission Motion 19825



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion NO. 19825

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2016

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: **2005.0912E**
Project Address: **Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan¹**
Zoning: N/A
Block/Lot: 31 Natural Areas in San Francisco and Pacifica (various parcels)
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
Stacy Bradley – (415) 575-5609
stacy.bradley@sfgov.org
Staff Contact: Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041
melinda.hue@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2005.0912E, the "Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan" (hereinafter 'Project'), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on April 22, 2009.
 - B. The Department held a public scoping meeting on May 12, 2009 and May 14, 2009 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Project's environmental review.
 - C. On August 31, 2011, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning


¹ The Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, or SNRAMP, is now referred to as the Natural Resources Management Plan; however, to maintain consistency between the Draft EIR and the RTC document, the term SNRAMP will continue to be used.

Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.

- D. On August 31, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
- E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2011.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on October 6, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on October 31, 2011.
3. On April 27, 2012, the Department opened a second public review and comment period for the DEIR, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the second public review and comment period; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice and to neighborhood groups registered with the Department at that time. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 11, 2012.
4. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the first 61-day public review period and the second 45-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 16, 2016, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
5. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.
6. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
7. On December 15, 2016, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
8. The project sponsor has indicated that the presently preferred alternative is the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan.

9. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2005.0912E: Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan reflects the independent judgement and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR that would require recirculation of the document pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
10. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the Environmental Impact Report and the project preferred by the project sponsor, described as the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan in FEIR would have the following significant unavoidable environmental impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:
- A. A significant project specific and cumulative impact on Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource under CEQA, due to modification of golf holes for restoration activities;
 - B. A significant cumulative impact on recreation in dog play areas (DPAs) within Natural Areas due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the National Park Service's (NPS) Dog Management Plan within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA);
 - C. A significant cumulative impact on biological resources within Natural Areas DPAs due to increased use resulting from the reduction of dog play areas by the project and potentially by the NPS Dog Management Plan within the GGNRA; and
 - D. A significant project-specific and cumulative impact on air quality from activities such as trail construction, hillside stabilization, erosion control, and tree removal.
11. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 15, 2016.


Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Richards
NOES: Moore
ABSENT: None
ADOPTED: December 15, 2016

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:01 PM
To: bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggas@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com; bo@slotelaw.com; richard@spublicgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: APPEAL RESPONSES: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Categories: 170044

Good afternoon,

Please find linked below the appeal responses received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the San Francisco Forest Alliance, and Lozeau Drury, LLP, on behalf of the Wild Equity Institute, concerning the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report Appeal for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project.

[SF Forest Alliance Appeal Response - February 16, 2017 - LARGE FILE](#)

[Wild Equity Institute Appeal Response - February 16, 2017](#)

The appeal hearing for this matter is scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on February 28, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

410 12th Street, Suite 250
Oakland, Ca 94607

www.lozeaudrury.com
michael@lozeaudrury.com

February 16, 2017

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
bos.legislation@sfgov.org

Sandra Fewer (District 1) - Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org
Mark Farrell (District 2) - Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org
Aaron Peskin (District 3) - Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org
Katy Tang (District 4) - Katy.Tang@sfgov.org
London Breed (District 5) - London.Breed@sfgov.org
Jane Kim (District 6) - Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
Norman Yee (District 7) - Norman.Yee@sfgov.org
Jeff Sheehy (District 8) - Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org
Hillary Ronen (District 9) - Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org
Malia Cohen (District 10) - Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
Ahsha Safai (District 11) - Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

Re: Analysis in Support of Wild Equity Institute's Appeal of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report's Analysis of the Sharp Park Project – File No. 170044.

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code § 31.16(b)(5), the following information is submitted on behalf of Appellant Wild Equity Institute in support of its appeal of the Environmental Impact Report and accompanying findings and certification prepared for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (Planning Department Case No. 2005.1912E; State Clearinghouse No. 2009042102) (hereinafter "SNRAMP EIR" or "EIR").

Wild Equity has no objections to either the programmatic or maintenance activities applicable to all of the significant natural areas addressed in the SNRAMP EIR. Wild Equity's objections are limited to the portions of the SNRAMP EIR and findings addressing the one large-scale site-specific project – the "Sharp Park Restoration Project." A thorough review of the restoration alternatives and a full

scientific debate of the viable options for restoring the Laguna Salada wetlands complex at Sharp Park is critical to the survival of two listed species depending on that habitat – the endangered and fully-protected San Francisco garter snake and the threatened red-legged frog. An adequate review is also critical for the public and policy-makers to consider its options regarding multi-million dollar financial investments in a Pacifica-based golf course.

In response to comments received on the Initial Study prepared for the SNRAMP project, the Planning Department and Recreation and Park Department issued a scoping report that reassured the interested public that the SNRAMP and its EIR would not include any changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course, an area not included within a natural resource area:

Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

(DEIR, App. A, *Scoping Report For San Francisco Natural Areas Management Plan* (Nov. 2009) (“Scoping Report”), p. 2-5.) Despite this assurance, the DEIR proposed and the Planning Commission went on to certify an FEIR that did just that – proposing changes to the design of the golf course and even mandating through a mitigation measure that a fairway be replaced. (See DEIR, p. 261.)

In addition to the Departments’ assurance, the Sharp Park Restoration Project should be analyzed in a separate project-level EIR in order to cure the Commissions’ CEQA violations. Because the SNRAMP EIR’s analysis of potential significant environmental impacts of the Sharp Park Project is significantly flawed and fails to comply with CEQA, Wild Equity requests that the Board of Supervisors reject those portions of the SNRAMP EIR, instruct the Planning Commission on remand to remove that individual project from the programmatic-level EIR, and prepare a separate project-level EIR remedying each of the flaws identified below.

The Sharp Park Project is readily severable from the programmatic and maintenance level activities addressed by the EIR. The EIR’s significant flaws in addressing that discrete project should not stand as an obstacle to the Planning Commission proceeding expeditiously with a programmatic EIR approving the programmatic and maintenance activities applicable throughout the Significant Natural Resource Areas. The Board’s findings and remand should ensure that any delay to the programmatic review of the entire SNRAMP program be minimal by instructing the Planning Commission to promptly remove the Sharp Park Restoration Project from the EIR and expeditiously proceed to reconsider certification of the SNRAMP programmatic EIR excluding that project.

The Board of Supervisors should reject the EIR and Planning Commission's certification of the Sharp Park Project included in the SNRAMP EIR for the following reasons:

1. The dredging mitigation measures to relocate San Francisco garter snakes, a fully-protected species under Fish & Game Code § 5050, are in violation of that section's strict prohibition on pursuing, catching or capturing fully-protected species and cannot be used as a mitigation measure for any CEQA project. (See *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204.)
2. The EIR fails to consider cumulative water quality and biological impacts of the Sharp Park Project resulting from anticipated sea level rise. Nor does the EIR evaluate the Project's cumulative impacts and the effectiveness of various alternatives in light of anticipated changes to the Sharp Park seawall. The Laguna Salada and the adjacent seawall exist at the battlefront of global warming and sea level rise. For any long-term restoration of the Laguna to make any scientific or even common sense, sea level rise must be taken into account. Relatedly, by not addressing the foreseeable changes to the sea wall as part of the Sharp Park Project's cumulative impact analysis, the EIR's analysis falls short of CEQA's requirements. The Board of Supervisors should not countenance an environmental review that actively seeks to avoid considering restoration alternatives for Sharp Park in light of their ability to withstand sea level rise and necessary changes to the degrading sea wall along its western edge.
3. The EIR fails to address the proposed Sharp Park Project's likely impacts to wetlands as defined by the California Coastal Commission that are located on golf fairways where dredged materials may be disposed by the proposed project. Alternatives left unanalyzed by the EIR would avoid this impact.
4. The EIR fails to address an adequate range of non-dredging alternatives to the Sharp Park Project, including an alternative consistent with the project proposed by the Planning Department and Recreation and Park Department in the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study and a detailed alternative prepared by PWA and wetland restoration expert, Peter Baye, Ph.D. These alternatives would significantly reduce the proposed Sharp Park Project's significant and unavoidable NOx emissions, would avoid any impacts to Coastal Commission wetlands, and would allow for migration of wetlands habitat that evolves with sea level rise.

Wild Equity respectfully requests that, applying its independent authority, the Board of Supervisors make findings that the SNRAMP EIR's analysis of the Sharp Park Project fails to comply with CEQA, reverse the Planning Commission's findings and

certification of the SNRAMP EIR, instruct the Planning Commission to remove the Sharp Park Project from the projects considered in the SNRAMP EIR, promptly complete the SNRAMP EIR for the programmatic and maintenance activities, and prepare a separate EIR for the Sharp Park Restoration Project addressing each of the flaws in the current analysis.¹

- 1. Like every other natural resource area's project level actions and due to the serious flaws in the project-level analysis of the Sharp Park Project, the Board of Supervisors should instruct the Planning Commission to separate the CEQA review of the Sharp Park Project from the programmatic EIR.**

There is no reason for the significant CEQA flaws found in the project-level analysis of the Sharp Park Project to impede the City's adoption of a programmatic level EIR for the SNRAMP. The Sharp Park Project is not necessary to the programmatic-level review of the SNRAMP or the project-level analysis of SNRAMP-wide maintenance activities. The Planning Department and Recreation and Park Department acknowledged as much, assuring the public during the scoping phase that the SNRAMP EIR would not include any changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course. (Scoping Report, p. 2-5.)

The Board of Supervisors is invested with plenary authority to reject the Planning Commission's certification and the EIR and remand the decision back to the Commission with instructions to remove the Sharp Park Project from the projects

¹ Additionally, the Board of Supervisors should reject the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the Recreation and Park Department as it pertains to the Sharp Park Project. The Recreation and Park Commission adopted a statement of overriding considerations finding that the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Sharp Park Project are acceptable because the Sharp Park Project "would ... ensure the sustained and increased populations of the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the threatened California red-legged frog, both protected under the Endangered Species Act, through the Laguna Salada restoration at Sharp Park." (San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission, California Environmental Quality Act Findings: Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp. 22-23 (Dec. 15, 2016).) This finding is not supported by substantial evidence because substantial evidence in the record indicates that sea level rise and the continued degradation of the Sharp Park sea wall will undermine the Project and neither sustain nor increase populations of the garter snake and red-legged frog. In addition, because the Sharp Park Project continues to limit the scope and type of habitat restoration in and adjacent to the Laguna Salada wetlands because of its existing and redevelopment features, including raising of golf holes, large-scale dredging and continued pumping operations, the Sharp Park Project does not ensure sustained and increased populations of San Francisco garter snakes and red-legged frogs. Thus, the Board should resolve to reject the Commission's statement.

considered in SNRAMP EIR, instruct the Commission to promptly recertify the SNRAMP EIR without that project, and prepare a separate EIR for the Sharp Park restoration activities for later tiered consideration.

a. The Sharp Park Project can be readily severed from the program-level and maintenance activity categories addressed in the EIR.

Because of its numerous flaws pursuant to CEQA described below, the City should review the Sharp Park Project and a reasonable range of alternatives in a separate tiered EIR. The EIR is a programmatic EIR for large-scale projects in the other natural resource areas. (See DEIR, p. 72.) The EIR addresses all of the natural resource areas on a programmatic level for “[r]erouting or constructing trails, using heavy equipment (such as bobcats, backhoes, and excavators) at a typical grading depth of two feet[,]... [s]tabilizing hillsides, using erosion control measures that require heavy equipment and grading and possible installation of structures, such as gabions[,] [and] [u]ndertaking initial invasive weed or tree removal projects that typically exceed half an acre (or on average 20 trees) at any one time.” (DEIR, p. 96.) Wild Equity does not contest the EIR’s programmatic review.

The EIR also conducts project-level review of two projects. One project is routine maintenance which includes “[r]emoving invasive weeds by hand, either as follow-up on a previously treated site or as initial treatment in small areas (less than half an acre).... Installing plants using hand tools and plants in one-gallon containers or smaller.... Removing invasive trees (mostly eucalyptus), as well as overhanging tree limbs.... Typically, no more than 20 trees (or half an acre) are treated at one time.... Maintaining trails, which includes clearing deposited soil from steps, replacing or installing steps or trail edging, and rerouting and benching trails... [and] Maintaining catchment basins and sediment dams through hand removal of accumulated materials.” (DEIR, pp. 96-97.) Like the programmatic components, the maintenance activities are SNRMP-wide and not specific to any particular natural area. Wild Equity does not contest this project-level review of maintenance activities throughout the natural resource areas, including where maintenance will be applied in Sharp Park.

The EIR’s second project considered at project-level review is for the proposed “Sharp Park restoration activities.” This project is focused on the Laguna Salada wetlands complex and Sanchez Creek, which flows into the complex. (DEIR, pp. 97-99.) In particular, this project-level component includes:

- Create upland mounds for foraging, resting, and escape cover for the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake;
- Dredge excess sediments and accumulated organic matter, including stands of encroaching tules, to maintain open water and fringe habitat in the wetlands complex and use appropriate dredged material on site to create or enhance upland habitat or to increase the elevation of certain golf course fairways;
- Continue monitoring for California red-legged frogs

and San Francisco garter snakes; and • Install and maintain signs and barriers to prevent disturbance of sensitive habitat in Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada by dogs or other possible nuisances. • SP-4b— Construct upland mounds in the area directly south and southeast of Laguna Salada and plant with native grasses and herbs to provide snake and frog basking sites, and to provide nesting habitat for riparian birds; and • SP-9b—Establish a vegetation management plan for the canal connecting Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond that would allow channel maintenance without affecting the forktail damselfly, California red-legged frog, or San Francisco garter snake.

(*Id.*) The main components of the Sharp Park Project include:

- Dredging up to 60,000 cubic yards of material to remove sediment, encroaching plant species, and decaying vegetation in Laguna Salada, Horse Stable Pond, and the channel that connects the two water bodies, resulting in the conversion of freshwater marsh, willow scrub, and wet meadow wetland habitat to open water habitat;
- Recontouring freshwater marsh wetland and ruderal (disturbed) habitat along the Laguna Salada, Horse Stable Pond, and channel shorelines to create shallow water wetland habitat;
- Creating an upland and wetland habitat corridor between Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada;
- Converting about half an acre of wet meadow/freshwater marsh wetland to upland habitat, creating an upland refuge in the middle of Laguna Salada to provide snakes and frogs with refugia from feral cats and other terrestrial predators, and creating about an acre of replacement wetland along the northern and western edges of the lagoon in place of coastal scrub habitat; and
- Constructing up to four acres of upland mounds on landscaped grass on the east side of the lagoon and between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond. These mounds would be placed in the area currently occupied by part of the Hole 13 fairway, which would be narrowed and reconfigured.

(*Id.*, pp. 98-99.) As discussed in detail below, the Sharp Park Project is the only project for which the EIR fails to comply with CEQA.

The Sharp Park Project is severable from the programmatic and maintenance activities analyzed in the SNRAMP EIR. The Project does not extend into any other natural resource area. As the Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (Feb. 2006) (“2006 SNRAMP”) acknowledged, “Sharp Park occupies a unique position amongst the Natural Areas. Not only is it located outside of the City proper, but it is bordered by designated open spaces (Sweeny and Milagra Ridges).” (2006 SNRAMP, p. 6.4-9). The issues relating to habitat for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog are specific to the Laguna Salada wetland complex. Although the SNRAMP assigns an objective to all of the natural resources

areas to “identify, prioritize, and implement restoration and management actions designed to promote the functioning of San Francisco’s native ecosystem, including the maintenance and enhancement of native biodiversity[,]” it is only the Sharp Park Project that the EIR reviews at a site-specific project-level. In addition, the Sharp Park Project is the only project that involves activities outside of the SNRMP, including work and dredge disposal sites on portions of the golf course that are not designated natural areas. (See Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, p. 6.4-21, Fig. 6.4-1; *Compare* DEIR, p. 100, Fig. 2.)

The City claims that “[i]f the Sharp Park component of the SNRAMP project were to be removed, one of the CEQA project objectives would not be achieved (i.e., restoring the Laguna Salada wetland complex), and the other objective would be achieved to a lesser extent (i.e., implementing restoration activities).” (Responses to Comments, p. 4-169.) This response is illogical and inconsistent with the main programmatic review conducted by the SNRAMP EIR. Separating out project level review of the Sharp Project would not eliminate an objective to restore Sharp Park. It would simply move that objective to the separate Sharp Park EIR that would focus on the unique species and habitat issues associated with that natural area and allow the City to cure the many CEQA problems with the current analysis discussed below and in previous comments. The objective could still remain in the program EIR as well but limited to a program-level review, allowing the details of the specific Sharp Park restoration project to be worked out in a later tiered EIR. This procedure would not implement restoration activities to a lesser extent. Indeed, it would be the same extent as every other natural area, none of which have any large-scale, project-specific restoration activities currently proposed. An EIR focused solely on the Sharp Park Restoration would instead ensure that effective restoration activities are conducted in that critical area.

The City also suggests that removing the Sharp Park project will have an unidentified adverse effect on the City’s review of cumulative impacts in the EIR. (Response to Comments, p. 4-169.) This is not the case. Although the City’s analysis thus far has been deficient, the Sharp Park Project is foreseeable and fully capable of being factored into any relevant cumulative impact analysis. The only conceivable cumulative impact would appear to be NOx emissions. Nothing would preclude the City from acknowledging those potential impacts even if the SNRAMP programmatic EIR does not yet include a project-level review of the Sharp Park Project. Likewise, the cumulative impact analysis relies for the most part on a long list of projects located in and around San Francisco. (DEIR, App. G.) Excluding the project-level CEQA review of the Sharp Park Project would not change that list of projects considered by the Commission in its cumulative impacts analysis.

///

///

b. The Board of Supervisors has ample authority to instruct the Planning Commission to sever the Sharp Park restoration activities project from the program-level and maintenance project CEQA review.

The Board of Supervisors has plenary authority to review the merits of the EIR, the underlying record, and the Planning Commission's findings and certification of the EIR. Under the City's CEQA regulations, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Department are treated as a single entity, *i.e.* the City and County of San Francisco. (Administrative Code § 31.04(a) ("The City and all its officials, boards, commissions, departments, bureaus and offices shall constitute a single "local agency," "public agency" or "lead agency" as those terms are used in CEQA"). Accordingly, the Code automatically suspends any activity by any other department addressed in an EIR that has been appealed to the Board of Supervisors. (§31.16(b)(3) ("For projects that require multiple City approvals, after the Clerk has scheduled the appeal for hearing and until the CEQA decision is affirmed by the Board, ... (B) other City boards, commissions, departments and officials shall not carry out or consider further the approval of the project that is the subject of the CEQA decision on appeal except activities that are essential to abate hazards to the public health and safety...").)

The Board of Supervisors conducts a plenary review of an EIR and the Planning Commission's findings and certifications. "The Board shall conduct its own independent review of whether the CEQA decision adequately complies with the requirements of CEQA." (§ 31.16(b)(6).) "The Board ***shall consider anew all facts, evidence and issues related to the adequacy, accuracy and objectiveness of the CEQA decision, including, but not limited to, the sufficiency of the CEQA decision and the correctness of its conclusions.***" (*Id.* (emphasis added).) The Board of Supervisors is required to reverse the Planning Commission's certification of an EIR "if the Board finds that the EIR does not comply with CEQA, including that it is not adequate, accurate and objective, is not sufficient as an informational document, that its conclusions are incorrect or it does not reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the City, or that the Planning Commission certification findings are incorrect." (§ 31.16(c)(5).) When the Board of Supervisors' reverses the Planning Commission's decision, that reversal automatically extends to all other actions by any other city department or commission approving the project at issue. (§ 31.16(b)(10) ("If the Board reverses the CEQA decision, the prior CEQA decision and ***any actions approving the project in reliance on the reversed CEQA decision, shall be deemed void***") (emphasis added). However, the Board's reversal is limited to those aspects of the EIR that are deficient. The Administrative Code provides that a remand of an EIR and its certification to the Planning Commission is limited to further action by the Commission "consistent with the Board's findings." (§ 31.16(c)(5) ("If the Board reverses the Planning Commission's certification of the final EIR, it shall remand the final EIR to the Planning Commission ***for further action consistent with the Board's findings***") (emphasis added).) Indeed, the Code ensures that the entire FEIR not have to be reopened and

subjected to future Board review and repetitive appeals by limiting any future appeals only to those portions of an EIR that are subsequently revised. (*Id.* (“Any further appeals of the EIR shall be limited **only to the portions** of the EIR that the Planning Commission has revised.... The Board's subsequent review, if any, also shall be limited to the **portions of the EIR** that the Planning Commission has revised including, without limitation, new issues that have been addressed”) (emphasis added).)

Because the Board of Supervisors has plenary review authority and the Planning Commission is obliged to revise the EIR on remand consistent with the findings of the Board of Supervisors, the Board may, based on its review, find that (1) the SNRAMP EIR is not adequate, not sufficient as an informational document, and its conclusions and accompanying findings are incorrect in considering the Sharp Park Project (as discussed further below); (2) the SNRAMP EIR is adequate regarding the programmatic and maintenance projects included in the EIR; (3) the Planning Commission, on remand, delete the Sharp Park Project from the project's considered in the SNRAMP program EIR, (3) the Planning Commission promptly recertify the Program-level and Maintenance Projects already included in the EIR, and (4) the Planning Commission prepare a separate EIR reviewing any proposal for Sharp Park restoration activities that addresses each of the inadequacies discussed below.

The Board of Supervisor's plenary authority to review the EIR and sever the deficient project level review of the Sharp Park Project is consistent with CEQA's recognition that errors in an EIR be cured with the least disruption to implementation of separate and severable related projects or even portions of projects. The Supervisors' de novo review of the Planning Commission's EIR certification and findings is broader than the review role exercised by the California courts. Nevertheless, CEQA plainly contemplates that the courts, even with their more limited review powers, are authorized to tailor any relief to cure an inadequate EIR or accompanying finding to fit the violation. (See Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act (Cont.Ed.Bar 2nd Edition, March 2016 Update), § 23.124.) Thus, under PRC § 21168.9(b), any order of a court addressing a violation of CEQA:

shall include only those mandates which are necessary to achieve compliance with this division and only those specific project activities in noncompliance with this division. The order shall be made by the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate specifying what action by the public agency is necessary to comply with this division. However, the order shall be limited to that portion of a determination, finding, or decision or the specific project activity or activities found to be in noncompliance only if a court finds that (1) the portion or specific project activity or activities are severable, (2) severance will not prejudice complete and full compliance with this division, and (3) the court has not found the remainder of the project to be in noncompliance with this division.

(PRC § 21168.9(b).) The Sharp Park Project is not just a severable activity – it is a separate project. The Board of Supervisors, exercising its de novo review authority, has even more discretion than the courts to remand the EIR back to the Planning Commission with instructions to remove those portions addressing the project level Sharp Park Restoration Project, promptly certify the programmatic-level EIR, and prepare a separate EIR for that project-level proposal consistent with Chapter 31. Because the programmatic and maintenance project components of the EIR are consistent with CEQA, those project components should be allowed to proceed, with instructions to the Planning Commission to promptly excise the Sharp Park Project from the EIR and recertify the programmatic EIR without that objectionable component.

2. The mitigation measures for addressing impacts to the San Francisco garter snake, a fully-protected species under Fish & Game Code § 5050, are not authorized by law and thus fail to mitigate impacts to the snake.

The City proposes to mitigate the Sharp Park Project's impacts to the San Francisco garter snake by having a biologist relocate any snakes found in the way of the proposed dredging. (DEIR, p. 320.) Because this proposed mitigation scheme amounts to a take of the fully-protected San Francisco garter snake, it is precluded by Fish & Game Code § 5050 and is inconsistent with law under CEQA.

The San Francisco garter snake is a fully protected species under Fish & Game Code § 5050(b). (Fish & Game Code § 5050(b)(2) (“The following are fully protected reptiles and amphibians:... (2) San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*”); DEIR, p. 279, Table 9; DEIR, p. 275 (“The San Francisco garter snake, which occurs at the Sharp Park Natural Area, is listed as fully protected under the Fish and Game Code”).)

The DEIR identifies the proposal to extensively dredge the Laguna Salada wetlands complex as a potential significant impact on the garter snake absent mitigation. (DEIR, pp. 319-320, 323.) As mitigation, the DEIR calls for relocation the garter snake when they are in the way of the dredging operations. (DEIR, p. 42, 323, 327.)

Any take or possession of a fully protected species is forbidden, in particular when the take or possession is done as part of specified mitigation for a project defined by CEQA:

(1) Except as provided in this section, Section 2081.7, Section 2081.9, or Section 2835,² a fully protected reptile or amphibian may not be taken or

² None of these exceptions apply to the San Francisco garter snake or Sharp Park. Only F&G Code § 2835 could conceivably apply, allowing for the Department of Fish & Wildlife to authorize take of fully-protected species “whose conservation and management is provided for in a natural community conservation plan approved by the

possessed at any time. No provision of this code or any other law shall be construed to authorize the issuance of a permit or license to take a fully protected reptile or amphibian, and no permit or license previously issued shall have any force or effect for that purpose. However, the department may authorize the taking of a fully protected reptile or amphibian for necessary scientific research, including efforts to recover fully protected, threatened, or endangered species. ...

(2) As used in this subdivision, "scientific research" does not include an action taken as part of specified mitigation for a project, as defined in Section 21065 of the Public Resources Code.

(Fish & Game Code § 5050(a)(1)-(2).)³ Fish & Game Code § 86 defines "take" as to "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill."

The California Supreme Court recently interpreted a related provision of the Fish & Game Code applicable to fully-protected bird species, Fish & Game Code § 5515, which contains identical language as in Section 5050 quoted above.⁴ The Supreme Court made clear that the Fish & Game Code provides no authority for any incidental take of fully protected species in the context of mitigation for any CEQA project. As the Court explains:

In light of the definition of "take" in section 86 as including an animal's "pursu[it]," "catch," or "capture," the capture and relocation of [fully protected] stickleback contemplated by mitigation measures BIO-44 and BIO-46 violates Fish and Game Code section 5515. Although trapping and transplantation are defined as possible conservation measures for endangered species under Fish and Game Code section 2061, the stickleback, as a fully protected species, is subject to the stricter prohibitions against taking set forth in Fish and Game Code section 5515,

department." (F&G Code § 2835.) However, "[n]o ... Natural Community Conservation Plans overlap with the Natural Areas." (EIR, p. 276.)

³ PRC § 21065 defines "project" as "an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following: (a) An activity directly undertaken by any public agency. (b) An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies. (c) An activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies." PRC § 21065

⁴ The Court of Appeal expressly identified Fish & Game Code § 5050 as a "[p]arallel provision[]" to Fish & Game Code 5515. (*Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204, 232.)

including an express prohibition on taking as mitigation for a project under CEQA. (§ 5515, subd. (a)(2).)

Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204, 232-233. The Court continues:

We must reject the claim DFW may authorize, as CEQA mitigation, actions to protect a fully protected species from harm when, as here, those actions are otherwise prohibited as takings. The Legislature has expressly precluded this interpretation of the statutes by providing, in Fish and Game Code section 5515, subdivision (a), that permitted taking of a fully protected species for “scientific research” may include “efforts to recover” the species but that such “scientific research” does not include “any actions taken as part of specified mitigation for a project” as defined in CEQA. We cannot give effect to this provision and at the same time hold that DFW may, as CEQA mitigation, authorize the trapping and transplanted of stickleback—actions that plainly call for the fish's “catch,” or “capture” (Fish & G. Code, § 86). That such catch or capture is intended to protect the stickleback from harm caused by the project's construction is inherent in its adoption as CEQA mitigation and is expressly barred under section 5515.

(*Id.* at 233; *see also id.* (“The Legislature evidently believed the prohibition on taking or possessing fully protected species should be relaxed to permit the use of wildlife management techniques needed for species recovery, but that agencies should not be allowed to rely on the availability of such techniques in approving or carrying out projects that would have significant adverse effects on a fully protected species..... such actions may not be relied on or “specified” as project mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA”).) Rather than restoration, the Sharp Park Project is more accurately described a mitigation project for operating the Sharp park golf course. However, even assuming Sharp Park were to qualify as a “restoration” project, the Supreme Court has made clear that takings to mitigate impacts of such a project are forbidden, (*Id.* at 232 (“DFW may conduct or authorize capture and relocation of the stickleback as a conservation measure to protect the fish and aid in its recovery, but the agency may not rely in a CEQA document on the prospect of capture and relocation as mitigating a project’s adverse impacts”).)

The City cannot distinguish its proposed relocations of the fully-protected San Francisco garter snake from the stickleback relocation mitigations prohibited by the Fish & Game Code and rejected by the Supreme Court in *Center For Biological Diversity*. This error only applies to the proposed Sharp Park project and its reliance on massive dredging of the Laguna Salada. Because the mitigation proposed by the City is illegal, it cannot be relied upon in the project-level CEQA analysis for Sharp Park. As a result, this project level component should be stripped out of the programmatic EIR. Future

review of any Sharp Park wetlands project must consider the feasible alternatives discussed that do not include extensive dredging.

3. The DEIR fails to address the likely cumulative impacts the Sharp Park Project will have on wetlands and aquatic resources when combined with future changes to the sea wall and sea level rise.

By refusing to address impacts beyond 20 years and future changes to the Sharp Park sea wall, the City's EIR fails to address the Sharp Park Project's cumulative impacts on water quality and biological resources. Although a 20 year management period may make sense for the general maintenance activities and programmatic activities, it makes no sense for a project-level analysis of the Sharp Park restoration activities. In particular, by avoiding looking at cumulative impacts of the Sharp Park dredging project beyond 20-years, the DEIR cannot assess those cumulative impacts in light of expected sea level rise. In addition, the City chooses to ignore the cumulative impacts associated with the reasonably foreseeable project that will be necessary to address the Sharp Park sea wall. Alternatively, future sea wall management is so intertwined with any long-term Sharp Park restoration project, omitting future changes to the sea wall improperly piecemeals review of the Sharp Park project.

An EIR must discuss significant cumulative impacts. (CEQA Guidelines § 15130(a).) This requirement flows from PRC § 21083, which requires a finding that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if "the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.... 'Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." "Cumulative impacts" are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." (CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a).) "[I]ndividual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects." (CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a).)

"The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time." (*Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency*, (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 117.) A legally adequate cumulative impacts analysis views a particular project over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects whose impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the project at hand.

Under CEQA, an EIR's cumulative impacts analysis must address all reasonably foreseeable projects. As the EIR acknowledges, "management options for the Sharp Park sea wall, including a naturally managed sea wall and shoreline, have been

considered by the SFRPD....” (DEIR, p. 103.) Despite that foreseeable sea wall project, the DEIR asserts that “those options are not proposed as part of the SNRAMP. Thus, they are not addressed in this EIR.” (*Id.*) Whether or not a future project must be included in an EIR’s cumulative impact analysis does not turn on whether it is part of the proposed management program. (See CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a).) Indeed, the list of projects included in the cumulative impact analysis in the current EIR are not limited to SNRMP projects. (See DEIR, App. G.) Moreover, the future sea wall project has no relevance to cumulative impacts for either the programmatic or maintenance activities that apply to the entire SNRAMP. However, the future management of the sea wall is directly linked to the Sharp Park Project’s impacts.

The City exacerbates this omission by invoking the SNRAMP’s 20 year management term to cut off any serious discussion of the Sharp project’s impacts in light of sea level rise: “During the 20-year project planning period for the project, the sea level is expected to rise less than one foot.” (DEIR, p. 381.) The SNRMP planning period should not act as a barrier to evaluating impacts or considering the long-term viability of Sharp Park restoration proposals. This is another reason why the Sharp Park Project should be evaluated under CEQA separately from the overall SNRMP program.

The City is very aware of inevitable sea level rise. “Recent computer modeling performed for this project indicates the potential for more widespread flooding of the golf course next to Laguna Salada (KHE 2009), including inundation as a result of sea level rise.” (DEIR, p. 358.) “Sea levels have risen over seven inches along the California coast in the past century and are projected to rise another 12 inches by 2040 and as much as 4.6 feet by 2100, in response to global climate change....” (*Id.*)

The City also anticipates that sea level rise will affect the Sharp Park sea wall and affect the performance of the proposed Sharp Park Project:

Sea level rise will put additional stress on the seawall at Sharp Park and could result in more frequent overtopping (SFRPD 2009a). Rising sea levels will also result in higher groundwater levels near the coast, as the water table rises to maintain net groundwater outflow to the ocean. Higher groundwater levels will reduce storage capacity of Laguna Salada somewhat and will require more frequent or increased rates of pumping to maintain the water level in Laguna Salada below the elevation at which flooding impacts could occur.

(DEIR, p. 361.) The City also acknowledges the inevitability of changes to the sea wall:

While portions of the seawall are in fair to good condition, mainly in armored areas, there are other portions of the seawall that are in poor condition. Significant erosion rills, near-vertical slope faces, and beach sand within two feet of the seawall are all issues that negatively affect the condition of the wall. If improvements are not performed to alleviate these

conditions, it is very likely that the seawall would be overtopped and breached during a 100-year storm or as a result of future sea level rise (Arup 2009).

(*Id.*) Both sea level rise and actions to address the sea wall's frailties are plainly foreseeable.

Dr. Baye has explained the direct cumulative link between the proposed Sharp Park Project and management decisions for the sea wall. As Dr. Baye states, "[t]he DEIR 'fails to address significant potential cumulative impacts between dredging, salinity stratification, seawater intrusion, and sea level rise within the 20 year planning period.'" (Responses to Comments, Attachments, p. B-510 (Baye-1).) Dr. Baye's comments point out the EIR's and previous reports' failure "to identify the significant long-term constraints of 'enhancing' non-tidal seepage lagoon wetlands that are artificially pumped to low water levels relative to sea level behind a permeable sand barrier." (*Id.*, p. B-512.) Dr. Baye also notes that "[n]one of the intended 'enhancement' benefits to wildlife species are physically possible if the long-term effects of pumping, sea level rise, and evaporative concentration of lagoon water interact to convert the wetlands from fresh -brackish to brackish-saline or even hypersaline marsh." (*Id.*, p. B-513.)

Dr. Baye further explains:

All coastal lagoons originate and are maintained by landward migration during sea level rise. The Laguna Salada wetland complex's long-term survival depends on planning for gradual landward migration of the barrier beach and its wetlands with rising sea level which requires geomorphic accommodation space. That space is currently displaced by the golf course, built on filled riparian wetlands of the past - the historic freshwater end of the Laguna Salada wetland complex. Rising level and a static golf course together will inevitably squeeze the existing (reduced area of) fresh-brackish wetlands out of existence, regardless of ephemeral "habitat enhancement' plan actions.

It is not feasible to stabilize the lagoon wetlands in the reduced "footprint" of the 20th century lagoon as sea level rises over three to four feet in coming decades of the 21st century. Oceanic overwash processes during extreme storms must drive the beach and its lagoon wetland complex landward as sea level rises. Any long-term wetland management plan for a backbarrier lagoon must presume upward and landward displacement of existing lagoon wetlands over multiple decades. This lagoon accommodation space location of historic freshwater riparian wetlands is occupied by golf links that will be subject to adverse increases in flooding and coastal storm risks.

(*Id.*, p. B-514.) It is up to the EIR for the Sharp Park Project to explore these obvious interactions and any cumulative impacts. Simply ignoring the inevitable future sea wall

project and inevitable sea level rise does not address the full impacts of the Sharp Park Project and is a recipe for failure.

Last year, the City adopted the Sea Level Rise Action Plan, released in March of 2016. This Action Plan requires San Francisco to consider adaptation and retreat alternatives where lands are at risk from expected sea level rise impacts. This was not applied by the Planning and Recreation and Park Commissions to their consideration of the Sharp Park Restoration Project.

Contrary to the DEIR's avoidance of the Sharp Park's cumulative impacts in light of sea level rise, the 2011 PWA Report proposes and analyzes an alternative that does not rely on extensive dredging and which anticipates expected sea level rise, the ineffectiveness of the existing sea wall and the need to allow the freshwater Laguna wetlands habitat to migrate inland. (2011 PWA Report.) The same is true of the original Sharp Park proposal included in the notice of preparation and initial study. (See *infra.*, pp. 21-23). If the City's goal is to restore the Laguna Salada habitat for the red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake in the long term, the project's impacts must be considered in light of the expected sea level rise.

Because the Sharp Park sea wall's management is so intertwined with the form and potential success of any Sharp Park restoration project, the two projects cannot be separated without improperly piecemealing the CEQA analysis. CEQA mandates "that environmental considerations do not become submerged by chopping a large project into many little ones -- each with a minimal potential impact on the environment -- which cumulatively may have disastrous consequences." (*Bozung v. LAFCO* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263, 283-84; *City of Santee v. County of San Diego* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1438, 1452.) Before undertaking a project, the lead agency must assess the environmental impacts of all reasonably foreseeable phases of a project and a public agency may not segment a large project into two or more smaller projects in order to mask serious environmental consequences. As the Court of Appeal stated:

The CEQA process is intended to be a careful examination, fully open to the public, of the environmental consequences of a given project, **covering the entire project, from start to finish**. . . the purpose of CEQA is not to generate paper, but to compel government at all levels to make decisions with environmental consequences in mind.

(*Natural Resources Defense Council v. City of Los Angeles* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 268 (emphasis added). Although holding off on a decision about the Sharp Park seawall is easily severed from the programmatic and maintenance activities addressed in the DEIR, it cannot legally be severed from the proposed wetlands restoration project at Sharp Park. A separate EIR for the Sharp Park Project will allow the City to conduct a thorough, wholistic analysis of the wetlands complex and how best to restore it in the long-term as well as in compliance with CEQA.

4. The DEIR fails to address the likely impacts to wetlands as defined by the California Coastal Commission located within fairways where dredged materials may be disposed by the proposed project.

The City acknowledges that wetlands within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission may be present on portions of fairways slated to be raised with sediments dredged from the Laguna. (Response to Comments, p. 4-426.) Dr. Baye documented the presence of these wetland areas in his expert comments. (Baye Comment, B-500-501.) Despite those comments six years ago, the City apparently has not yet investigated Dr. Baye's evidence. A simple site visit by a knowledgeable aquatic biologist some time in the last six years would have sufficed to confirm Dr. Baye's observations. Instead, the City claims it does not know where wetlands are being mowed on the fairways and that information would come out during the proceeding before the California Coastal Commission. (See Response to Comments, p. 4-427) As a result, the City makes no effort to identify potential impacts to these wetland areas and evaluate any mitigations or alternatives to avoid such impacts. The City's decision to turn a blind eye to Dr. Baye's expert observations and attempt to sidestep substantial evidence that wetlands within the Coastal Commission's jurisdiction are in harm's way at the project site is an abuse of discretion under CEQA.

Where an EIR fails to address a potential significant impact, that omission is subject to de novo review by court as a matter of law. (*Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 1184, 1208.) "[U]nder CEQA, the lead agency bears a burden to investigate potential environmental impacts." (*Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296, 311). "While foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." (*Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Com. v. Board of Port Cmrs.* (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1370.)

Relatedly, responses to comments on a draft EIR must state reasons for rejecting suggested mitigation measures and comments on significant environmental issues. "Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information" are not an adequate response. (14 CCR §15088(b, c); *Cleary v. County of Stanislaus* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3rd 348.) The need for substantive, detailed response is particularly appropriate when comments have been raised by experts or other agencies. (*Berkeley Keep Jets*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1367.) A reasoned analysis of the issue and references to supporting evidence are required for substantive comments raised. (*Calif. Oak Found. v. Santa Clarita* (2005) 133 Cal.App.4th 1219, 1240.)

The agency cannot simply rely on a future regulatory effort by another agency as an excuse not to identify and evaluate a potential impact. (See *Kings Co v. Hanford* (1990) 221 CA3d 692, 712-718 (agency erred by "wrongly assuming that, simply because the smokestack emissions would comply with applicable regulations from other agencies regulating air quality, the overall project would not cause significant effects to air quality."); *Citizens for Non-Toxic Pest Control v. Dept. Food & Agr.* (1986) 187 CA3d

1575, 1587-88 (state agency may not rely on registration status of pesticide to avoid CEQA review). Indeed, the lead agency is required to consult "with all responsible agencies and with any other public agency which has jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project . . ." (§ 21080.3(a); *Berkeley Keep Jets*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1370.) Where comments identify a possible significant impact to natural resources within the jurisdiction of another agency, the lead agency is supposed to make inquiries of environmental or regulatory agencies having expertise in the matter. (*Id.*)

By failing to address the presence of wetlands within the Coastal Commission's jurisdiction on fairways where dredged materials are proposed to be disposed, the City has run afoul of each of the above CEQA obligations. The City fails to determine the scope of wetlands on the relevant fairways. Although the City did a "CCC wetlands" delineation for the previous smaller pumphouse project, the City did no such evaluation for the current, much larger dredging and fairway supplementing project. (Response to Comments, p. 4-426.) As the City acknowledges, "[t]he wet meadow area is within the SNRAMP area proposed for restoration and management, but the precise area of additional wetlands that may be delineated using the single-parameter approach has not been determined" and "[t]here may be other CCC wetlands that are outside of the Pumphouse project's area of impact, but within the potential SNRAMP area of impact that would classify as CCC wetlands but have not been identified." (Response to Comments, p. 4-426.) The City attempts to downplay this omission, asserting that "[w]hether or not additional areas are subject to CCC wetland delineation, the Draft EIR concluded that raising the fairways and Hole 18 would not cause significant physical environmental impacts, including, but not limited to, impacts to hydrology, biological resources, cultural resources, or aesthetics, as compared to baseline conditions." (*Id.*, pp. 4-426 – 4-427. See *also* Planning Commission Errata, p. 2 (Dec. 15, 2016).) This statement is however unsupported given the City's admission it does not know the extent of CCC wetlands on the adjacent fairways. The statement that the City can evaluate this potential impact without even knowing whether CCC wetlands are present is not an adequate response to Dr. Baye's comments and personal expert observations of the site.

The City also attempts to cover this omission by stating, "[h]owever, to the extent the CCC may determine that these areas qualify as wetlands using the single-parameter approach, SFRPD would seek necessary permits and comply with any conditions required by the CCC." However, the City must evaluate this impact in the EIR and not simply await another agencies' proceeding or assert it will comply with another agencies' standards. (See *Kings Co.*, 221 CA3d at 712-718.)

5. The EIR fails to address an adequate range of alternatives to the Sharp Park Project.

Although the EIR claims to review a total of five alternatives for the Sharp Park Project, only four distinct alternatives are actually identified. (DEIR, p. 463.) The "No

Project” and the “Maintenance Alternative” are the same version. (See DEIR, pp. 463-64; *Compare id.*, p. 465 & p. 512.). Putting aside the “No Project Alternative,” the range of actual alternatives consists of the Proposed Sharp Park Project, a “Maximum Restoration Alternative,” and a “Maximum Recreation Alternative.”

With regard to the Sharp Park Project, the “Maximum Restoration Alternative” purports to restore an additional 5 acres of habitat for the red-legged frog and garter snake, amounting to a total of 24 acres compared with 19 acres under the proposed Project. Essentially, it appears that more dredging would occur in order to generate sediment that would then be used to restore an additional 5 acres of upland habitat. The EIR concludes that this alternative “does not meet the objective related to recreation, as the Maximum Restoration Alternative would provide additional restrictions on public use and access of the Natural Areas,” though there is no indication what restrictions would result. (DEIR, p. 481.) The DEIR also states that any potentially significant impact to recreation at the golf course would be reduced to less than significant “by implementing mitigation measures similar to those developed for the proposed project.” (DEIR, pp. 484-85.) The DEIR does not indicate that this version of an alternative would reduce the proposed Sharp Project’s NOx emissions. Given the additional dredging and habitat work, it would appear likely to make that impact worse. As much or more dredged materials would be deposited on CCC wetlands that currently exist on adjacent fairways. All in all, this Alternative remains a dredging alternative for the Laguna Salada with few differences from the proposed project.

With regard to the Sharp Park Project, the “Maximum Recreation Alternative” maintains the proposed project’s dredging components but would eliminate any habitat alterations that encroach on the adjacent golf course fairways. (DEIR, p. 463.) This alternative, like the proposed project, includes the same amount of dredging activity in the Laguna Salada. (DEIR, p. 494.) This alternative would reduce the amount of edge and upland habitat for the San Francisco garter snake. (*Id.*) The DEIR does not evaluate whether this alternative would reduce NOx emissions from the Sharp Park wetlands project. Given that the same amount of dredging is proposed, it would appear likely that the significant NOx emissions would be the same as the proposed project.

Likewise, no discussion is included in the EIR evaluating this alternative’s impacts on CCC wetlands. Although the DEIR asserts that the Maximum Recreational Alternative “would not encroach on the Sharp Park Golf Course or modify the golf course in any way,” it provides no information on where the 40,000 cubic yards of dredged material slated for adjacent fairways would be dumped. (DEIR, p. 498.)

With regard to the Sharp Park Project, the Maintenance Alternative would not include the proposed dredging of Laguna Salada. (See DEIR, p. 512.) However, this alternative is doomed from the start and adds nothing to the City’s ability to consider alternatives because, in regard to the Sharp Park wetlands, it is indistinguishable from the No Project Alternative. (See *id.*, pp. 512, 518. *Compare* p. 470)

Where a project is found to have significant adverse impacts, CEQA requires the adoption of a feasible alternative that meets most of the project objectives but results in fewer significant impacts. (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167, 1180-81; see also, *Burger v. County of Mendocino* (1975) 45 Cal.App.3d 322) A “feasible” alternative is one that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. (Pub. Res. Code § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines § 15364.)

CEQA requires that an EIR provide a discussion of project alternatives that allows meaningful analysis. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 403.) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. (CEQA Guidelines § 15125.6.) The purpose of the discussion of alternatives is both to support the decision makers and to inform public participation. Thus, “[a]n EIR’s discussion of alternatives must contain analysis sufficient to allow informed decision making.” (*Laurel Heights*, 47 Cal.3d at 404.) An EIR must also include “detail sufficient to enable those who did not participate in its preparation to understand and to consider meaningfully the issues raised by the proposed project.” (*Id.* at 405.)

The analysis of project alternatives must contain a quantitative assessment of the impacts of the alternatives. In *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 733-73, the court found the EIR’s discussion of a natural gas alternative to a coal-fired power plant project to be inadequate because it lacked necessary “quantitative, comparative analysis” of air emissions and water use. The court concluded that absent such data, the significance of the elimination of this impact was unknown.

In the end, with the exception of a no project alternative, all three proposed projects for the Sharp Park wetlands complex are large-scale dredging projects. No restoration alternatives are evaluated that do not include dredging 60,000 cubic feet of materials from Laguna Salada. No restoration alternatives address or provide any quantitative comparisons of the unavoidable air quality impacts of the proposed project. No alternative explores how the project could avoid smothering CCC wetlands or provides any quantitative assessment of that impact.

The EIR truncates the alternatives discussion despite at least two Sharp Park alternatives, including one proposed by the City itself at the outset of this process and another provided by an expert wetlands restoration firm, having been provided to the City that would avoid these impacts, would achieve most or all of the project’s objectives, and may not result in any unavoidable environmental impacts. The City’s refusal to evaluate these two alternatives in the EIR violates CEQA.

a. It is an abuse of discretion for the City to fail to evaluate the proposed Sharp Park Project included in the notice of preparation and initial study.

The EIR fails to evaluate the most obvious alternative to the current large-scale dredging project at Sharp Park – the Sharp Park wetlands project initially proposed by the City in the notice of preparation and initial study issued by the City in 2009. The NOP and Initial Study proposed a project that implements the Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan published by the City in February 2006. (Initial Study, p. 1 (FEIR, App. A) (“The proposed project is the SFRPD’s implementation of the SNRAMP”). See Response to Comments, p. 4-170.) This original proposed project for Sharp Park’s wetlands does not involve the proposed large-scale dredging of 60,000 cubic feet of sensitive habitat. Instead, the proposal is based on the Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan issued in 2006.

The proposed project at that time included the following recommendations for the Laguna Salada wetlands management areas:

- SP-4a—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 California 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, and
 - Restore Sanchez Creek by deepening the channel, expanding the creek corridor upstream, and buffer zones to limit human disturbance....

(Initial Study, p. 43.) This proposed project tracks the recommendations of the Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. (2006 SNRAMP, p. 6.4-13.)

The recommendations in the initial study and the 2006 SNRAMP also included various other measures relevant the wetland areas:

- SP-4b—create low mounds, planted with willows, on the western edge of Laguna Salada to serve as a visual barrier, to provide snake and frog basking sites, and to provide nesting habitat for riparian birds;
- SP-4c—reduce draw-down of Horse Stable Pond when California red-legged frog egg masses are present or maintain a stable water level during red-legged frog breeding season;
- SP-4d—remove any bullfrogs that are found in Laguna Salada;

- SP-4e—stop all golf course vehicles from using the service road from Moose Lodge to Horse Stable Pond;
- SP-5a—work with golf course staff to minimize use of chemicals;
- SP-6a—coordinate with the golf course to remove aquatic vegetation within the channel every spring and fall;
- SP-6b—remove and trim vegetation along the edges of the channel between Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond to allow forktail damselfly perching within sight of the water;

- SP-8a—make 33.3 acres of Arrowhead Pond, Laguna Salada, and Horse Stable Pond off limits to dogs to prevent access to sensitive habitats; if this is not effective, use fencing to close social trails in these areas;
- SP-9a—educate golf course staff about the importance of identifying California red-legged frogs, San Francisco garter snakes, and forktail damselflies and their habitats;
- SP-9b—establish a vegetation management plan for the canal connecting Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond that would allow channel maintenance without affecting the forktail damselfly, California red-legged frog, or San Francisco garter snake;
- SP-9c—create a buffer zone between the Laguna Salada wetlands and the golf course fairways; ...

(Initial Study, pp. 43-44; 2006 SNRAMP, p. 6.4-14 – 6.4-16.) Neither the EIR’s proposed project nor any of the alternatives addressed this original Sharp Park wetlands project.

As acknowledged by its inclusion in the 2006 SNRAMP and 2009 initial study, as well as the 1992 Laguna Salada Enhancement Plan (PWA 1992) on which they rely, this alternative is entirely feasible. Unlike the current proposed wetlands project for Sharp Park, the Initial Study alternative anticipated having no air quality impacts. (Initial Study, p. 79.) The expansion of buffer areas “could be as simple as developing a wider rough, an unmowed strip of native grasses, or installing upper marsh vegetation to narrow the fairways. Any of these options would help protect these sensitive habitats and species from human disturbance and provide greater wildlife value.” (SNRAMP, p. 6.4-16.) By expanding these buffer zones between the lagoon and the fairways, this alternative could be designed to avoid any impacts to CCC wetlands.

Any possible impacts from this reduced scope alternative to recreation or any cultural resource value associated with the adjacent fairways would appear to be capable of mitigation or, in the case of impacts to golfing, not an environmental impact. As for cultural resource impacts, the City’s proposed project will have significant and unavoidable impacts on Fairway 12 of the golf course. Nevertheless, that project alternative was not eliminated, indeed it is the City’s preferred project. Under that alternative, the fairway will be documented consistent with the National Park Service guidelines prior to the project’s implementation. Other alternatives should be treated in a like manner. The Initial Study alternative’s inclusion of expanded buffer zones may

actually have less impact on the fairways than the preferred project. Indeed, the map included in the Initial Study does not indicate any impact on the general layout of the course fairways. (See 2006 SNRAMP, 6.4-25 (Fig. 6.4-5).) As for impacts to recreational golf, as discussed below, that is not an environmental impact, and cannot be used as a proper rationale to eliminate consideration of a feasible alternative. Because the City's Initial Study alternative is feasible, would meet all of the Sharp Park project's objectives, and would have fewer, if any, significant impacts than the City's currently preferred proposed project, the City abused its discretion in failing to address this alternative.

b. The City abuses its discretion by refusing to analyze in the EIR the restoration alternative proposed by ESA/PWA and Peter Baye, Ph.D.

The City has not articulated a legal basis for rejecting consideration of an additional non-dredging alternative prepared in 2011 by ESA/PWA and Dr. Peter Baye and presented in a detailed report entitled, "Conceptual Ecosystem Restoration Plan And Feasibility Assessment: Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California" (hereinafter the "PWA 2011 Report".) We will refer to this alternative as the "PWA Alternative." The first three phases of the PWA 2011 Report outline in extensive detail a feasible restoration alternative for the Laguna Salada and adjacent habitats that does not involve the massive dredging proposed by the current preferred project. (PWA 2011 Report, pp. 26-38.) Dr. Baye also outlined a version of this same alternative in his comments on the DEIR. (Response to Comments, Attachments, p. B-507.) Rather than primarily relying on dredging, the PWA Alternative relies on reducing artificial pumping of the lagoon and allowing higher lagoon levels to achieve increases in open water marsh and other habitat beneficial for the garter snake and red-legged frog. (PWA Report, p. 29.) This proposal would result in a much larger area of habitat for the listed species. The PWA Alternative also includes extensive upland habitat restoration for the garter snake (*Id.*, p. 30.) Although the PWA 2011 Report extends to a long-term proposal to allow the existing seawall between the Laguna Salada and Ocean Beach to erode over time to a natural barrier beach and includes some new berms to protect nearby neighborhoods, the future of the seawall would not need to be part of this alternative, in the same way it is not included in the City's preferred project. Dr. Baye's comments on the DEIR also provide a more modest version of the PWA alternative:

The most obvious environmentally superior feasible alternative that was ignored was modification of water level management of the lagoon, which is controlled by artificial drainage of the lagoon by pumps operated by the City. Increased water surface elevations and seasonal fluctuation of lagoon levels combined with peripheral flood control berms that double as buffers upland refuge and basking habitat is a wetland habitat management/enhancement alternative that would eliminate the need for high-cost, high-impact risk engineered dredging alternatives, and would have superior environmental benefits for salinity intrusion and endangered species habitat enhancement. Artificially managing water level fluctuations

in the lagoon emulating natural lagoon hydrology would maintain a favorable seasonal dynamic balance of shallow open water habitat (submerged aquatic vegetation, principally sago pondweed) and emergent marsh (tule, bulrush, cattail, spikerush) that is evident in the constructed GGNRA ponds at the toe of Mori Point slopes, where California red-legged frogs and tree frogs are now breeding.

(Response to Comments, p. B-507.)

The PWA Alternative would significantly reduce the current proposed Sharp Park project's significant NOx emissions. Although the PWA Alternative may still result in significant NOx emissions itself, by eliminating the substantial dredging component those emissions would be significantly reduced compared to the current proposed Sharp Park project.

Dr. Baye's expert comments also confirm that the PWA Alternative would not adversely affect any wetlands, including CCC wetlands. Instead, it would expand those habitats to the benefit of listed and other species.

The City rejects consideration of Dr. Baye's and the PWA Alternative based on its conclusion that the alternative would have additional impacts on historic resources and recreation:

The creation of a berm and the maintenance of higher water levels at the lagoon would eliminate more areas of the golf course, which would create additional impacts related to historic resources and recreation. Further, the maximum restoration alternative was designed to maximize restoration activities while allowing the golf course to operate, which would not be achieved with the commenters proposed changes to this alternative.

(*Id.*, p. 4-601.) As for historic resources, assuming the City's analysis of the historic significance of the golf course is correct, the PWA Alternative would have additional impacts on the existing fairways. However, that conclusion, by itself, does not mean the City can avoid evaluating this feasible alternative. The historic resource impacts are but one category of impacts related to the Sharp Park project. Two other impacts – CCC wetlands and NOx emissions – would be either eliminated or dramatically reduced by the PWA Alternative. And any historic impacts to the golf course could be mitigated at least in part by their documentation consistent with the National Park Service guidance documents. (See DEIR, p. 13.)

As for impacts to golfing, that impact is not an environmental impact within the purview of CEQA and not an impact justifying a refusal to evaluate a feasible alternative. The Appendix G checklist included in the CEQA Guidelines only identifies two impacts under the heading "Recreation." Neither impact involves an impact to the recreational activity itself. Section XV of Appendix G has a lead agency respond to two questions pertaining to recreation. First, "Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial

physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?" (CEQA Guidelines, App. G, § XV(a).) Of course, eliminating golfing from some or even all areas of Sharp Park would do the opposite and would not have any impact based on this question. Fewer fairways would decrease the use and any accompanying physical deterioration. And although golfing recreation would be reduced, other forms of passive recreation, one of the purported objectives of the Natural Areas program, would be enhanced by the PWA Alternative.

The second question posed by Section XV of Appendix G is "Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?" (CEQA Guidelines, App. G, § XV(b).) The City's response would flip this question on its head. An alternative reducing the size of the golf course is the opposite of expanding the course. A reduction would have a positive effect on the environment, certainly in regard to expanded habitat for listed and other species.

In its version of the Initial Study form, the City has taken the liberty of adding an additional question to the checklist. Section E.9 of the Initial Study adds in, "Physically degrade existing recreational resources?" to the Guideline's form. This additional question was added in order "[t]o address degradation of trails" and the expectation that "[i]n the short-term, recreational resources, including trails, DPAs, and scenic viewing areas, could be temporarily closed for restoration efforts if necessary." (Initial Study, p. 93.) This additional checklist question does not transform reduction in golfing or the size of the golfing facilities at Sharp Park into environmental impacts. Just because an activity involves recreation does not mean that degrading that activity is an environmental impact. For example, when the City closed the Sharp Park rifle range, there was no environmental impact from precluding recreational gun enthusiasts from shooting rifles at that location. Less golf in Sharp Park does not amount to an environmental impact of the Sharp Park project. Accordingly, the City's reliance on impact to golfing as a rationale for avoiding consideration of the PWA Alternative is an abuse of discretion.

CONCLUSION

Wild Equity requests that the Board of Supervisors reject the SNRAMP EIR and certification and make findings that ensure that the Planning Commission proceeds with the portions of the EIR addressing the programmatic and maintenance level activities. As the Planning Department and Recreation and Park Department indicated many years ago, a Sharp Park Project addressing changes to the golf course should be conducted in a separate project-level EIR. Separating the Sharp Park Project into a

///

///

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Wild Equity Institute - Supplemental Information
February 16, 2017
Page 26 of 26

separate project-level EIR is now an imperative given the many flaws in the current analysis.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michael R. Lozeau". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "M".

Michael R. Lozeau
Lozeau Drury LLP
On behalf of Appellant Wild Equity Institute

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 12:00 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggass@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com; bo@slotelaw.com; richard@sfpublishgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: APPEAL RESPONSE - SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017

Good morning,

Please find linked below the appeal response received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the Planning Department, concerning the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report Appeal for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project (SNRAMP). Also linked below is a reference copy of the SNRAMP FEIR.

[Planning Appeal Response - February 17, 2017](#)

[Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan FEIR](#)

Please also note that we received supplemental materials to the SF Forest Alliance letter received February 16, 2017. You may review the updated document with new Appendix listing and Appendix A-1 linked below.

[SF Forest Alliance Supplemental Appeal Letter - February 16, 2017 - LARGE FILE](#)

The appeal hearing for this matter is scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on February 28, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all

members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:01 PM
To: bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggas@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com; bo@slotelaw.com; richard@spublicgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: APPEAL RESPONSES: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Categories: 170044

Good afternoon,

Please find linked below the appeal responses received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the San Francisco Forest Alliance, and Lozeau Drury, LLP, on behalf of the Wild Equity Institute, concerning the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report Appeal for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project.

[SF Forest Alliance Appeal Response - February 16, 2017 - LARGE FILE](#)

[Wild Equity Institute Appeal Response - February 16, 2017](#)

The appeal hearing for this matter is scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on February 28, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

SF Forest Alliance's ASKS on SNRAMP's EIR Certification February 16, 2017

Reject the certification of the EIR by the Planning Commission. Instruct the Planning Department to revise the EIR to address the insufficient and incorrect information. Require that Planning add the following mitigation measures to the EIR:

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 FEB 16 PM 3:49
BY BJ

1. that the location(GPS coordinates), size, species, date and reason for removal be recorded for each tree removed in San Francisco. A public log of this data shall be available to compare tree removals approved under the Plan with actual removals. (According to RPD, there will only be about 14 tree removals per month.)
2. that additional mitigation measures be required to address the Plan's impact on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions relative to San Francisco's 2008 Greenhouse Gas Ordinance and AB 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Planning will need to sort that out.
3. assuming the GHG mitigation requires replacement tree planting, that the location (GPS coordinates), size, species and date of replacement trees planted be recorded. Further, that the ongoing survival and growth of those trees be tracked. The data should be available to the public.
4. that the impact of parkland closures be studied and mitigation measures added to address these losses. Residents in S.E. San Francisco are particularly dependent on parks that are primarily Natural Areas.
5. that trail additions and trail closures be tracked in relation to the original trail system documented in the SNRAMP and that public maps documenting this be maintained.
6. that metrics for the success of the Project be defined and progress be systematically evaluated. If the Plan results in sustainable improvements to our Natural Areas, capital landscape renovations, maintenance costs and herbicide use will decline. Forest health will improve. Restored areas will survive on their own without substantial human intervention. If not, the program should be scaled back to reduce the environmental damage and shift the spending to programs that benefit the public.
7. that measures be devised to mitigate the reduction in off-leash dog play areas under the SNRAMP. The EIR recognizes the reductions in dog play areas at GGNRA and under the SNRAMP would result in a significant cumulative impact to recreational use. RPD and the drafters of the EIR have failed to define mitigation measures.

Require that the Recreation and Parks Department halt further implementation of the SNRAMP until the EIR is certified and necessary mitigation measures are documented and adopted.

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

2/13/17

From: San Francisco Forest Alliance
Dee Seligman, Interim President
Rupa Bose, Vice President
Tom Borden, Director

Subject: Appeal of the Certification of the EIR for the Significant Natural
Resource Areas Management Plan
SF Planning Case number 2005.1912E

This document and its 8 appendices (A through H) comprise our full set of arguments and supporting evidence.

This appeal is not about whether you prefer trees or grass, whether you want to preserve and expand our historic native habitat or accept the changes caused by humans and nature. This appeal is about accountability and transparency. Does the EIR correctly identify the significant environmental impacts of the SNRAMP and have mitigation measures been put in place to minimize or eliminate those impacts?

The EIR for the SNRAMP is inaccurate and inadequate and biased. The poor quality information it provides is not sufficient to enable informed decisions about the Plan. The process used to bring the DEIR to certification violated CEQA and local regulations. Here are the issues.

- 1 Public access restrictions: The SNRAMP calls for us to surrender public access to 28% of our parkland. The Project applies to one third of our parkland. Public access will be restricted to on-trail only, or less than 5% of current access. Comments on the DEIR asked that this be addressed. The FEIR fails to respond to this.
- 2 Greenhouse gas release: The FEIR claims implementing the SNRAMP will result in reduced emissions of greenhouse gasses (GHG). Actually, the GHG releases that would result from Plan implementation are a Significant Environmental Effect that is hidden by the EIR. Carbon sequestration is dramatically miscalculated, equipment emissions are not included and methane and carbon dioxide emissions from decay of the destroyed trees are ignored.
- 3 Increase in herbicides: The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides. However, the FEIR claims there will be no increase in herbicide use with SNRAMP implementation. In other words, the SNRAMP does not require the use of herbicides. It is impossible for this to be correct. The "no increase in herbicide use" is an entirely new conclusion the DEIR did not present.
- 4 CEQA process violations: The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR. External agencies and the public were never allowed to challenge major changes made to the DEIR, such as the nonsensical greenhouse gas analysis; the assertion of no increase in pesticide use; and the mitigation of acidic soils at Laguna Salada.

In addition, the Certification hearing involved multiple violations of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

- 5 Trail closures: The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. In parks where the NAP has already implemented its "Trail Improvement Projects" over 50% of the trails have been closed. The EIR does not address this significant impact on public recreation.
- 6 Tree replacement: The EIR analysis of the Project's impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
- 7 Implementation before Certification: The EIR claims the SNRAMP has not been implemented ahead of the EIR certification. This is false.
- 8 Cycling prohibition: The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." This is false. The Plan prohibits bicycles in the program areas. This is contrary to our Transit First, Green Connections, ROSE, Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights and other policies.
- 9 Impact of fencing ignored: The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP. The EIR does not address this significant impact on public recreation and aesthetics.
- 10 Bias: Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the Mt Davidson bench removal and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

1 Public Access Restrictions, On-Trail Use Only

The intent of the SNRAMP is to restrict public access to designated trails only. Not only does this mean closing social trails and other trails the planners find undesirable, it also means access will be limited to **on-trail use only**. Multiple commenters raised this issue. The Response To Comments (RTC) recognizes the comments, but it fails to address them. The fact that the Plan will deny public access to more than 95% of the Project area must be addressed.

The SNRAMP is a bit vague in expressing its intent. The drafters knew direct statements would draw direct fire from the public. Here is what is in the SNRAMP.

Recommendation GR-11C in the SNRAMP says, "Public use in all Natural Areas, unless otherwise specified, should encourage on-trail use." It goes on to say, "interpretive and park signs should be installed or modified as appropriate to include "Please Stay on Trails" and then, "If off-trail use continues in a particularly sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands), permanent fencing shall be considered as a last resort once all other options, including enforcement, have failed."

Page 1-6 of the SNRAMP makes it clear that public use of MA-2 areas will be on-trail only.

“Relatively fewer use restrictions will be implemented within the MA-2 areas. In general, all passive recreational uses will be allowed in these areas as long as they include **on-trail use only** and leashed pets”

In the preceding paragraph on the same page it discusses MA-1 areas but does not mention on trail use only. Clearly, if the less sensitive MA-2 areas are on-trail only, the MA-1 areas will be on-trail only as well.

The SNRAMP does not call for on-trail use only in MA-3 areas, but only talks about closing social trails.

Action by the NAP since the SNRAMP was written confirms the actual intent is to restrict the public to on-trail use only in all Natural Areas, including MA-3. In early 2015, the NAP installed signs in virtually all of its Natural Areas requiring that users, “Stay on Designated Trails” threatening \$100 fines via Park Code 3.02.



Please note, the installation of these signs is a clear violation of CEQA. The NAP is instituting new public access restrictions which are part of the SNRAMP in advance of its EIR certification.

The impact on the public is huge. Consider the Plan covers 836 acres of land in San Francisco. (SNRAMP page 43) Prior to the NAP’s access restrictions, all of that was freely available to the public. Once the Plan is implemented, the public will be restricted

to 30.6 miles of trails. (SNRAMP page 52) Assuming the average usable width of a trail is 10 feet, the acreage available to the public under the Plan will be just 37 acres, or 4.5 percent of what we had.

Multiple commenters raised this issue and are quoted in Response To Comments (RTC). In one section after another, the RTC ducks this issue.

Response PD-6 "Opposition to the proposed public access restrictions" page 4-145
"The proposed project is a management plan for the current program area and does not create new Natural Areas or restrict access to the existing Natural Areas, but instead focuses on enhancing native communities within existing Natural Areas." This statement is incorrect. Clearly they are restricting access to existing Natural Areas.

Response G-5 "Impacts of Natural Areas access restrictions on social fabric of San Francisco" page 4-31 "These comments express concern that the SNRAMP would prohibit access to the Natural Areas" The response only talks about trails and ignores the fact the SNRAMP would restrict use to on-trail only.

Response RE-8 "Impacts resulting from restrictions on recreational access" page 4-323
This response is supposed to address denial of access. Commenters say that,
"A majority of land under NAP control citywide (57%) will have significant restrictions to access by all people (not just people with dogs); that is the amount of land designated as MA-1 and MA-2."

The response talks about on-leash dog walking and a designated trail system and then suddenly concludes,

"Therefore, the proposed project would not result in large-scale restrictions on recreational access."

Again, the drafters completely refuse to recognize the issue that the Plan will convert our parks from free use to on-trail use only.

RE-10 "Recreational analysis related to trails" page 4-330

This is supposed to address comments that call for the EIR to analyze the impacts of **confining recreation activities to trails**, as well as the closure of trails in Natural Areas. The response proceeds to discuss trails at length but never addresses the issue in bold above. They duck the question again. The response does not acknowledge the vast acreage that would be closed to the public due to on-trail use only.

The NAP controls the entire park in over half of the parks with natural areas (18 of 32 parks). In an additional 10 parks, NAP controls over 50% of the park. Only 4 of 32 parks with natural areas have less than 50% of their land controlled by NAP. So when NAP confines access to trails only, in 18 parks, that closure affects the entire park, not just a small portion of each park. People are losing access to their neighborhood parks.

It is important to note that parks in the underserved neighborhoods of S.E. San Francisco contain large percentages of Natural Areas. This is because we never spent money to develop those parks and just left the land as-is. Now this Plan intends to close those undeveloped parklands to public use. Half of McLaren Park, most of Bayview Hill and most of India Basin are Natural Areas. The residents can ill afford to lose the limited park resources available to them. **Implementing the access restrictions of the plan is a form of environmental racism, forcing already disadvantaged neighborhoods to carry a disproportionate burden of these access closures.**

The Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights adopted by the BOS in October 2013 <http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions15/r0081-15.pdf> includes the promise that our children will be able to, "Explore all the wild places in the City". Restricting children to on-trail use only in our natural areas flies in the face of this.

The EIR completely fails to address the issue of on-trail access only. The EIR claims Recreation is an Effect not found to be significant. (DEIR page 442) **This is an incorrect conclusion, reducing public access to only 5% of the Program area is a Significant Environmental Effect.**

2 Greenhouse Gas Release, an inconvenient truth

The EIR grossly miscalculates the greenhouse gas (GHG) releases that would be caused by implementation of the SNRAMP. Implementing the Plan would result in a significant release of GHGs, not a reduction as the EIR claims. In total, the vegetation change contemplated by the Plan would release 44,035 metric tons of CO₂ and prevent the capture of 28,600 metric tons of CO₂ that would otherwise occur. This is a net release of 72,635 metric tons of CO₂. Actually, the situation is much worse since much of the carbon in the felled trees would actually be released as methane, a GHG with 34 times the Global Warming Potential of carbon dioxide.

Therefore the project conflicts with:

San Francisco's 2008 Greenhouse Gas Ordinance, SF Environment Code Chapter 9, sections 900 to 908

and with

California's goal of reducing GHG emissions set forth by the timetable established in AB 32 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

The GHG release is automatically Significant since it conflicts with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.


The error in the IER comes from a variety of sources:

- 2.1 The EIR ignores that the Plan allows and does not count the cutting of 11,920 existing "saplings" in San Francisco.
- 2.2 The EIR assumes trees removed will be replaced on a 1 to 1 basis in the project area. This 1 to 1 replacement is not part of the SNRAMP.
- 2.3 The EIR claims to use an accepted calculation methodology, but instead makes up its own to reach a false conclusion.
- 2.4 The EIR misstates the forest management objectives of the SNRAMP.
- 2.5 The EIR assumes any replacement trees planted will be trees. Actually, shrubs and "grassland species" are suggested when replacing trees is discussed in the SNRAMP.
- 2.6 The EIR fails to account for the GHG emissions from vehicles and equipment used for the project.

- 2.7 The EIR does not account for the GHG releases that will result from the 60,000 cubic yards of organic material dredged from Laguna Salada to convert it from marshland to open water.
- 2.8 The EIR does not even mention methane. As the trees cut down under this plan decay, the carbon in them will be released in the form of carbon dioxide and as methane. Methane is much more damaging for our environment than carbon dioxide.

The San Francisco Forest Alliance engaged the services of the Quercus Group to provide expert opinion on the EIR GHG analysis. Please see Appendix A. That testimony validates our analysis and reveals additional shortcomings of the EIR analysis.

The idea that the landscapes envisioned in the SNRAMP will sequester more carbon than today's landscapes defies common sense. Compare early pictures of San Francisco with those of today. Where is all the carbon in those historical landscapes? You can see it in the large trees we have now. The SNRAMP is not taking the landscape back to 1790, but it is moving in that direction. Yet the RTC states, "the proposed project is expected to result in a net increase in carbon sequestration capacity within the Natural Areas in San Francisco." (page 4-285) The land use conversion in Sharp Park, where 15,000 trees are to be cut down and replanted with grasses, is claimed to increase carbon sequestration. (page 4-301) This is crazy talk. Obviously the science cited in the EIR is being used incorrectly.



Mt Davidson today



Mt Davidson tomorrow?.... Which landscape holds more carbon?

2.1 Saplings

The SNRAMP defines a Tree as a tree having a dominant vertical trunk greater than 15 feet tall. Smaller trees are considered “Saplings”. (DEIR page 92) The SNRAMP allows Saplings to be cut without any limitations or accounting. These small trees are what would normally regenerate our forests, replacing trees as they fall to age or disease. There are a lot of these young trees in our natural areas.



Forest in McLaren Park

A US Forest Service survey of San Francisco’s urban forest cited in the EIR reports that 31.4% of trees in the City are 1 to 3 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) and that

51.4% of trees are less than 6 inches DBH.¹ Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress trees less than 3" DBH are typically short enough to qualify as saplings. Eucalyptus tend to be taller for the same trunk diameter. Perhaps an average Sapling cutoff would be 2.5" DBH. To get an idea of the scale of this issue, let's make a conservative assumption that half of trees 1" to 3" DBH are Saplings.

This means 15.7% of the trees are Saplings and 84.3% are Trees in terms of the SNRAMP.

Since the San Francisco Natural Areas contain 64000 Trees larger than Saplings, that means there are 75,920 total trees. Of this 15.7%, or 11,920 are saplings and 35.7%, or 27,100 are Trees less than 6" DBH.

The EIR talks of removing 3,448 non-native trees in San Francisco and replacing them with 3448 Coast live Oak or similar plantings. The additional 11,920 saplings they can remove are already established successful trees. These Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress and Blue Gum Eucalyptus saplings would grow into much larger trees than the oaks.

The EIR is inadequate because it fails to address the allowed destruction of 11,290 young trees. The significance of these Saplings vastly outstrips that of the replacement trees the EIR says would be planted under the Plan.

It must also be pointed out NAP staff is allowed to cut Trees smaller than 6" diameter at breast height without involving the RPD arborist. There is no 30 day preposting requirement for these trees and no record of the cutting is required. This is a major accountability issue that puts 27,100 trees at risk. This must be addressed. **There must be a mitigation measure that requires record keeping of all tree cutting.** This should also include trees killed by girdling or by chemical means such as Drilling, Frilling, & Basal Bark treatments. Given the plan calls for cutting 3,448 trees over a 20 year period in San Francisco, this would not be an onerous task. It is about 14 trees per month.

2.2 Trees 1:1 Replacement

The DEIR states the SNRAMP institutes a 1:1 tree replacement policy, that every tree removed in the project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the project area. This is a false premise. No such commitment appears in the SNRAMP. Nor is there any section of San Francisco Code that would require the RPD Natural Areas Program to plant a new tree for every one they remove. The EIR cites no documented public policy to support this assertion, yet it makes the claim over and over again:

The DEIR (pages 92, 456, 484, 514) states that, "Trees removed in the Natural Areas in San Francisco would be replaced at a one-to-one ratio, although not necessarily in the same location." This commitment does not appear in the SNRAMP.

The DEIR (page 408) says, "The total number of trees would not change within the Natural Areas of San Francisco". This does not appear in the SNRAMP.

¹ Nowak "Assessing urban forest effects and values, San Francisco's urban forest" U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Northern Research Station 2007

The DEIR (page 92) says, "Invasive trees removed in San Francisco would be replaced with native tree species at a ratio of roughly one-to-one, although not necessarily at the same location or within the same Natural Area." This does not appear in the SNRAMP.

The CEQA process for the Beach Chalet Fields, Planning Case 2010.0016E revealed that SFRPD has no policy or ordinance requiring 1:1 tree replacement. See the RTC Page X.L-41. As a result, a mitigation measure was added to that EIR.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD) shall replace the trees removed within SFRPD-managed lands with trees of equivalent ecological value (i.e., similar species providing the same general microhabitat characteristics for wildlife species) to the trees removed. If trees of equivalent ecological value are not feasible or available, removed trees shall be replaced at a ratio of 1 inch for 1 inch of the diameter at breast height of the removed tree. SFRPD shall monitor tree replacement plantings annually for a minimum of three years after completion of construction to ensure establishment of the plantings and, if necessary, shall replant to ensure the success of the replacement plantings.

Why would the SNRAMP EIR, where the scale of tree removal dwarfs that of the Beach Chalet Fields, be considered adequate when it does not include a mitigation measure to insure tree replacements are carried out?

The Plan cannot be properly executed unless an accounting system is put in place to track these things. RPD tree removal and planting records are almost non-existent. Only the Urban Forestry group within RPD operations keeps any records at all. They do not know what they cut or where and they do not know what they planted or where. The NAP keeps no records of tree cutting or tree planting. The following was asked of RPD as a Sunshine request, "RPD must have a record keeping system to track trees that have been removed and trees that have been planted. I would like RPD to provide a copy of tree removal and tree planting records for the past 5 years." The only record provided is shown below.

Tree count July 2015 to Dec 2015				
Pruned	Removed	Planted	Vandalized or Stolen	
27	10	27	1	July 15
12	12	17	6	August 15
45	18	24	0	September 15
22	18	30	0	October 15
27	21	15	0	November 15
49	11	21	0	December 15
Total- 182	Total- 90	Total- 134	Total-7	

RPD has no system to track the survival of trees planted. This is true of the Urban Forestry group and the NAP.

A requirement to plant replacement trees in the Natural Areas must be added as a mitigation measure in the EIR. The measure needs to include a recording system to

track the size, type, location, date and health of trees removed. At the same time it should track the size, type, location and date of trees planted. Planted trees should be monitored annually to assess survival/growth versus species and location. Failed trees must be replaced.

Even if the SNRAMP contained language requiring 1:1 tree replacement within the Project area, the Project area is so large that concentrated tree removal in one area with its trees replaced in another area across town, could produce severe results. The southeast part of the City contains a concentration of disadvantaged neighborhoods. It also contains parks with large Natural Areas like McLaren and Bayview Hill. Removing a large quantity of trees from these parks will reduce air quality. **This is an environmental justice issue which should have been considered under CEQA. It was not.**

2.3 Calculation Methodology

The RTC purports to use the calculation methodology incorporated into the "California Emission Estimator Model" (CalEEMod). However, this is not the case. Instead, the authors have made up their own method based on carbon accumulation rates that fails to account for the carbon released from the trees destroyed. At the December 15 Certification hearing, Planning staff explained this debate over the calculation method as a "disagreement of experts". This is not a scientific debate, this is grade school math. The RTC says $2+2=-1$. The CalEEMod calculation says $2+2=4$. The numbers in the EIR are intentionally miscalculated.

Please note. There is a troubling lack of transparency in the RTC figures. Final numbers are presented, but not the calculations. For this section of the RTC to be credible, the basis for the numbers should have been revealed. A copy of a February 19, 2013 technical memorandum, "Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAMP" prepared by Chris Sanchez of Environmental Science Associates was obtained from the Planning Department. This document is clearly the source of the misleading calculations but it is not referenced in the RTC. See Appendix B.

The CalEEMod program the EIR refers to was developed to address this situation. Unfortunately, it is an outdated program. The methodology it uses is out of touch with current scientific thought. It assumes all carbon in the removed trees will be released as carbon dioxide. It does not account for the methane release from decomposing trees. Further, it assumes trees stop sequestering carbon at age 20. Actually, trees continue to grow and sequester carbon for 100 years or more. See the Quercus Group document, Appendix A.

CalEEMod grossly underestimates the environmental damage from cutting down trees. However, even using the output for CalEEMod was not enough to produce positive results for the SNRAMP. Let's look more closely for the sleight of hand. A copy of the "CalEEMod User Guide, Calculation Details" is attached as Appendix C. It clearly shows how land use changes, such as those proposed by the SNRAMP, should be evaluated. The EIR refers to the method, but does not follow it.

RTC Response GG-1 "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" page 4-297

The EIR makes the argument that once trees reach the age of 20 years they cease to sequester more net carbon. The EIR stops here and uses this, and a HortScience report that 90% of the trees in our natural areas are over 20 years old, to say that 90% of the

trees can be removed without any effect on GHG calculations. (see Appendix B) Rather than look at the net release of GHG caused by the project (as is the accepted practice used in CalEEMod), they look at carbon sequestration rate, MT/yr, that would occur in year 20 of the plan. On page 4-298, they say, "CalEEMod calculates GHG emissions based solely on sequestration rates and not based on release of stored carbon". This is completely incorrect. CalEEMod, calculates the total change in stored carbon in converting one landscape type to another. The carbon released from destroyed vegetation is a main factor. See the user guide in Appendix C.



The tree age cited by HortScience is far out of step with reality. For instance, in McLaren Park there are many young trees regenerating the forest. This looks more like the distribution of tree sizes described in the Nowak report cited in footnote 1. See additional forest images in D.

As an example, consider Table 19B on RTC page 4-301. This relates to plans to clear cut 56 acres of forest in Sharp Park and replace it with grassland and scrub. For Grassland plantings it presents "annual sequestration gain (year 20) of 241 MT CO₂/yr. Where does that come from? The EIR says, "Replacement vegetation was assigned a grassland sequestration rate as provided by CalEEMod." That CalEEMod "rate" is not a rate as in MT/yr. It is the amount of CO₂ storage in an acre of mature grassland, 4.31 MT CO₂/acre. See page 46 of the CalEEMod user guide in Appendix C. The EIR multiplies this times 56 acres. This should give a value of 241 MT of CO₂ but instead they declare it to be an ongoing capture rate 241 MT of CO₂ per year. This is wrong. They are mixing apples and oranges.

Going back to the accepted methodology contained in CalEEMod. It assumes trees increase in stored carbon for 20 years and then hold a fixed amount of carbon from then on. Fast growing trees have a higher sequestration rate and end up with more carbon at the end of the 20 year growing period. Existing forest land could be 500 years old and still sequester the same amount of carbon per acre because new trees grow to replace the old ones that die. Similarly, grasslands are assumed to reach a static amount of stored carbon per acre. See the explanatory pages from the CalEEMod User Guide, Calculation Details attached as Appendix C.

The CalEEMod calculation is very straightforward. The calculation is simply to compare the carbon stored in the current landscape to how much the new landscape will accumulate in 20 years.

Consider the 56 acres of forest in Sharp Park that is to be converted from forest into grassland. The values used in the CalEEMod calculation are 111 MT CO₂/ acre for forest and 4.31 MT CO₂/ acre for grassland. The net emission of GHG due to this part of the SNRAMP would be:

Forest removed	new grassland	
56 x 111	-	56 x 4.31
6,216	- 241	= 5,975 metric tons of CO ₂ released

This is a number for an average forest. It is based on trees with a sequestration rate of 0.035 MT CO₂/year and a tree density of about 158 trees /acre. However blue gum eucalyptus is not average. According to the SNRAMP (page 3-11), blue gum eucalyptus “is one of the fastest growing trees in the world”. A growth rate for eucalyptus is not published in the CalEEMod. Fortunately, the ESA technical memorandum prepared for the EIR, “Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAMP” does provide a value, 0.12 MT/year/tree. (see page 5 of the memo) Note this sequestration rate is 3.4 times higher than the average CalEEMod tree species.

We can redo the calculation using the information specific to eucalyptus. 15,000 trees will be removed from the 56 acres in Sharp Park, that essentially all are Eucalyptus and (supposedly) most at least 20 years old.(see page 5 of the memo) So, the stored carbon in the trees that would be removed is:

$$15,000 \times 0.12 \times 20 = 36,000 \text{ MT}$$

This means that the SNRAMP activity in Sharp Park would produce a net release of 36,000 – 241 = 35760 MT of CO₂. This does not even include the emissions from the vehicles and equipment used for the logging and for the replanting. Nor does it include the emissions from the wetlands restoration part of the project.

Consider the 3448 Trees the Plan contemplates removing in San Francisco. (RTC page 5-44) According to the RTC these are predominantly blue gum eucalyptus. Over the standardized 20 year growth period, the trees would have stored

$$3,448 \times 20 \times 0.12 = 8,275 \text{ MT CO}_2$$

All of this would be released under the SNRAMP.

Finally, consider the existing 11,920 saplings the SNRAMP would allow to be removed in San Francisco. Were they allowed to grow, they would sequester:

$$11,920 \times 20 \times 0.12 = 28,600 \text{ MT CO}_2$$

In total, the vegetation change contemplated by the Plan would release 44,035 metric tons of CO₂ and prevent the capture of 28,600 metric tons of CO₂ that would otherwise occur. This is a net loss of 72,635 metric tons of CO₂

sequestration. In reality, the situation is much worse because a large portion of the carbon in the trees will actually be released as methane.

If a mitigation measure is added to require 1:1 tree replacement and the replacement trees are coast live oaks we can calculate the outcome. No growth rate is published in the CalEEMod for these trees either. The EIR chooses to classify them as having a medium growth rate. Using the average accumulation rate from CalEEMod, 0.0354 MT CO₂/yr replacement trees, if actually planted, would hold:

$$3,448 \times 20 \times .0354 = 2,441 \text{ MT CO}_2$$

The net loss of carbon sequestration caused by the plan, even if there were replacement trees, would be 70,195 MT of CO₂. This is a Significant Environmental Effect the EIR fails to reveal. Please keep in mind, this is a very understated analysis. It assumes trees only capture carbon for 20 years and only release carbon dioxide as they decompose.

2.4 Forest Management Objectives

The RTC misstates the forest management objectives of the SNRAMP. Pages 4-284 to 4-285 say,

“because the proposed project would replace primarily dead, dying, and diseased trees that have limited capability to sequester carbon or other pollutants for that matter, with young saplings that have long-term carbon sequestration capabilities, the proposed project is expected to result in a net increase in carbon sequestration capacity within the Natural Areas in San Francisco.”

This is not true, trees to be removed under the SNRAMP are not selected based on health, but rather to remove trees in specific areas to open up those areas to promote grasslands. This is a fundamental intent of the SNRAMP. The DEIR page 456 states,

“Further, most of the trees within the Natural Areas are nonnative and most are also invasive. The invasive forests within the Natural Areas are predominantly eucalyptus, although cypress, pine, and acacia also occur (SFRPD 2006). The long term goal in MA1 and MA2 is to slowly convert those areas to native scrub, grassland habitats, or oak woodlands.”

For another example, consider the map of central McLaren Park below. Additional maps are presented in Appendix D. These maps were obtained from the Natural Areas Program by Sunshine requests. They show specific locations for tree removal under the SNRAMP and were the basis for the tree removal numbers presented in the Plan. You can see this is not about culling unhealthy trees. It is about clearing trees from specific areas.


These trees are not selected because they are unhealthy or unsafe. In fact, the Program has a strong incentive to remove the largest healthiest trees to get the most bang for the buck from the allowed number of tree removals. Dead, dying and diseased trees can be removed later on the basis of public safety without being counted under the Program. This public safety excuse has been well used by the NAP to justify tree fellings to date.

The forest management statement in the EIR is not only incorrect, it is a purposeful misstatement of fact.



Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSU GIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s StreetMap 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002; Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1 Foot Resolution - 2001; City of San Francisco Department of Public Works, San Francisco; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.

Map created May 30, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSU GIS).



2.5 Tree Definition for Replacement

For what tree replacement does take place, the SNRAMP makes no commitment what will be planted. The SNRAMP and the EIR suggest the new trees to be planted will be coast live oak, California laurel, California wax myrtle and dwarf California buckeye. (RTC page 4-464) Many of the NAP areas did not historically sustain these trees. Even in favorable locations, only a small percentage may ever grow tall enough to escape Sapling status. If we apply the same definition for tree replacement as for tree removal, they may not even qualify as Trees.

The DEIR page189-190 shows that any replacement trees contemplated would not necessarily be trees at all:

“Although the removal of invasive trees would be noticeable, the trees in the San Francisco Natural Areas would be replaced with either native trees or other native vegetation, such as native scrub or grassland species....in some locations, trees would be replaced by native scrub or grassland species...”



Will this “tree”

replace this tree killed by NAP supporters?

Again, a mitigation measure similar to the one put in place for the Beach Chalet Fields should be required. Obviously, the intent of the SNRAMP is to remove certain types of trees. Any replacements would be native trees of a different ecological value. However, the latter two requirements should still apply, that the size of the trees be comparable and that the establishment of the plantings be monitored. Unfortunately, given the restriction imposed by the SNRAMP, that new trees be native trees, the new trees will never grow to comparable size. This can be compensated for by planting multiple native trees for each tree removed. A 3:1 ratio should be required. Such requirements are much more critical for this EIR given the vast quantity of trees at stake.

2.6 Equipment Emissions

The EIR fails to account for the GHG emissions from vehicles and equipment used for tree felling, limbing, chipping, hauling, fence installation, watering, grading etc. associated with implementation. Neither does it account for transportation and equipment emissions associated with ongoing maintenance operations such as weeding, pesticide application, sapling cutting and replanting. Given the number of trees to be removed and the 32 far-flung worksites, these emissions would be significant. The only equipment GHG emissions accounted for by the EIR is for the Sharp Park Wetland Restoration Project. The equipment emissions for all of the other program operations would vastly outstrip this and are not accounted for. See page 4-302 of the RTC.

2.7 Wetland Dredging

The SNRAMP calls for dredging 60,000 cubic yards of mixed mineral/organic material from wetlands at Sharp Park. The EIR does not account for the GHG that will be released when this material is brought to the surface and allowed to decompose.

2.8 Methane

The EIR does not even mention methane. As the trees cut down under this plan decay, the carbon in them will be released in the form of carbon dioxide and as methane. Methane is much more damaging to our environment than carbon dioxide. It has 34 times the Global Warming Potential of carbon dioxide. This EIR cannot be considered adequate when methane release is completely unquantified.

3 Herbicide Use

The RTC page 4-538 says,

“The amount and frequency of pesticide applications as a result of implementation of the SNRAMP would be similar to what currently occurs within the NAP areas and what has occurred over the past 10 years.” In other words, implementation of the Plan will not require pesticide use beyond what is already occurring.

Please note, herbicides are considered a type of pesticide.

Supposedly, the Plan has not commenced. The November 2, 2016 report by the Department of Environment Integrated Pest Management Group, “City and County of San Francisco Agency Responses to the 2016 Request for Information on Future Herbicide Reduction” shows the NAP is the largest user of Tier 1, Most Hazardous, herbicides in RPD.

The Plan calls for a large number of Trees to be cut down. The stumps of all of those will be treated with Tier 1 herbicide to prevent resprouting. This is a new activity requiring pesticide use. When the SNRAMP commences, a large number of Saplings are to be removed during forest thinning, forest removal and in less forested MA-1 and MA-2 areas. All of these stumps will be treated with herbicide to prevent resprouting. This is a new activity requiring pesticide use. When the SNRAMP commences, grasslands will be expanded by removing non-native scrub. This is a new activity that will require herbicide use. All of these new activities will clearly increase pesticide use. The statement in the EIR above cannot be correct.

4 CEQA process violations

In addition to failings of the EIR itself, the process for EIR certification was unlawful. The SF Planning Department and Commission violated sections of the California Environmental Quality Act and of the San Francisco Administrative Code. This regards the process used to move the EIR for the RPD Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan from its draft form to certification by the Planning Commission. The most egregious violation is the failure of Planning to recirculate the EIR for comments and responses (Consultation) following the addition of significant new information to the EIR after the close of public comment on the DEIR. This is required by CEQA:

CEQA § 21092.1. ADDITION OF NEW INFORMATION; NOTICE AND CONSULTATION

When significant new information is added to an environmental impact report after notice has been given pursuant to Section 21092 and consultation has occurred pursuant to Sections 21104 and 21153, but prior to certification, the public agency shall give notice again pursuant to Section 21092, and consult again pursuant to Sections 21104 and 21153 before certifying the environmental impact report.

The August 2011 DEIR contained no quantitative analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would result from SNRAMP implementation, other than equipment emissions from the Sharp Park wetlands project. Otherwise, it contained nothing but hand waving arguments. (Grasslands reflect more sunlight than forests in regions where there is snow on the ground for many months of the year.) This was roundly criticized during the comment period for the DEIR.

The November 2016 Response to Comments contains entirely new information regarding GHG emissions. (pages 5-41 to 5-45) Most of the old DEIR arguments were removed. Completely new analysis was added based on newly cited practices and newly generated data. The new information purports to demonstrate that Plan implementation will result in a net reduction in GHG emissions. It is important to vet this seemingly impossible outcome since Plan implementation will obviously produce extensive GHG emissions resulting in a Significant Environmental Impact.

After adding this new information to the EIR, Planning did not circulate the EIR for Consultation as required by 21092.1 above. Done correctly, Planning would have made the amended EIR available for public review. They would have accepted public and agency comments and then created a new Response To Comments (RTC). The new RTC would have addressed concerns over the validity of the new information.

Other significant new information was added to the EIR following the close of consultation. One was the new conclusion that Plan implementation will not require an increase in pesticide use over current levels. See RTC page 5-40 A huge new section was added regarding mitigation measures to deal with acidic soils at Laguna Salada in Sharp Park. See RTC pages 5-4 to 5-8.

Other code violations by Planning in the execution of this process include:

San Francisco 67.15 (b) Every agenda for special meetings at which action is proposed to be taken on an item shall provide an opportunity for each member of the public to directly address the body concerning that item prior to action thereupon.

The certification hearing for the RPD SNRAMP EIR was held on December 15, 2016. The agenda for the hearing can also be found at: <http://sf-planning.org/meeting/planning-commission-december-15-2016-agenda>

The Planning Commission combined its certification hearing of the EIR with the Rec and Park Commission hearing on adoption of the SNRAMP. The hearing contained two agenda items, strangely noted as 1a and 1b. These are two entirely different decisions, made by two different commissions based on two different sets of input information. The Planning Commission action is to assess the technical conformance of the EIR to CEQA regulations and if it is acceptable, to certify it. The Rec and Park Commission is to consider the information contained in the certified EIR and decide whether or not to adopt the Plan in light of its environmental impacts. Despite this, they held the meeting as if only one item was on the agenda. All testimony by Planning and RPD was given, followed by all public testimony on both decisions. When all that was completed, the Planning Commission voted to certify the EIR and the Rec Park Commission voted to adopt the plan. All of the public testimony was mixed together randomly. It lasted for about 5 hours. About 10% of the comments were directed to EIR certification. Members of the public were only allowed to testify once.

There are two 67.15 (b) issues here.

1) This way of conducting the hearing is legalistically in compliance with 67.17 (b). However, it circumvents the intent of the Code. The Planning Commission should have heard testimony on the EIR and made their decision on certification. Then the Rec Park Commission should have heard testimony on the SNRAMP and made their decision on adoption of the SNRAMP. We asked the Planning Commission if they would at least separate the testimonies on the EIR from testimonies on the SNRAMP. They said they chose not to. The effect was to fragment and dilute public testimony on the EIR. The public's ability to convey information to the Planning Commission was stifled as a result.

2) Members of the public were only allowed to speak once. There were two distinct agenda items at the hearing. Numbering them as 1a and 1b does not erase that fact. If you choose to speak on the EIR and then you could not speak on the SNRAMP. They will say people could have split their time in half and spoke a little bit about both. Doing that would have diluted their messages and made them less intelligible.

San Francisco 31.15 (d) When the final EIR has been prepared and in the judgment of the Planning Commission it is adequate, accurate and objective, reflecting the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission shall certify its completion in compliance with CEQA. The notice of the Planning Commission hearing on the certification of the final EIR shall inform the public of its appeal rights to the Board of Supervisors with respect to the final EIR within the time frame specified in Section 31.16 of this Chapter. The certification of completion shall contain a finding as to whether the project as proposed will, or will not, have a significant effect on the environment.

The certification of the EIR is supposed to be an unbiased technical decision by the Planning Commission. Is the EIR "adequate, accurate and objective, sufficient as an informational document, correct in its conclusions, and reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission". The Planning Commission chose to structure the hearing to immerse themselves in testimony for and against the SNRAMP before making their certification decision. 90% of the testimony they heard

was of this sort. Why would this be relevant if they are trying to make an unbiased decision on the technical merits of the EIR? Clearly, they see the certification decision as a political one, biased by other factors than those they are supposed to be considering.

San Francisco 31.15 (d) ...The notice of the Planning Commission hearing on the certification of the final EIR shall inform the public of its appeal rights to the Board of Supervisors with respect to the final EIR within the time frame specified in Section 31.16 of this Chapter....

The Administrative Code requires that the hearing notice inform the public of its rights to appeal the certification. The notice did not contain the required information.

San Francisco 67.7 (g) Each policy body shall ensure that notices and agendas for regular and special meetings shall include the following notice: KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

The notice for the hearing did not include this required information.

Based on these procedural issues alone, the certification of the EIR should be rescinded and Planning required to recirculate the EIR for Consultation. Once the new RTC is completed, the Planning Commission must conduct the certification process in compliance with CEQA and our local ordinances.

5 The SNRAMP does not disclose the full extent of planned trail closures and so the EIR is not evaluating the correct Plan.

The SNRAMP does not accurately reflect the extent of trail closures actually planned by the NAP. In most of the parks where the NAP has violated CEQA and moved forward with implementation of the SNRAMP, trail closures have been more extensive than disclosed in the SNRAMP. The table below compares the footage of trails to be closed under the SNRAMP versus what has actually been closed.

	Trails Existing per SNRAMP	Trails to be closed per SNRAMP	Trails additional actually closed	Trails actually remaining	Trails Percent closure per SNRAMP	Trails percent closure actual
Glen Canyon	23251	3173	5515	14563	14%	37%
Bayview	4610	1752	1607	1251	38%	73%
Twin Peaks	9400	2779	3736	2885	30%	69%
Billy Goat Hill	2660	598	1412	650	22%	76%
Hawk Hill	1639	702	937	0	43%	100%
Grandview	1893	239	627	1027	13%	46%
Corona Heights	6230	1589	1896	2745	26%	56%
total	49683	10832	15730	23121	22%	53%

Note, there is a discrepancy in the Bayview Hill numbers. The SNRAMP includes the length of the road. This is not in the Plan area. It has been removed from the numbers above.

So, the Natural Areas Program has been closing about 2.5 times the amount of trails than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP. The EIR cannot be valid because it is not evaluating the actual plan of the Natural Areas Program.

See Appendix F for more detailed information on the trail closures to date.

6 Tree Replacement

We noted in section 2.2 the DEIR and the RTC make the unwarranted assumption that removed trees will be replaced, that the replacement will be on a 1:1 basis, that the replacements will be trees and that the replacement trees will be planted in the project area. These assertions are not supported by any language in the SNRAMP.

This is not just a critical issue for greenhouse gas emissions. A reduction in the number and size of trees in the project area also impacts air quality, aesthetics, wind and hydrology. All of the following sections of the DEIR and RTC hinge on the tree replacement premise.

DEIR

III.E.5	Management Practices
Impact LU-7:	Implementation of programmatic projects under the SNRAMP would not have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)
Impact AE-1:	Implementation of programmatic projects under the SNRAMP would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Less than Significant)
Impact WS-1:	Implementation of the programmatic projects under the SNRAMP would not result in significant ground-level wind hazards and windthrow risks. (Less than Significant)
Impact BI-2:	The SNRAMP and implementation of programmatic projects under the SNRAMP would have a substantial adverse effect on special status bird species. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)
Impact AF-4:	Implementation of the programmatic projects under the SNRAMP would not have a substantial adverse effect on the loss or conversion of farmland or forest land. (Less than Significant)
VII.B.2 Impacts	Wind and Shadow
VII.B.2 Impacts	Hydrology and Water Quality
VII.D.2 Impacts	Wind and Shadow

RTC

Response PD-3	General opposition to the project
Response PD-34	Elimination of 18,000 trees
Response LU-4	Applicability of San Francisco Urban Forestry and Landmark Tree Ordinances
Response AE-1	Aesthetics [AE]
Response CP-8	Impacts of tree removal on historic Mount Davidson Area
Response CP-9	Inadequate/Incomplete HRER for Mount Davidson

Response AQ-1	Increased pollution from tree removal activities
Response BI-12	Tree removal at Mount Davidson
Response BI-30	Impacts related to the removal of nonnative trees and invasive vegetation
Response BI-33	SNRAMP proposals for tree replacement
5.A.3 Chapter III:	Project Description
5.A.12 Chapter VI:	Other CEQA Issues
5.B.3 Section V.B:	Project Description

A mitigation measure must be put in place to record data on the trees removed, trees planted and the survival of the planted trees.

7 Implementation before Certification

The NAP has been flagrantly violating CEQA, moving forward with the Program before EIR certification. The EIR denies this, despite the many examples.

RTC Response G-3 page 4-20 With respect to bond monies spent in various parks says,

“It is possible that some of these monies could be used for management actions and improvements proposed under the SNRAMP, but no physical improvements could be accomplished unless and until this EIR is certified by the Planning Commission.”

It goes on to say the NAP “provided fencing for public safety” as part of the Glen Canyon Restoration Project. In fact, only a small percentage of the fence installed on that project was for public safety. The remainder was for public access control. The EIR does not mention the extensive trail closures implemented under that project.

In 2002 the Board of Supervisors issued resolution 653-02 requiring the RPD halt implementation of the Natural Areas Plan until a final plan was approved. That plan is the subject of the EIR before you. The resolution clearly defines the difference between implementing the plan versus a holding pattern for the Natural Areas Program.

FURTHER RESOLVED, That until the Natural Areas Management Plan is completed and approved by the Board of Supervisors, the Natural Areas Program may continue to preserve and maintain genuine remnants of San Francisco's native flora and fauna so long as those activities do not include:

Removal of healthy trees that pose no safety hazards

Trail closures, or restrictions on access and recreation

Trapping and removal of wild or feral animals currently inhabiting parks and lakes

Expansion of activities into areas that no longer support predominantly native flora and fauna

We have clear information from CEQA and additional guidance from the Board of Supervisors about what amounts to plan implementation prior to EIR certification. **RPD has been violating CEQA and the BOS resolution.** Violations include the following:

- Closure of trails
- Installation of public access control fences
- Installation of signs restricting the public to “designated” trails making it illegal for park goers to use “un-designated” trails and making off-trail use illegal.
- Installation of signs prohibiting people from riding bicycles, or even walking bicycles into Plan management areas.
- Removal of healthy trees.

-Establishing new native plant gardens in areas that no longer supported predominantly native flora.

Below is a detailed listing of these violations:

Citywide

- Signs have been placed in almost all parkland managed by the NAP that say, "Stay on Designated Trails. No Bicycles."

Glen Canyon Park

- The NAP closed 8,688 feet of trails since 2006.
- Extensive fencing intended to discourage public access was erected at many locations in the park. The SNRAMP EIR claims RPD "provided fencing for public safety" when in fact only about 153 feet of fence was installed for public safety. The remaining 680 feet of split rail fence was installed purely for public access control.
- a fenced native plant garden was added in SNRAMP zone MA-3b that did not previously support predominantly native flora. The SNRAMP criteria for MA-3 areas includes the "absence (current or historic) of sensitive plants"

Mt. Davidson

- As part of the Mt. Davidson Seismic Tank upgrade by the SFPUC in 2008, the NAP insisted that the water pipeline from the Stanford Heights Reservoir to the tank on Mt. Davidson be relocated from its existing location among shrubs and grass to the forested area. This required clear cutting a swath of healthy trees up the face of the mountain.
- In about January 2014 the trail below the lower saddle viewing area on the east side of the park was blocked off with felled trees and limbs. More trees and limbs have been added since.
- In October 2015 the trail that runs north from the cross down to the open plateau and rocky knoll was blocked off with felled trees and limbs. This is a historic WPA trail with extensive stone work. One staircase was stuffed full of tree limbs. In the summer of 2016, in the same area, two staircases constructed with wood treads were ripped out. The steel spikes that had held the treads were left protruding from the ground.

McLaren Park

- Multiple trails have been closed in the area south of Mansell and west of Visitacion.
- Fencing was installed at the Visitacion overlook parking area to prevent people from walking out onto the knoll above Visitacion Valley.
- The trail that runs along twin water tanks fence line was closed.
- Native plantings were extended into areas that did not support predominantly native flora and fauna under the McLaren Park Connector Trail Project. Plantings were established at the Persia, Campbell and Visitacion entrances. The Persia and Campbell sites are classed MA-3, "absence (current or historic) of sensitive plants". The project plan for the Persia site indicates a large healthy tree at the south end of the project site is to remain. That tree has disappeared. The fencing for the Campbell site blocked the trail running north from the sidewalk intersection. That was subsequently removed by the public. The Visitacion site is classed MA-2, still not an area that "supports predominantly native flora". The project plan for the Visitacion site indicates 2 healthy trees at the SW corner of the project. One of them went missing.
- Based on numbered stumps, one hundred trees were cut in the summer of 2014 in conjunction with the Visitacion trail restoration project. The 2012 HortScience McLaren Park Tree Risk Assessment report only identified 26 trees in the project area that should have been removed.

Pine Lake

- Fencing has been erected around the lake to limit public access.

Twin Peaks

- The NAP has active plans to close trails on Twin Peaks under the Figure 8 project. These trail closures, in conjunction with the "stay on designated trails" signage, will effectively close the two southern lobes of Twin Peaks to the public.

See: http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/TwinPeaksMeeting2_11.02.11.pdf

Trail closures are faintly marked on pages 33 and 34. The trail that runs down the South lobe was closed in August/September 2016.

India Basin Shoreline Park

- The coastline of the SE parcel of the park at the foot of Arelious Walker Street has been made off limits to the public. Permanent fences were erected and signs posted that say "Wildlife Area No Access."

Bayview Hill

- Split rail fencing has been installed under the Bayview Trail Improvement Project that closes off the north-west quadrant of the park. The gate in the steel fence has been locked, closing off the south-west quadrant of the park to the public.

Bernal Hill

- The trail on the NE end of the park just east of Folsom St has been blocked. It is the easiest, most sustainable route up onto the hill along the entire north face. The NAP has active plans to close additional trails under the Bernal Heights Park Trails Improvement Project.

Also see Appendix F. It shows the trail closures planned under the SNRAMP and also shows which trails have been closed by the NAP since work was started on the EIR in 2005. The footage of access control fencing installed in each area is given. These trail closures and fence installations are all CEQA violations.

The Recreation and Parks Department should be admonished for violating CEQA. Where practical, these violations should be cured. No further violations should be allowed until this EIR is corrected, certified and the Plan adopted by the Recreation and Parks Commission.

8 Bicycle Prohibition

The SNRAMP hints that its drafters consider bicyclists to be a problem, but does not state any broad action that would be taken to restrict bicycle use in Natural Areas. However, in early 2015, the NAP erected signs prohibiting the public from bringing bicycles into Natural Areas. (See the sign photo in section 1.) The NAP is only allowing bicycles on a few trails by special exception. Prior to the posting of these signs, RPD regulations permitted bicycles on all trails unless signs were posted forbidding them. There were no such signs in the Natural Areas when the new signs were installed. See the discussion in Appendix G.

This hidden agenda of the NAP was not disclosed in the SNRAMP and the idea that the implementation of the SNRAMP would bar people from walking their bikes or riding them in NAP managed parklands is incorrectly addressed by the RTC.

Not only does the prohibition prevent people from riding their bicycles in our parks, it prevents them from riding their bicycles to our parks. You cannot expect people to lock their bicycles at park borders and leave them while they spend time in the park. Bike theft is just too rampant. **This bicycle prohibition flies in the face of City initiatives including Green Connections, Transit First and the ROSE.**

RTC Response PD-6 "Opposition to the proposed public access restrictions" page 4-146 claims,

"The SNRAMP does not propose changes to bicycle use in the Natural Areas."

This is not true. Prior to the NAP's premature implementation of the SNRAMP, bicycles were allowed anywhere in Natural Areas unless specifically prohibited. In 2015, the NAP blanketed the Natural Areas with signs prohibiting riding or walking bicycles in Natural Areas.

Response RE-10 "Recreational analysis related to trails" page 4-339

"The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use. Off-road bicyclists would be affected by proposed trail closures similarly to other trail users, such as hikers and runners."

That is incorrect. The NAP allows all other users on Designated Trails while people with bicycles are forbidden to enter Program areas at all.

The RTC fails to address this important issue and misstates the facts.

9 Aesthetic Impact of Fences

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that the use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

Recommendation GR-11C in the SNRAMP says, "If off-trail use continues in a particularly sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands), permanent fencing shall be considered as a last resort once all other options, including enforcement, have failed." In fact, the NAP has installed vast quantities of fencing that have a Significant Environmental Effect on Aesthetics. The EIR only discusses the aesthetic impact of the seawall fence at Sharp Park. The impact of fences in other areas is not addressed.

Parks particularly hard hit with fences are Corona Heights, Grandview and Glen Canyon where fences are now dominant features of the landscapes. Here is a tabulation for parks that have benefited from "improvement" projects.

Bayview Hill	430 feet 80 feet	Chainlink fence installed some time ago, but gate now locked splitrail fence installed since 2005
Corona Heights	936 feet 500 feet	splitrail fence installed since 2005 low wire fence (not the old chainlink fence for public safety)
Glen Canyon	680 feet	splitrail fence installed since 2005

80 feet plastic on metal posts installed since 2005

Grandview 856 feet splitrail fence installed since 2005

See the fence photos in Appendix H.

The effect of fences on Aesthetics is a Significant Environmental Effect not addressed by the EIR.

10 Bias

The EIR contains a surprising number of statements that are not true. Their inclusion indicates bias by the drafters of the document.

- A Response GG-1 and its supporting technical memorandum, "Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAM" discussed in Section 2.3 are wrong. Given the author's "expert" status, one can only assume the faulty GHG accounting method was intentionally presented.
- B HortScience, a frequent beneficiary of NAP contracts, was asked to author a very unscientific paper in January 2013 titled, "Age of blue gum in San Francisco's Natural Area Parks". This report is cited by ESA in their carbon sequestration memo and used to support the false GHG calculations that appear in the EIR.

HortScience cites their assessment of 800 blue gums larger than 6" diameter, with a median size larger than 20" diameter to make the statement that, "Given my observations of blue gum in Glen Canyon, McLaren, Mount Davidson and Pine Lake Park, I estimate that at least 90% are more than 20 years old." Obviously, given the large trees Mr. Clark was examining, they were indeed more than 20 years old. Given the title of the document, you would think these statements were referring broadly to all trees in our Natural Areas, but the writing allows the possibility he was referring to only the large trees he was assessing.

HortScience never actually studied the parks with the intent to determine the mix of tree ages. Their work included no assessment of smaller trees. The only evidence presented about the quantity of young trees is:

-a paper from Dr. Joe McBride from 1994 related to some specific stands in the Presidio and Golden Gate Park.

-an examination of Google Earth historical photos from which he somehow deduces that there are very few young trees in our forests.

-finally the author says young trees observed at the edges of the stands examined were not common. (That is a recollection of something the author was not specifically looking at when he was in the parks.)

HortScience must know there is a high percentage of young trees in our natural areas. The language of this memo is intentionally ambiguous to give the impression the author is saying 90% of the blue gums in our natural areas are more than 20 years old, when the legalistic meaning is that 90% of the trees HortScience specifically assessed were more than 20 years old.

Please see the photos in Appendix E. These were taken in various natural areas that show the mix of trees that actually exist.

- C The HortScience report only dealt with observations of a few parks in San Francisco, yet the EIR specifically cites it to claim that 90% of the trees in Sharp Park are more than 20 years old. There is no connection. RTC Footnote 76, page 4-300
- D Impact of removing benches and recreational amenities

The response to comments about the removal of benches from Natural Areas, RE-11 page 4-340 contains an outright lie,

“In 2011, SFRPD removed a bench on the northern portion of Mt. Davidson because it was rotting and unsafe for sitting. “ The truth is revealed in the email below sent by Chris Campbell of the NAP. The bench was not rotting and unsafe. It was removed because people liked it and used it.

To: jacquieproctor@hotmail.com
CC: chuck@paskerian.com; Lisa.Wayne@sfgov.org
Subject: Re: Bench missing on Mt. Davidson
From: Christopher.Campbell@sfgov.org
Date: Thu, 27 May 2010 08:42:45 -0700

Hello Jacquie,

The bench that you're referring to was installed by the Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program. It was installed a number of years ago on this site to take advantage of the views, beauty and serenity of the plateau. We monitored the use of the bench and it unfortunately became an attractive nuisance. The secluded location was a draw for night time drinking and smoking. Bottles were thrown down the hill slope and most often broke, causing a hazard for both animals and people. Secondly the bench became a draw for commercial dog walkers, at times with more than 12 dogs in the area at once. This activity resulted in trampling of this sensitive slope, disturbance of wildlife and the creation of trails around the bench. One of the trails remains in the grassland below the bench location. After consideration we concluded it was best to remove this bench.

Over the coming year we will evaluate the installation of benches city-wide. This will be done in correlation with a natural areas trail project . Due to the activities associated with this bench we unfortunately do not have intentions to re-install one on the lower plateau at Mount Davidson.

Sorry for the disappointment this may bring,
Christopher

Christopher Campbell
Natural Areas Program

- E Closure of the Miraloma trail in Glen Canyon, Comment LU-2 page 4-214
In Glen Canyon the only sustainable trail on the entire west side of the park was closed. This runs from O'Shaughnessy Blvd. down to the Silver Tree Camp.

Response LU-2

"The trail to which the commenter refers (at the entry to the park from O'Shaughnessy Blvd.) was closed prior to the commencement of the environmental review for the SNRAMP. This unofficial path was deemed unsafe, due to a significant presence of poison oak. A low post-and-cable fence was installed near Silver Tree camp and day care center to discourage use. This trail closure is not part of the SNRAMP project and thus was not analyzed in the EIR."

This is a fabrication. The trail closure is part of the SNRAMP. The trail is shown on the SNRAMP Glen Canyon map as an existing trail slated for closure. (SNRAMP page 6.3-24) The bottom of the trail was closed with a split rail fence after 2011. The trail itself is not hazardous. The NAP could easily control the poison oak along the trail if they wanted to. They simply want to exclude the public from the west side of the park.

Not only is this trail closure planned under the SNRAMP and subject to this EIR, it was still indicated as an existing trail under the Glen Canyon Trails Improvement Project published in July 2011. It clearly shows this trail as one they plan to close under that project.


<http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/GlenCanyonTrailconceptplan.pdf>

F Forest Management Objectives

As noted in section 2.4 of this document, the EIR willfully misstates the forest management objectives of the SNRAMP. This occurs on pages 4-284 to 4-285 of the RTC. It is amazing the authors would try to pass off such a bald lie involving the fundamental purpose of the SNRAMP tree removals.

Appendices' relation to items in SFFA Appeal of EIR

Item in SFFA Appeal of EIR	Appendix detailed information
1.Public access restrictions	H
2. Greenhouse gases	A, A-1, B, C, D
3.Herbicide use	
4.CEQA process violations	F
5. Planned trail closures	F
6.??	
7. CEQA implementation violations	E
8.Bicycle prohibition	G
9. Aesthetics of fencing	H
10. Bias	



January 15, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: Planning Case No. 205.1912E SNRAMP

Board Members:

The Quercus Group appreciates the opportunity to submit Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan EIR comments on behalf of the San Francisco Forest Alliance. We incorporate by reference the Alliance forest comments of November 27, 2016.

Review of the EIR finds that the project fails to comprehensively analyze or feasibly and proportionally mitigate terrestrial conversion vegetation and soil organic matter direct/indirect¹ greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. Specifically, the failure to fully account for the foreseeable carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) emission effects due to biomass disposal decomposition (Exhibit A) and soil disturbance. These EIR omissions represent a failure to proceed in the manner prescribed by CEQA.

Forest Resources Conversion Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The limitations of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) generic vegetation land use change general default standards were clearly demonstrated in the excellent Forest Alliance comments. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) used for the EIR GHG biogenic emissions analysis employs IPCC forest general defaults that are unrelated to actual California forest carbon stocking conditions (CalEEMod, Appendix A, pp. 51, 52). This one size fits all approach does not reflect California's diverse forests resources and fails to account for CEQA site-specific forest conversion requirements or other pertinent California GHG policies/laws (Exhibit B). In fact the only IPCC general default standards relevant to California forest resources are the international GHG global warming potential (GWP) values established by the 2013 IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

CEQA § 15364.5 states that "Greenhouse gas" or "greenhouse gases" includes but is not limited to: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. In 2016 Senate Bill 1383 designated methane a short-lived climate "super" pollutant.² Neither the 2009 CEQA GHG amendments nor the enabling legislation Senate Bill 97 mention the term "carbon sequestration." CEQA's focus is "*the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions.*" Further, the EIR must explain how the terrestrial conversion mitigation proposals result in less than significant GHG emissions consistent with state 2020, 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction targets.

¹ CEQA recognizes these secondary GHG biogenic emissions in the indirect effects language of Guidelines § 15358(2), "... are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable."

² SB 1383 requires a 40 percent statewide reduction in methane emissions from 2013 levels by 2030.

Upon the disposal of impacted vegetation, the decomposition of biomass does in all cases result in CO₂ and CH₄ biogenic emissions.³ CEQA doesn't differentiate between anthropogenic and biogenic GHG emissions. The following 2009 Natural Resources Agency response to the California Wastewater Climate Change Group proves the point:

Response 95-1: "Regarding the comment that the Guidelines should distinguish between anthropogenic and biogenic carbon dioxide emissions, the Natural Resources Agency notes that SB 97 did not distinguish between the sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, it would not be appropriate for the Natural Resources Agency to treat the different categories of emissions differently absent a legislative intent that the Guidelines do so. Neither AB 32 nor the Air Resources Board's Scoping Plan distinguishes between biogenic and anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gas emissions. On the contrary, the Scoping Plan identifies methane from, among other sources, organic wastes decomposing in landfills as a source of emissions that should be controlled. (Scoping Plan, at pp. 62-63)."

AB 32 defines carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) to mean, "... the amount of carbon dioxide by weight that would produce the same global warming impact as a given weight of another greenhouse gas, based on the best available science, including from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."

"The IPCC released its Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) in 2013, including scientific research and conclusions regarding current GHG global warming potential (GWP) values for determining CO₂e. The IPCC recommends using the AR5 GWP values, as they reflect the best information on global warming potentials. The Air District is using the GWP values from AR5, which include a GWP for methane (including all feedback effects) of 34. We recommend that ARB also use GWPs from AR5 in the Strategy."⁴ Consistent with the AB 32 carbon dioxide equivalent definition, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District uses the GWP values from AR5.

CalEEMod Model Methodology

The CalEEMod model is used for project forest conversion GHG biogenic emissions analysis. Like all publicly available forest conversion models the CalEEMod measures only the carbon loss (emission) or carbon gain (sequestration). The CalEEMod was not designed to calculate vegetation methane biogenic emissions due to biomass decomposition. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association have never claimed their model has that capability regarding forest resources conversion GHG biogenic emissions analysis.

Other flawed aspects of the forest resources GHG biogenic emissions analysis include:

- "IPCC Good practice Guidance for Land Use and Forestry (2003) applies a 20 year window for calculating positive sequestration from trees" (Appendix B).

The cited IPCC standard is antiquated, pre-dating California's development of extensive GHG policy and law. Both forest resources and GHG biogenic emissions are analyzed over a standard one-hundred year planning horizon. The assertion that trees are limited to a 20 year positive carbon sequestration window is baseless and the EIR provides no science or fact to support this speculative opinion. In fact planted native oak trees don't attain appreciable carbon sequestration until about 20 years of age.

³ "Anaerobic digestion, chemical process in which organic matter is broken down by microorganisms in the absence of oxygen, which results in the generation of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) Sugars, starches, and cellulose produce approximately equal amounts of methane and carbon dioxide." Encyclopædia Britannica (2016). <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/22310/anaerobic-digestion>.

⁴ BAAQMD May 26, 2016 letter from Jack P. Broadbent, Executive Officer/APCO to Richard Corey, Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board regarding ARB Short-Lived Climate Pollutants Strategy.

- The CalEEMod uses a IPCC forest general default of 111 metric tonnes (MT) of CO₂e emissions per acre.

Dividing 111 MT CO₂e by 3.67 yields 30 MT biomass/soil carbon sequestration per acre. Based on the age and density of the forest this figure substantially underestimates the carbon sequestration stocking per acre values of the thousands of large trees to be removed. Actual non-plantation eucalyptus aboveground biomass carbon sequestration stocks are +60 MT C/acre and 0.4 MT C/acre-year. According to the latest literature eucalyptus soil carbon stocks are as high as 50 MT C/acre.

- “At the end of the 20 year horizon window of the SNRAMP, there would be a calculated net gain of sequestration of approximately 388 MT of CO₂ per year. The primary contributing factor to this sequestration gain would be the removal of an aging eucalyptus tree population which would be replaced with much more efficiently sequestering tree and plant growth” (Appendix B).

The EIR does not stipulate that new planted trees will be a mitigation measure. Nor does it provide data on the species/number of planted trees required to reduce GHG biogenic emission impacts consistent with state 2020, 2030 and 2050 reduction goals. Essentially the EIR is falsely claiming that the existing forest carbon sequestration capacity will be more than replaced by the grassland sequestration. Quercus Group suggests the EIR preparers query the USDA Forest Service or CALFIRE regarding the veracity of this assertion.

- The SNRAMP defines a Tree as a tree having a dominant vertical trunk greater than 15 feet tall. Smaller trees are considered “Saplings” (EIR at 92).

The thousands of EIR uncounted “saplings,” which under the plan may be removed, would replace the “aging eucalyptus tree population” over time and sequester significantly more carbon, much faster than grassland.

To accurately and fully account for forest conversion GHG biogenic emissions the total biomass weight or total biomass carbon weight of the impacted overstory/understory vegetation must be known, the means of vegetation disposal identified and the soil organic matter emissions calculated.

- Please provide the following forest resources information:
 1. What is the estimated total biomass weight or total biomass carbon weight of all the impacted vegetation?
 2. What are the estimated biomass decomposition CO₂ and CH₄ emissions?
 3. What are the estimated soil organic matter CO₂ biogenic emissions associated with ground disturbing activities?⁵

⁵ Soil organic matter (SOM) is the organic matter component of soil, consisting of plant and animal residues at various stages of decomposition, cells and tissues of soil organisms, and substances synthesized by soil organisms. The SOM carbon sequestration zone extends to a depth of 1 meter.

The EIR provides no science or fact to support how its potential mitigation measures are going to actually mitigate the project's dual impacts of lost forest carbon sequestration capacity *and* significant biomass disposal/soil disturbance GHG biogenic emissions.

- Please provide the following forest resources mitigation information:
 1. Demonstrate mathematically how the proposed measures will mitigate the CO₂ and CH₄ biogenic emissions due to the decomposition of the impacted biomass.
 2. Demonstrate mathematically how the proposed measures will mitigate the soil organic matter CO₂ biogenic emissions associated with ground disturbing activities.
 3. Explain how the proposed mitigation is consistent with SB 1383 2030 reduction requirements regarding methane emissions.
 4. Explain how the non-tree planting migration measures are consistent with reducing GHG emissions statewide 80 percent by 2050.

Wetlands are major carbon sinks. Impacted wetlands carbon sequestration rates can take decades or longer to replicate through replacement mitigation. In general, Ambrose et al. (2007) found that the primary state and federal wetland protection programs have been generating more wetlands of lower quality than the wetlands they allowed to be destroyed. The EIR proposes the conversion of freshwater marsh, willow scrub and wet meadow wetland habitat to open water habitat.

- Please provide the following wetlands conversion information:
 1. What are the estimated CO₂ and CH₄ biogenic emissions associated with impacts to all project area wetland classifications, including the dredging of up to 60,000 cubic yards of "material"?
 2. What is the estimated carbon sequestration rate (i.e. metric tonnes carbon per acre per year) for the wetland classifications replacement mitigation?
 3. Explain how the proposed mitigation is consistent with SB 1383 2030 reduction requirements regarding methane emissions.

Summary

The 2008 California Air Resources Board's AB 32 Scoping Plan recognized the significant contribution that terrestrial greenhouse gas storage will make in meeting the state's GHG emissions reduction goals: "This plan also acknowledges the important role of terrestrial sequestration in our forests, rangelands, wetlands, and other land resources." The EIR perpetuates the myth that forest and other terrestrial conversion GHG emissions are simply an issue of carbon transformed to carbon dioxide. This fallacy belies the fact that potentially four other GHGs are involved, including the super pollutant methane. The constant among court decisions regarding GHG analysis is that project emissions must be accurately and fully rendered in a CEQA document. This EIR appears designed to obfuscate and minimize project GHG biogenic emissions, rather than a bona fide attempt to comply with CEQA's focus of ascertaining the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions.

Substantial evidence has been presented that project GHG biogenic emissions will result in potentially significant environmental effects that have not been sufficiently analyzed or feasibly mitigated. The project has not made "a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project" (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(a)). Therefore the EIR is deficient as an informational document, in that it fails to apprise decision-makers/public of the full range and intensity of the adverse GHG emission effects on the environment that may reasonably be expected if the project is approved.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ron Cowan".

Ron Cowan, Principal

attachments (3)


Exhibit A

Biomass Disposal Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The following chart illustrates the relative GHG indirect biogenic emission effects from common methods of vegetation (biomass) disposal.¹ The biomass combustion GHG emission values do not include black carbon emissions.

Uncontrolled landfill disposal produces the greatest biomass GHG biogenic emissions followed by composting, open burning, mulching, forest thinning, controlled landfills and biomass power. The chart demonstrates that peak greenhouse gas emissions vary substantially depending on the means of biomass disposal, with the higher peaks reflecting increased amounts of methane and/or nitrous oxide emissions.

Terminology: Net effect of thinning emissions apply to forest thinning emissions and spreading emissions are equivalent to mulching emissions.



Graphic: Gregory Morris, PhD. *Bioenergy and Greenhouse Gases*. Published by Pacific Institute (2008).

¹ One bone dry ton (bdt) is a volume of wood chips (or other bulk material) that would weigh one ton (2000 pounds, or 0.9072 metric tons) if all the moisture content was removed.

Exhibit B

Terrestrial Conversion Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Policy and Regulatory Framework

The following policy and regulatory background information provides context to the importance of reducing and feasibly mitigating terrestrial conversion greenhouse gas (GHG) biogenic emission effects:

Governor Brown

"We must also reduce the relentless release of methane, black carbon and other potent pollutants across industries. And we must manage farm and rangelands, forests and wetlands so they can store carbon." – January 2015 inaugural address regarding the state's greenhouse gas reduction goals for the next 15 years.

California Air Resources Board

"California is committed to reducing emissions of CO₂, which is the most abundant greenhouse gas and drives long-term climate change. However, short-lived climate pollutants [methane, black carbon, etc.] have been shown to account for 30-40 percent of global warming experienced to date. Immediate and significant reduction of both CO₂ and short-lived climate pollutants is needed to stabilize global warming and avoid catastrophic climate change." *Reducing Short-Lived Climate Pollutants in California, 2014.*

Assembly Bill 32

Signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on September 27, 2006. This statute requires a statewide GHG emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990 to be achieved by 2020.

Senate Bill 97

Signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on August 24, 2007. This statute required that the Office of Planning and Research prepare CEQA guidelines for evaluating the effects of GHG emissions and for mitigating such effects. The Natural Resources Agency adopted these guidelines on December 31, 2009.

Senate Bill 32

Signed by Governor Brown on September 8, 2016. This statute requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 40% below the 1990 level by 2030.

Senate Bill 1383

Signed by Governor Brown on September 19, 2016. This statute requires a 50 percent statewide reduction in black carbon emissions and a 40 percent reduction in methane and hydrofluorocarbon emissions from 2013 levels by 2030.

Executive Order S-3-05

Signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on June 1, 2005. Executive Order S-3-05 established a California GHG reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

Phoenix Energy

"As wood starts to decompose it releases roughly equal amounts of methane (CH₄) and carbon dioxide (CO₂)." 2014. <http://www.phoenixenergy.net/powerplan/environment>

Macpherson Energy Corporation

"Rotting produces a mixture of up to 50 percent CH₄, while open burning produces 5 to 10 percent CH₄." 2014. <http://macphersonenergy.com/mt-poso-conversion.html>

References

Vegetation

Brown, S., T. Pearson, A. Dushku, J. Kadyzewski, and Y. Qi. 2004. *Baseline greenhouse gas emissions for forest, range, and agricultural lands in California*. Winrock International, for the California Energy Commission, PIER Energy-Related Environmental Research. Publication # CEC 500-04-069F.

Chojnacky D. C.; Heath L. S.; Jenkins J. C. 2014. *Updated generalized biomass equations for North American tree species*. *Forestry Journal*, 87, 129-151.

Gonzalez et al. 2010. *Forest carbon densities and uncertainties from Lidar, QuickBird, and field measurements in California*. Center for Forestry, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Smith, James E.; Heath, Linda S.; Jenkins, J. C. 2003. *Forest Volume-to-Biomass Models and Estimates of Mass for Live and Standing Dead Trees of U.S. Forests*. General Technical Report NE-298. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. 57 p.

Van Deusen, P., and L.S. Heath. 2016. *Carbon OnLine Estimator (COLE) web applications suite*. NCASI and USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. COLE database last updated 1/21/2016.

Waddell, K. and B. Hiserote. 2005. *The PNW-FIA Integrated Database User Guide: A database of forest inventory information for California, Oregon, and Washington*. Forest Inventory and Analysis Program, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Woodall, C.W., L.S. Heath, G.M. Domke, and M.C. Nichols. (2011) *Methods and equations for estimating aboveground volume, biomass, and carbon for trees in the U.S. forest inventory*. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS -88. Newtown Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 30 p.

Soil

Brady, N.C., and Weil, R.R. 1999. *The nature and properties of soils*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2016. *Rapid Carbon Assessment (RaCA) web applications suite*. USDA-NRCS Soil Science Division.

https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/survey/?cid=nrcs142p2_054164#intro

Whendee L. Silver, Rebecca Ryals, and Valerie Eviner. 2010. *Soil Carbon Pools in California's Annual Grassland Ecosystems*. University of California-Davis, 1210 PES, Mail Stop 1, One Shields Ave, Davis, CA 95616, USA

Zhi J, Jing C, Lin S, Zhang C, Liu Q, DeGloria SD, et al. (2014). *Estimating Soil Organic Carbon Stocks and Spatial Patterns with Statistical and GIS-Based Methods*. *PLoS ONE* 9(5): e97757. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0097757.

Wetlands

Ambrose, R.F., Callaway, J. C., and S. F. Lee. 2007. *An Evaluation of Compensatory Mitigation Projects Permitted Under Clean Water Act Section 401 by the California State Water Resources Control Board, 1991-2002*. Prepared for California State Water Resources Control Board. 158 pp.

Collins, J.N., E.D. Stein, M. Sutula, R. Clark, A.E. Fetscher, L. Grenier, C. Grosso, and A. Wiskind. 2008. *California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM) for Wetlands*. Version 5.0.2. 151 pp.

Nahlik, A. M. & Fennessy, M. S. *Carbon storage in US wetlands*. 2016. *Nat. Commun.* 7, 13835 doi:



Appendix A-1

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Please Support the EIR Appeal
Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan**

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We ask you to please support the appeal of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

We are concerned that the EIR violates CEQA law because it contains fundamental math errors, incorrect assumptions, and outdated science related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

We are concerned that the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan violates AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, by generating significant carbon emissions and causing climate change by felling 18,448 large trees and only replanting 3,448 of them (a replacement rate of 0.19).

We are concerned that this Plan threatens public safety by causing climate change, degrading air quality, increasing mudslide risk, and spraying toxins in children's parks.

CEQA: The CEQA Guidelines §15364.5 require the City of San Francisco to determine the significance of impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Greenhouse gases include but are not limited to carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. By law, the lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project.

Please send the EIR back to Planning to correct the math errors and incorrect science contained within as follows:

- **Math Errors:** The EIR adds together a rate and a stock and produces a meaningless final number for Greenhouse Gas Emissions.
- **90% of Trees Deleted:** The EIR assumes 90% of the existing trees are absorbing no carbon because they are over 20 years old. According to best available science from 2010 Forest Ecology & Management and the 2014 U.S. Geological Survey, older trees continue to actively sequester more carbon than younger trees. To be good faith, all 18,448 trees must be included in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

- **Tree Survival Rates:** The Greenhouse Gas calculations in the EIR presume that 100% of the newly-planted trees will survive. This is overly optimistic. SF Rec and Park’s numerical model assumes that all new trees are live oaks. Per the Department of Public Works, oaks are known to be uneven survivors in San Francisco because they prefer heat, wind protection, and good drainage. This is why in the 1800s, oak trees were found in San Francisco only in limited numbers in creek beds. To be good faith, a more realistic tree survival rate needs to be incorporated into the EIR when estimating net Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

CEQA law requires the lead agency, SF Rec and Park, to answer the following questions in good faith. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The EIR Responses to Comments (4-301) concludes, “There would be a calculated total net sequestration gain of 202 MT of CO₂ per year.” The Sharp Park portion of this total is shown as 64 MT, but this number is meaningless because it results from combining an annual rate with a stock. This is a fundamental math error that renders the result invalid.

When the math errors and assumptions are corrected using best available science and the same methodology, the new Greenhouse Gas calculations are shown below. Subsequently, a top sustainability and greenhouse gas verification firm was hired to perform the carbon calculations using best practices in accordance with AB 32. Per the attached appendix, they found that felling the 18,448 trees in the Plan would release total carbon emissions of **177,572 MT of CO₂e** and would result in a loss of carbon sequestration over the life of the project of **-44,275 MT of CO₂e**.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions for SNRAMP

	Annual Carbon Sequestration	Carbon Emissions
EIR with Errors:	Gain of +202 MT of CO ₂ per year	Not Presented
Corrected Math:	Loss of -2,401 MT of CO ₂ per year	65,101 MT of CO ₂
Top GHG Firm:	Loss of -44,275 MT of CO ₂ e	177,572 MT of CO ₂ e

Therefore, the Greenhouse Gas Emissions caused by the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan are significant under CEQA, violate the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), and must be mitigated.

The EIR Responses to Comments (4-301) erroneously concludes, “The proposed project would have a net GHG benefit and would not conflict with California’s goal of reducing GHG emissions set forth by the timetable established in AB 32.”

By presenting Greenhouse Gas calculations in the EIR that contain both fundamental math errors and assumptions that have been disproved by modern science, SF Rec and Park did not make a good-faith effort to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions from this project as required by law. Please refer the EIR back to Planning to remedy this.

Tree Replacement Rate: The tree replacement ratio in the EIR is only **0.19**. SF Rec and Park would replant only 3,448 trees out of 18,448 felled. Per the EIR on page 92, “Trees removed in San Francisco would be replaced with native tree species at a ratio of roughly one-to-one, although not necessarily at the same location or within the same Natural Area. For Sharp Park in Pacifica, many of the trees would be replaced not with trees but with native vegetation, specifically coastal scrub.” The SF Rec and Park Memo “SNRAMP Tree Removal and Replacement” dated November 27, 2012 states, “At Sharp Park, a total of 15,000 trees will be removed and replaced over 20 years with native grassland or coastal scrub.” The numerical model used by SF Rec and Park to calculate Greenhouse Gases replants grassland in place of the 15,000 trees killed in Sharp Park.

This Plan will cause climate change by deforesting 15,000 large carbon-sequestering trees without replacement. We request that the minimum replacement rate be **1:1** or 18,448 trees. Best practice per the U.S. Forest Service 2016 would be **3:1** to account for the loss of carbon sequestration and the inevitable partial mortality of the saplings. If the replacement rate is not raised from 0.19 to a guaranteed 1:1 or higher with trees, then this Plan will cause climate change and threaten public safety.

Air Pollution: We are concerned that cutting down 15,000 trees without adequate replacement per the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan will hurt human and environmental health by worsening air pollution. The EIR states that the deforestation “would result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts as a result of exceeding the BAAQMD thresholds for NOx pollutant emissions.” It concludes that “cumulative impacts associated with criteria air pollutants would be significant and unavoidable.” (EIR pages 438-440) We urge the SF Board of Supervisors to please send the EIR back to Planning for further air quality mitigation measures.

Herbicides: SF Rec and Park’s spraying of herbicides including Roundup required by the Plan is posing a threat to public health and safety. Per SF Rec and Park, “If you don't treat a felled eucalyptus stump with herbicides, it will come back.” Glyphosate in Roundup was declared a probable carcinogen by the World Health Organization. The four toxic herbicides being used in the Natural Resource Areas are Roundup, Garlon 4 Ultra (triclopyr), Milestone (aminopyralid), and Habitat (imazapyr). San Francisco residents are very concerned that SF Rec and Park is polluting children’s parks with cancer-causing chemicals in order to kill trees that the public wants to stay standing.

In summary, SF Rec and Park's plan to cut down over 18,000 large trees without adequate replacement and spray toxic herbicides would damage public safety, public health, and the environment.

Please refer the EIR back to Planning so that it can provide an accurate picture of Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the California Environmental Quality Act and include further mitigation for the environmental harm to climate and public health. Otherwise, the City will be vulnerable to future risks under CEQA.

Please ensure that the City of San Francisco continues to be a global leader in the fight for climate resilience.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nadine Weil

Nadine Weil
Founder
Heart of Green

cc: San Francisco Forest Alliance

Sources:

Increasing Wood Production Through Old Age in Tall Trees, Eucalyptus and Redwood, Stephen Sillett, Forest Ecology and Management Journal, February 2010: "Increasing wood production as trees age is a mechanism underlying the maintenance of biomass accumulation during forest development and the carbon-sink capacity of old-growth forests."
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900872X>

Tree Growth Never Slows

Idea debunked that young trees have the edge on their older siblings in carbon accumulation, U.S. Geological Survey, Nature Journal, January 2014
<http://www.nature.com/news/tree-growth-never-slows-1.14536>

Carbon Capture: Tree Size Matters

Yale Environment Review, July 2015
<http://environment.yale.edu/yer/article/carbon-capture-tree-size-matters#gsc.tab=0>

Compensating for the Loss of a Healthy Tree: How Many Trees Do You Owe Me?

Dr. David Nowak, U.S. Forest Service, November 2016
<http://www.slideshare.net/arbordayfoundation/compensating-for-the-loss-of-a-healthy-tree-how-many-trees-do-you-owe-me>

Mayor Ed Lee signs Mayors' National Climate Action Agenda Letter

November 2016
<http://www.climate-mayors.org/our-letter-to-the-presidentelect-november-2016/>

References:

Board of Supervisors File No. 170044

Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan per Planning Case No. 2005.0912E

Tree growth never slows

Idea debunked that young trees have the edge on their older siblings in carbon accumulation.

Jeff Tollefson
January 15, 2014



Trees add an increasing amount of mass every year.

Many foresters have long assumed that trees gradually lose their vigor as they mature, but **a new analysis suggests that the larger a tree gets, the more kilos of carbon it puts on each year.**

“The trees that are adding the most mass are the biggest ones, and that holds pretty much everywhere on Earth that we looked,” says Nathan Stephenson, an ecologist at the US Geological Survey in Three Rivers, California, and the first author of the study, which appears today in *Nature*. “Trees have the equivalent of an adolescent growth spurt, but it just keeps going.”

The scientific literature is chock-full of studies that focus on forests' initial growth and their gradual move towards a plateau in the amount of carbon they store as they reach maturity. Researchers have also documented a reduction in growth at the level of individual leaves in older trees.

In their study, Stephenson and his colleagues analyzed reams of data on 673,046 trees from 403 species in monitored forest plots, in both tropical and temperate areas around the world. They found that the largest trees gained the most mass each year, capitalizing on their additional leaves and adding ever more girth high in the sky.

Although they relied mostly on existing data, the team calculated growth rates at the level of the individual trees, whereas earlier studies had typically looked at the overall carbon stored in a plot.

Estimating absolute growth for any tree remains problematic, in part because researchers typically take measurements at a person's height and have to extrapolate the growth rate higher up. **But the researchers' calculations consistently showed that larger trees added the most mass.** In one old-growth forest plot in the western United States, for instance, trees larger than 100 centimeters in diameter comprised just 6% of trees, but accounted for 33% of the growth.

The findings build on a detailed case study published in **2010**, which showed similar growth trends for two of the world's tallest trees — the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) and the **eucalyptus** (*Eucalyptus regnans*), both of which can grow well past 100 meters in height. In that study, researchers climbed, and took detailed measurements of, branches and limbs throughout the canopy to calculate overall tree growth. Stephen Sillett, a botanist at Humboldt State University in Arcata, California, who led the 2010 study, says that the latest analysis confirms that his group's basic findings apply to almost all trees.

The results are consistent with the known reduction in growth at the leaf level as trees age. Although individual leaves may be less efficient, older trees have more of them. And in older forests, fewer large trees dominate growth trends until they are eventually brought down by a combination of fungi, fires, wind and gravity; the rate of carbon accumulation depends on how fast old forests turn over.

“It's the geometric reality of tree growth: bigger trees have more leaves, and they have more surface across which wood is deposited,” Sillett says.

The findings help to resolve some of these contradictions, says Maurizio Mencuccini, a forest ecologist at the University of Edinburgh, UK. “On an absolute scale, the old trees keep growing far more.”

The study has broad implications for forest management, whether in maximizing the yield of timber harvests or providing old-growth habitat and increasing carbon stocks. More broadly, the research could help scientists to develop better models of how forests function and their role in regulating the climate.

Appendix A-1
Technical Memorandum for Nadine Weil
02/16/17

Background:

This memorandum is intended to provide support to Nadine Weil regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) sequestration and emissions quantification related to implementation of the proposed Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan (SNRAMP). The proposed activities include removal of non-native trees, predominantly *Eucalyptus globulus* (blue gum eucalyptus), in Pacifica (Sharp Park Natural Area) and in San Francisco (in several parks and natural areas), followed by subsequent replanting of the areas with diverse native vegetation types, as stated in the “Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAMP” prepared by the firm Environmental Science Associates (ESA 2013).

The main purpose of this analysis is to provide a quantification using best practices of the carbon stored in the 18,448 trees proposed for removal at the Pacifica and San Francisco sites. Below and in the attached worksheet (“Euc_removal_GHG_021417.xls”), we provide detailed description of the quantification (including data and assumptions) used. Please note that much of the analysis uses the methods set forth in the US Forest Projects Protocol for California Air Resources Board’s compliance offset forest protocols for AB32 Cap and Trade. These are the most rigorous methods available. In addition, we calculated the amount of annual mean sequestration that would occur over the 20 year proposed timeline of the study. For the purposes of the study, all trees proposed for removal were assumed to be *Eucalyptus globulus*.

In summary, our results indicate the following:

Carbon Storage and Annual Carbon Sequestration

Parameter Measured	Sharp Park	San Francisco	Total
Loss of stored carbon for all trees	-144,383 MT CO2	-33,189 MT CO2	-177,572 MT CO2
Loss of annual sequestration (over 20 years)	-36,000 MT CO2	-8,275 MT CO2	-44,275 MT CO2

The numbers reported here (shown in negative to indicate emissions if the trees are harvested) are much larger than those reported in the ESA 2013 study used in the EIR. While limited information is available regarding the calculations employed in the ESA study, a principle reason for the difference may be the key assumption made in the ESA 2013 study that carbon sequestration ceases at 20 years of age. Based on best current scientific information (e.g. Nature 2014 and prior), we do not believe it is appropriate to assume that sequestration ceases at 20 years of age, or at any age for healthy trees, for that matter. More information to this effect is provided on page 3 of this memo.

Methodology:

Greenhouse gas calculations were conducted by converting volume of trees to biomass to carbon content to metric tons of CO₂e as follows.

Volume

Volumetric values were calculated in cubic feet from DBH values using local volume equations as follows:

$$\text{Vol (cf)} = a (\text{DBH})^b$$

Where a and b are known species-specific regression coefficients.

The following local volume equation was derived from Pillsbury and Reimer (1997), from local coastal California eucalyptus globulus stands:

- Blue-gum eucalyptus: $\text{Vol (cf)} = 0.055113 (\text{DBH})^{2.436970}$
- $= 0.055113 (28.0')^{2.436970}$

Note: Vol = volume outside bark

Converting Volume to Biomass:

Once volume was derived, the following steps were taken to determine the amount of carbon stored in the standing live Eucalyptus trees. The methodology used was the Air Resource Board (ARB) Cap and Trade AB32 US Forest Project Protocol for determining the amount of carbon in the live standing trees (ARB 2014; Appendix C, Section C.1):

- Multiply the cubic foot volume by the appropriate wood density factor by species. This results in pounds of biomass with zero moisture content, also referred to as biomass of dry weight.

A wood density factor of 49.92 lbs/ft³ was used, from the United States Forest Service's (USFS) Forest Inventory Analysis's wood density factor for *Eucalyptus globulus*.

- Biomass of dry weight= (volume * wood density)
- Multiply the biomass of dry weight values by 0.5 pounds of carbon/pound of wood to compute the total carbon weight.
- Divide the carbon weight by 2,204.6 pounds/metric ton to convert to metric tons of carbon.

Carbon estimates are presented in CO₂ equivalent rather than carbon (C) alone. Once carbon weight was derived, the total metric tons of CO₂ or CO₂e were calculated by multiplying carbon by 3.67, the molecular weight ratio of CO₂ to C (IPCC, 2007). Because the resulting carbon amounts were for trunks only, the following conservative ratio was used as a root to shoot ratio, added into the carbon total: 0.25.

Harvested Wood

The fate of the harvested wood determines the rate at which carbon is released into the atmosphere through decomposition. For example, if the wood is used in wood products, more carbon is retained than if it is allowed to decompose on the forest floor, or if it is mulched or sent to a landfill. Nowak et al 2002 modeled carbon content of wood over time following harvest, in two common tree disposal/utilization scenarios 1) mulching and 2) taking wood to landfills, two common tree disposal/utilization scenarios. Although no mulch decomposition studies could be found, studies on decomposition reveal that 37–56% of carbon in tree roots and 48–67% of carbon in twigs is released within the first 3 years. The remaining carbon was estimated to be lost within 20 years of mulching. For the purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that carbon in the harvested wood pool will be lost within 20 years; however a greater level of effort would be needed to determine this with greater accuracy.

Replacement with Native Vegetation following Removal of Trees:

The SNRAMP study states that removed trees at Sharp Park would be replaced with native grassland and coastal scrub over a 20 year period. ESA 2013 calculated replacement vegetation as grassland (rather than a scrub type) in the CalEEMod emissions estimator model. This is a conservative assumption given the scrub type would sequester more carbon than the grassland type. Replacement planting with trees in certain areas is also calculated in the ESA 2013 study.

A greater level of effort would be needed to prepare analysis for the replacement plantings. For the purposes of this report, the sequestration values for the replacement types are small compared to the numbers associated with the removal of trees.

False Assumption: Sequestration does not occur in trees 20 years and after

Based on best current scientific information (e.g. Nature 2014 and others), it is not appropriate to assume that sequestration ceases at 20 years of age. The study reported in Nature (2014) presents a global analysis of 403 tropical and temperate tree species, including *Eucalyptus* species, including 673,046 trees, demonstrating that for most species mass growth rate increases continuously with tree size. They found that the largest trees gained the most mass each year, capitalizing on their additional leaves and adding ever more girth high in the sky. The study finds that large, old trees do not act simply as senescent carbon reservoirs but actively fix large amounts of carbon compared to smaller trees. At the extreme, a single big tree can add the same amount of carbon to the forest within a year as is contained in an entire mid-sized tree. The apparent paradoxes of individual tree growth increasing with tree size despite declining leaf-level and stand-level productivity can be explained, respectively, by increases in a tree's total leaf area that outpace declines in productivity per unit of leaf area and, among other factors, age-related reductions in population density. The study's authors assert that their results resolve conflicting assumptions about the nature of tree growth, inform efforts to

understand and model forest carbon dynamics, and have additional implications for theories of resource allocation and plant senescence.

References:

ARB. 2014. Compliance Offset Protocol U.S. Forest Projects. California Air Resources Board. Adopted November 14 2014. Appendix C- Estimating Carbon in Wood Products. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2014/capandtrade14/ctusforestprojectsprotocol.pdf>

ESA. 2013. Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAMP. Environmental Science Associates.

HortScience. 2013. Diameter of Eucalyptus Trees in SF Natural Resource Areas. Memo. January 2013.

Nature 2014. Stephenson, NL, AJ Das, R Condit, SE Russo, PJ Baker, NG Beckman, DA Coomes, ER Lines, WK Morris, N Rüger, E Álvarez, C Blundo, S Bunyavejchewin, G Chuyong, SJ Davies, Á Duque, CN Ewango, O Flores, JF Franklin, HR Grau, Z Hao, ME Harmon, SP Hubbell, D Kenfack, Y Lin, JR Makana, A Malizia, LR Malizia, RJ Pabst, N Pongpattananurak, SH Su, IF Sun, S Tan, D Thomas, PJ van Mantgem, X Wang, SK Wisser, MA Zavala. 2014. 'Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size.' Nature, 507.

Nowak and Crane. 2002. Carbon storage and sequestration by urban trees in the USA. Environmental Pollution. 116: 381-389.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/743b/793c93faef72c9699a656f4052476d8fd649.pdf>

Pillsbury and Reimer. 1997. Tree Volume Equations for 10 Urban Species in California https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/documents/psw_gtr160/psw_gtr160_04e_pillsbury.pdf

USFS. 2009. United States Forest Service Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) regional species-specific equations for biomass.

cc: San Francisco Forest Alliance

Appendix A-1

Corrected Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan EIR

Carbon Storage in Standing Live Trees	Sharp Park (Pacifica)	San Francisco	TOTAL	Data source
# of trees to be felled	15,000	3,448		
# of acres	56			
Average tree density (trees per acre)	227.66	72.95		
Average DBH (inches)	28	28		HortScience data
Volume (Live tree Bole)				
Allometric equation for euc	Blue-gum eucalyptus: Vol (cf) = 0.055113 (DBH ^{2.436970})			Pillsbury Reimer 1997
regression coefficient a	0.06	0.06		
regression coefficient b	2.44	2.44		
DBH ^b	3,362.64	3,362.64		
Volume (ft ³)/tree	185.33	185.33		
Biomass to Carbon (for Standing Carbon Storage)				
	Dry Biomass of tree stem (in tons)= (volume * wood density)			
Wood Density (lbs/ft ³) value for Eucalyptus globulus	49.92	49.92		FIA data (USFS 2009)
Dry Biomass (in lbs)	9,251.44	9,251.44		
Carbon fraction (lbs C/lbs of wood)	0.50	0.50		ARB 2014
C/tree (lbs)	4,625.72	4,625.72		
C/tree (metric tons)	2.10	2.10		
C, ALL trees (metric tons)	31,473.19	7,234.64		
CO2e, ALL trees(metric tons)	115,317.78	26,507.71		
Per Tree CO2e (in metric Tons)	7.70	7.70		
Per Tree with roots (using root to shoot ratio 0.25) (in metric tons)	1.93	1.93		
Per Tree CO2e including roots (in metric tons)	9.63	9.63		
Carbon Emissions				
CO2e (in metric Tons)	115,506.62	26,551.12		
With roots (using root to shoot ratio 0.25)	28,876.65	6,637.78		IPCC 2007
CO2e (in metric Tons) including roots	144,383.27	33,188.90	-177,572.17	Carbon Emissions
Loss of Annual Carbon Sequestration				
Mean Annual Increment for Eucalyptus (MT CO2/tree/year)	0.12	0.12		ESA 2013
Per Year Sequestration (all trees combined)(MT CO2/year)	1,800.00	413.76		
x 20 years	36,000.00	8,275.20	-44,275.20	

Appendix A-1

Carbon Emissions using Diameter of Eucalyptus Trees

San Francisco Areas

Diameter

<u>Diameter (in)</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Trees Sampled</u>	<u>Average Diameter</u>	Volumes Carbon			MTCO2 total		
< 10	5	25	125	0.037037	2.784	0.16973	555.55556	94	
10 - 19	15	208	3,120	0.308148	40.491	1.9225	4622.2222	8,886	
20 - 29	25	181	4,525	0.268148	140.602	6.3448	4022.2222	25,520	
30 - 39	35	140	4,900	0.207407	319.228	14.0938	3111.1111	43,847	
40 - 49	45	74	3,330	0.10963	588.817	25.6875	1644.4444	42,242	
50 - 59	55	28	1,540	0.041481	960.429	41.5658	622.22222	25,863	
60 - 69	65	15	975	0.022222	1443.011	62.1165	333.33333	20,706	
70 - 79	75	2	150	0.002963	2045.136	87.6896	44.444444	3,897	
80 - 89	85	1	85	0.001481	2774.534	118.606	22.222222	2,636	
90 +	90	1	90	0.001481	3189.219	136.162	22.222222	3,026	
TOTAL		675	18,840	28	inches	TOTAL	49.43582	15,000	176,717

Carbon Emissions

Source: HortScience Memo, January 2013

Age

McBride and Froehlich (1984) noted that almost all of the older blue gum stands in San Francisco were even-aged, established in a brief period in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Therefore, many trees are over 100 years old.

Conclusion:

We used the smaller of the two total MT CO2 #'s to be conservative, but thought it would be interesting to see this as well.

Appendix B

Technical Memorandum

date February 19, 2013

to Nancy Clark; Barbara Sahm; Michael Li
Turnstone Consulting

from Chris Sanchez
Environmental Science Associates

subject Sequestration Study of Greenhouse Gases for SNRAMP

This Technical Memorandum is intended to provide an estimate of the greenhouse gas (GHG) sequestration and release potential related to implementation of the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan (SNRAMP). The SNRAMP would result in removal of non-native trees and their replacement with either native tree species or grasslands. These tree removal and replacement activities would occur at various restoration sites throughout the City of San Francisco as well as within the Sharp Park Natural Area (Sharp Park) in Pacifica, under the management of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. In addition, the SNRAMP outlines the City's program to propagate trees and plants at restoration sites throughout the City. Tree removal throughout San Francisco and in Sharp Park would result in initial CO₂ sequestration loss, whereas tree planting and planting of scrub, grasslands and herbaceous plants would result in carbon sequestration.

Methodology

The following analysis draws from a number of resources to estimate anticipated CO₂ sequestration gains and losses. These include the Urban Forestry Carbon Sequestration Workbook published by the U.S. Department of Energy,¹ the Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator published by the U.S. Forest Service², the *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry* published by the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)³ and the CalEEMod emissions estimator Model supporting calculations.⁴

Trees have a relatively high rate of CO₂ sequestration potential. However, while the sequestration rate increases over a period of time (assumed to be approximately 20 years, based on professional practice), after that point the accumulation of carbon in biomass slows with age, and eventually is completely offset by losses associated with tree clipping, pruning, and occasional death (IPCC, 2003). Sequestration rates for grasslands and herbaceous plants, which grow quickly, were assumed to be static. This analysis applied tree age for Blue Gum (eucalyptus trees would be the predominant species removed) provided by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to

¹ U.S. Department of Energy, Urban Forestry Carbon Sequestration Workbook, 2007

² U.S. Forest Service, Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator, 2005.

³ International Panel on Climate Control, National greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry*, 2003.

⁴ SQAQMD, CalEEMod Appendix A, 2011.

determine increases and losses in CO₂. The Urban Forestry Carbon Sequestration Workbook was used to estimate increasing carbon sequestration of new tree plantings over a 20 year period. The Tree Carbon Calculator from the USFS was used as a source of sequestration rates for specific tree types to be removed as provided by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department.⁵ The CalEEMod model supporting documentation provided the sequestration rates for grasslands.

Sequestration Losses and Gains from Tree Replacement in San Francisco

Data provided indicate that 3,443 trees would be removed in San Francisco over a 20 year period. While six species of tree were identified for removal, species-specific sequestration rates could not be identified for four of these species. However, the remaining two species (eucalyptus and pine) comprise over 96 percent of the trees to be removed. Consequently, sequestration rates for the remaining species were assigned to the known sequestration rates equally. Based on field data estimates provided by Hort Science⁶, approximately 2,942 of these trees to be removed are Blue Gum trees greater than 20 years of age for which sequestration has been slowed and is assumed by IPCC Good Practice⁷ to be offset by maintenance and mortality. Loss of sequestration from trees to be removed in San Francisco is presented in Table 1.

Over the same 20-year period that trees would be removed, new tree plantings would occur. These trees were assumed, based on data provided, to largely consist of California Live Oak. Consequently, these trees were assigned to the “medium hardwood” category in the Urban Forestry Carbon Sequestration Workbook. Carbon sequestration increases over time from replanting 3,448 trees are also presented in Table 1.

Table 1 - CO₂ Sequestration Losses and Gains from Tree Removal and Planting in San Francisco

Tree Removal – San Francisco	Estimated CO₂ Losses (-) and Gains (+)
Annual Sequestration loss (over 20 years)	- 54 MT CO ₂ /year
Tree Plantings – San Francisco	
Annual Sequestration gained (year 20)	+ 192 MT CO ₂ /year
Net sequestration gain at end of 20 year program =	+ 138 MT CO ₂ /year

Sequestration Losses and Gains from Tree Removal and Grassland and Scrub placement in Sharp Park

Data provided indicate that 15,000 trees would be removed in Sharp Park over a 20 year period. These tree species are almost entirely eucalyptus. Based on field data estimates provided by Hort Science⁵, approximately 13,500 of these trees to be removed are Blue Gum trees greater than 20 years of age for which sequestration has been slowed and is assumed by IPCC Good Practice to be offset by maintenance and mortality. Loss of sequestration from trees to be removed at Sharp Park is presented in Table 2.

Over the same 20-year period that trees would be removed from Sharp Park, trees would be replaced with native grassland and coastal scrub. Replacement vegetation was assigned a grassland sequestration rate as provided in the CalEEMod emissions estimator model. A specific sequestration rate for coastal scrub was not available and all

⁵ San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, Memorandum to Jessica Range of San Francisco Environmental Planning, November 27, 2012.

⁶ Hort Science, Memorandum to Jessica Range, January 17, 2013.

⁷ International Panel on Climate Control, National greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry*, 2003.

56 acres of replaced vegetation was assumed to be grassland for purposes of calculation. Carbon sequestration associated with planting approximately 56 acres of grasslands is also presented in Table 2.

Sequestration Gains from Annual Plantings of propagated plants and trees in San Francisco

Each year the Natural Areas Program propagates and plants over 10,000 plants in restoration sites throughout the City⁵. Each year these plantings mature and their GHG sequestration potential increases. Consequently, the plants, and particularly the trees, continue to increase their sequestration of CO₂ during the 20 year horizon of this analysis. Table 3 provides an estimate of this increase at the end of the 20 year planting window.

Table 2- CO₂ Sequestration Losses and Gains from Tree Removal and Grassland Planting in Sharp Park

Tree Removal – Sharp Park	Estimated CO₂ Losses (-) and Gains (+)
Annual Sequestration loss (over 20 years)	- 177 MT CO ₂ /year
Grassland Plantings – San Francisco	
Annual Sequestration gained (year 20)	+ 241 MT CO ₂ /year
Total Sequestration Gain (after 20 years)	+ 64 MT CO₂/year

Table3- CO₂ Sequestration Gains from Propagated Tree and Herbaceous Plant Planting in San Francisco

Tree Plantings	Estimated CO₂ Losses (-) and Gains (+)
Annual Sequestration gain (after 20 years)	+ 166 MT CO ₂ /year
Herbaceous Plant Plantings –	
Annual Sequestration gained (after 20 years)	+ 20 MT CO ₂ /year
Net sequestration gain at end of 20 year program =	+ 186 MT CO₂/year

Conclusion: Net Sequestration Changes Associated with the Implementation of the SNRAMP

At the end of the 20 year horizon window of the SNRAMP, there would be a calculated net gain of sequestration of approximately 388 MT of CO₂ per year. The primary contributing factor to this sequestration gain would be the removal of an aging eucalyptus tree population which would be replaced with much more efficiently sequestering tree and plant growth.

Tree Replacement in San Francisco Natural Areas

3443 tree would be removed in phases over the next 20 years, replaced with primarily native trees such as coast live oak, red alder, California buckeye, toyon, wax myrtle, and various willow trees.

Table 1 shows the trees proposed for removal by park and species

Table 1: Trees proposed for removal in SF:

	Eucalyptus	Pine	Cypress	Maytens	Tea	Acacia
Species specific data only for Eucalyptus & Pine>allot others evenly	3269	50	54	10	4	56
# of trees with active sequestration (see below)	3331	112				
	388.9	112				

All will be replaced by natives trees.
Coast live oak will be the most commonly planted replacement tree.

IPCC Good practice Guidance for Land Use and Forestry (2003) applies a 20 year window for calculating positive sequestration from trees.

Tree survey Results (Hort Science, 2013) :

Percentage of Blue Gum/Eucalyptus trees > 20 years =	90%
Number of Eucalyptus Trees with active positive sequestration =	326.9

TREE REMOVAL:

SF Tree:	Eucalyptus	Pine	Cypress	Matens	Tea	Acacia
CUFR Tree:	EUF181 (Eucalyptus globulus)	PICOS (Pinus contorta var. bolanderi)				
Sequestration Rate at 20 years =	260	163	N/A		N/A	N/A
kg CO2/tree/year =	118.00	74.23				
MT/tree/year =	0.12	0.07				
MT CO2 loss over 20 yrs:	46	8				
Sum MT CO2 loss over 20 years:	54	MT eCO2/yr				
Loss of sequestration in each year	2.71	MT eCO2/yr				

TREE REPLACEMENT:

# Trees	3448	
Tree type in Model:	Medium Hardwood	
Model has 15 year window		
Planting rate =	230 trees /year	
Total MT CO2 sequestered after 15 years=		178.18 MT eCO2
Total MT CO2 sequestered in Year 15 =		28.71 MT eCO2/yr
After 15 years annual increase =		2.79 MT eCO2/yr
Sequestration after 20 years =		192.13

Sharp Park Vegetation Replacement

15000 tree would be removed in phases over the next 20 years, replaced with grassland or coastal scrub.

Table 1 shows the trees proposed for removal by park and species

Table 1: Trees proposed for removal in SF:
Eucalyptus

15000

IPCC Good practice Guidance for Land Use and Forestry (2003) applies a 20 year window for calculating positive sequestration from trees.

Tree survey Results (Hort Science, 2013) :

Percentage of trees > 20 years =	90%
Number of Trees with active positive sequestration =	1500

TREE REMOVAL:

SF Tree:	Results: Eucalyptus
CUFR Tree:	EUFI81 (Eucalyptus ficifolia)
Sequestration Rate at 20 years =	260 lb CO ₂ /tree/yr
kg CO ₂ /tree/year =	118.00
MT/tree/year =	0.12
Total MT CO ₂ loss over 20 yrs:	177
Sum MT CO ₂ loss:	177
Annual MT CO ₂ loss over 20 years =	8.85 MT eCO ₂ /yr

GRASSLAND REPLACEMENT:

Seuestration Rate =	4.31 MT CO ₂ /acre
Grassland acreage =	56 acres
Sequestration =	241.36 MT eCO ₂ /yr

(Source CalEEMod, Appendix A;

Planting in San Francisco Natural Areas

10000 plantings/yr
 200 trees/yr
 9800 plants/yr

The number of plants the NAP propagates and plants in restoration sites throughout the City. Typically at least 200 of those plants being trees.

TREE PLANTINGS: This calculation used data in a separate workbook: Urban Forestry Carbon Sequestration Workbook

# Trees	200 per year	
Tree type in Model:	Medium Hardwood	
Model has 15 year window		
Planting rate =	200 trees /year	
Total MT CO2 sequestered after 15 years=		154.94 MT eCO2
Total MT CO2 sequestered in Year 15 =		24.96 MT eCO2/yr
After 15 years annual increase =		2.28 MT eCO2/yr
Total MT CO2 sequestered after 20 years=		166.34 MT eCO2

PLANTS

No data available for singular herbaceous plant types
 deep-rooted prairie grasses, forbs and **herbaceous perennials** have been found to sequester as much as 1/3 of a ton of carbon per acre per year (Rice, 2001).
 The above data from : <http://www.plna.com/content.asp?pl=99&contentid=99>

Sequestration rate for herbaceous plants =	0.33 Ton C/acre/year	
	1.22 Ton CO2/acre/yr	(based on C to CO2 conversion factor of 3.667 from Urban Forestry Carbon Seq
	1.11 MT CO2/acre/yr	

Convert plants to acres

Assume:	4 square feet (sf)/plant	
9800 plants =	39200 square feet	
	0.90 acre of planting/year	
Sequestration =	0.997 MT CO2/yr	
Sequestration after 20 years =	19.94 MT eCO2/yr	this is annual increase in sequestration that includes 20

2).

(ustration Workbook)

years of planting



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jessica Range, Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department
FROM: Lisa Wayne, Open Space Manager, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD)
CC: Karen Mauney-Brodek, Deputy Director for Park Planning, SFRPD
DATE: November 27, 2012
RE: SNRAMP Tree Removal and Replacement


This memorandum provides additional detail on tree removal and replacement practices pursuant to the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) and SFRPD's Natural Areas Program (NAP) current practices.

1. *Tree Removal:* The number and species of trees proposed for removal are detailed in the specific chapters of the SNRAMP and within SNRAMP Appendix F: Urban Forestry Statements. Appendix F of the SNRAMP explains how the number of trees to be removed from each Natural Area was determined, what defines a tree and other urban forestry practices. The number of trees to be removed from each Natural Area is also shown in Table 5 of the SNRAMP. Table 1 below, provides further detail on the species of tree proposed for removal under the SNRAMP. All tree removal proposed in the SNRAMP would be phased over 20 years.
2. *Tree Replacement in San Francisco Natural Areas:* In San Francisco, all trees that are proposed for removal would be replaced, although not necessarily within the same location or with the same species. A total of 3,448 trees would be removed in phases over 20 years and replaced with primarily native trees such as coast live oak, red alder, California buckeye, toyon, wax myrtle, and various willow trees (e. g., arroyo, shining, or yellow willow). Some non-native trees that provide high value habitat for wildlife may also be planted as replacement trees including Douglas fir, pines and other non-invasive conifers. The species that would be planted at a location would depend upon the particular habitat needs and ecosystem suitability. It is anticipated that coast live oak trees would be the most commonly planted replacement tree.
3. *Vegetation Replacement at Sharp Park Natural Area:* At Sharp Park, a total of 15,000 invasive trees, primarily blue gum eucalyptus, will be removed and replaced over 20 years with native grassland or coastal scrub such that all areas are restored with dense vegetative cover. It is anticipated that most of the 56 acres would be replanted with coastal scrub species.
4. *Planting in San Francisco Natural Areas:* Each year, the NAP propagates and plants over 10,000 plants in restoration sites throughout the City. Typically at least 200 of those plants being trees. Attached are four years of plant inventories from 2009 to 2013 that detail the plants that have been propagated and planted by NAP.

Table 1: Trees proposed for removal by park and species

Natural Area	Trees to be Removed by Species						Total trees to be removed
	Eucalyptus	Pine	Cypress	Maytens	Tea	Acacia	
Balboa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bayview Park	506	5	0	0	0	0	511
Bernal Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Billy Goat Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brooks Park	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Buena Vista Park	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Corona Heights		15	0	0	0	0	15
Dorothy Erskine	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Duncan- Castro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edgehill Mountain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Everson/Digby	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairmount Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Glen Canyon / O'Shaughnessy Hollow	120	0	0	0	0	0	120
Golden Gate Heights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Golden Gate Park/Oak Woodlands	12	0	0	10	4	56	82
Grandview Park	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Hawk Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
India Basin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior Greenbelt	140	0	0	0	0	0	140
Kite Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Merced	134	0	0	0	0	0	134
Lakeview/Ashton Mini Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
McLaren Park	759*	20*	30*	0	0	0	809
Mount Davidson	1570*	10*	20*	0	0	0	1600
Palou-Phelps	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pine Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rock Outcrop	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tank Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twin Peaks	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
15 th Ave Steps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sharp Park	14,800*	50*	150*	0	0	0	15,000

* Represents an estimate of species distribution



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

ATTACHMENT:

NAP Plant Inventories 2009 to 2013

Propagation Request and Inventory --2009/2010

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL														
<i>Abronia latifolia</i>																		
<i>Acaena pinnatifida</i> var. <i>californica</i>																		
<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	50	70	150	80	200	48	130	20	150	21	70	10	400	139	350	110	50	29
<i>Aesculus californica</i>		15	2	5			3	2		22	2	15		37	7	22	-7	15
<i>Alnus rubra</i>	30	160		33				5					30	160		38	30	122
<i>Amelanchier pallida</i>					40	16		5					40	16		5	40	11
<i>Anaphalis margaritacea</i>			10	35		45		10						45	10	45	-10	
<i>Angelica hendersonii</i>				10	16								16			10	16	-10
<i>Aquilegia formosa</i>	1				50	14	40					10	51	14	40	10	11	4
<i>Arctostaphylos crustacea</i> ssp. <i>Crustac</i>		1												1				1
<i>Arctostaphylos tomentosa</i> ssp. <i>Crusta</i>		1												1				1
<i>Aristolochia californica</i>		10		10		15								25		10		15
<i>Armeria maritima</i> ssp. <i>californica</i>																		
<i>Artemisia californica</i>	50		15	50	94			35		141	25	55	144	141	40	140	104	1
<i>Artemisia douglasiana</i>		16		10			15							16	15	10	-15	6
<i>Artemisia pycnocephala</i>		49	15	35										49	15	35	-15	14
<i>Aster chilensis</i>	200	12	120	50	21	33	50	15	175	104	30	10	396	149	200	75	196	74
<i>Athyrium filix-femina</i> var. <i>cyclosorum</i>			20	5		45		10						45	20	15	-20	30
<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>	360	45	85	45	100	40	60	30		40		35	460	125	145	110	315	15
<i>Baccharis pilularis</i> ssp. <i>consanguinea</i>			15	50				20	30	70	20		30	70	35	70	-5	
<i>Calamagrostis nutkaensis</i>					150		55						150		55		95	
<i>Cardamine californica</i> var. <i>integrifolia</i>					2		30				20		2		50		-48	
<i>Carex obnupta</i>						8								8				8
<i>Castilleja wightii</i>	10		50	25									10		50	25	-40	-25
<i>Ceanothus thyrsoiflorus</i>	16	188	50	45			10	15			10	52	16	188	70	112	-54	76
<i>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</i>						14	5	5	15			5	15	14	5	10	10	4
<i>Cirsium occidentale</i> var. <i>californicum</i>	15		25										15		25		-10	
<i>Cirsium occidentale</i> var. <i>occidentale</i>		12												12				12
<i>Cirsium quercetorum</i>									25	10	25		25	10	25			10
<i>Cornus sericea</i> ssp. <i>sericea</i>	60	26	35	5								5	60	26	35	10	25	16
<i>Danthonia californica</i> var. <i>americana</i>	18		10										18		10		8	
<i>Delphinium californicum</i>									25		25		25		25			
<i>Dichelostemma capitatum</i>			10		10		10						10		20		-10	
<i>Disporum hookeri</i>					8	1	1						8	1	1		7	1
<i>Dudleya farinosa</i>																		
<i>Elymus glaucus</i>			35		35		10		50		55		85		100		-15	
<i>Elymus multisetus</i>									50		50		50		50			
<i>Ericameria ericoides</i>		45		45										45		45		
<i>Erigeron glaucus</i>	300	12	350										300	12	350		-50	12
<i>Eriogonum latifolium</i>	37		60		200	57	165	15					237	57	225	15	12	42
<i>Eriophyllum confertiflorum</i>	1				1	20	22						2	20	22		-20	20
<i>Eriophyllum confertiflorum</i> var. <i>confertif</i>																		

Propagation Request and Inventory --2009/2010

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL												
Eriophyllum staechadifolium	25		35	5		23							25	23	35	5	-10	18
Festuca californica					100		100						100		100			
Festuca rubra			70	40				150	40	80			150	40	150	40		
Fragaria chiloensis	48		48										48		48			
Fragaria vesca					68		65						68		65			3
Gaultheria shallon					35		10						35		10			25
Heracleum lanatum	12	90	25		2	40	10	15		5	20	5	14	135	55	20	-41	115
Heteromeles arbutifolia		22	10	25	2	21		5	16				18	43	10	30	8	13
Heuchera micrantha					200		30						200		30			170
Holodiscus discolor		13		5			10	5						13	10	10	-10	3
Hordeum brachyantherum									50		30		50		30			20
Horkelia californica					100		80						100		80			20
Iris douglasiana	11	16	25	15	12	90	10		22		25		45	106	60	15	-15	91
Iris longipetala									311		75		311		75			236
Juncus effusus var. brunneus			10		65						50	10	65		60	10	5	-10
Juncus patens	45		50		120						50		165		100			65
Leymus xvancouverensis		10		10										10		10		
Lomatium caruifolium									8				8					8
Lomatium dasycarpum									1				1					1
Lonicera hispidula var. vacillans						4				4				8				8
Lonicera involucrata	130	80	35	10		5	5			45	10	5	130	130	50	15	80	115
Lotus scoparius		15	20						60		55		60	15	75		-15	15
Lupinus albigifrons var. collinus					110		174			8			110	8	174		-64	8
Lupinus chamissonis	37	49	20	45									37	49	20	45	17	4
Lupinus formosus var. formosus					60		141						60		141		-81	
Lupinus variicolor							175								-175		-175	
Melica californica					75	61	130	35		40	20		75	101	150	35	-75	66
Melica torreyana					25	25	25	25					25	25	25	25		
Mimulus aurantiacus	250	120	145	160	150	19	90	45	100	470	50	55	500	609	285	260	215	349
Mimulus cardinalis					48						25		48		25			23
Monardella villosa					10		25		90	40			100	40	25			75
Myrica californica	80	100		33								15	80	100		48	80	52
Nassella pulchra			10		50	46	115		150		40		200	46	165			35
Oemleria cerasiformis		20	5	30	45	80	40	5					45	100	45	35		65
Pentagramma triangularis					6								6					6
Perideridia kelloggii						32				20	55			52	55		-55	52
Phacelia californica	1	40	25		65	140	150	15					66	180	175	15	-109	165
Polypodium californicum										12				12				12
Polystichum munitum	25			85	120	455	60			48		50	145	503	60	135	85	368
Prunus ilicifolia							5	20		60		15	60		5	35	-5	25
Pteridium aquilinum var. pubescens			3					5					3		5			-2
Quercus agrifolia		60		15		51	3	17		15				126	3	32	-3	94

Propagation Request and Inventory --2009/2010

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA		
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL	
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	
Ranunculus californicus							20		65		25		65		45			20	
Rhamnus californica	50	35	45	85	145	75	15	20	359	35	25	40	554	145	85	145	469		
Rhamnus crocea					3								3				3		
Ribes menziesii					1								1				1		
Ribes sanguineum var. glutinosum		5	80	50	225	240	70				25	20	225	245	175	70	50	175	
Rosa californica	6	49		25									6	49		25	6	24	
Rosa gymnocarpa							15								15		-15		
Rubus parviflorus	100	63	50	25			25						100	63	75	25	25	38	
Rubus ursinus	6		10	10									6		10	10	-4	-10	
Salix lasiolepis										20				20				20	
Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra								10								10		-10	
Salvia spathacea										14	10			14	10		-10	14	
Sambucus mexicana		44								11				55				55	
Sambucus racemosa var. racemosa			25	15	100	25							100	25	25	15	75	10	
Satureja douglasii									16			25	16			25	16	-25	
Scrophularia californica	100	159	110	140	21	40		10	150	218	50	25	271	417	160	175	111	242	
Sedum spathulifolium					21					3			21	3			21	3	
Senecio aronicoides											20				20		-20		
Sidalcea malvaeflora					37		89		182	3	30		219	3	119		100	3	
Silene scouleri ssp. grandis									50		25		50		25		25		
Silene verecunda ssp. verecunda					32	28	25						32	28	25		7	28	
Sisyrinchium bellum										65	65			65	65		-65	65	
Solanum umbelliferum																			
Stachys ajugoides var. ajugoides						7						10		7		10		-3	
Symphoricarpos albus var. laevigatus		22		5										22		5		17	
Tellima grandiflora					138		65						138		65		73		
Triteleia laxa			10		9		20		12		10		21		40		-19		
Vaccinium ovatum						21	30			5				26	30		-30	26	
Viola pedunculata							25		45		10		45		35		10		
Woodwardia fimbriata					6								6				6		
Wyethia angustifolia		6					20				20			6	40		-40	6	
	2,074	1,683	1,920	1,371	3,133	1,884	2,478	419	2,357	1,589	1,232	472	7,564	5,156	5,630	2,262	1,934	2,894	

Propagation Request and Inventory --2010/2011

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA		
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL	
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL															
Abronia latifolia																			
Achillea millefolium	350	40	24	58	400	60	220	10			35	15	750	100	279	83	471	17	
Aesculus californica		6		3				5		22	2			28		10		18	
Agoseris grandiflora		38									5			38		5		33	
Allium dichlamydeum							45		2		10		2		55			-53	
Alnus rubra	305	132											305	132			305	132	
Amelanchier pallida					45	17		25					45	17		25	45	-8	
Anaphalis margaritacea		40		30				15					40		45			-5	
Angelica hendersonii					16								16				16		
Aquilegia formosa					125	14	20				10		125	14	30		95	14	
Arabis blepharophylla					290		20						290		20		270		
Arctostaphylos tomentosa ssp. Crusta		1												1				1	
Aristolochia californica		34		15		5		5						39		20		19	
Artemisia californica				10		101	30	30	9	9	35	15	9	110	65	55	-56	55	
Artemisia douglasiana		19		10			10	10						19	10	20	-10	-1	
Artemisia pycnocephala	20	191		30									20	191	30		20	161	
Aster chilensis	139	48	10	24		12	25	10	25	35	10	25	164	95	45	59	119	36	
Athyrium filix-femina var. cyclosum		3				11				3				17				17	
Baccharis pilularis	90			35		14	10	15	19	39	10	10	109	53	20	60	89	-7	
Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea				10				10	19	38			19	38		20	19	18	
Calamagrostis nutkaensis					20	78	20						20	78	20			78	
Cardamine californica var. integrifolia							10				10				20			-20	
Carex obnupta										6				6				6	
Castilleja wightii	80		25	10									80		25	10	55	-10	
Ceanothus thyrsiflorus		89		75			5	33			15	15		89	20	123	-20	-34	
Cirsium occidentale var. californicum		14	25											14	25			-25	14
Cirsium occidentale var. occidentale																			
Cirsium quercetorum									3	8		10	3	8		10	3	-2	
Cornus sericea ssp. sericea	140	20									5		140	20	5		135	20	
Corylus cornuta var. californica	5	7		5									5	7		5	5	2	
Danthonia californica var. americana		12	10							13				25	10			-10	25
Delphinium californicum									25		10		25		10		15		
Disporum hookeri					60	1	5						60	1	5		55	1	
Elymus glaucus		20							50	26		10	50	46		10	50	36	
Elymus multisetus									25	20	10	10	25	20	10	10	15	10	
Ericameria ericoides	100			35			15						100		15	35	85	-35	
Erigeron glaucus	100	121		78			50						100	121	50	78	50	43	
Eriogonum latifolium	10	60	10		125	25	140	10					135	85	150	10	-15	75	
Eriophyllum confertiflorum						7		10						7		10		-3	
Eriophyllum staechadifolium		80		30										80		30		50	
Erysimum franciscanum	50	80		10									50	80		10	50	70	
Festuca californica					50	20	45						50	20	45		5	20	

Propagation Request and Inventory --2010/2011

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL												
Festuca rubra		26		34			25		100	14	15		100	40	40	34	60	6
Fragaria chiloensis	149	6	12	60									149	6	12	60	137	-54
Fragaria vesca					22								22				22	
Fritillaria affinis					4								4				4	
Garrya elliptica						60								60				60
Gaultheria shallon					37		30						37		30		7	
Grindelia hirsutula							10								10		-10	
Heracleum lanatum	12	50				11	35	5			15		12	61	50	5	-38	56
Heteromeles arbutifolia				35				2						37		37		
Heterotheca sessiliflora ssp. bolanderi										9	5		9		5			4
Heuchera micrantha					250		20						250		20		230	
Holodiscus discolor		3		5		7	20	25			180			190	20	30	-20	160
Hordeum brachyantherum									90		30		90		30		60	
Horkelia californica					70		40						70		40		30	
Iris douglasiana	13	32		10	37	40	50	37			15		50	72	65	47	-15	25
Iris longipetala											225	20		225		20		205
Juncus effusus var. brunneus	25			25					50	80	10		75	80	10	25	65	55
Juncus lesueurii				48											48			-48
Juncus patens					28	30					10		28	30	10		18	30
Koeleria macrantha					50		50						50		50			
Leymus xvancouverensis		46		48										46		48		-2
Lomatium caruifolium						4								4				4
Lomatium dasycarpum									3				3				3	
Lonicera hispidula var. vacillans						5								5				5
Lonicera involucrata	100	149									5		100	149	5		95	149
Lotus scoparius									1				1				1	
Lupinus albifrons var. collinus					225		140			7	10		225	7	150		75	7
Lupinus chamissonis		62		65										62		65		-3
Lupinus formosus var. formosus					85		140		22		10		107		150		-43	
Lupinus variicolor					510		160						510		160		350	
Melica californica						5				20	15			25		15		10
Melica torreyana						5								5				5
Mimulus aurantiacus		36		75		96	70	40		51	35	25		183	105	140	-105	43
Mimulus cardinalis											10				10		-10	
Mimulus guttatus					14								14				14	
Monardella villosa					6	1	30			85	30		6	86	30	30	-24	56
Myrica californica	50	30									5	5	50	30	5	5	45	25
Nassella pulchra			10			40		30	50	13	15		50	53	10	45	40	8
Oemleria cerasiformis				45	36	132		15					36	132		60	36	72
Pentagramma triangularis					104	3							104	3			104	3
Perideridia kelloggii						15	5				15			15	5	15	-5	
Phacelia californica		20		20	400		130	10					400	20	130	30	270	-10

Propagation Request and Inventory --2010/2011

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL
Polygonum paronychia	22	15		15									22	15		15	22	
Polypodium californicum						46								46				46
Polystichum munitum				175	360	279					30		360	279		240	360	39
Prunus ilicifolia				15						26				26		20		6
Pteridium aquilinum var. pubescens				10											15			-15
Quercus agrifolia		134		18		36				30				200		25		175
Ranunculus californicus									29				29				29	
Rhamnus californica	12	17	10	90		123	13	35	50	319	20	15	62	459	43	140	19	319
Rhamnus crocea						7								7				7
Ribes divaricatum				15											15			-15
Ribes malvaceum																		
Ribes menziesii		1												1				1
Ribes sanguineum var. glutinosum				75	420	214	5	5			25		420	214	30	80	390	134
Rosa californica	5	21		5									5	21		5	5	16
Rosa gymnocarpa		1					20							1	20		-20	1
Rubus parviflorus	100	40		40									100	40		40	100	
Rubus ursinus	3		24										3		24		-21	
Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra										10				10				10
Salvia spathacea										45		30		45		30		15
Sambucus mexicana		39												39		3		36
Sambucus racemosa var. racemosa				10	200	18		8	100		10		300	18	10	18	290	
Satureja douglasii					21						10		21		10		11	
Scrophularia californica				132		74	10	10		188	35			262	45	142	-45	120
Sedum spathulifolium					30								30				30	
Senecio aronicoides											5				5		-5	
Sidalcea malvaeflora					37		75	20		78		15	37	78	75	35	-38	43
Silene scouleri ssp. grandis					6				7		10		13		10		3	
Silene verecunda ssp. verecunda																		
Sisyrinchium bellum		40			200			40	200		25	15	400	40	25	55	375	-15
Solanum umbelliferum										9				9				9
Solidago sp.							10								10		-10	
Stachys ajugoides var. ajugoides											10				10		-10	
Symphoricarpos albus var. laevigatus				5	10	13							10	13		5	10	8
Tellima grandiflora					46								46				46	
Triteleia laxa							10								10		-10	
Vaccinium ovatum					180		10	5					180		10	5	170	-5
Viola adunca							20								20		-20	
Viola pedunculata							10		12		10		12		20		-8	
Woodwardia fimbriata						10		20						10		20		-10
Wyethia angustifolia							10		4				4		10		-6	
	1,880	1,823	160	1,543	4,519	1,639	1,818	550	895	1,645	490	352	7,294	5,107	2,468	2,445	4,826	2,662

Propagation Request and Inventory --2011/2012

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL												
Achillea millefolium	100	444	115	376	200		260				55		300	444	430	376	-130	68
Aesculus californica										39				39				39
Allium dichlamydeum					90		10		100		10		190		20			170
Alnus rhombifolia												5				5		20
Alnus rubra	20	126											20	126		5	20	121
Amelanchier pallida					46	53		15					46	53		15	46	38
Anaphalis margaritacea		18	25		32	14	20	20					32	32	45	20	-13	12
Angelica hendersonii						16								16				16
Aquilegia formosa						76		25						76		25		51
Arabis blepharophylla					96		25						96		25			71
Arctostaphylos tomentosa ssp. Crusta		1												1				1
Aristolochia californica		24		10		6								30		10		20
Artemisia californica		20	30	20		62		55		62	5	45		144	35	120	-35	24
Artemisia douglasiana	1		10								10		1		20		-19	
Artemisia pycnocephala		164	10	100										164	10	100	-10	64
Aster chilensis	2	74	60		139	60	30	75	28		5	30	169	134	95	105	74	29
Athyrium filix-femina var. cyclosorum						12								12				12
Baccharis pilularis	38	33	20	65	58	120	15	65		20	20	25	96	173	55	155	41	18
Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea		20	10	20				10	25				25	20	10	30	15	-10
Bromus carinatus ssp. carinatus																		
Calamagrostis nutkaensis																		
Calystegia purpurata ssp. purpurata	36		40										36		40		-4	
Camissonia cheiranthifolia	145		100										145		100		45	
Cardamine californica var. integrifolia							20		25				25		20		5	
Castilleja wightii	78		50										78		50		28	
Ceanothus thyrsiflorus	9	125	15	20				35	2	23		50	11	148	15	105	-4	43
Chlorogalum pomeridianum						15		10	15				15	15		10	15	5
Cirsium occidentale var. californicum	20		65										20		65		-45	
Cirsium quercetorum						3	10				15			3	25		-25	3
Cornus sericea ssp. sericea		164								20		5		184		5		179
Corylus cornuta var. californica		33		5										33		5		28
Danthonia californica var. americana		10							31		20		31	10	20		11	10
Delphinium californicum											10				10		-10	
Dichelostemma capitatum					7								7				7	
Disporum hookeri					38	7							38	7			38	7
Dodecatheon hendersonii					2		10		12				14		10		4	
Dryopteris arguta						2								2				2
Dudleya farinosa	86		70										86		70		16	
Elymus californicus																		
Elymus glaucus					10						5		10		5		5	
Ericameria ericoides		37		35										37		35		2
Erigeron glaucus	180	162	75	149	44		20						224	162	95	149	129	13

Propagation Request and Inventory --2011/2012

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL												
Eriogonum latifolium	89	401		380	33		40	20			20		122	401	60	400	62	1
Eriophyllum staechadifolium	12		15	10									12		15	10	-3	-10
Erysimum franciscanum	100		25										100		25		75	
Festuca rubra	10		45										10		45		110	
Fragaria chiloensis	161		125										161		125		36	
Fragaria vesca					16								16				16	
Garrya elliptica					1	49		7					1	49		7	1	42
Gaultheria shallon						3								3				3
Grindelia hirsutula var. maritima					75		25						75		25		50	
Grindelia maritima																		
Heracleum lanatum	12	18					10	15			15		12	18	25	15	-13	3
Heteromeles arbutifolia				5		15	3	5			2			15	5	10	-5	5
Heuchera micrantha					15		10						15		10		5	
Holodiscus discolor	3			10		145		30					3	145		40	3	105
Hordeum brachyantherum									50		10		50		10		40	
Horkelia californica					50		20						50		20		30	
Iris douglasiana		80	100		7	6	40	30					7	86	140	30	-133	56
Iris longipetala						17				174		60		191		60		131
Juncus effusus var. brunneus					150						10		150		10		140	
Juncus effusus var. pacificus			15												15		-15	
Juncus lesueurii			20												20		-20	
Juncus patens					25						10		25		10		15	
Juncus phaeocephalus						2								2				2
Koeleria macrantha					7								7				7	
Leymus xancouverensis		9	20											9	20		-20	9
Lomatium caruifolium										4				4				4
Lonicera hispidula var. vacillans	15					4							15	4			15	4
Lonicera involucrata	103	26									5		103	26		5	103	21
Lotus scoparius	50												50				50	
Lupinus albifrons var. collinus							40		50				50		40		10	
Lupinus chamissonis	70	280		305									70	280		305	70	-25
Lupinus formosus var. formosus							120		175				175		120		55	
Lupinus varicolor					45		110						45		110		-65	
Melica californica					50						5		50		5		45	
Melica torreyana						10								10				10
Mimulus aurantiacus		520	35	380		197	85	105	46	88	80	25	46	805	200	510	-154	295
Monardella villosa					45	20	40		45			10	90	20	40	10	50	10
Myrica californica		34										2		34		2		32
Nassella pulchra					200		150				10		200		160		40	
Oemleria cerasiformis				15		107		30						107		45		62
Pentagramma triangularis					53								53				53	
Pentagramma triangularis ssp. triangul																		

Propagation Request and Inventory --2011/2012

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL
Perideridia kelloggii					55		10				25		55		35		20	
Phacelia californica	150			100	138	100	100	45					288	100	100	145	188	-45
Polygonum paronychia	28		40										28		40		-12	
Polypodium californicum						18								18				18
Polystichum munitum				130	160	340		20					160	340		150	160	190
Prunus ilicifolia										8				8				8
Pteridium aquilinum var. pubescens							10							10			-10	
Quercus agrifolia		180		5		31		2		35				246		7		239
Rhamnus californica	7	5		85	42	31		65	20	237	20	30	69	273	20	180	49	93
Rhamnus crocea						7								7				7
Ribes divaricatum			15												15		-15	
Ribes malvaceum										22				22				22
Ribes menziesii		4												4				4
Ribes sanguineum var. glutinosum		202		75			15	45						202	15	120	-15	82
Rosa californica	100	8		10									100	8		10	100	-2
Rosa gymnocarpa	50	2				7							50	9			50	9
Rubus parviflorus		70		5	3								3	70		5	3	65
Rubus ursinus			25		3								3		25		-22	
Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra		10												10				10
Salvia spathacea										5				5				5
Sambucus mexicana		37							23		5		23	37	5		18	37
Sambucus racemosa var. racemosa		5		5	80				75				155	5		5	155	
Satureja douglasii					48	10			10				58	10			58	10
Scrophularia californica	85		70		100	40	105			39	25		185	79	200		-15	79
Sedum spathulifolium					30		25						30		25			5
Sidalcea malvaeflora					94		40				5		94		45			49
Silene scouleri ssp. grandis									9		10		9		10			-1
Silene verecunda ssp. verecunda					222		20						222		20			202
Sisyrinchium bellum					20		25		200		30		220		55			165
Solanum umbelliferum										23				23				23
Solidago californica							20								20			-20
Solidago spathulata ssp. spathulata	100		100										100		100			
Symphoricarpos albus var. laevigatus		10		5		22	10							32	10	5	-10	27
Tanacetum camphoratum	106		50										106		50			56
Tellima grandiflora					32		30						32		30			2
Triteleia laxa					15		10				10		15		20			-5
Vaccinium ovatum						194								194				194
Viola adunca	6				2	10		20					8	10		20	8	-10
Viola pedunculata					15		10		59		15		74		25			49
Woodwardia fimbriata					4								4					4
Wyethia angustifolia					10		10			20		20	10	20	10	20		
	1,972	3,356	1,395	2,325	2,607	1,831	1,553	749	1,220	819	537	312	5,799	6,006	3,485	3,386	2,314	2,620

Propagation Request and Inventory --2012/2013

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL														
Achillea millefolium		8	10	30	50	92	40	30					50	100	50	60		40
Aesculus californica								5		60		15		60		20		40
Allium dichlamydeum					177				286				463				463	
Alnus rubra		52						5			7			52		12		40
Amelanchier pallida						88		35						88		35		53
Anaphalis margaritacea						78		25						78		25		53
Angelica hendersonii					6			25					6			25	6	-25
Aquilegia formosa											20					20		-20
Aristolochia californica		10		10										10		10		
Armeria maritima ssp. californica	80	20		20									80	20		20	80	
Artemisia californica		65		15		140		53		40		35		245		103		142
Artemisia douglasiana	1	24										10	1	24		10	1	14
Artemisia pycnocephala		265		260										265		260		5
Aster chilensis	56			20		45		10		35		10	56	80		40	56	40
Aster radulinus									2				2				2	
Athyrium filix-femina var. cyclosorum						7								7				7
Baccharis pilularis	94	96		97	12	49		42		25		25	106	170		164	106	6
Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea		20								175			175	20			175	20
Berberis pinnata					1								1				1	
Bromus carinatus ssp. maritimus																		
Camissonia cheiranthifolia		50		40										50		40		10
Camissonia ovata									158				158				158	
Cardamine californica var. integrifolia					2		20		8				10		20		-10	
Carex obnupta										30				30				30
Castilleja wightii	19		50	20									19		50	20	-31	-20
Ceanothus thyrsiflorus	15	38		32				5				20	15	38		57	15	-19
Chlorogalum pomeridianum					15								15				15	
Chlorogalum pomeridianum var. divaric																		
Cirsium occidentale var. californicum	45	7	50	5									45	7	50	5	-5	2
Clarkia rubicunda																		
Cornus sericea ssp. sericea		25						10		125		60		150		70		80
Corylus cornuta var. californica		24		30				15						24		45		-21
Delphinium californicum									119	8	25		119	8	25		94	8
Dichelostemma capitatum					196								196				196	
Disporum hookeri						30		10						30		10		20
Dodecatheon clevelandii ssp. patulum									13				13				13	
Dodecatheon hendersonii									98				98				98	
Elymus glaucus									5		5		5		5			
Ericameria ericoides		65		89										65		89		-24
Erigeron glaucus	115	107		87				20					115	107		107	115	
Eriogonum latifolium	50	140		87			40	5			10	10	50	140	50	102		38
Eriophyllum confertiflorum								5								5		-5

Propagation Request and Inventory --2012/2013

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL														
Eriophyllum staechadifolium		100		15										100		15		85
Erysimum franciscanum	5	60	5	20									5	60	5	20		40
Eschscholzia californica																		
Festuca californica						40		15						40		15		25
Festuca rubra		70		50						30	30			100	30	50	-30	50
Fragaria chiloensis	20	61		80									20	61		80	20	-19
Fragaria vesca					24			24					24			24	24	-24
Fritillaria affinis					1								1				1	
Garrya elliptica					18	39		40					18	39		40	18	-1
Gaultheria shallon						4								4				4
Gnaphalium californicum						40								40				40
Gnaphalium canescens ssp. beneolen																		
Heracleum lanatum		110		45				40						110		90		20
Heteromeles arbutifolia	8	40		23				5					8	40		28	8	12
Heuchera micrantha					15								15				15	
Holodiscus discolor				51		91		40						91		96		-5
Hordeum brachyantherum								155		146				146		155		-9
Horkelia californica						20		15						20		15		5
Iris douglasiana	725	223		10	650	180		150				100	1,375	403		260	1,375	143
Iris longipetala										24				24				24
Juncus effusus var. brunneus		50						30				20		50		50		
Juncus lesueurii		20		20										20		20		
Juncus patens	41												41				41	
Lasthenia californica																		
Leymus xvancouverensis		26		20										26		20		6
Lonicera hispidula var. vacillans		72		40	4	3							4	75		40	4	35
Lonicera involucrata	50	36						85		52		22	50	88		107	50	-19
Lotus scoparius		6		25										6		25		-19
Lupinus albifrons var. collinus					50			80						50		80		-30
Lupinus arboreus																		
Lupinus bicolor																		
Lupinus chamissonis		115		109										115		109		6
Lupinus formosus var. formosus								160		257				257		160		97
Lupinus variicolor					11			40						11		40		-29
Mimulus aurantiacus	130	134		44				45				10	130	134		99	130	35
Monardella villosa					27	40		40		10		10	27	50		50	27	
Myrica californica		32						5						32		5		27
Nassella pulchra					200			100				10	200			110		90
Oemleria cerasiformis				15		25		5				5		25		25		
Oenothera elata ssp. hookeri																		
Pentagramma triangularis					50								50					50
Perideridia kelloggii					42							10	42			10		32

Propagation Request and Inventory --2012/2013

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA		
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL	
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL													
Phacelia californica	10			34		69		40	25				10	10	69	40	69	-30	
Phacelia distans																			
Phacelia malvifolia																			
Plantago erecta																			
Polygonum paronychia		20		5											20		5		15
Polypodium californicum						4			2						4		2		2
Polystichum munitum				400		376			25				10		376		435		-59
Prunus ilicifolia				8							8				8		8		
Pteridium aquilinum var. pubescens				3											3				3
Quercus agrifolia	35	146		131		24		5		27			15	62	170		151	62	19
Rhamnus californica	10	4		95		69					86		60	10	159		155	10	4
Rhamnus crocea					6	6		5						6	6		5	6	1
Ribes divaricatum				15													15		-15
Ribes malvaceum											19		20		19		20		-1
Ribes menziesii	5	1												5	1			5	1
Ribes sanguineum var. glutinosum		76		50		52		35					35		128		120		8
Rosa californica	3	90				9		30						3	99		30	3	69
Rosa gymnocarpa		5		24		12									17		24		-7
Rubus parviflorus		31		15				25							31		40		-9
Rubus ursinus				95	130	70								130	70		95	130	-25
Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra		6													6				6
Salvia spathacea								20			26				26		20		6
Sambucus mexicana		7		15											7		15		-8
Sambucus racemosa var. racemosa				112		130		40					20		130		172		-42
Satureja douglasii					80	15		5					10	80	15		15	80	
Scrophularia californica		40		40		20		10							60		50		10
Sedum spathulifolium					25		20							25		20		5	
Sidalcea malvaeflora											20	10			20	10		-10	20
Silene scouleri ssp. grandis										9				9				9	
Silene verecunda ssp. verecunda					42		50							42		50		-8	
Sisyrinchium bellum										50		10		50		10		40	
Solanum umbelliferum											3				3				3
Solidago spathulata ssp. spathulata	65	65		65										65	65		65	65	
Symphoricarpos albus var. laevigatus		4			120		5							120	4		5	120	-1
Symphoricarpos mollis							15										15		-15
Tanacetum camphoratum		100		90											100		90		10
Tellima grandiflora				80				10					12				102		-102
Triteleia laxa					98									98				98	
Vaccinium ovatum						101		50							101		50		51
Viola adunca					6	6		60			5			6	11		60	-54	11
Viola pedunculata										46				46				46	
Woodwardia fimbriata	35							5		24	10		8	59	10		13	59	-3

Propagation Request and Inventory --2012/2013

Species	ZONE 1				ZONE 2				ZONE 3				TOTALS				DELTA	
	INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		INVENTORY		REQUESTS		LUKE	GAL
	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL	LUKE	GAL
	1,617	2,769	115	2,683	2,058	1,974	650	1,306	1,277	762	110	589	4,952	5,505	875	4,578	4,077	927



Memorandum

DATE: January 17, 2013
TO: Jessica Range, SF Planning Department
FROM: Jim Clark *Me*
SUBJECT: Age of blue gum in San Francisco's Natural Area Parks

As coordinator for the environmental analysis for the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan proposed by San Francisco Rec and Park, you asked if I could provide an estimate of the percentage of blue gums (*Eucalyptus globulus*) in these forests that are at least 20 years or older.

Blue gums in Natural Area parks

I have assessed over 800 blue gums in Pine Lake, Glen Canyon, Mount Davidson and McLaren Parks (Table 1). My work focused on trees adjacent to areas of high use such as streets, playgrounds, adjacent properties and parking lots. The assessment was limited to tree 6" or greater in diameter. I examined 675 trees with one stem and 146 with 2 or more stems.

Table 1. Diameter distribution and condition of blue gum. Pine Lake, Glen Canyon, McLaren and Mount Davidson. Recreation & Park Department. San Francisco CA.

Diameter Class (in.)	Condition					Avg. Condition	No. of Trees
	Dead	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent		
<10	--	24	1	--	--	1.8	25
10 to 19	--	151	45	12	--	2.2	208
20 to 29	--	72	76	25	8	2.8	181
30 to 39	--	41	66	30	3	2.9	140
40 to 49	--	11	40	21	2	3.2	74
50 to 59	--	1	13	13	1	3.5	28
60 to 69	--	--	8	7	--	3.5	15
70 to 79	--	1	1	--	--	2.5	2
80 to 89	--	--	--	1	--	4.0	1
90 & >	--	--	1	--	--	3.0	1
Multistem	--	46	84	16	--	2.8	146
Total	--	347	335	125	14	2.7	821

Condition rating: 0 = dead. 1=poor. 5=excellent.
 Trees with more than one stem were categorized as multistem.

Among the 675 trees with one stem, approximately 33% were less than 20" in diameter. Almost half of the trees were between 21" and 40" while about 18% were larger than 40". In these four parks, trunk diameters varied from 6" to 90". Tree condition was poorer in small diameter trees.

In general the blue gum stands I examined were a mix of large diameter, tall dominant trees, smaller diameter codominant and intermediate trees and small diameter suppressed individuals. In some cases, small diameter trees were present along the edge of the stand.

All stands had a large variation in trunk diameter. Although I made no measurements, tree height appeared to vary just as widely. I think that all of the trees were planted at the same time. Some grew faster than others, becoming large and dominant. Because blue gum is intolerant of shade, slow growing trees became less vigorous and remained small in size.

Blue gum stands

Stands of blue gums in San Francisco were created by planting. McBride and Froehlich (1984) noted that almost all of the older blue gum stands in San Francisco were even-aged, established in a brief period in the late 1800s and early 1900s. It is likely that some blue gum stands in San Francisco parks including Glen Canyon, McLaren, Mount Davidson and Pine Lake Parks were planted after this time.

I did not observe, however, any recent plantings of this species. All of the stands I observed were mature in development.

Historical photos viewed on Google Earth illustrate overall patterns of vegetation. For the four Natural Area Parks, it is clear that vegetation was well-established by 1993. This would suggest that the large majority of blue gums are over 20 years old.

Blue gum can reproduce by both seed and root sprouts. McBride and Froelich noted the absence of seedling development and the presence of root sprouts in their assessment of old blue gum stands in Golden Gate Park, Mountain Lake Park and the Presidio. I don't know if the small diameter trees I observed at the edge of some stands were sprouts or seedlings. Whatever their origin, such small trees were not common.

Given my observations of blue gum in Glen Canyon, McLaren, Mount Davidson and Pine Lake Park, I estimate that at least 90% are more than 20 years old.

Please contact me with any questions.

10 Vegetation

The program calculates GHG emissions associated with the vegetation activities of land use change and the planting of new trees.

The program calculates GHG emissions from vegetation activities according to the IPCC protocol for vegetation since it has default values that work well with the information typically available for development projects. This method is similar to the CAR Forest Protocol⁵⁴ and the Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator⁵⁵, but it has more general default values available that will generally apply to all areas of California without requiring detailed site-specific information⁵⁶.

10.1 Land Use Change

A development which changes land use type results in changes in CO₂ sequestration from the atmosphere which would not have been captured had there been no land-type change.

Overall Change in Sequestered CO₂ [MT CO₂]

$$= \sum_i (SeqCO_2)_i \times (area)_i - \sum_j (SeqCO_2)_j \times (area)_j$$

Where:

SeqCO ₂	=	mass of sequestered CO ₂ per unit area [MT CO ₂ /acre]
area	=	area of land for specific land use type [acre]
i	=	index for final land use type
j	=	index for initial land use type

Overall change in sequestered CO₂ is the summation of sequestered CO₂ from initial land use type multiplied by area of land for initial land use type subtracted by the summation of sequestered CO₂ from final land use type multiplied by area of land for final land use type.

There is no reduction in GHG emissions associated with preservation of a land.

SeqCO₂

The mass of sequestered CO₂ per unit area [MT CO₂/acre] is dependent on the specific land use type. The program uses default CO₂ sequestration values from CCAR for each land use that will be preserved or created:

⁵⁴ CCAR. 2007. Forest Sector Protocol Version 2.1. September. Available at: http://www.climate registry.org/resources/docs/protocols/industry/forest/forest_sector_protocol_version_2.1_sept2007.pdf

⁵⁵ Available at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/urban-forests/ctcc/>

⁵⁶ The CAR Forest Protocol and Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator are not used since their main focus is annual emissions for carbon offset considerations. As such they are designed to work with very specific details of the vegetation that is not available at a CEQA level of analysis.

this is equivalent CO₂ stored in mature vegetation per acre
 this is not a sequestration rate as in MT CO₂/acre/year

Land Use	Sub-Category	Default CO ₂ accumulation per acre (MT CO ₂ / acre)
Forest Land	Scrub	14.3
	Trees	111
Cropland	--	6.20
Grassland	--	4.31
Wetlands	--	0

The EIR uses the 4.31 figure as an annual CO₂ capture rate of CO₂/acre/year.
 It is not a rate.

The default annual CO₂ is calculated by multiplying total biomass (MT dry matter/acre) from IPCC data by the carbon fraction in plant material (0.47), then using the ratio of molecular weights (44/12) to convert from MT of carbon (C) to MT of carbon dioxide (CO₂).

Vegetation Type

Vegetation types are defined by IPCC as follows:

(i) Forest Land

This category includes all land with woody vegetation consistent with thresholds used to define Forest Land in the national greenhouse gas inventory. It also includes systems with a vegetation structure that currently fall below, but *in situ* could potentially reach the threshold values used by a country to define the Forest Land category.

(ii) Cropland

This category includes cropped land, including rice fields, and agro-forestry systems where the vegetation structure falls below the thresholds used for the Forest Land category.

(iii) Grassland

This category includes rangelands and pasture land that are not considered Cropland. It also includes systems with woody vegetation and other non-grass vegetation such as herbs and brushes that fall below the threshold values used in the Forest Land category. The category also includes all grassland from wild lands to recreational areas as well as agricultural and silvi-pastoral systems, consistent with national definitions.

(iv) Wetlands

This category includes areas of peat extraction and land that is covered or saturated by water for all or part of the year (e.g., peatlands) and that does not fall into the Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland or Settlements categories. It includes reservoirs as a managed sub-division and natural rivers and lakes as unmanaged sub-divisions.

Area

The user must specify area of land in acres for specific final and initial land use types. These area changes include not only the area of land that will be converted to buildings, but also areas disrupted by the construction of utility corridors, water tank sites, and associated borrow and

grading areas. Areas temporarily disturbed that will eventually recover to become vegetated will not be counted as vegetation removed as there is no net change in vegetation or land use.⁵⁷

10.2 Sequestration

Planting trees will sequester CO₂ and is considered to result in a one-time carbon-stock change. Trees sequester CO₂ while they are actively growing. The amount of CO₂ sequestered depends on the type of tree.

sequestration rate only comes in to calculate carbon storage in a mature landscape

$$\text{Total Sequestered CO}_2 = (\text{Growing Period} \times \sum_{i=1}^n [\text{Sequestration } i \times \text{Trees } i])$$

Where:

Growing Period = Growing period for all trees, expressed in years (20).

n = Number of broad species classes.

Sequestration i = Default annual CO₂ accumulation per tree for broad species class i .

Trees i = Number of net new trees of broad species class i .

Total Sequestered CO₂ is the growing period for all trees multiplied by the summation of annual CO₂ accumulation multiplied by the number of new trees per broad species class.

Growing Period

The program assumes the IPCC active growing period of 20 years. Thereafter, the accumulation of carbon in biomass slows with age, and will be completely offset by losses from clipping, pruning, and occasional death. Actual active growing periods are subject to, among other things, species, climate regime, and planting density. Note that trees may also be replaced at the end of the 20-year cycle, which would result in additional years of carbon sequestration. However, this would be offset by the potential net release of carbon from the removal of the replaced tree.

⁵⁷ This assumption facilitates the calculation as a yearly growth rate and CO₂ removal rate does not have to be calculated. As long as the disturbed land will indeed return to its original state, this assumption is valid for time periods over 20 years.

Sequestration

The program uses default annual CO₂ accumulation per tree for broad species class as follows:

Broad species class	Default annual CO₂ accumulation per tree¹ (MT CO₂/ year)
Aspen	0.0352
Soft maple	0.0433
Mixed hardwood	0.0367
Hardwood maple	0.0521
Juniper	0.0121
Cedar/larch	0.0264
Douglas fir	0.0447
True fir/Hemlock	0.0381
Pine	0.0319
Spruce	0.0337
Miscellaneous ²	0.0354

1. IPCC's carbon (C) values converted to carbon dioxide (CO₂) using ratio of molecular weights (44/12).
2. Average of all other broad species classes. To be assumed if tree type is not known.



Management Areas		Trails	
	management area 2		secondary
	management area 3		proposed

Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s Street-Map 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1-foot resolution - 2001; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.

Map created May 29, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSUIGIS).



5348

DRAFT
May 29, 2005





FIGURE 6.23 - 5
MANAGEMENT AREAS
AND TRAIL PLAN
Interior Greenbelt
Significant Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan
San Francisco, California





Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s Street-Map 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1-foot resolution - 2001; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.

Map created May 28, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSUGIS).



DRAFT
May 28, 2005






FIGURE 6.24 - 4
MANAGEMENT AREAS
AND TRAIL PLAN
Dorothy Erskine
Significant Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan
San Francisco, California



Management Areas		Trails	
	management area 1		primary
	management area 2		secondary
	management area 3		



DRAFT
May 30, 2005

0 187.5 375 750
Fect


FIGURE 6.19 - 12
MANAGEMENT AREAS
AND TRAIL PLAN

McLaren Park
Significant Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan


San Francisco, California




Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s StreetMap 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1 Foot Resolution - 2001; City of San Francisco Department of Public Works, San Francisco; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.



Map created May 30, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSUIGIS).



Management Areas		Trails	
	management area 1		primary
	management area 2		secondary
	management area 3		



DRAFT
May 30, 2005




FIGURE 6.19 - 13
MANAGEMENT AREAS
AND TRAIL PLAN

McLaren Park

Significant Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan


San Francisco, California




Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s StreetMap 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1 Foot Resolution - 2001; City of San Francisco Department of Public Works, San Francisco; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.



Map created May 29, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSUIGIS).



Management Areas		Trails	
	management area 1		primary
	management area 2		secondary
	management area 3		



DRAFT
May 30, 2005






FIGURE 6.19 - 11
MANAGEMENT AREAS
AND TRAIL PLAN

McLaren Park
Significant Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan
San Francisco, California

20 total



Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc.'s StreetMap 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1 Foot Resolution - 2001; City of San Francisco Department of Public Works, San Francisco; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.



Map created May 29, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSUIGIS).

Appendix **E** Our forests regenerate. There are many young trees.



Bayview Hill, large trees killed by NAP supporters surrounded by young trees



McLaren Park



McLaren Park It is not just eucalyptus saplings we worry about.



McLaren Park



Mt Davidson



Mt. Davidson, girdled tree with younger trees



Mt Davidson, there would be more saplings in the photo above, but they have been cut.



Edge Hill has lots of young trees



where they have not been cut down.

Appendix F Trail Closure Maps


Below are maps of the Natural Areas showing trail closures implemented by the Natural Areas Program since 2006. Some have been physically decommissioned by placing logs, branches and other obstructions in the trails. Many have been fenced off. Others can still be accessed, but to do so is punishable by a fine. The latter applies to Natural Areas where "Designated Trails" have been identified for the public and users would be disobeying the "Stay On Designated Trails" signs.

On the maps, trails are marked in three colors. The green trails are the Designated Trails where we are still allowed to walk. The red trails are ones identified in the SNRAMP as unwanted and planned for closure. The purple trails are identified in the SNRAMP as Designated Trails to remain open. However, the NAP has chosen to close those as well. We are now forbidden to walk on the red and purple trails. Each park map is followed by a skeleton map highlighting the tiny amount of parkland now open to the public. The only public use of NAP parkland is along those green lines. The rest is off-limits.

The maps contain text indicating the linear feet of access control fence installed by the NAP.

The SNRAMP states that 26% of the existing trails would be closed, leaving us with 30.8 miles of trail. Based on what they have done so far, the NAP is actually closing 51% of the trails in Natural Areas. If we extrapolate the actual closure rate to all of the Natural Areas, the 41 miles of existing and planned trails documented in the SNRAMP will be reduced to 20.9 miles.

The loss in trails is nothing compared to the loss in actual parkland available to the public. Assuming the average trail is 10 feet wide and the NAP only closes the trails disclosed in the SNRAMP (both very generous assumptions based on what we have seen so far), we can calculate how much parkland remains for the public. 30.8 miles of 10 foot wide trail only amounts to 37 acres. This is 3.4% of the 1100 acres available to the public before the new access restrictions. At the actual trail closure rate we will only be left with 25 acres.




Bayview Hill

- original 4610'
- closed per SNRAMP 1752'
- additional closed 1607'
- remaining 1251'
- trail loss 76%

Access Control Fencing
 chain link 430'
 split rail 80'

5361



Bayview Hill

The park is now just the road and the two trails.
 There are historic WPA trails, walls and staircases
 inside the road loop that could be rebuilt.

Billy Goat Hill Trails

- original 2660'
- closed per SNRAMP 598'
- additional closed 1412'
- remaining 650'
- trail loss 76%




Soils, Land Features and Trails

- slope
- chert
- [unlabeled]

Billy Goat Hill Park

The park is now just
the green lines






Corona Heights Trails

- original 6230'
- closed per SNRAMP 1589'
- additional closed 1896'
- remaining 2745'
- trail loss 56%

Land Features, and Trails


- escarpment
- parking lot

- access control fence
- split rail 936'
- low wire 500'



Corona Heights Park

The park is now just
the green lines



nd Trails


flow

or marsh area

Is over bedrock

Glen Canyon Park

The park is now just the green lines



Neighborhood access loss


Neighborhood access loss

Notice how they have closed the entire west side of the park.

X neighborhood access loss

Grandview Trails

- original 1893'
- closed per SNRAMP 239'
- additional closed 627'
- remaining 1027'
- trail loss 46%



split rail access control fence 856 feet


Soils, Land Features and Trails

- | | | | |
|--|------------|--|-------------------------|
| 1A | slope | | primary earthen trail |
| 5369 | escarpment | | steps |
| | | | secondary earthen trail |

X neighborhood
access loss

Grandview Park

The parks is
just the green lines




Hawk Hill Trails

original 1639'
closed per SNRAMP 702'
additional closed 937'
remaining 0'
trail loss 100%

16
NAP "determined no designated trails or recreation"


- Soils, Land Features, ar
- 16 sandy soil
 - secondary cart
 - closed trail
 - Natural Area I
 - vegetation ser



Hawk Hill Park

It is not a park anymore

NAP "determined no designated
trails or recreation"




Soils, Land Features, and Trails

- 1A slopes
- 1B paths and trails
- 3H tank pad
- 4A chert
- 4B sandstone
- 5 bare ground
- 12 wet/seepage or marsh area
- 14 thin rocky soils over bedrock

- earthen road
- primary earthen trail
- steps
- secondary earthen trail
- closed trail

Mt. Davidson

- original
- closed per SNRAMP
- extra closed 362'
- remaining trail loss



Twin Peaks Trails

- original 9400'
- closed per SNRAMP 2779'
- extra closed 3736'
- remaining 2885'
- trail loss 69%

X Neighborhood access loss

X Neighborhood access loss



X Neighborhood access loss

Twin Peaks Park

The park is now just the green lines

X Neighborhood access loss

5375

Natural Areas Program Cycling Prohibition

February 19, 2016
Tom Borden**The Situation**

In February 2015 RPD installed new signs in our parks. There are two types, one for regular park areas and one for areas managed by the Natural Areas Program. The NAP signs flatly state, "Stay on Designated Trails. No Bicycles." The NAP signs appear on both paved and earthen trails. The signs for regular park areas make no mention of bicycles. Needless to say, San Franciscans who cycle are extremely unhappy about the signs that now prohibit bike riding on large portions of Twin Peaks, Mount Davidson, Bayview Hill, McLaren Park and even the road on the floor of Glen Canyon.



Letters were sent to RPD and to the Recreation and Park Commission noting cyclists objections and asking for an explanation. A formal response was returned by RPD General Manager Phil Ginsberg on March 3, 2015. Critical assertions made in the email are:

- Cycling is not allowed on NAP controlled lands except for two trails
 - In all other parklands, bikes are not allowed on earthen trails.
- "The signs posted in McLaren Park are correct and are consistent with long-standing regulations."

This is a dramatic change in policy. The only existing cycling prohibitions are on certain trails in Golden Gate Park marked by signs at their street entrances. SFRPD currently runs a children's mountain biking program, apparently in violation of their own "longstanding regulations". Over the past 5 years, NAP invited cyclists to volunteer thousands of hours to build trails in Golden

Gate Park Oak Woodlands, Interior Greenbelt and McLaren Park. The NAP staff did not tell the cyclist volunteers it was illegal to ride bicycles on the trails they were building.

The SF Park Code contains no rules forbidding cyclists from riding on dirt trails in any of our parks. SECTION. 3.04. BRIDLE PATHS makes it clear that bicycles are expected to be on these earthen trails.

Sunshine Request 1 Alex Aldrich April 22, 2015 “Bicycle Policy”

An information request submitted to RPD under the SF Sunshine Ordinance and a subsequent hearing at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Complaints Committee proved that there are no “long standing regulations” and in fact, no records whatsoever that support the assertion that bikes are not allowed on earthen trails.

The Sunshine request asked for copies of all regulations that prohibit or restrict bicycle riding on paved or un-paved paths and trails in City parks. In response, RPD provided no existing documents related to regulations, rather they provided a letter written in response to the Sunshine request by RPD Operations Manager Dennis Kern. In that he says, “We post signs restricting or prohibiting bicycle riding on trails at specific park sites where we believe that such activity would either be inappropriate (*e.g.*, the trail is too narrow or not constructed to support biking activity) – or – potentially destructive (*e.g.*, creating land erosion conditions, compaction, endangering sensitive natural habitat).” This confirmed the public’s understanding, that cycling is generally allowed, but that RPD might choose to limit cycling in specific areas by posting signs per Park Code 3.02. This is the logical inverse of what Phil Ginsberg wrote.

The SOTF issued Order of Determination 15087 for RPD’s failure to disclose there were no documented regulations. Further, the SOTF issued a second letter to RPD, “Codification of Recreation and Park Department Policies”, admonishing them for failure to follow proper process.

Sunshine Request 2 Tom Borden June 24, 2015 “information request regarding off-road cycling”

A second sunshine request was lodged to find out what sorts of problems trail cyclists were causing, who decided to put “No Bicycles” on the signs and why. RPD was able to produce some emails from gardeners working the west end of Golden Gate Park complaining about rude cyclists riding off trail and a video shot by “outlaw” cyclists from a bike event in 2008 that shows riders skidding alongside a staircase in Glen Canyon. That is all.

RPD was not able to produce any documentation about the decision making process to exclude bicyclists from NAP managed land, other than a document titled “Offroad Mountain Biking on City Parkland Trails” which was written after the signs were installed. This document claims “The language for both signs was vetted through a review process inclusive of staff participation from Operations, Capital and Public Affairs; as well, as review of existing regulatory guiding documents (*i.e.* Park Code, SNRAMP, etc..).” This document is clearly a fabrication. RPD was unable to produce any documents related to this interdepartmental vetting process. The documents produced under the Sunshine request show that staff in Operations, Capital and Public Affairs were unaware the NAP was putting the “No Bicycles” text on their signs. Obviously, the Park Code was not reviewed, or the bicycle references would have been discovered. The SNRAMP does not disclose any plan for the wholesale exclusion of bicycle riders. The paper erroneously claims riding bicycles on earthen trails is not considered a “hazardous recreational activity” under California Government Code 831.7.(a) and (b) and therefore a major liability concern for RPD.

The produced documents show the anti-cycling signage was a unilateral NAP initiative. This was undertaken without public input and without public notice. It was not based on a demonstrated need to prohibit cycling in the NAP areas.

Clearly, RPD is withholding documents related to the decision to post No Bicycles on the signs. Tom filed a complaint with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the task force found RPD to be in violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. See SOTF Order of Determination 15159.

Sunshine Request 3 Alex Aldrich December 2015

In a third Sunshine Request, Alex asks for documents related to several topics.

Question: Please share the document(s) that show who and when the decision was made to put no bikes on the signs erected in February 2015.

Answer: The Department has no documents responsive to this request.
RPD continues their refusal to produce the documents.

Question: Is the recent no off trail bike sign a rule or a regulation?

Answer: It's neither. There are no rules or regulations that restrict or prohibit bikes on earthen trails in all parkland.

RPD finally admits that Phil Ginsberg's assertion was wrong. Why did it take so long?

Violation of BOS Resolution 653-02 and CEQA

Posting of the signs with language "Stay on Designated Trails. No Bicycles." by the Natural Areas Program violates BOS Resolution 653-02 which prohibits the NAP from imposing, "Trail closures, or restrictions on access and recreation" until the BOS has approved the natural areas management plan (SNRAMP). The BOS has not approved the management plan. The EIR for the SNRAMP has not even been released and certified by the Planning Commission. See the sister document, BOS 653-02 violation, for more information.

The closure of NAP controlled park lands to cycling violates the will of the public as expressed in BOS 653-02 and violates CEQA.

List of Related Documents:

Email from Phil Ginsberg, March 3, 2015

Sunshine Response from Denny Kern, May 1, 2015

SOTF Order of Determination 15087

SOTF Codification of Recreation and Park Department Policies

SOTF Order of Determination 15159

On 3/3/2015 2:41 PM, Ginsburg, Phil (REC) wrote:

> Dear Tom,

>

> I spoke with Dan Schneider earlier today, but am also reaching out to you

> and others copied on your email.

>

> We recognize your concerns and take all public input about our parks quite

> seriously. The Recreation and Park Department manages over 4,000 acres of

> land and over 30 miles of urban trails. Our goal is to provide

> opportunities for safe, fun spaces that welcome all types of uses

> including mountain biking. Currently mountain biking is allowed on

> earthen trails in the Interior Greenbelt and in portions of the Oak

> Woodlands in Golden Gate Park. In all other parklands, bikes are not

> allowed on earthen trails.

>

> Recently, newly designed parks signs went up in a variety of park

> locations and admittedly have created some confusion. Incorrect signs were

> posted in the Interior Greenbelt; mountain biking is permitted on the

> Interior Greenbelt trails. We are in the process of fixing those and

> expect to have that work completed in the next two weeks.

>

> The signs posted in McLaren Park are correct and are consistent with

> long-standing regulations. Many of the trails in McLaren are too narrow,

> run through sensitive natural habitat and are not constructed to support

> mountain biking. However, as we have discussed, the department is working

> to expand opportunities for mountain biking in McLaren. First, as you

> know, we are partnering with the San Francisco Urban Riders to build a

> bike park in McLaren. Second, the Department would like to work with

> SFUR and other interested mountain bikers by engaging in a park-wide

> circulation study that will help us identify opportunities and constraints

> for expanding mountain biking trails in McLaren and, perhaps, elsewhere.

>

> We recognize that mountain biking is a healthy recreational opportunity

> and pledge to continue to work with SFUR to expand opportunities for

> mountain biking throughout the city.

>

> Best,

>

> Philip A. Ginsburg

> General Manager

> San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

On Fri, May 1, 2015 at 4:34 PM, Kern, Dennis (REC) <dennis.kern@sfgov.org> wrote:

Mr. Aldrich,

I am responding on behalf of the Department to the queries in your recent Sunshine Ordinance request regarding bicycle riding on paths and trails in City parks.

Our approach to this issue has been one of park stewardship and land management, which is our mission. We post signs restricting or prohibiting bicycle riding on trails at specific park sites where we believe that such activity would either be inappropriate (*e.g.*, the trail is too narrow or not constructed to support biking activity) – or – potentially destructive (*e.g.*, creating land erosion conditions, compaction, endangering sensitive natural habitat). We have continuously posted such signage since at least 2008 and it has taken various formats. See first two attachments for examples of such signage that preceded our recent revised sign format (which you'll find at the third attachment).

Our authority for the posting of these signs is Park Code 3.02 which states “*No person shall willfully disobey the notices, prohibitions or directions on any sign posted by the Recreation and Park Commission or the Recreation and Park Department.*” This Park Code section was enacted in 1981 and has been in force since then.

We recognize that bicycling and mountain biking are healthy recreational opportunities and we are actively working with SF Urban Riders to expand opportunities for this activity throughout the City.

I hope that this information is helpful.

*Dennis Kern
Director of Operations
San Francisco Recreation & Parks*

Appendix H Access Control Fence Photos

Much more split rail public access control fencing has been installed in parks than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.



Grandview



Grandview




Glen Canyon The EIR claims these fences are for public safety.



Glen Canyon, The runner squeezed past the fence to access a newly closed trail.



Glen Canyon Is public safety an issue here?



Corona Heights cattle pen
The steel fencing above the quarry is pre-NAP for public safety.



Corona Heights



Corona Heights



Corona Heights



Bayview Hill Fence installed in 2016 closing off NW quadrant of the park.



Bayview Hill This gate used to be open. Now it is locked shut, closing off the SW quadrant of the park.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 - 170047 FW: PLEASE REJECT THE APPEAL RELATING TO REC & PARK'S SNRAMP EIR
Date: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:42:43 AM
Attachments: [LRT Supervisor Norman Yee - 1-5-17.pdf](#)

From: Bo Links [mailto:bo@slotelaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SF Public Golf Alliance <info@sfpublicgolf.com>
Subject: PLEASE REJECT THE APPEAL RELATING TO REC & PARK'S SNRAMP EIR

Dear Supervisors:

I fully support the certified EIR prepared for the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (the so-called "SNRAMP") prepared by the Recreation and Park Department. As you know, there is an appeal hearing relating to this EIR, and it will be heard by the Board on February 28th.

I am writing to request that you **REJECT** the appeal.

I have already written to Supervisor Yee about this issue, as I am a District 7 resident. I have attached my detailed letter to Supervisory Yee, asking him to reject this appeal and allow the SNRAMP to move forward.

By way of background, I am a native San Franciscan and a public course golfer. I have played our public golf courses for over 55 years and Sharp Park is the course with the most profound historic roots. It has been loved by generations of players for over 80 years. It should be preserved and this plan allows for that, while also providing for much needed habitat restoration.

This is work that has been endorsed by every public agency – state and federal – to have considered the issue. It is a small group of anti-golf forces who are trying now to scuttle this effort. They are misguided and flat out wrong. Sharp Park was an uninhabitable salt marsh before legendary architect Alister MacKenzie transformed it into a fresh-water oasis. Indeed, it was Dr. MacKenize's work that created habitat in the first place. The endangered species who occupy the area adjacent to the golf course weren't even documented there until approximately 15 years after the course had opened for public play. This EIR includes steps that will allow this historic asset to be preserved AND allow for habitat enhancement -- a "win-win" situation if ever there was one.

The EIR is well thought out, is based upon two decade of input from diverse voices from throughout San Francisco. There have been many, many public hearings; a multitude of public comments; and rigorous analysis by staff. All of that combined to produce the EIR that is coming before you. This EIR amply satisfies the legal requirements for inclusiveness and careful analysis. Most importantly, it represents responsible stewardship of our precious assets and I hope you will reject the pending appeal and allow this much needed, and well-conceived plan to move forward.

It really is time to move on. Stopping now, or severing out particular elements, would be an irresponsible step backward.

PLEASE REJECT THIS APPEAL.

Thank you for considering my views.

--

BO LINKS

SLOTE, LINKS & BOREMAN, LLP

One Embarcadero Center, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94111-3619

P 415.393.8099 direct dial

F 415.294.4545

E bo@slotelaw.com

Visit us on the Internet - www.slotelaw.com

This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or are not authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message.

BO LINKS
585 Ortega Street
San Francisco, CA 94122

Cell 415-509-4133
Email bo.links.sfo@gmail.com

January 5, 2017

**BY REGULAR MAIL &
EMAIL TO Norman.Yee@sfgov.org**

Supervisor Norman Yee (District 7)
City Hall, Room 244
1 Cr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94012-4689

**Re: Approval of Final EIR for Recreation & Parks Department's
Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan**

Dear Supervisor Yee:

I live in District 7 resident and am a lifelong resident of San Francisco. I am also an avid golfer and golf-historian, having written extensively on the legacy of our City's treasured public courses, which I have played since 1961. I am also a co-founder (along with my colleague, Richard Harris) of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, a non-profit 6,500-member volunteer community organization dedicated to the preservation of the City's public golf courses, which are priceless recreational and historic assets.

I am writing to urge you to support and approve the final EIR for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP EIR) that has been prepared by the hard-working and dedicated staff of the Recreation & Parks Department. The SNRAMP EIR recently was approved by the Planning Department and certified by the Recreation and Parks Department. Now is the time to move forward to implement the thoughtful and visionary plan contained in that EIR. It could be that there will be no appeal from the recent certification of the SNRAMP EIR and, if so, it will stand and our local officials will be able to move forward with responsible action to preserve and enhance our local park facilities.

But if there is an appeal and the issue comes before you, we hope we can count on your support. Our 6,500 members, many of whom live in your District, are counting on that. They are looking to you, as our Supervisor, to support the SNRAMP EIR so this much needed (and long planned) work can proceed.

I hasten to add that the SNRAMP EIR represents two decades of tireless effort to embrace responsible stewardship and practical vision, all with an eye to making sure all of our City parklands, large and small, wherever located and whatever particular

constituency they serve, will be here for future generations to love and enjoy just as we have done for all these years.

There is no question that the Sharp Park Golf Course (aptly nicknamed the "Poor Man's Pebble Beach") is a significant historical asset worthy of preservation. Although located in Pacifica, Sharp Park is one of the City's legacy properties—it was gifted to the City a century ago. The golf course has been in place for almost 85 years.

Sharp Park Golf Course is no ordinary golf course. It has been recognized as a prized historic asset, not just here in San Francisco but across the country and around the world. This is a living, breathing masterpiece, created during the "Golden Age" of American golf course architecture by Dr. Alister MacKenzie, a man honored and lauded the world over as perhaps the greatest golf architect who ever lived. He is golf's Frank Lloyd Wright, its Monet, its Michelangelo, if you will. Among MacKenzie's fabled courses—there are many spread around the Globe on four continents—is Augusta National, the home of the Masters Tournament (one of golf's four major championships).

The true miracle here is that most of the courses built by Dr. MacKenzie are private. But Sharp Park is a remarkable and refreshing exception. It has always been public in every sense of the word. Since the day it opened for play in April of 1932, Sharp Park Golf Course has been affordable and accessible to a wide variety of local golfers. No less an icon than the late Ken Venturi, a San Franciscan to his core, a U.S. Open Champion and a Hall of Fame golf commentator, called Sharp Park "Dr. Mackenzie's great gift to the American public golfer."

Sharp Park is beautiful and cries out for restoration, as recognized in the SNRAMP EIR that may come before you. Our organization is dedicated to that restoration and we are raising the philanthropic funds to carry through on that promise.

One thing you should keep in mind is that the creation of this golf course was the brain child of none other than John McLaren—the very man who gave us Golden Gate Park and so many other local parks that San Franciscans have long enjoyed. McLaren was a visionary and in creating Sharp Park with Dr. MacKenzie, he gave us something very, very special.

It also needs be said that Sharp Park is more than just a golf course. It has become home to two endangered species (the California Red-Legged Frog and the San Francisco Garter Snake). But the golf course does not threaten those species. Indeed, it is the golf course and its responsible maintenance that created the very habitat occupied by those very species today, for both the frog and the snake are *fresh-water* creatures. They cannot sustain themselves in salt-infested, brackish environs, which is what Sharp Park was before 1930. Dr. Mackenzie literally transformed a barren salt marsh into a fresh water oasis when he created Sharp Park over eight decades ago.

The SNRAMP EIR represents a remarkable balance of many interests. It should be approved and much needed habitat restoration work should proceed. Approving this EIR is, simply put, the right thing to do.

Supervisor Norman Yee
Re: Approval of SNRAMP EIR
January 5, 2017
Page 3

I am happy to come meet with you to discuss this issue any time. I'm sure you will be hearing from other residents of your District, and from others as well, and I hope that as you listen to those voices, you will bear these thoughts in mind. That said, I hope for and expect your support for the SNRAMP EIR. To cast it aside, or to sever out Sharp Park, is a terrible waste of public funds and the 20-year effort to bring this Master Plan to the point where it can become a reality for our collective benefit.

Thank you for your consideration.


Respectfully,
BO LINKS

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SNRAMP FEIR appeal
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:28:53 AM

From: Stan Zeavin [mailto:margstan@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 9:05 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SNRAMP FEIR appeal

Honorable Supervisors,

We are writing as residents of Pacifica to appeal the recent approval of the SNRAMP FEIR.

We Pacificans are very concerned about Sea Level Rise (SLR) and the eventual loss of our beaches and homes. The SNRAMP FEIR includes changes to the golf course that also have the potential to cause harm to both the beach and homes.

There is almost nothing in the FEIR addressing SLR. In the last election all nine counties on the Bay passed a tax to increase the size of the wetlands knowing that these wetlands are one of the best ways to control storm-powered flooding from rising seas. Rather than allowing for the Laguna Salada wetland to migrate with sea level rise, the FEIR approves raising the golf course east of the lagoon, which will essentially trap its wetlands between the golf course and the rising ocean. With this plan, the wetlands will shrink and eventually disappear. By raising the height of the fairways, you restrict the lagoon, which then cannot migrate away from the sea as it rises due to climate change. The lagoon will become saltier due to salt intrusion through the berm as the sea rises. The golf redesign approved in this FEIR will permanently limit the lagoon and place it and its inhabitants in mortal danger.

The Sharp Park golf course is definitely NOT a natural area. The changes to the golf course are not within the natural area. Including these changes in the SNRAMP FEIR invalidates the entire plan. This is a cynical manipulation of Natural Areas planning and the FEIR to hide golf changes.

The relationship between the golf course and Laguna Salada wetlands is far too complex to be dumped in with all the other natural areas. The importance of the wetlands as home to endangered and threatened species deserves far more careful consideration than to merely serve as mitigation for golf. The FEIR approves moving habitat closer to the threat of the ocean and invites the endangered species you are trying to protect into an area where they are even more at risk. The long term effect to the lagoon and its endangered and threatened populations will be disastrous.

Another serious consideration for Pacifica is the possibility that by raising the golf course the natural storm drainage into Laguna Salada will be further compromised. With every major storm, Pacifica is currently required to set up pumps to prevent flooding homes on Lakeside Avenue and Clarendon Road. That storm water should naturally drain into the lagoon.

SFRPD talks about protecting the wetlands, but most everything they are planning can be scientifically shown to eventually destroy them. Do the right thing for both Pacifica and the wetlands and remove the golf course from the FEIR.

Sincerely,

Margaret Goodale
Stan Zeavin
Laurie Goldberg
Noel Blincoe
Celeste Langille
Kristen Schwind
Hal Bohner
Cynthia Kaufman
Susanne Jonas
Victor Carmichael
Joanne Gold
Chaya Gordon

From: [Geoff Herman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:33:16 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Regards

Geoff Herman

VP- Sales and Marketing



Phone: 415-447-4212

Fax: 415-447-4181

422 Presidio Ave, San Francisco, CA 94115

geoff@riskguardins.com

www.riskguardins.com

Your referrals are the highest compliment you can give us. If you know of someone who can benefit from our services please let us know



A proud affiliate of Pacific Interstate Insurance Brokers (PIIB)

E-MAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, copying, or storage of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited.

From: [Pete Shoemaker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:39:28 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

**Sincerely,
Pete Shoemaker**

From: Jvdrills@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Support the Park and Rec Plan
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:41:52 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I have been a second generation Sharp Park golfer for more than twenty years, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan. This plan among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal so we can move forward not backwards.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie.

Since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

Please vote to deny the appeal, and approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jeff Volosing
1019 Zamora Dr.
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [Julie Schreuder](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park!
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:45:09 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Julie Schreader

From: [Carol Kaufman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org; [Carol Kaufman](#)
Subject: Letter in Support of Sharp Park Golf; Please reject the appeal to your decision on Feb. 28th
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:48:46 AM

Dear SF Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of Sharp Park Golf and express my concern over frustrating, never-ending efforts that could overturn the Supervisors' decision and harm the city's historic golf course. We are so fortunate to have Sharp Park, one of SF's treasures, a stunningly beautiful, affordable, and accessible golf course and I hope to will help protect SF golfers and this very special and historic place for all SF residents.

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Carol R. Kaufman
1688 Pine St.
San Francisco, CA 94109**

From: [Mailbox USA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:57:05 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Please stop the ECO activist from wasting SF tax payers money and your time with appeal after appeal.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jason Poon

Mailbox USA
1618 Sullivan Ave. Suite 103
Daly City, Ca 94015
(650)757-6245

From: [Ted Ward](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:15:06 AM

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This controversy has gone on far too long, and it is ridiculous. Here in San Francisco we have one of the most unique golf courses in the country, a jewel box sitting by the sea, designed by arguably the game's most reknown architect, and it is loved by the kind of golfing citizens that are the backbone of the city's culture. To take this wonderful golf experience and camaraderie away from its loyal participants would be comparable to taking a kids park or beach away from the children who love it. I say again - how ridiculous and narrow minded.

Let's keep Sharp Park forever as a special destination for all golfers but mostly for the many San Franciscans cherish all that it offers.

Respectfully,

Ted Ward
Sausalito

Sent from my iPad

From: [Phil Rushng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:49:57 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Sincerely,
Phil Rushing
481 Dellbrook Ave.
San Francisco, Ca. 94131**

From: [George Lazar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: The Alister MacKenzie Historical Sharp Park Golf course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:23:01 AM

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Closing Sharp Park golf course would be a travesty!

It was one of the few golf courses I could afford when I took up the game of golf. Blue collar golfers all over the Bay Area would be denied this jewel of a course that Mr.Mackenzie built. He gave it a personality and feel that encourages middle class people like myself to play one of the most enjoyable games known to man.

Had Sharp Park not been built that land would look like the housing project we know as Daly City...nothing but rows of houses.

The snake and frog situation can be dealt with in other ways. Please don't let an out of state environmental group destroy something that means a lot to so many.

I am an environmentalist (Nature Conservancy, Cal Trout, California Fly fishing Unlimited) and favor saving the environment but I feel that the environmentalists trying to close Sharp Park are misguided. I wonder if they have made attempts to study the flora and fauna at Harding Park, The SF golf Club, or The Olympic Club? I think not.

I live in Sacramento and do not have an opportunity to play Sharp Park much anymore but still feel strongly about this issue and still hold a place in my heart for this sparkling Mackenzie created jewel.

And while I'm at it, if the city would bother putting some money into Lincoln Park, and pair it with the tourist industry, San Francisco could add greatly to it's coffers. I truly believe that vacationing tourists would flock to play the course. (Best to keep the greens fees down for residents)

I truly believe that Lincoln Park could be an incredibly popular golfing destination and suggest that members of the board take a walk around the course and see what it has to offer. You will find that there are no bad views on this course. The Palace of the Legion of Honor and the hiking trail along the cliffs could offer a day package that no other city could ever imagine!

Kindest regards,
George Lazar
Former SF resident

From: [Johnston, Jay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharp Park
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:50:33 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Jay Johnston
385 Day Street
San Francisco, CA 94131**

From: [James Feichtl](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course Natural Areas Plan
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:54:10 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jim Feichtl
2036 Lyon Ave
Belmont, CA 94002

From: [Clayton Fandel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Natural Areas Plan - Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 12:00:13 PM

Dear Supervisors,

It has been brought to my attention that 'The Natural Area Plan' to improve the snake and frog habitat in Sharp Park, while preserving Sharp Park Golf Course, which was approved December 15th, has been appealed by the group who opposes the continued operation of the golf course. I am reached out today to request that you vote to deny that appeal, and move forward with the plan that was approved by the Planning and Rec and Park Commission.

About me;

I was born and raised in Pacifica before moving away for a decade to go to college and start my career in Southern California. I have since moved back and made Pacifica my permanent and future home where I intend to raise my family. One of the greatest parts of living in Pacifica is the available outdoor recreation. From its many hiking trails which I use on a weekly basis, to its beaches and Ocean, which I fish and kayak on a season basis, to the beautiful nature watching enjoyed year round. Among the many outdoor gems that Pacifica has to offer, Sharp Park Golf Course stands out as one of its most attractive and unifying. A historical golf courses, that has managed to maintain many of its famous Alister MacKenzie touches, despite a need to do some shuffling of the course as a result of the changing coast line. A beautiful, affordable, democratic golf course, enjoyed by people of all ages and from all walks of life.

Now, I'm admittedly bias... growing up a young athlete, I played four sports year round from the time I was about eight years old, competition and comradery of team sports was my life. Then I had the type of accident active children sometimes do, and wound up with a fractured c7 vertebrae. I was about to start High School, but could not receive medical clearance to join the sports teams that I had looked forward to being a part of my entire life. It was devastating. I was depressed. I was a born competitor, but wasn't allow to play any sports that had even a chance of contact. I was lost. Then, my grandmother suggested that I give golf a try. She paid for my first lesson and a friend of my parents gave me a set of hand me down clubs. I took to it fairly well, but I couldn't afford regular lessons, and certainly couldn't afford to buy 12 dollar baskets of range balls, or pay the ever increasing prices for greens fees at bay area courses on nearly a regular enough basis to truly improve. For economic reasons alone, golf would not be my salvation. But, one day I was told that the local golf course, Sharp Park, would allow juniors to play for a few hours in the evenings before dark for just one dollar. That I could afford. I had found my outlet, and a path back to my happiness. I ended up spending more time on that golf course over the next four years than I did anywhere else outside of school. I built myself into a two time, first team all-league Peninsula Athletic League award winner, and academic MVP of the Terra Nova Golf Team, mostly on the strength of those one dollar practice rounds at Sharp Park. Fast forward a few decades and I'm still an avid golfer who carries a scratch handicap, and have been lucky enough to play the highest level NCGA events, events on the Pepsi Golf Tour, as well as captain the Canada Colts Golf team, among countless other memories... all of which I owe to the existence of Sharp Park Golf Course, and their public policies.

So again, I'm biased, as I always have and still do love Sharp Park Golf Course, (I was actually the guy on KTVU Fox news June 10th 2015 who was interviewed while out playing a few holes during a segment about Sharp Park), so I still find myself unwinding on the course from time to time. But even if I did not, or was not a local and frequent user, I would still plead for continued operation of the course, if for no other reason than to afford children, not unlike myself, their opportunity to make similar memories and learn analogous life lessons as I was afforded through the courses existence.

Ultimately, I see things this way; golf gives people an outlet to relax, it give young people a sport they can pursue no matter their size or body type. It's a beautiful game that teaches patience, self-discipline, honor, honesty, and countless other life lessons. For these reasons, and countless others, any public golf course with affordable rates should be preserved and maintained. A course with historical implications like Sharp Park deserves even more careful protection. Again, I'm an admitted nature lover, and absolutely understand striving to protect the wetlands adjacent to the golf course, and think that a continued effort to maintain a healthy marriage between the golf course and wet lands is imperative.

Now, this is mostly assumption on my part, but I think it's also important not to overlook why this disputed habitat is even still in existence and is there to protect at all. And it is my assumption, and assertion, that if Sharp Park never existed these wetlands would have been leveled long ago, and there would be additional Sharp Park homes build on every piece of structurally sound ground and there would be no habitat to discuss. Therefore, the golf courses existence has afforded these animals and their habitat protection from development. That union has worked so far, and it is my hope that we will continue to protect not only the wildlife, but the historically significant golf course that has fostered it, and that union will go forward into perpetuity.

Again, I urge you to vote down this attempted appeal, and continue with the plan to maintain and protect the frog and snake habitat while also protecting and allowing the continued operation of historic Sharp Park Golf Course.

Sincerely yours,

clayton fandel
831 Cape Breton Drive
Pacifica, Ca. 94044

From: [Forrest Richardson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [SF Public Golf Alliance](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course / Feb. 28th, 2017 Board Meeting
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 12:02:23 PM

City of San Francisco
Board of Supervisors

January 27th, 2017

Dear Board:

Firstly, let me say that I find it nearly incredible that you have yet again been asked to consider your opinion of the preservation and improvement of the overall habitat of the Sharp Park Golf Course, as well as the golf course itself. I find the continual opposition to your previous reasonable and rationale decisions to be a form a badgering. Frankly, the appeal you have been asked to hear next month nearly amounts to an abuse of the legislative process, especially when it gets to the point of arguing points that have been fully testified to, explained, proven and decided upon previously --- and on more than one occasion.

On the matter of the Sharp Park Golf Course not being considered "historic" allow me to, once and for all, set the record straight for your consideration. Dr. Alister MacKenzie was indeed the original golf course architect and his original design remains in many facets.

- 1) The routing of the golf course, which is the anatomy of any golf course, is more than 75% per MacKenzie's earliest plans with the exception being only the holes that had to be re-accommodated due to two events: (i) the very early erosion of the coastline and construction of a levee; and (ii) the c. 1960s work to construct the highway.
- 2) The record of the earlier replacement holes is that MacKenzie and his assistants were well a part of considering where some replacement holes would eventually go. This was due to the fact that it was well known that these ocean holes would very likely be compromised by nature, and this realization became evident not long after the course opened.
- 3) To suggest otherwise -- that the golf facility is not a MacKenzie design -- would be akin to suggesting that work now ongoing to add elevators and disabled access to Grady Gammage Concert Hall in Arizona, a Frank Lloyd Wright design, somehow makes the significant building not Wright's. Absurd.

As I wrote for an early study for you (the City) in 2006:

"The history of Sharp Park begins with Mackenzie's well-intentioned design of an 18-hole course along the dunesy coastline of Pacifica. With Lincoln Park and Harding Park busy on weekends, another course was needed. The City of San Francisco purchased lots in San Mateo County from 1929 to 1930, paving the way for creating another golf course.

Jack Fleming was Mackenzie's assistant at the time. The approach to the Sharp Park site was to dredge material in order to build up fairway grades. This work took a reported 14 months.

In mid 1930, Robert Hunter was appointed to direct construction of Sharp Park Golf Course. Hunter had relocated to California (Oakland to be specific) after a career teaching sociology. Hunter was still teaching occasionally and had, by this time, written several books on sociology. One, Poverty, was a best-seller in America during 1904. Hunter is thought to have a great deal to do with the creation of Sharp Park, assisting Mackenzie and carrying out his design philosophy. Hunter took the lead of field work at many of Mackenzie's northern California projects. Just a few years earlier, in 1926, Hunter authored The Links, still today an acclaimed book on golf course design."

I have spent considerable time studying the work of both MacKenzie and Hunter. Our restoration work in El Cerrito, California at Mira Vista Country Club was to the only sole design effort ever by Hunter. Through this process I researched and have gained a great deal about the work of both golf architects. I relate this so you will know that these are not as much opinions as they are factual recounts of what actually occurred in California golf history.

Without any doubt, the history record shows that Sharp Park is a MacKenzie design and remains among only a very few of his golf courses worldwide that are publicly owned and operated for the benefit of the ordinary golfer. It is an historic golf course regardless of the changes made, and it is my understanding that the plans for its future will restore even more of the original design. This is a proud point to weigh, and it should be a heavy weight indeed.

You have in your archives a very handsome blueprint on linen (dated 1931) that shows work to the course and the pipelines that formed the old irrigation works. By overlaying this to plans from the 1960s you can easily see that a majority of the golf course remains per the MacKenzie design, not only in terms of the footprint, but also the corridor formed by the holes. Golf courses are always evolving -- changing. The key here is that the basis of the golf remains, despite the natural and man-caused changes that were simply unavoidable at various times in its history.

Old buildings are the same. They need to be changed and revised, but this does not diminish their historic roots.

You will do well to look straight into the eyes of those who are now coming before you to argue this silly point and to ask them to simply get on with it. For their argument that Sharp Park is not an Alister MacKenzie design, or that it has been so significantly changed as to not be considered his valuable work, is pure rubbish.

Sincerely,

//s//

Forrest L. Richardson, ASGCA
Golf Course Architect

Forrest Richardson & Associates
Los Angeles California • Phoenix, Arizona

p 602-906-1818, Ext. 202

From: gemdan271
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 12:07:42 PM

Dear Supervisors, I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course. The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal. Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County. It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course. Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request. [Include Name and Address Here]

Daniel lim 1126 Rainer Ave

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From: [MJG](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Yet another Fight for Sharp Park?
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 12:52:41 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I was previously a San Francisco resident. I am a Sharp Park golfer who greatly appreciates that old course designed by MacKenzie.

I support the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal and to end the incessant harassment of our course by those crazy eco-fanatics.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Jay Greenberg
66 Poppy Lane
Berkeley, CA 94708**

From: [Mike O'Neill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 1:09:24 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident and a Native San Franciscan, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Sharp Park is a valuable asset to both Pacifica and the City of San Francisco. Please support recreation that is a win win for both the environment and residents of Pacifica and San Francisco.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Mike O'Neill
Mayor of Pacifica
650-302-2470

From: [Mike O'Neill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 1:09:24 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident and a Native San Franciscan, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Sharp Park is a valuable asset to both Pacifica and the City of San Francisco. Please support recreation that is a win win for both the environment and residents of Pacifica and San Francisco.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Mike O'Neill
Mayor of Pacifica
650-302-2470

From: [Evans, David W](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: ["SF Public Golf Alliance"](#)
Subject: Uphold the Approval of Recreation and Parks" Natural Areas Plan - Hearing Date: 2/28/2017
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 1:55:04 PM
Attachments: [imageb107e7.PNG](#)
Importance: High

TO: SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Dear Supervisors,

I was a San Francisco resident for 22 years and continue to work in the City every day; I'm also someone who enjoys golf at Sharp Park and am a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. I have been a volunteer Course Rater for the Northern California Golf Association for thirteen years and, during that period, have rated and played dozens of public and private golf courses throughout Northern California. This has made me appreciate even more the spectacular benefits offered to the golfers of Northern California, and San Francisco in particular, of having access to such a wonderful and historic golf course like Sharp Park; one doesn't typically see a public course designed by golf architects like Alister MacKenzie, a highly accomplished historical figure who designed Sharp Park in the early 20th century, along with many other well-known golf courses, including Augusta National, where the Masters is played every spring, and Cypress Point on the Monterey Peninsula, both of which naturally encompass and complement their surroundings.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal

Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Regards,

David Evans
24 Heuters Lane
Mill Valley, CA 94941

David W. Evans | [Profile](#)
Partner
D: 415.281.7624
DF: 415.766.6006
devans@hbblaw.com



Haight Brown & Bonesteel LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94111
O: 415-546-7500
F: 415-546-7505
www.hbblaw.com

The contents of this email message and its attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) hereof. This email transmission may be confidential and it may be subject to privilege protecting communications between attorneys and their clients. If you are not the named addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are directed not to read, disclose, reproduce, distribute, disseminate or otherwise use this transmission. Delivery of this message to any person other than the intended recipient(s) is not intended in any way to waive privilege or confidentiality. If you have received this transmission in error, please alert the sender by reply e-mail. We request that you immediately delete this message and its attachments, if any. UNAUTHORIZED INTERCEPTION PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL LAW (18 U.S.C 2510-2522).

From: [Stacey Baba](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Consideration of Sharp Park
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 2:38:36 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I am an environmentalist with a degree from UC Berkeley in the Biology of Natural Resources, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course. I have spent my years supporting the environment and our natural resources.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. It was Alister's gift to our community and has incredible historical significance. It is tragic the each year we read about the demise of areas that have brought many folks joy over so many years because of some folks who are well meaning but misguided. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Stacey Baba
13553 Old Oak Way
Saratoga, CA 95070

From: [Jack Scott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Richard Harris](#)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 2:38:36 PM

Dear Supervisors,

You all have been successful in winning the election that you ran for to make our city and county a strong and secure place to raise our kids and enjoy the many features of San Francisco.

Among those features is a place called SHARP PARK golf course. SHARP PARK is an historic golf course designed by the legendary Allister MacKenzie and it is available and affordable to every level of player and every age group from school kids to super senior players.

I urge you to REJECT the appeal proposed by the Wild Equity Institute. Sharp Park has gone through years of planning, studies, investigations and conclusions that have proved beyond question that SHARP PARK, The PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE, SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARKS, The SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION, The CORPS OF ENGINEERS, The U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, The CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION, STATE AND FEDERAL TRIAL AS WELL AS THE APPELLANTCOURTS have all approved the Natural Areas Plan, The Laguna Salada Restoration Plan and the Sharp Park habitat improvement plan for the Red Legged Frog and the California Garder Snake.

My name is Jack Scott I live at 1200 Gough Street, San Francisco and I believe in low cost family entertainment and the availability of a sensational, locally available, world class golf course for ALL of the San Francisco/San Mateo residents and visitors alike.

Jack Scott, a registered voter.

From: [Chris Vinculado](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Chris Vinculado](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 2:52:39 PM

San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Pastor Chris Vinculado
126 Los Olivos Ave.
Daly City, CA 94014**

From: rkr96@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course Supporter
Date: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:36:06 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Sincerely yours,

**Ray Kong
Sharp Park Golf Course Supporter**

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Remove Sharp Park Golf Course from the Natural Areas Plan! (File No. 170044)
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:04:23 AM

From: Sherri Elinson [mailto:info@actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 11:58 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Remove Sharp Park Golf Course from the Natural Areas Plan!

Angela Calvillo,

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal "A18", from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment project that was inserted into the SNRAMP environmental review years after the review of SNRAMP was initiated, and long after several mandatory CEQA steps were completed. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project never completed formal environmental scoping, was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

When A18 was originally released in 2009, the Planning Department seemed to understand this procedural concern. The Department explained in the SNRAMP environmental scoping report, also released in 2009, that the golf course redevelopment project could never be incorporated into the SNRAMP environmental review process.

Despite this promise, in 2011 the draft environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project, and after the draft was rubber-stamped by the planning and recreation and park commissions, the final environmental review does as well.

You cannot complete your job of fully vetting the environmental issues presented by the golf course redevelopment project, because the document before you skipped key steps in the CEQA process for the golf course redevelopment project.

Only if that portion of SNRAMP is removed and put through a separate environmental review process can we all be assured that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible. Unless and until that happens, you must reject the final

environmental review document for SNRAMP, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sherri Elinson
slelinson@gmail.com
7111 Sunkist Drive
Oakland, California 94605

||

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:16:13 AM

From: Pete Gandell [mailto:peteandmilli@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 10:27 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sharp Park

What can be more environmentally correct than a golf course? The Sharp park course is again under attack to be closed by Extreme environmentalists despite all the extra efforts to further protect all the wild life in the area. I am one of thousands of golfers who enjoy the course and feel that a solution of compromise should certainly be able to be found. Please support the Natural Areas Plan as approved by the Dec. 15 by the Planning and Rec. and Park Divisions as this culminated an intensive study of the situation and appeared to resolve the issue.

Thank you for your Community service and for considering this request.

Peter Gandell
640 Davis Street #24
San Francisco CA. 94111

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 3:54:34 PM

From: Homer Hudelson [mailto:hhudelson@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 11:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear SF Board of Supervisors: Please reject the latest of many appeals by the Wild Equity Institute etc., regarding the closure of Sharp Park Course. I personally have played there over 50 years. Golfers respect and protect the environs, not harm them. These are needless tactics. This famous and beautiful course is enjoyment to so many people, especially the elderly, like myself. It keeps us active and healthy. Please reject this appeal. Thank you for your commitment to doing what is right. Respectfully, Homer Hudelson, 2684 Sean Ct. South SF, CA 94080

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Deny the Appeal: Natural Areas Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 10:48:43 AM

From: Jim [mailto:jasmlynch@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 7:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Deny the Appeal: Natural Areas Plan

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco native, resident, retired SF Police officer, and a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Please keep Sharp Park as a great recreational area for those that love the game, exercise, and the City they served. Golf and nature can and do co-exist at Sharp park!!!

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Jim Lynch
453 Duncan Street
San Francisco, CA 94131**

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Email in support of Natural Areas Plan and Sharp Park
Date: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 9:20:30 AM

From: Lisa Villasenor-Volosing [mailto:lavillasenor744@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 10:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Email in support of Natural Areas Plan and Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

My husband Jeff's family has a long history of playing and enjoying Sharp Park Golf Course. When we married 10 years ago I was lucky to be introduced to Sharp Park and appreciate that legacy. I am not an old, white, rich guy golfer! I am not the face that anti-golf rhetoric would have you visualize. I am a 59 year old Hispanic female who loves everything about golf and especially at a muni course like Sharp Park. I appreciate that I can walk into Sharp Park for a round of golf and feel unintimidated, pay reasonable rates, and enjoy a beautiful old course with a wonderful variation of men, women and junior golfers. Please do not let anti-golf activists ruin decades of public access to municipal golf at Sharp Park. We are one of the most affordable, welcoming and historic courses in our geographical area. This gem that belongs to SF County is one that should not only be kept alive, but nurtured and protected for SF and San Mateo County residents for years to come. So many resources have already been invested in the prior approval by Planning and Rec & Park, not to mention the time already spent by SF Board of Supervisors in hearing the SAME OLD ARGUMENTS. This is just a repackaging of old, failed anti-golf arguments. It's time to move forward and allow the users of Sharp Park to show that they/we can take care of the animals and environment that surrounds us at the course. As players and users of it, we are the best ones to guard our gem - we want its beauty and environment to survive! We are motivated to care for it - contrary to the false and misleading rhetoric you have heard in the past, and will hear again, by haters of golf and golf courses.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan

to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Lisa Villasenor-Volosing
1019 Zamora Drive
Pacifica, CA 94044**

*Lisa A. Villasenor-Volosing
Law Offices of Lisa A. Villasenor
Business/Cell: (415) 518-8479
lavillasenor744@aol.com*

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please Vote to Save Sharp Park Golf Course File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 1:37:22 PM

From: Gerry Tom [mailto:Gerry.Tom@synopsys.com]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 11:30 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: info@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Please Vote to Save Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am currently a Pacifica resident, a native San Franciscan born here and attending all my education in San Francisco from Kindergarten through college...attending schools such as Lowell High School, City College of San Francisco, and San Francisco State University, a frequent golfer at Sharp Park Golf Course through all those years and still am today. I'm too am also a lover of nature and the preservation of natural resources. I'm an avid outdoors person who enjoys fly fishing (I'm a member of the Golden Gate Park fly casting ponds), backpacking, camping, and grew up learning to fish locally at Lake Merced and was part of the Friends of Lake Merced preservation effort. Suffice it to say, I love San Francisco and the outdoors.

I'm also a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course. The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

One additional point I'd like to make is you'd be hard pressed to find such a quaint, affordable, and relaxing setting for beginners and youngsters alike to learn the game and the sportsmanship and life lessons golf can offer. And it also has a huge following of

seniors who come out daily to meet with friends and enjoy a round during the week. As beautiful as this course is, you won't find many courses like this anywhere in the US with this type of following, stature, and beauty. It's truly a gem, let's work to keep it that way.

Thank you for your service and for considering my request.

Gerry Tom
1040 Zamora Dr
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sharp Park Golf Course File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:58:02 AM

From: jmndenike@aol.com [mailto:jmndenike@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 3:22 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: info@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo

County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Howard J. De Nike

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sharp Park File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:19:18 AM

From: Grant Ingram [mailto:grant.ingram@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 5:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sfpublicgolf Info <info@spublicgolf.org>
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Grant Ingram
106 Point Lobos Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94121**

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:17:23 AM

From: Paul Murillo [mailto:pmurgolf@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 8:02 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Paul Murillo
280 Winwood Ave.
Pacifica, CA

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sharp Park Golf Course File No. 170044
Date: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:16:48 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Wisnia [<mailto:davewisnia@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 4:07 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

To the attention of the Board of Supervisors

My name is David Wisnia & I'm a San Francisco native now living in San Bruno.

The constant harassment that environmental activists are continually causing is counterproductive to the operation & revenue that the Sharp Park Golf Course produces for San Francisco. The golfing & other patrons of this long standing public facility are the ones who should be listened to in this battle over the continued use of the Sharp Park Golf Course property. I feel it is more responsible to serve the needs of people that are willing to spend their hard earned dollars to support the course & the wildlife that make it their home. Please continue to keep the public golf course & the environmentally sensitive area contained within it as is, coexisting harmoniously!

Thank you for supporting this Pacifica gem & please keep up the good work.

Sincerely

David Wisnia
2399 Valleywood Dr
San Bruno, Ca 94066

Sent from my iPad



Alfred D. Oppenheim, MD, Inc.

Tel: (415) 686-7331 (Linda) • (415) 606-3333 (Dr. Opp)

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park and urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR. Case No. 2005.0912E; Hearing February 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the FINAL EIR for the Park and Rec Department's Natural Areas Plan. This includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes while maintaining the historic and important 18 hole Sharp Park Golf Course. I implore you to likewise support this and our ongoing efforts to save this masterpiece for all residents to enjoy for decades to come.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Alfred D. Oppenheim, M.D.

Name: Jim Grandcolas
Address: 566 Trinidad LANE
FOSTER CITY, CA 94404
Phone: 650 345-1968
E-mail: grand87435@sbcglobal.net

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board_of_supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

THERE IS ABSOLUTELY, A SHORTAGE OF AFFORDABLE public COURSES ON THE PENINSULA. THIS IS A public TREASURE DESIGNED BY A RENOWNED golf ARCHITECT. BIO FRIENDLY GREENSKIPPING PRACTICES, AS USED AT CRYSTAL SPRINGS E. C. IN THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE FOOTPRINT OF THE C. S. RESERVOIR, PROVES THE VIABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY OF THE COEXISTENCE OF BOTH NATURE AND A REWARDING GOLFING EXPERIENCE.

Sincerely,
Jim Grandcolas
Jim Grandcolas

From: [McLoughlin, Aidan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org; mippolitosf@hotmail.com
Subject: Save Sharp Park
Date: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 8:17:56 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thanks,
Aidan

Aidan McLoughlin
Regional Manager | Surgical Innovations

Medtronic
Minimally Invasive Therapies Group
Cell: (415) 269-2440

medtronic.com | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

LET'S TAKE HEALTHCARE
FURTHER, TOGETHER

From: [T. Whitson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Case No. 2005.0912E
Date: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 10:49:00 PM

Terrence Whitson

3132 Lawton Street

San Francisco, CA. 94122

Phone: 415 312 2538

E-mail: abiogen2@hotmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: [Feb. 28, 2017](#)

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Kay Cockerill

Address: 131 Beulah Street, SF, CA 94117

Phone: 415-571-8022

E-mail: kaycockerill@gmail.com

February 2 , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

I am a proud product of public NorCal golf, growing up in the Santa Cruz mountains. If it weren't for the accessibility and opportunities given via public golf, I wouldn't be where I am today—a proud graduate of and former golfer at UCLA, former LPGA professional and current commentator for Golf Channel.

I continue to play public golf in the San Francisco bay area and support the SF First Tee program, a grassroots junior program based at Harding Park whose kids also play Sharp Park. I firmly believe that Sharp Park should remain open and operating, offering a crucial recreational experience to the everyday person on an exceptional, historic coastal course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Kay Cockerill

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Rip Malloy <ripmalloy1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 1:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: richard@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: A San Francisco Resident, Sharp Park

Name: Rip Malloy

Address: 572 8th Avenue

Phone: 415-725-4746

E-mail: ripmalloy1@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: John Kirtland <jkrtland@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 4:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Please Deny Appeal to Golf @ Sharp Park Program

February 2, 2017
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program & Golf at Sharp Park and deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department™'s Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals to the Commission'™'s decision.

John

John Kirtland (District 2)
2160 Pacific #5
San Francisco, CA 94115
415-561-9554

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Mike Wong <mjwong@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:02 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: richard@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharp Park Golf Course

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Michael J. Wong
mjwong@pacbell.net
758 34th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415/751-3924

Name: David Brown
Address: 393 West Spain St, Sonoma, Ca 95476
Phone: (707) 529-8564/E-mail: davidwbrown@comcast.net
February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

BOS-11 - opage
BOS - Legislation
File 170044
2017 FEB - 8 PM 2:49
OK

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

Hear my plea for Sharp Park, one of the great public golf courses in the world.

I am a 65 year-old retiree who lives in Sonoma. I have been a golfer for 54 years—ever since both my grandfathers taught me the history, traditions, rules, etiquette, and *tempermental challenges* of the ancient Scottish seaside game.

I started golf when I was 11. By 12, I could introduce myself to three adult strangers and share 4-5 hours of golf's unique and revealing challenge and communion. I scored my first job on the green. I made scores of friends for a lifetime. I know how golf, the "honorable" game of golf, serves a community's soul.

Fact is, what other sport 1) demands you call penalties on yourself, 2) envelops & involves you for hours in nature's ever-changing beauty, 3) provides physical *and mental* challenges, 4) can be shared—and competed— by players of different skill levels, genders, ages, physiques, handicaps, races, nationalities and even income levels. In my view, golf is the most *revealing, worldly & shared* sport—not soccer, football, baseball, or basketball. (Think how much space is devoted to these pursuits in the city! What percentage of these spaces are busy right now as you read this?)

Since 1963, I estimate I have played over 5,000 times (with 12,000+ people?) in seven countries. **One thing I know, there are few *unforgettable* golf courses by all who play them. Sharp Park is one of them.**

I learned golf on Oakland's billy goat public course: Lake Chabot. The revered master golf professional, Dick Fry, with his sons, managed it. (Every young person, and many did, should have a Mr. Fry—and his lofty expectations—to live up to.) Golf pros teach a game that *reveals more you to yourself* (and others) than any other game. Is this why it's a favorite of so many politicians and businesspeople?

Mr. Fry was a mentor, teacher and patient example to many boys & girls. His eldest son, John Fry, became the famed head pro at San Francisco's exquisite, yet today, *very crowded and expensive* Harding Park. Maybe you remember John Fry and how many fine young golfers he inspired, developed, mentored and employed in your city.

I eventually captained the UC Berkeley golf team. We started to travel and test our mettle on many distant courses. When we played San Francisco State, we discovered seaside Sharp Park. I remember we all regretted that it took so long to discover its beauty and challenge. We soon shared the discovery of Sharp Park with East Bay competitors, friends and relatives and car-pool returned over the years.

This verdant "Scottish" masterpiece, designed by the *Rembrandt* of golf course architects, Alister MacKenzie,* remains one of my all-time favorite golf courses. Its seaside foggy-moist *terroir*, *cypress-forested beauty and chilly, breezy challenge* is truly unique in the world of golf. And so, too, are its always accessible tee times, affordability and welcoming vibe. (The staff there is lean yet efficient, helpful and always friendly.)

A few of my most pleasurable memories of golf are finishing in the goldening light and the quieting afternoon breeze of Sharp Park. A friendly, "yep, still opened!" snack bar and its hot chocolate or beer often warms further conversation, laughs, and recounts of our day-old foursome's competition and adventure. It's akin to fishermen returning from a challenging, brisk day at sea with a full boat and a happy soul.

There is much adventure, communion and good cheer shared in that wonderous place: Sharp Park. Please allow this beauty—and hopefully a relentlessly well-supported junior program—to continue on its storied path in the world of golf and for all who already know it...or will.

YES! I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny appeals to the Commission's decision. Don't neglect this unique and venerated 85 yr old gem that's so "becoming" to even the finest city in America.

Sincerely,
David Brown
Sonoma, CA



* *A few renowned, and mostly publicly inaccessible, Alister MacKenzie masterpieces: Augusta National (Georgia), Claremont Country Club (Oakland), Burning Tree Club (Maryland), The Valley Club (Santa Barbara), Royal Troon (Scotland), Royal Melbourne (Australia), Pasatiempo Golf Club (Santa Cruz), Cypress Point Club (Carmel), Lahinch Golf Club (Ireland), Meadow Club (Fairfax), Royal Adelaide Golf Club (Australia).*

From: Peter Glikshtern <peterg@lmi.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: Holly Nicolson
Subject: Send Natural Areas Management EIR (file #170046) back to Planning!

To whom it may concern:

We support the San Francisco Forest Alliance's appeal of the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP). Please send the biased, inaccurate, and inadequate EIR back to Planning for revision.

The EIR is not objective. It talks about one-to-one tree replacement to make the Plan look better. One-to-one tree replacement *is not* in the plan. The actual language reads, "...the trees in the San Francisco Natural Areas would be replaced with either native trees or other native vegetation, such as native scrub or grassland species."

The EIR is inaccurate. The carbon sequestration numbers are wrong. According to the correct calculations, there will be a net release of over 70,000 metric tons of carbon.

This is not a matter of experts disagreeing. The EIR authors claim to use calculation methodology of CalEEMod, but instead, use their own method, one that fails to account for the carbon released from the felled trees.

They reach the conclusion that grasses and shrubs will sequester more carbon than trees which is wrong also. There are studies concluding that forests store about 10 times more carbon than grasslands. Also, the EIR doesn't account for the carbon released from disturbing the ground and from the machinery and vehicles used in implementation.

In addition, the calculations are based on obsolete assumptions. The EIR claims that trees stop sequestering additional carbon after 20 years, but research now shows the oldest trees are still growing rapidly, and storing increasing amounts of carbon as they age. They sequester more additional carbon than young trees.

The EIR is inadequate. It does not consider the effect of cutting down the saplings – young trees that are less than 15 feet tall. According to the Plan, they can be cut down without any notice, at will. However, small trees account for some 15-30% of San Francisco's trees. There are an estimated 11,000 such trees in "Natural Areas", already established and growing. Left alone, these are the ones that will regenerate our forests and become the carbon-sinks of the decades to come. Instead, the plan is to just cut them down without any notice or consideration, and instead plant at taxpayers expense *other saplings* which will require care for the first few years, have a fairly high mortality rate, and never grow as large as the removed saplings would have.

The EIR is inaccurate. It understates the increased herbicide use. The Natural Resources Division (NRD, formerly Natural Areas Program) had used herbicides every year since 200, possibly since mid 90s, when this environmentally damaging program started. They use Tier I and Tier II herbicides (most hazardous and more hazardous) including Roundup, which was declared a probable carcinogen by the World Health Organization in 2015.

The EIR inaccurately claims that implementing the Plan will not increase herbicide use. This is blatantly inaccurate. The Plan specifically calls for cutting down 18,488 trees and treating the stumps with herbicides. The stumps of uncounted saplings will be treated with herbicides as well. This means a massive increase in herbicide use.

The EIR also understates the impact of removing trees in specific locations. For example, removing trees on Mt. Davidson is likely to lead to flooding, increased wind, failure of remaining trees, increased air pollution, and slope instability. *This will very likely lead to property damage and create a huge potential liability for the City.*

The EIR also uses the wrong definition of biodiversity. All trees and plants, whether they are called native or non-native are part of our local biodiversity, just like people from everywhere are part of our city's population diversity.

Furthermore, the EIR says that native plants are more drought tolerant and require less irrigation than non-native plants. It says that native plants are more adaptable to climate change, more sustainable, than non-native plants. But *no evidence is provided*.

The fact that the Natural Areas program has used the most toxic herbicides to establish native vegetation without success for the last 15 years, clearly demonstrates that these claims are inaccurate.

This program proposes to return our parks to what *might* have been growing here 250 years ago, while the climate and the environment today are completely different today. It requires intensive gardening on one quarter of our park land. It is *not sustainable*.

The EIR for example, claims that eucalyptus is invasive. You only need to look around Mt. Davidson to see that eucalyptus hasn't invaded anything. Even the California Native Plant Society classifies eucalyptus as having only "limited" invasiveness.

Read more here: <http://www.sacbee.com/news/state/california/fires/article74496267.html#storylink=cpy>

Please vote YES on File# 170046 to rescind the certification of this bias, inaccurate, and inadequate EIR for Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Thank you,
Holly Nicolson and Peter Glikshtern
534 Shotwell #4
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Tomas Nakada <thnakada@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2017 8:35 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Sharp Park

San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Tomas Nakada
21 Lapidge st.
SF, CA. 94110**

Gerald Williamson Stratford



650.367.9027
g@stratford.name
One Arthur Lane, Atherton, California 94027

File 170044
BOS-11, CP page
BOS-118
RECEIVED
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 FEB -3 PM 3:11

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Honorable Supervisors,

As a fourth-generation San Franciscan, whose grandfather introduced him to the game of golf on the historic course at Sharp Park, I implore you to recognize the heritage this course represents, and its essential service to so many bay area residents.

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which while providing for the recovery of habitat for frogs and snakes, maintains the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the ill-considered appeals to reverse the Commission's decision.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald W Stratford

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Sharp Park Golf Course

From: Homer Hudelson [mailto:hhudelson@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 11:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear SF Board of Supervisors: Please reject the latest of many appeals by the Wild Equity Institute etc., regarding the closure of Sharp Park Course. I personally have played there over 50 years. Golfers respect and protect the environs, not harm them. These are needless tactics. This famous and beautiful course is enjoyment to so many people, especially the elderly, like myself. It keeps us active and healthy. Please reject this appeal. Thank you for your commitment to doing what is right. Respectfully, Homer Hudelson, 2684 Sean Ct. South SF, CA 94080

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: Sharp Park Golf Course Natural Areas Plan
Attachments: Support of Sharp Park Golf Course; Sharp Park Golf Course; A San Francisco Resident, Sharp Park; Re: 'Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017; Save Sharp Park Golf Course; Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park; Sharp Park = Save the Golf Course / Deny the Appeal; Save Sharp Park; Sharp Park Golf Course; Sharp Park; Save Sharp Park; Please Deny Appeal to Golf @ Sharp Park Program

Dear Supervisors:

The Clerk's Office has received similar emails regarding Sharp Park (Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan) and all are attached. Thank you.

From: Petersen Barbara [mailto:barbarapetersen201@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 4:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: info@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course Natural Areas Plan

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

I have lived in the Sharp Park neighborhood, 2 blocks from Sharp Park Golf Course for over 40 years. It is an integral part of our neighborhood affording open vistas, recreational use and animal habitat. I am a 65 year old retired Pacifica elementary school teacher, a golfer, a parent of golfers and a grandparent of young golfers. My family and friends all value and enjoy public access to *affordable* municipal golf at Sharp Park. Sharp Park Golf Course hosts golfers of all ethnicities, ages, and economic status. Several high schools in the area use it for their golf teams practice sessions.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been

going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Barbara Petersen
201 Lunetta Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: taylor@pier39.com on behalf of Taylor Safford <tsaff@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: richard@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Name: George Safford

Address: PO Box 193730, SF, CA 94119-3730

Phone: 415-381-1595

E-mail: tsaff@comcast.net

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. The plan is a WIN-WIN for everyone. The historic Sharp Park Golf Course should be preserved.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely,

George Safford

From: hat@purestorage.com
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 4:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: joshzander@zandergolf.com; richard@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharp Park

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

David M. Hatfield

From: Sandy McDade <mcsimi123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 2:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Sharp PArk Golf Course
Categories: 170044

Hello, I am sending this to support continuing operation of Sharp Park Golf Course. The course is beautiful even though not getting S.F.'s care the other S.F. Courses get. It attracts players who are near and far, it remains affordable for blue collar workers, and it supports Junior golfers. Please do not let so called conservation people take this away. These conservationist should be after the pipe lines and Trumps attack against EPA.
Thank You, Sandy McDade
Sent from my iPad

BOS-11,0p18
BOS-128

Name: WARREN MILLER
Address: 1001 RAIMIER AVE
DUBLIN CA 94044
Phone: 650 359 3627
E-mail: WCMILLER@AOL.COM

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 FEB 13 PM 4:22
BY: AK

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Warren Miller

BOS-11, cpage
BOS- Leg

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

February , 2017

2017 FEB 13 PM 4:22
BY AK

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Merkle Kohr
Signature

Name: MERKLE KOHR
Address: 127 SHOOTING STAR ISLE
City: FOSTER CITY, CA 94404
Phone: 650 678-8614
E-mail: JAKOHR@GMAIL.COM

BOS-11, Bos Leg
0page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 FEB 13 PM 4:22

BY AK

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:

Signature

Name: NATE GUSTAVSON

Address: 166 Surf St.

City: Pacifica, CA

Phone: 415-786-9410

E-mail: NATHAN.GUSTAVSON@GMAIL.COM

BAS-11, Bas Leg
CPast

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 FEB 13 PM 4:22

BY AK

William Brangan
327 Reichling Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044
Pacbill66@gmail.com

February 6, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the
Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery
for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf
Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision

Thank you,



William Brangan

February , 2017

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 FEB 13 PM 4:22

BY AK

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: BRIAN TIDWELL

Address: 123 SHOOTING STAR ISLE

City: FOSTER CITY

Phone: 650-341-2271

E-mail: tidwell14@icloud.com

Name: Dean White
Address: 101 Outlook Cir
Phone: Pacifica, CA 94044
E-mail: (650) 823-1776
dswhite8@yahoo.com
February 9, 2017

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 FEB 15 PM 2:38

BY JB


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



BOS-11, page
BOS-108

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 FEB 15 PM 2:38

BT ~~ZLB~~

Anne F. Burgoyne
15 Rossmoor Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94132

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94104

Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to support the current Natural Areas Program. My request is to Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park.

Please deny appeal Case # 2005.0912E for which hearing will be held on February 28, 2017.

There is more than sufficient ground to a habitat recovery for snakes and frogs and to preserve historic Sharp Park 18-hole golf course. Closing the course would be a double loss: first for many golfers who consider Sharp Park almost a second home and second for the loss of another golf course to create more habitat space when already there seems to be an ample sufficiency .

Voting against the proposed measure would mean a win/win all around.

Sincerely yours,


Anne F. Burgoyne



P.O. Box 20184
Oakland, CA 94620
tel. - 510/652-5603
fax - 510/654-7432
e-mail - afa@mcn.org

"We need a boundless ethics which
will include the animals also."
-Dr. Albert Schweitzer

February 13, 2017

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
City Hall
McAllister at Van Ness, room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 FEB 15 PM 2:38

RE: SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE - PACIFICA

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to ask that you remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

That area is crucial habitat for the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog, amongst others. Surely their survival needs should take precedent over a money-losing, out-of-town golf course, one which provides little recreational benefit to the residents of San Francisco.

On February 28, please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

Failing that, I ask that you reject the entire EIR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eric Mills, coordinator

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Rich Radford <rich@gardenrouteco.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richard@sfpublicgolf.org; mippolitosf@hotmail.com
Subject: Save Sharp Park

Subject: Save Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thanks,

RICH RADFORD
The Garden Route Co
www.gardenrouteco.com
800-551-1123

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Alan Willis <awillis@p2capital.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: richard@sfpublicgolf.org; joshzander@zandergolf.com
Subject: Sharp Park = Save the Golf Course / Deny the Appeal

David Alan Willis
576 Craig Road
Hillsborough CA 94010
917-455-7167
d.alan.willis@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: [Feb. 28, 2017](#)

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course, which is one of a very few publicly playable Alistair Mackenzie courses in the world. It is a priceless public work, and there is room for both the course and its players as well as the frogs and snakes.

Please deny the appeals to the Commission's decision from the anti-golf group.

Thank you,

David Alan Willis

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Bts4birdie@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 12:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Byron Sakamoto, a long time resident , golfer and member of Harding Park Golf Club.

I have lived in San Francisco since 1981 and I'm a home owner.

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Case No. 2005.0912E

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

you can contact me at E-mail: bts4birdie@aol.com if you need more information from me.

February 2 , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Chris Cullen <cjcullen56@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: Mike Ippolito; richard@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park

San Francisco, Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

I am a SF resident, and view Sharp Park Golf course as a wonderful resource. It's historic value is maintained by its continued operation, and pays benefits to the community by attracting many people to the area that would otherwise not receive the exposure.

Chris Cullen

cjcullen56@gmail

650-333-3273

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: Edith Juarez Souter <ejs@lsallc.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.org; Josh Zander
Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

Edith Juarez Souter

506 Roosevelt Way

San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Dana Kelly](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Natural Areas Plan
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 1:38:27 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a longtime Sharp Park golfer, former Pacifica homeowner, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course. The Natural Areas Plan is a win-win both for golfers and the frogs and snakes -- habitats will be unspoiled, as golfers (unlike hikers) will want to avoid going into them!

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Dana Kelly
17 Ahab Drive
Muir Beach, CA 94965

From: [Mike Josepher](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PRESERVE sharp park golf
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 7:38:48 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

--

Mike Josepher

Owner

www.photoworkssf.com

From: [Lee Blaylock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Reasons why Sharp Park is a civic treasure and must be saved
Date: Thursday, February 02, 2017 8:25:17 PM

Lee Blaylock
450 Townsend, San Francisco 94107
415 839 6700
lblaylock@whoat.io

February 2nd, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Public, municipal golf is the basis of how golf started back in the 1400s at St Andrews in Scotland. It is owned by the city and brings in millions in tax dollars and is a beacon in a worldwide sport. They recognize the value of the asset and protect it and leverage it for civic gain.

Enlightened, civic minded people know that Sharp Park is a treasure and a gift to not only all citizens of San Francisco, but all who travel here. Sharp Park is unique in its history and importance to American Golf for reasons I'm sure you are aware being involved in this process. We were bestowed this course almost 100 years ago and city leaders then recognized the value the course

would provide to the community for their descendants. I hope that the Supervisors will recognize you made the right decision previously and deny the appeals from misguided groups who don't recognize the importance of affordable public golf and its many uses and value to making San Francisco a worldwide treasure to live, work and play.

Best,

Lee Blaylock
(C) 415.810.6911
(t) @leeblaylock

From: [Grant Ingram](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 1:39:01 PM

From: Grant Ingram
106 Point Lobos Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-519-1144
grant.ingram@yahoo.com

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Regards,

Grant Ingram
San Francisco Resident

From: [Thomas Dittmann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@sfgolf.org; [HPGC Tournament Committee](#)
Subject: Save Sharp Park
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 11:59:46 AM

Name: Thomas Dittmann

Address: 1491 Sanchez Street, San Francisco, CA 94131

Phone: 408-313-1917

E-mail: thomas.dittmann@gmail.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

I am an avid golfer and play Sharp Park several times per year and support local restaurants after my round. If Sharp Park closes I do feel as if local businesses will suffer as well.

Best regards,

Thomas Dittmann

From: [Michael Yeh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Thursday, February 02, 2017 10:57:42 PM

As a long time resident (48 plus years) of San Francisco, I urge the Board to support the recommendation of continuing operation of Sharp Park with minor changes. Hopefully, this will be the end of this matter. All the years I played at Sharp, I have not seen a single snake or frog. Maybe they only come out after dark.

Mike Yeh
1450 Sloat Blvd
San Francisco

From: [Lee Blaylock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@sfpublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park is a civic treasure and important to both San Francisco's heritage and keeping golf affordable
Date: Thursday, February 02, 2017 8:37:06 PM

Lee Blaylock
450 Townsend, San Francisco 94107
415 839 6700
lblaylock@whoat.io

February 2nd, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Public, municipal golf is the basis of how golf started back in the 1400s at St Andrews in Scotland. It is owned by the city and brings in millions in tax dollars and is a beacon in a worldwide sport. They recognize the value of the asset and protect it and leverage it for civic gain.

Enlightened, civic minded people know that Sharp Park is a treasure and a gift to not only all citizens of San Francisco, but all who travel here. Sharp Park is unique in its history and importance to American Golf for reasons I'm sure you are aware being involved in this process. We were bestowed this course almost 100 years ago and city leaders then recognized the value the course would provide to the community for their descendants. I hope that the Supervisors will recognize you made the right decision previously and deny the appeals from misguided groups who don't recognize the importance of affordable public golf and its many uses and value to making San Francisco a worldwide treasure to live, work and play.

Best,

Lee Blaylock
(t) @leeblaylock

From: denpr@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); richard@sfpublishgolf.org.
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 1:39:16 PM

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

The frogs and snakes need help from people who know a lot more about environmental statistics than I do; but I do have a clear perception that all such creatures are an important element in the natural community of living things, and that I always come away from a morning at Sharp with an almost ecstatic appreciation for the few hours of direct communing with these sadly shrinking but still vital islands of harmony and sanity.

Golf and golfers are easy prey for ridicule, but so is Yoga and other pursuits of peaceful coexistence with this planet and other human beings. Golf courses are natural peace pockets, and their intrusion into the natural order of things is always outweighed by the benefits to the preservation of scenic harmony and mental health.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Dennis Ruel

From: [Mike Walsh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@sfgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 12:41:20 PM

Name: Mike Walsh

Address: 1592 Union Street #86

San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 415-823-1056

E-mail: mihol33@gmail.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for

the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Sharp Park is great course and needs to be kept available for Bay Area golfers.

It is also one of the courses where I recorded a "hole in one", so, it has special sentimental value to me.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

--

Mike

Name: Maurice Monserez

Address: 88 King Street #114

Phone: 415-310-7776

E-mail: Maurice.monserez@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

As an avid golfer and one who plays Sharp Park, the golf course has helped maintain and increase the frog and snake population, and will continue to do so while giving thousands of San Francisco and Bay Area golfers the opportunity to play a legendary course. Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Maurice Monserez

From: [Paul Castleman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [SheehyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SFForestNews@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Send the Natural Areas' Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)
Date: Saturday, February 04, 2017 11:53:14 PM

Dear Supervisors

Tank Hill Neighbors supports the San Francisco Forest Alliance's appeal against the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Natural Areas Management Plan. We request you to send the error-filled EIR back to Planning for revision.

The EIR is inaccurate. The carbon sequestration numbers are just plain wrong. This is not a matter of experts disagreeing. The actual calculations are wrong and as a result, understate the net release of carbon dioxide. You would not consider it "expert disagreement" if one expert claimed that $2+2=3$, but this is what is happening with the EIR. Not only that, but the calculations are based on obsolete assumptions: that trees stop sequestering additional carbon after 20 years. Research now shows that bigger trees and older trees actually sequester more additional carbon than young trees. (Study in "Nature" magazine, 2014, quoted in Time magazine: 'An international research group led by Nate Stephenson of the U.S. Geological Survey Western Ecological Research Center reviewed records from forest studies on six continents, involving 673,046 individual trees and more than 400 species, going back as far as 80 years ago. For 97% of the species surveyed, the mass growth rate—literally, the amount of tree in the tree—kept increasing even as the individual tree got older and taller.'")

The EIR understates the increased herbicide use. The Natural Areas Program, now re-named the Natural Resources Department, has used herbicides every year since the public started obtaining the data in 2008.

They use only Tier I and Tier II herbicides (most hazardous and more hazardous) including Roundup, which is a likely carcinogen. The EIR inaccurately claims implementing the Plan will not increase herbicide use beyond current levels, in other words, that the Plan can be implemented without herbicides.

The EIR doesn't properly evaluate the loss of recreation. The Plan calls for closing 95% of the Natural Areas to public access, by prohibiting people from leaving the confines of the "designated" trails and also by closing many miles of trail. This takes away 30% of our total park land and converts it into nature preserves we can only view from a distance.

We ask the Board of Supervisors to send the EIR back for the following actions:

- properly identify significant impacts of the Natural Areas Management Plan for San Francisco Parks;

- require mitigation/accountability measures for the added significant impacts;
- remove the incorrect statements;
- add a mitigation measures that introduce accountability for tree removal and replacement

Thank you.

Paul Castleman for
Tank Hill Neighbor Association

From: [Damon Hope](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 4:52:37 PM

Name:Damon Hope
Address: 6743 California St., SF , CA. 94121
Phone:510-682-3786
E-mail: damonhope@hotmail.com

February 3rd , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final
EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

Damon Hope

From: [Tim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Friday, February 03, 2017 3:58:49 PM

Sharp Park golf course is the only recreational athletic facility owned by the City that seniors can use. Seniors only have walking as their crucial exercise (most doctors recommend 10,000 steps per day as a complete exercise program for seniors). That means golf is the appropriate sport to accomplish this. The other golf courses owned by the City are not appropriate for seniors to use: Lincoln is beautiful but way too hilly to climb up and down, especially with clubs. As is Gleneagles and Golden Gate (and it and Fleming are only 9 holes). And Harding is a wonderful course, not too hilly, but a senior resident must pay \$38 to play Harding, and that's too expensive for most seniors. Sharp costs less than half of that to play.

Who are these seniors who play Sharp? Go over there sometime...see for yourself. The image of rich white males as golfers is completely not the case. Most players, and there are lots of women playing there, are Asian, Hispanic, Filipino, and all, without exception, are blue collar working people or retired workers on pension or social security. Many are former City and County employees.

I am 73, have lived in San Francisco for 52 years, and play Sharp Park all the time. It is a recreational treasure for everyone my age who wants to get some needed exercise, and enjoy the aspects of sport. Please retain Sharp Park in its current condition.

Tim Savinar
GHIN#6689940
San Francisco

From: [John Bird](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No.005.0912E Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017
Date: Sunday, February 05, 2017 10:03:54 AM

Name: John J Bird III

Address: 565 18th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94121

Phone: 415-221-3065

E-mail: jjbirdiii@gmail.com

February 5th, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. It is true gem of a public course and one that is accessible to all. This is a fair and good compromise.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely,

John Bird

From: [Robert Turley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: richard@sfgolf.org
Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Date: Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:20:45 PM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Warm regards,

Robert Turley
45 Glover Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-964-1222

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Save Sharpe Park! (File No. 170044)
Date: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:48:02 AM

From: Seamus Whitley [mailto:seamu_w@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharpe Park!

Name: James "Seamus" Whitley

Address: 127 McKinney Ave.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: 415.203.4010

E-mail: seamu_w@yahoo.com

February 10, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. There has to be a way to make this work.

Thank you,

- Seamus Whitley

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Send the Natural Areas" Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)
Date: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 1:26:54 PM

From: klebans@wellsfargo.com [mailto:klebans@wellsfargo.com]

Sent: Monday, February 06, 2017 1:05 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@SFGOV1.onmicrosoft.com>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Send the Natural Areas' Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I support the San Francisco Forest Alliance's appeal of the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP). Please send the bias, inaccurate, and inadequate EIR back to Planning for revision.

The EIR is not objective. For example, it discusses one-to-one tree replacement which IS NOT in the plan - to make the plan look better. It needs to discuss what IS in the document.

The actual language: "...the trees in the San Francisco Natural Areas would be replaced with either native trees or other native vegetation, such as native scrub or grassland species..."

The EIR is inaccurate. The carbon sequestration numbers are wrong. **According to the correct calculations, there will be a net release of over 70,000 metric tons of carbon– and that's a conservative figure.**

- The calculations are wrong and grossly understate the net release of carbon dioxide
- this is not a matter of experts disagreeing. The EIR authors claim to use calculation methodology of CalEEMod, but use their own, made up method, one that fails to account for the carbon released from the killed trees.

They reach the conclusion that grasses and shrubs will sequester more carbon than trees. It is obviously false. Plus there are studies concluding that forests store about 10 times more carbon than grasslands. The EIR doesn't account for the carbon released from disturbing the ground and from the machinery and vehicles used in implementation.

- In addition, the calculations are based on obsolete assumptions. The EIR claims that trees stop sequestering additional carbon after 20 years, but research now shows the oldest trees are still growing rapidly, and storing increasing amounts of carbon as they age. They sequester more additional carbon than young trees.

The EIR is inadequate. It does not consider the effect of cutting down the saplings – young trees that are less than 15 feet tall. According to the Plan, they can be cut down without any notice, at will. However, small trees account for some 15-30% of San Francisco's trees. There are an estimated 11,000 such trees in "Natural Areas", already established and growing. Left alone, these are the ones that will regenerate our forests and become the carbon-sinks of the next decades. Instead, the plan is to just cut them down without any notice or consideration, and instead plant at taxpayers expense *other saplings* which will require care for the first few years, have a fairly high mortality rate, and never grow as large as the removed saplings would have.

The EIR is inaccurate. It understates the increased herbicide use. The Natural Resources Division - NRD (former "Natural" Areas Program - NAP) had used herbicides every year - definitely since 2001- most likely since mid 90s, when this environmentally damaging program started.

They use Tier I and Tier II herbicides (most hazardous and more hazardous) including Roundup, which was declared a probable carcinogen by WHO in 2015. The EIR inaccurately claims that implementing the Plan will not increase herbicide use, in other words, that the Plan can be implemented without herbicides. This is impossible: the Plan calls for cutting down 18,488 trees and treating the stumps with herbicides. For the years to come. The stumps of uncounted saplings will be treated with herbicides as well. It would all lead to a massive increase in herbicide use.

The EIR is inaccurate. It understates the impact of removing trees in specific locations. For example, removing trees on Mt. Davidson is likely to lead to flooding, increased wind, failure of remaining trees, increased air pollution, slope instability.

The EIR is inaccurate. It uses the wrong definition of biodiversity. All trees and plants, whether they are called native or non-native are part of our local biodiversity, just like people from everywhere are part of our city's population diversity. Adding the word "native" to "biodiversity", demonizes any non-native species. Our urban forests are historically a part of the totality of plant diversity in San Francisco and have been so for almost 150 years.

The EIR is inaccurate. It says "native" plants are more drought tolerant than "non-native". It says "native" plants are more adaptable to climate change, more sustainable, than "non-native". It says that "native" plants require less irrigation than "non-native". **No evidence is provided.** The fact that the "Natural" Areas program continuously, for at least 15 years, uses the most toxic herbicides to establish "native" vegetation without success shows that none of those claims are true. It tries to return our parks to what **MIGHT** have been growing here 250 years ago while the climate and the environment are different. It requires intensive gardening on one quarter of the park land. It is **NOT SUSTAINABLE.** There are "native" and "non-native" plants which are drought tolerant

The EIR is inaccurate. It claims that eucalyptus is "invasive." You only need to look around (Mt. Davidson is a good example) to see that the trees haven't invaded anything.

Even California Native Plant Society classifies it as having only “**Limited**” invasiveness.

The EIR is inaccurate. It claims that thinning will encourage growth and forest health.

Thinning is a technique used for forest management for LOGGING, and it is done when trees are young. Established forest is a community adjusted to the existing conditions which in all likelihood will be damaged by the change. As was the tree which fell and caused the Butte Fire in 2015. It was determined that a stand of trees surrounding the one that fell and burned was removed by PG&E before the fire. That was poor tree maintenance: it left the remaining tree “exposed to open space” and “prone to failure.” Both Cal Fire and Calaveras County are seeking millions (90M by Cal Fire) from PG&E as reimbursement for damages.

Read more here:

<http://www.sacbee.com/news/state/california/fires/article74496267.html#storylink=cpy>

Please vote YES on File# 170046 to rescind the certification of this bias, inaccurate, and inadequate EIR for Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

While it is revised, please work on cancelling this environmentally damaging, unnatural "Natural" Areas Program (now "Natural" Resource Division), or at least on the legislation to:

- remove all forested areas from NAP (NRD) control and give management of forested areas to the Recreation and Park Department's Forestry Division's trained arborists for routine maintenance, and prohibit the removal of any trees in NAP-managed areas except for reasons of hazard abatement or construction of buildings (but not habitat restoration);
- restrict NAP to implementing only the ("environmentally superior" according to the EIR itself) Maintenance Alternative identified in the EIR;
- prohibit all Tier 1 and Tier 2 [the most toxic] herbicide use by NAP to ensure public safety in all park areas.

Thank you,

Susanna Klebaner
6924 Fulton St.
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Send the Natural Areas" Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)
Date: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 12:07:48 PM

From: Eugene Bachmanov [mailto:bsidecon@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, February 06, 2017 8:25 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@SFGOV1.onmicrosoft.com>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Send the Natural Areas' Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)

SUBJECT: Send the Natural Areas' Management EIR back to Planning (File# 170046)

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I support the San Francisco Forest Alliance's appeal of the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP).

The EIR is inaccurate, inadequate, and not objective.

The EIR is not objective. One-to-one tree replacement IS NOT in the plan - but EIR talks about it as if it IS in the document.

The actual language of the Plan: "...the trees in the San Francisco Natural Areas would be replaced with either native trees or other native vegetation, such as native scrub or grassland species..."

The EIR is inaccurate. The carbon sequestration numbers are wrong. **According to the correct calculations, there will be a net release of over 70,000 metric tons of carbon– and that's a conservative figure.**

- The calculation method is made up by the EIR authors, who claim falsely that they use CalEEMod methodology. They do not account for the carbon released from the killed trees.

They claim that grasses and shrubs will absorb more carbon than tree, while studies show that forests store about 10 times more carbon than grasslands. They don't account for the carbon released from disturbing the ground and from the machinery and vehicles used during tree killing.

The calculations are based on obsolete assumptions. The EIR claims that trees stop sequestering additional carbon after 20 years, but research shows the oldest trees are still growing rapidly, and storing increasing amounts of carbon as they age. They sequester more additional carbon than young trees.

The EIR is inadequate. It does not consider the effect of cutting down young trees that are less than 15 feet tall. According to the Plan, they can be cut down at will.

However, small trees account for some 15-30% of San Francisco's trees. There are an estimated 11,000 such trees in "Natural Areas", already established and growing. Left alone, these are the ones that will regenerate the forests and become the carbon-sinks of the next decades. Instead, the plan is to cut them down without any notice or consideration, and plant other saplings instead, which will require care for the first few years, have a fairly high mortality rate, and never grow as large as the removed saplings would have.

The EIR is inaccurate. It grossly understates the increased herbicide use. The Natural Resources Division - NRD (former "Natural" Areas Program - NAP) had used herbicides every year - definitely since 2001- most likely since mid 90s, when this environmentally damaging program started.

They use Tier I and Tier II herbicides (most hazardous and more hazardous). The EIR inaccurately claims that implementing the Plan will not increase herbicide use, in other words, that the Plan can be implemented without herbicides. This is impossible: the Plan calls for cutting down 18,488 trees and treating the stumps with herbicides for the years to come. The stumps of uncounted saplings will be treated with herbicides too. It would all lead to a massive increase in herbicide use.

The EIR is inaccurate. It uses the wrong definition of biodiversity. All trees and plants, whether they are called native or non-native are part of our local biodiversity, just like people from everywhere are part of our city's diversity. Adding the word "native" to "biodiversity", demonizes any non-native species. Our urban forests are historically a part of plant diversity in San Francisco and have been so for almost 150 years.

The EIR is inaccurate. It says "native" plants are more drought tolerant than "non-native". It says "native" plants are more adaptable to climate change, more sustainable, than "non-native". It says that "native" plants require less irrigation than then "non-native". **No evidence is provided.** The fact that the "Natural" Areas program continuously, for at least 15 years, uses the most toxic herbicides to establish "native" vegetation without success shows that none of those claims are true. It tries to return our parks to what **MIGHT** have been growing here 250 years ago while the climate and the environment are now different. It requires intensive gardening on one quarter of our park land. It is **NOT SUSTAINABLE.**

There are both "native" and "non-native" plants which are drought tolerant. NAP often irrigates "native" plantings, but they usually die nevertheless.

The EIR is inaccurate. It claims that eucalyptus is "invasive." You only need to look around Mt. Davidson to see that the trees haven't invaded anything. California Native Plant Society classifies eucalyptus as having only "**Limited**" invasiveness.

The EIR is inaccurate. It claims that thinning will encourage growth and forest health.

Thinning is a technique used for forest management for LOGGING, and it is done when trees are young. Established forest is a community adjusted to the existing conditions which in all likelihood will be damaged by the change. For the tree which fell and caused the Butte Fire in 2015 it was determined that a stand of trees surrounding was removed by PG&E before the fire. That was poor tree maintenance: it left the remaining tree "exposed to open space" and "prone to failure." Both Cal Fire and Calaveras County are seeking millions from PG&E as reimbursement for damages.

Read more here:

<http://www.sacbee.com/news/state/california/fires/article74496267.html#storylink=cpy>

Please vote YES on File# 170046 to rescind the certification of this bias, inaccurate, and inadequate EIR for Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

The environmentally damaging, unnatural "Natural" Areas Program (now "Natural" Resource Division) needs to be eliminated.

At the very least

- all forested areas should be removed from NAP (NRD) control and their management should be done by the RPD's Forestry Division's trained arborists;
- the removal of any trees in NAP-managed areas should be prohibited except for reasons of hazard abatement or construction of buildings (but not "habitat restoration");
- only the "environmentally superior" (according to the EIR itself) Maintenance Alternative identified in the EIR should be allowed;
- all Tier 1 and Tier 2 (the most toxic) herbicides use in parks should be prohibited to ensure public safety.

Sincerely,
Eugene Bachmanov
418 Arch St.,
SF, CA 94132

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: SF Public Golf Alliance Supports Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, Opposes Appeal; Board of Supervisors Hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.
Date: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:24:03 PM
Attachments: [SFPGA.Nat.Areas.FinalEIR.Commt.12.12.16.pdf](#)

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.org]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:07 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@SFGOV1.onmicrosoft.com>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; asha.safai@sfgov.org

Cc: Johnston, Conor (BOS) <conor.johnston@sfgov.org>; Pagoulatos, Nick (BOS) <nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org>; Kelly, Margaux (BOS) <margaux.kelly@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Summers, Ashley (BOS) <ashley.summers@sfgov.org>; Lopez, Barbara (BOS) <barbara.lopez@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (BOS) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Goossen, Carolyn (BOS) <carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org>; Chan, Yoyo (BOS) <yoyo.chan@sfgov.org>; cathy.mulkaymeyer@sfgov.org; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Hue, Melinda (CPC) <melinda.hue@sfgov.org>; Range, Jessica (CPC) <jessica.range@sfgov.org>; Bradley, Stacy (REC) <stacy.bradley@sfgov.org>

Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance Supports Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, Opposes Appeal; Board of Supervisors Hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance and its 6,500-plus members support the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, and oppose the appeal from the Planning Department's certification of the Final EIR. We ask that our position, and our supporting documentation and letters, including this letter and its attachments, be included in the Board's record in the matter.

An important component of the NAP is the Rec & Park Department's restoration plan for the lagoons and wetlands at Sharp Park, together with maintenance of the popular and historic 18-hole public Sharp Park Golf Course. Opened in 1932, the golf course was built for San Francisco by the preeminent golf architect Alister MacKenzie, and is formally recognized as an historic site by the Pacifica General Plan and Pacifica Historical Society, and as Historic Resource Property under CEQA by the San Francisco Planning Department. Sharp Park is listed as one of the 50 Best Municipal golf courses in America by Golfweek Magazine. And the California Coastal Commission has found that "Sharp Park Golf Course qualifies as sensitive coastal resource area [under Public Resources Code 30000 et seq.] due to its significant recreational value."

San Francisco's effort to balance the interests of habitat recovery, reasonably-priced public recreation, and historic preservation at Sharp Park go back to the early 1990's, with involvement and supervision from the US Fish & Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Conservancy, and California Coastal Commission. Environmentalist groups led by Wild Equity Institute have in recent years unsuccessfully contested San Francisco's restoration plans for Sharp Park in the state and federal courts. However, the San Francisco and San Mateo County Superior Courts, the US District Court for the Northern District of California, and the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit have rejected the claims, and dismissed all of these lawsuits. Key issues raised in Wild Equity's current appeal to Your Board from the Planning Commission's December 15, 2016 Order Certifying the Final EIR, have already been considered and decided against Wild Equity and the other appellants in those prior administrative agency and court proceedings. All of this is set forth in detail, with extensive documentation to the public record, in the above-attached letter, dated December 12, 2016, which San Francisco Public Golf Alliance filed with the Planning Commission in advance of its December 15 public hearing on the Final EIR.

We will submit to Your Board an additional comment letter, opposing Wild Equity's appeal of the Planning Commission's Certification of the Final EIR. But in the meantime, we will by separate correspondence deliver to the Clerk of the Board, with copies to the individual supervisors' offices, letters from many of our individual members in support of the Natural Areas Plan and in opposition to the appeal.

We look forward to seeing you at the public hearing on February 28.

Best Regards

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Phone: (415) 290-5718

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE



235 Montgomery St., Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94104 • 415-290-5718 • info@sfpublicgolf.org



December 12, 2016

San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

San Francisco Park & Recreation Commission
501 Stanyan St.
San Francisco, CA. 94117

**Re: Natural Areas Plan, Final EIR
Planning and Rec & Park Commissions Joint Hearing, Dec. 15, 2016**

**San Francisco Public Golf Alliance supports the Final EIR,
Including the RPD's 18-hole Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Plan,
and urges the Commissions not to "sever" Sharp Park.**

Dear Commissioners,

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sharp Park Golf Course, built in the early 1930's by the preeminent architect Alister MacKenzie in collaboration with John McLaren, is one of the best-known and best-loved jewels in San Francisco's parks system. It is known nation- and world-wide as an historic cultural landscape and public golf treasure, and is ranked as one of the 50 Greatest Municipal Courses in America. It is also one of the most reasonably-priced public courses in the Bay Area, beloved by golfers across all gender, age, racial, and economic strata.

Since the issuance of a California Coastal Conservancy-sponsored study in 1992, the Rec & Park Department has pursued a long-term program of renewing and improving the historic golf links, while protecting and enhancing habitat for endangered snakes and frogs that live in the Sharp Park wetlands. The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance supports this balanced program. We are optimistic that under provisions of the Final EIR – with its Revisions to Mitigation Measures M-CP-7 and M-RE-6 requiring consultation with an expert in Alister MacKenzie and historic golf architectural renovation – the city will be able to protect the species, the public recreation, and the historic golf architecture at Sharp Park. These are all very important public resources at Sharp Park, and we must seek the proper balance – as the Coastal Commission did in the case of the Pump House Project.

Your two commissions -- Recreation and Park, and Planning – together with the Public Utilities Commission, have repeatedly since 2000 developed plans, adopted resolutions, and spent millions of dollars in support of the Sharp Park Golf Course. This includes the \$10 Million Pacifica Recycled Water Project, specifically designed to deliver recycled irrigation water to the course. Completed in 2012, that project makes Sharp Park one of the few courses between San Francisco and San Jose with a recycled water source.

Between 2012-2015 these plans have received regulatory approvals from the US Fish & Wildlife Service, US Army Corps of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, and San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board. Challenges from anti-golf activists have been rejected, and lawsuits dismissed, by the San Francisco Superior Court, San Mateo County Superior Court, US District Court for the Northern District of California, and the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Now, the same anti-golf activists whose announced goal is to close the golf course, are asking Your Commissions to “sever” Sharp Park from the Natural Areas Final EIR – and thus delay needed habitat recovery and restoration work at the golf course. This is a bad idea, and we urge you to reject “severance”.

Sharp Park has been part of the Rec & Park Department’s Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan since the program’s inception. An earlier attempt by these same anti-golf activists to “sever” Sharp Park from the Natural Areas Program – virtually identical to arguments currently being made to your two Commissions -- died in committee at the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2012.

Preserving this precious public resource is our collective duty, and the specific responsibility of our public officials, who are trusted stewards of our parks, recreation, and great public architectural facilities, especially those such as Sharp Park Golf Course that have been loved and enjoyed by millions of people for nearly a century.

For these reasons and more – all of which are thoroughly footnoted to original source documents in the following sections of this letter – the 6,500-plus members of the non-profit, pro-bono San Francisco Public Golf Alliance urge Your Commissions to proceed with the Natural Areas Final EIR, including the 18-hole Sharp Park restoration plan.

II. Background

A. Sharp Park is a Significant Recreational and Historical Resource

Sharp Park Golf Course, opened in 1932 and located adjacent to Salada Beach in Pacifica, is a San Francisco-owned seaside public golf links, designed by preeminent architect Dr. Alister MacKenzie¹, and often called “The Poor Man’s Pebble Beach.” It is: (1) one of the most reasonably-priced golf courses in the Bay Area²; (2) heavily-played³; (3) recognized by the San Francisco Planning Department as an “historic resource” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)⁴; (4) recognized by the California Coastal Commission as a “sensitive coastal resource area” under the Coastal Act for its seaside public golf recreational values⁵; (5) designated an “historic site” by the City of Pacifica General Plan⁶ and by the Pacifica Historical Society⁷; (6) designated a nationally-significant “At-Risk Cultural Landscape” by the Washington D.C.-based Cultural Landscape Foundation⁸; and (7) recognized (along with Harding Park) as one of America’s 50 Best Municipal Courses by Golfweek Magazine.⁹

¹ Dr. MacKenzie, inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame, was the architect of several of the world’s most highly-esteemed courses, including Augusta National (home of the annual Masters Tournament) and the Cypress Point Club at Monterey, CA. World Golf Hall of Fame, “Alister MacKenzie” <http://www.worldgolffhalloffame.org/alister-mackenzie/> Sharp Park is one of only a handful of municipal courses in the world built by Dr. MacKenzie, and his only public seaside links.

² A chart compiled by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department and presented in November, 2009 to the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee – the Department’s citizens’ advisory committee – shows that Sharp Park’s greens fees are among the lowest for 18-hole public courses in the San Francisco Bay Area. San Francisco Recreation & Park Department, Chart: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFRPD.Survey.Bay.Area.Golf.Fees.2009.pdf>

³ Annual play figures at Sharp Park vary with the weather. In Fiscal Year 2013-2014, 45,622 18-hole rounds were played at Sharp Park, more than at any of the city’s other municipal courses. See SF Rec & Park Department, Golf Revenue & Expenditure Report, for FY 13-14: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/%2713-%2714%20Actuals.pdf>

⁴ San Francisco Planning Dept., Historic Resource Evaluation Response (“HRER”), February 15, 2011, at Page 2: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SF_Planning_Dept_Historic_2_8_2011.pdf

⁵ California Coastal Commission, Staff Report, April 3, 2015, at pp. 18-19: <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2015/4/th8a-4-2015.pdf>. In its April 16, 2015 ruling granting the Permit for the Pump House Project, the Coastal Commission unanimously adopted the Staff Report and its findings. *Id.*, April 3, 2015, at page 5.

⁶ The golf course is designated a Pacifica “Historic Site” in the Pacifica General Plan, Historic Preservation Element and Historic Sites Map, at pages 95 and 95a. <http://www.cityofpacific.org/civica/filebank/blobload.asp?BlobID=3443> .

⁷ The City of Pacifica’s official historian, the Pacifica Historical Society, by Resolution dated June 14, 2011, designated Sharp Park Golf Course a Pacifica “historical and cultural resource”: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Pacific_Historical_Society_Resolution_6-14-11.pdf

⁸ Cultural Landscape Foundation, “Sharp Park Golf Course Threatened With Closure,” About TCLF, At Risk Landscapes: <http://tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure> ; <http://tclf.org/about> ; <http://tclf.org/stewardship/about-landslide?destination=search-results>; <http://tclf.org/landscapes/sharp-park-golf-course>

Congresswoman Jackie Speier¹⁰, the County of San Mateo¹¹, the cities of Pacifica¹² and San Bruno¹³, and the Chambers of Commerce of both San Francisco¹⁴ and Pacifica¹⁵ have all urged that Sharp Park Golf Course be preserved.

Specifically, the City of Pacifica in the current Natural Areas Plan EIR process, has called Sharp Park Golf Course “an important resource that is shared by the two cities [Pacifica and San Francisco] as well as the rest of San Mateo County,” and officially endorsed the Natural Areas Draft EIR, and called upon San Francisco to “. . . mov[e] forward the work called for in the Significant Natural Resources Areas Management Plan and in the preservation of the Sharp Park Golf Course.”¹⁶

1. Sharp Park is the People’s Course, the “Poor Man’s Pebble Beach,” enjoyed by a broad and diverse group of men, women, seniors, and students across the full range of age, gender, race, and income.

Long known as “the poor man’s Pebble Beach,” Sharp Park is a mere 15-minute freeway ride from San Francisco’s southern neighborhoods, and has historically been a favorite of low-income golfers, seniors, students, and racial and ethnic minorities. In 1955, Sharp Park played an important role in the racial integration of public recreation in America, when it hosted the inaugural championship tournament of the Western States Golf Association, one of the country’s oldest and largest African-American golfing societies.¹⁷

⁹ Golfweek, Best Municipal Courses (2014) (Sharp Park rated No. 50, Harding No. 17): <http://golfweek.com/news/2014/jun/25/golf-courses-municipal-golfweeks-best-travel/>

¹⁰ Statement, Congresswoman Jackie Speier re Sharp Park, Nov. 6, 2009: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.Speier.Stmt.Save.Sharp.11.6.09.pdf>

¹¹ San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, Resolution G69145, December 18, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/smbos_res.pdf

¹² Pacifica City Council, Resolution 63-2007, December 10, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/cop_res.pdf

¹³ Letter, San Bruno Mayor Jim Ruane to Hon. Ed Lee, Dec. 22, 2011: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/12-22-11_Mayor_Ruane_Letter.pdf

¹⁴ Letter, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Sr. Vice President Jim Lazarus to Hon. Ed Lee, Dec. 14, 2011 https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Chamber_of_Commerce_SaveSharpPark.pdf

¹⁵ Letter, Pacifica Chamber of Commerce to Pacifica Mayor Mary Ann Nihart, March 26, 2011: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Pacifica.CofC.ltr.SFMayor.3.26.11.Sh.Pk..pdf>

¹⁶ Letter, Pacifica Mayor Mary Ann Nihart to San Francisco Planning Department, October 26, 2011 <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Pacifica.ltr.SFPIng.SNRAMP%20EIR.10%2C26%2C11.pdf>

¹⁷ Letter, October 5, 2011. from Nathaniel Jackson, President, Bay Area Golf Club of Northern California,: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Ltr.Bay.AreaGC%20to%20MayorLee.10.5.11.pdf>

Sharp Park is a favorite venue for several San Francisco and North Peninsula high school boys' and girls' golf teams, as well as Senior and ethnic minority golf associations, including the Bay Area Golf Club of Northern California¹⁸ Mabuhay Golf Club¹⁹, Sons in Retirement²⁰, Mexican American Golf Association²¹, and Golden Hill Golf Club²², all of which have written letters calling for preservation of the 18-hole golf course.

2. With its Alister MacKenzie architecture, seaside location, and great beauty, Sharp Park is widely admired as a national and international golf treasure.

The late Ken Venturi, San Francisco favorite son, US Open Champion, and World Golf Hall of Fame member, called Sharp Park Dr. MacKenzie's "great gift to the American public course golfer."²³ And state, national, and world golf associations, including the United States Golf Association²⁴, Northern California Golf Association²⁵, Southern California Golf Association and Pacific Women's Golf Association²⁶, Golf Course Superintendents Association of America²⁷, Professional Golfers' Association of America²⁸, World Golf Foundation²⁹, and the Alister MacKenzie Society of Great Britain and Ireland³⁰, have called upon San Francisco to save and protect Sharp Park Golf Course.

¹⁸ Letter, October 5, 2011, from Nathaniel Jackson, etc., Id.

¹⁹ Mabuhay Golf Club, Letter, March 29, 2011
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGAMabuhayLtr32911.pdf>

²⁰ Sons in Retirement, Letter, June 2, 2010:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.SIRS.Letter.Sharp%20Park.6.2-10.pdf>

²¹ Mexican American Golf Association, San Jose Chapter, Letter, March 5, 2011:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGAMAGALtr3511.pdf>

²² Golden Hill Golf Club, Letter, June 17, 2011:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGAGoldenHillLtr61711.pdf>

²³ Letter, Dec. 11, 2011, Ken Venturi to Mayor Ed Lee
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Ken%20Venturi%20Ltr%20re%20Sharp%2C%202012.11.11.pdf>

²⁴ Letter, USGA Executive Director Mike Davis to Mayor Ed Lee, Dec. 14, 2011:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/USGA%20Ltr.Mike.Davis%20to%20MayorLee%20Sharp%20Park.pdf>

²⁵ Letter, March 26, 2015, Northern California Golf Association to California Coastal Commission:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/NCGA.Ltr.CCC.re.Sh.Pk.3.26.15.pdf>

²⁶ Letter, Sept. 28, 2009 California Alliance for Golf (incl. So.Cal.Golf Assn. and Pacific Women's Golf Assn):
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/CAG-SharpPark-letter.9.28.09.pdf>

²⁷ Letter, October 6, 2011, GCSAA to San Francisco Planning Department (Copy attached as Exhibit):
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/GCSAA.Ltr.Plng.10.6.11.pdf>

²⁸ Letter, Sept. 27, 2011, PGA of America to San Francisco Planning Department
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/PGA%20of%20Amer.Ltr.to.Plng.9.27.11.pdf>

²⁹ Letter, World Golf Foundation, July 23, 2009:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/WorldGolfFdnLtr.Plng.9.29.11.pdf>

B. Sharp Park is also home of protected frogs and snakes, which were not found at Sharp Park until years after golf course construction converted the previously-brackish Laguna Salada into a “picturesque freshwater pool.”

Following trial in 2015, San Francisco Superior Court Judge Garrett Wong on May 28, 2015 dismissed a Sharp Park lawsuit brought by anti-golf groups against San Francisco and its agencies, including the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and Planning Department. Among other things, Judge Wong found:

“The golf course at Sharp Park was constructed in 1932 . . . The seawall along the western edge of Sharp Park was originally constructed between 1941 and 1952 and eliminated the historic hydrologic connection between the Pacific Ocean and the wetland complex. . . . The first recorded sighting of the California red-legged frog or the San Francisco garter snake at Sharp Park was in 1946, after the seawall was constructed [citation omitted]. Red-legged frogs cannot live in saline conditions [citation omitted], and before the seawall, Laguna Salada was regularly inundated with seawater. . . .”³¹

A contemporaneous newspaper description of John McLaren’s planning and Alister MacKenzie’s design vision for Sharp Park Golf Course that appeared in the February 23, 1930 San Francisco Chronicle reported: “More than half of the holes border on Lake Salada, which John McLaren, superintendent of parks, transformed from a salt water marsh into a picturesque fresh-water pool.”³²

San Francisco’s plan to recover habitat in Sharp Park’s wetlands for the threatened California red-legged frog and its predator the San Francisco garter snake grew out of the California Coastal Conservancy-sponsored “Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan,” a 1992 study authored by Philip Williams & Associates (PWA).³³ The PWA plan called for **“use which is compatible with the natural resource values of the site and with the golf course operation”**³⁴ including habitat enhancement for the frogs and snakes, pumping to manage water levels and quality, dredging tules from ponds and wetlands, maintaining the Sharp Park seawall, continuing the 18-hole golf course, and developing a recycled water irrigation system for the course.³⁵

³⁰ Alister MacKenzie Society of Great Britain & Ireland, letter, April 28, 2009
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/MacKenzie%20Society%20Ltr.Save.Sharp.4.28.09.pdf>

³¹ *Wild Equity Institute, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Superior Court, No. CPF 14-513613, Order Denying Writ of Mandate, May 28, 2015. at page 2:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.SFSup.Ct.Wld.Eq.Dismiss.Jn.1.15.pdf>

³² San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 23, 1930, “Chandler Egan Will Inspect Sharp Park Golf Course”:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFChron.2.23.30.EganWillInspectSharp.pdf>

³³ Philip M. Williams Associates, 1992, “Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.PWilliams.Laguna.Salada.Plan.1992f.pdf> , at p. 35.

³⁴ Philip M. Williams Associates, *Id.*, at p. 35.

³⁵ Philip M. Williams Associates, *Id.*, at pp. 37-51

Before construction of the golf course at Sharp Park in the early 1930's, PWA concluded, Laguna Salada "is not likely to have supported the San Francisco garter snake, which feeds on freshwater frogs":

"Prior to development as a golf course in the 1920's and 1930's, the site, referred to as Laguna Salada (Salty Lake), consisted of ranch lands, sand dunes, and a large lagoon. . . the common name of Salt Lake Valley³⁶ suggests that the lagoon was brackish to saline. The absence of trees also suggests a more saline environment. . . . Given the saline nature of the pond, it is not likely to have supported the San Francisco garter snake, which feeds on freshwater frogs. The construction of the golf course modified the hydrologic connection with the ocean. . . tidal exchange was greatly reduced and eventually eliminated. The elimination of saline water during the spring months allowed freshwater vegetation to become established. . . ³⁷

To the same effect are (1) an historic photograph, taken before the golf course was built, showing artichoke fields surrounding Laguna Salada field³⁸, and (2) the October 2, 2012 US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion, which states:

"Little is known about the history of San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog in the action area prior to the completion of Sharp Park Golf Course in 1932. The species were first documented in the action area in 1946."³⁹

³⁶ A copy of an 1892 US Geological Survey map of the area, included as Figure 2 to the Williams Report, shows Laguna Salada located in a valley named "Salt Valley":
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Sh.Pk.USGS.Topo.Map.1892.pdf>

³⁷ Philip M. Williams Associates, 1992, "Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan: *supra* (at fn. 33), pp 2-3.

³⁸ An early 20th Century panoramic photograph of the Laguna Salada area, taken from the hill south of the lagoon and looking north with Mt. Tamalpais in the distant background, shows Laguna Salada surrounded by artichoke fields: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.Artichokes.Sharp.early.20.cent.pdf>

³⁹ US Fish & Wildlife Service, Oct. 2, 2012, at p. 28:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/USFWS%20BiOp.pdf>

The Biological Opinion was the result of a 17-month consultation between San Francisco Rec & Park and the US Fish and Wildlife Service and Corps of Engineers.

III. San Francisco has for years worked to balance the recreational, historical, and environmental values at Sharp Park, and this work has been upheld –over objections from the same anti-golf activists who are today calling for Sharp Park to be “severed” from the Final EIR -- by San Francisco’s Rec & Park, Planning, and PUC commissions, and by the lead Resource Agencies, including US Fish & Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Coastal Commission. And these approvals have been upheld by the state and federal courts.

A. In 2009, Rec & Park adopted, and the Commission approved, the Laguna Salada Conceptual Restoration Plan, to enhance wetland habitat at Sharp Park, while retaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The San Francisco Rec and Park Commission in December, 2009, unanimously approved the Laguna Salada Conceptual Restoration Plan, to recover habitat for the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake in the Sharp Park wetlands, while preserving the historic 18-hole golf course.⁴⁰ Before the Commission approved it, the 18-hole plan was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC).⁴¹ The plan was recommended by the Department in November, 2009, based upon a six-month study and report by the environmental consulting firm Tetra-Tech.⁴² Throughout this process, environmental activist groups vigorously but unsuccessfully lobbied to close the golf course.⁴³

B. Anti-golf activists admit that the Sharp Park Plan now before Your Commissions as part of the Natural Areas Plan is “substantially the same plan” as the Pump House Project, approved in October, 2012 by a US Fish & Wildlife Service Biological Opinion.

In its October 31, 2011 Comment letter to the Planning Department on the Natural Areas Plan, the anti-golf activist group Wild Equity Institute admits that “the Fish and Wildlife Service has already reviewed **substantially the same plan** that is proposed in the [RPD’s] preferred alternative for Sharp Park Golf Course.”⁴⁴ (That is to say, the same

⁴⁰ San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission Minutes, Dec. 17, 2009, Resolution No. 0912-018, at pp. 40-41 <http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/121709-minutes1.pdf>

⁴¹ Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), Minutes, Dec. 1, 2009, at page 4: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SharpParkPROSACResol%27ns12109_00000.pdf

⁴² Tetra-Tech, Sharp Park Conceptual Alternatives Report, November, 2009: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2005.0912E_DEIR6.pdf (at pages 4-5 46-47, and 59-60) This November, 2009 Report updated and generally followed the approach originally recommended by the 1992 PWA Plan (see footnotes 16 and 23, supra,

⁴³ The anti-golf campaign was announced in an August 19, 2009 press release from Center for Biological Diversity: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/CBD.Prs.Rls.re.Scientist.Ltr.Sh.Pk.8.19.09.pdf>

⁴⁴ Letter, Wild Equity Institute to SF Planning Dept., Oct. 31, 2011, at 6th unnumbered page, 1st full paragraph: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Wild.Eq.Ltr.SNRRAMP.EIR.11-16.11.pdf>

Sharp Park Plan which is a component of the Natural Areas Plan, currently before Your Commissions.)

That US Fish and Wildlife Service review resulted in a Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement, dated October 2, 2012⁴⁵, for the first phase of the Rec & Park's long-term Sharp Park plan, including partial dredging of the ponds and connecting channel, plus worker safety and other improvements to the golf course's flood-control pumping system.

This project was entitled the Sharp Park Safety, Infrastructure Improvement, and Habitat Enhancement Project ("Pump House Project").^{46, 47} Following a 17-month study, the USFWS on October 2, 2012 concluded that, subject to a set of Conservation Measures designed to minimize the project's potential impacts, the Pump House Project "is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the California red-legged frog or San Francisco garter snake" (*Id.*, at page 38).^{48, 49}

C. Federal Trial and Appeals courts dismiss anti-golf lawsuit filed in 2011 by Sierra Club, Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, Sequoia Audubon, Surfrider Foundation, and National Parks Conservation Association.

On March 2, 2011, Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, National Parks Conservation Association, Surfrider Foundation, Sequoia Audubon, and the Sierra Club filed a lawsuit against San Francisco, Mayor Edwin Lee, and Rec & Park General Manager Phil Ginsburg in the US District Court for Northern California, for declaratory and injunctive relief under the Endangered Species Act, based on allegations of "unlawful take" (killing and other damage) of the California red-legged frog and San Francisco Garter Snake at the Sharp Park Golf Course.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), October 2, 2012 <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/USFWS%20BiOp.pdf>

⁴⁶ Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement, *Id.*, Project Description, at pp. 5-6

⁴⁷ The Pump House Project is discussed in detail below, in Section III.D of this letter.

⁴⁸ Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement, *supra* (fn. 46)

⁴⁹ Before reaching its conclusions, the USFWS considered objections and arguments from Wild Equity and Center for Biological Diversity's consultants ESA/PWA and Peter Bayh. This can be seen from the USFWS Biological Opinion. *Id.* Literature Cited at pages 48-49, which includes a lengthy report from consultant ESA-PWA, dated February 9, 2011, entitled "Conceptual Ecosystem Restoration Plan and Feasibility Assessment, Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California. Prepared for Wild Equity Institute and Center for Biological Diversity." <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/ESA-PWA.2011.Laguna.Salada.Plan%2C%202.10.11.pdf>

⁵⁰ *Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, U.S. Dist.Ct.N.D.Cal., No. C 11-00958 SI, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, filed March 2, 2011: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/WildEq.vs.San%20Fran.USDC.Complaint.3-2-11.pdf>

Following issuance of the USFWS Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement on October 2, 2012⁵¹, U.S. District Court Judge Susan Illston on December 6, 2012 ruled that the lawsuit was mooted by the Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement, and dismissed the lawsuit.⁵² On March 25, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit dismissed the plaintiffs' appeal.⁵³

D. In 2014, San Francisco Planning and Rec & Park Commissions and Board of Supervisors approved the Sharp Park Pump House Project; the approvals were upheld in 2015 by San Francisco Superior Court.

On January 16, 2014 – and over opposition from anti-golf activists -- the San Francisco Planning Commission unanimously approved a Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Sharp Park Pump House Project.⁵⁴ The Rec & Park Commission – again over opposition from anti-golf activists -- approved the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Pump House Project at its January 23, 2014 meeting.⁵⁵ And the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, after a long public hearing on March, 25, 2014, denied the anti-golf activists' appeal of the Rec & Park and Planning Commissions' decisions, and approved the Pump House Project.⁵⁶

Wild Equity, Save the Frogs, and Sequoia Audubon Society then brought a Writ of Mandamus in San Francisco Superior Court, naming the City and County of San Francisco, and its Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department, and Mayor Edwin Lee as defendants, and alleging that their approvals violated the California Environmental Quality Act.⁵⁷ Following trial, San Francisco Superior Court Judge Garrett

⁵¹ Biological Opinion Letter, USFWS, October 2, 2012, *supra* (fn 43)

⁵² *Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, *supra*, Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, etc., Dec. 6, 2012: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Sharp.Park.Order.Dismissal.12.6.12.pdf>

⁵³ *Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, U.S Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, No. 13-1546, Memorandum [Order Dismissing Appeal], March 25, 2015: <http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/memoranda/2015/03/25/13-15046.pdf>

⁵⁴ Minutes, Planning Commission meeting, January 16, 2014, Item No. 11, Motion No. 19063, adopting findings and affirming decision to issue a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Sharp Park Pump House Project: http://default.sfplanning.org/meetingarchive/planning_dept/sf-planning.org/index.aspx-page=3770.html [minutes]; http://default.sfplanning.org/meetingarchive/planning_dept/commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcmotions/2014/19063.pdf [Motion]

⁵⁵ Minutes, Recreation and Park Commission meeting, January 23, 2014, Resolution 1401-007 (at pages 11-16): <http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/012414-minutes.pdf>

⁵⁶ San Francisco Board of Supervisors, March 25, 2014, Motion No. M14-039: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=2952903&GUID=29926E90-097F-4F34-BFE1-26579EE3DCBB>

⁵⁷ *Wild Equity Institute, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Sup. Ct, CPF 14-513613, Verified First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/WildEq.v.CCSF%28SFSuper%291Am.Writ%20Petn.4.23.14.pdf>

Wong on August 18, 2015 entered an Order Denying Writ of Mandate⁵⁸, and a Judgment in favor of the defendants.⁵⁹ Among other things, Judge Wong found in his Order Denying Writ of Mandate:

“ . . . the Biological Opinion provides an absolute guarantee that the Project will not harm Sharp Park’s red-legged frog population. . . . The [US Fish and Wildlife] Service has authorized this Project by issuing the Biological Opinion and the Incidental Take Statement. *Under the Biological Opinion there are no circumstances whereby the Project could possibly “substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; [or] substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species,” which is the measure of a significant adverse impact on a listed species. [citation omitted] The Service has determined that the take levels it authorized in the Incidental Take Statement are “not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the California red-legged frog or San Francisco garter snake.” [citation omitted] Under the Biological Opinion and the Incidental Take Statement, the Service has already prohibited the Project from causing any level of take that might harm the frog population at Sharp Park. Before the Project could have a detrimental impact on the frog population, it would lose its authorization under the Biological Opinion.”⁶⁰

E. The US Army Corps of Engineers and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board approved the Pump House Project and rejected the anti-golf arguments.

The Pump House Project required – and received – permits and approvals from (1) the Army Corps of Engineers, which granted a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit on February 5, 2014⁶¹; and (2) the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which on June 25, 2014 issued a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification.^{62, 63}

⁵⁸ *Wild Equity Institute, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Sup. Ct, CPF 14-513613, Order Denying Writ of Mandate, May 28, 2015: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.SFSup.Ct.Wld.Eq.Dismiss.Jn.1.15.pdf>

⁵⁹ *Wild Equity Institute, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Sup. Ct, CPF 14-513613, Judgment, Aug. 18, 2015: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Wild.Eq.v.CCSF%2CJudgment.8.18.15.pdf>, Adopting Order Denying Writ of Mandate, May 28, 2015)

⁶⁰ *Wild Equity Institute, et al. vs. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Sup. Ct, CPF 14-513613, Order Denying Writ of Mandate, *supra* (Note 56), at page 10 line 15 to page 11 line 2: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.SFSup.Ct.Wld.Eq.Dismiss.Jn.1.15.pdf>

⁶¹ Letter, February 5, 2014, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (“Corps of Engineers letter”), <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SharpPark.Corps.Eng%27rs.Permit.2.5.14.pdf>

⁶² San Francisco Bay RWQCB, CWA Section 401 Certification letter, June 25, 2014, <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/RWQCB.Sh.Pk.Certif%27n.6.25.14.pdf>

F. California Coastal Commission finds Sharp Park Golf Course to be a “sensitive coastal resource area” under the Coastal Act because of its recreational – and specifically public golf -- values, and grants a coastal development permit to the Pump House Project, to protect the course from flooding and to “maintain the existing functional capacity of the wetland”.

The California Coastal Commission on April 16, 2015 approved a Coastal Development Permit for the Pump House Project.^{64, 65} Significantly, the Commission found that, under the Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code Section 30000, et seq.):

“Sharp Park Golf Course qualifies as **sensitive coastal resource area** due to its significant recreational value and because it is a highly scenic area. (See § 30116(b) and (c)) . . . In particular, Sharp Park Golf Course is open to the public. It is a highly popular course enjoyed by golfers who appreciate its historic architecture, dramatic views, and inexpensive rates.”⁶⁶

Included in the Pump House Project was retroactive approval of new, larger pumps at the pump house. The Commission found that the new pumps are needed to reduce golf course flooding, which would otherwise substantially impact the low-cost public golf “sensitive coastal resource” at Sharp Park.

“In the end, the Commission must determine whether its decision to either deny or approve a project is the decision that is most protective of significant coastal resources. In this case, the Commission finds that the impacts on recreational resources from not constructing the project as conditioned, would be more significant than the project’s potential adverse effects to sensitive EHSA buffer areas and upland habitat. Denying the proposed project because of its inconsistency with Section 30240 would result in the continued flooding of the golf course, which over time may discourage its use and deprive low-income users of the opportunity to play golf with coastal views. In contrast, approving the development as proposed protects and continues recreational uses, and provides some habitat enhancement. . . .

⁶³ Wild Equity Institute on July 25, 2014 filed a Petition for Review and Reconsideration of the Section 401 Certification: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/docs/petitions/a2321petition.pdf ; but according to the California State Water Resources Control Board’s online listing, “Water Quality Petitions” (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/petitions.shtml), as of October 10, 2016 Wild Equity’s Petition (Petition No. A-2321) has not been acted upon by the Water Resources Control Board.

⁶⁴ California Coastal Commission, Permit 2-12-014, June 2, 2015: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.Sh.Pk.Coast.Comm.CDP.6.2.15.pdf>

⁶⁵ California Coastal Commission, Staff Report, April 3, 2015 and Addendum April 15, 2015: <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2015/4/th8a-4-2015.pdf> . In its April 16, 2015 ruling granting the Permit for the Pump House Project, the Coastal Commission unanimously adopted the Staff Report and its findings. Id., April 3, 2015, at page 5.

⁶⁶ California Coastal Commission, Staff Report, Id. April 3, 2015, at pages 18-19 (emphasis added).

Therefore, the Commission finds that, approving the project, as conditioned, is, on balance, most protective of coastal resources.”⁶⁷

On June 15, 2015, Wild Equity Institute (alone) filed suit in San Mateo Superior Court against the Coastal Commission, seeking a writ of administrative mandamus to require the Commission to vacate its permit for the Pump House Project.⁶⁸ On August 20, 2015, San Mateo County Superior Court Judge George Miram denied Wild Equity’s motion for preliminary injunction to stay the permit pending outcome of the lawsuit. In so ruling, Judge Miram found that Wild Equity Wild Equity “failed to demonstrate a reasonable probability of prevailing on the merits of its Writ Petition.”⁶⁹ Wild Equity then dismissed its lawsuit on October 9, 2015.⁷⁰

San Francisco completed work on the Pump House Project in October, 2015.

G. San Francisco Public Utilities and Rec & Park Commissions Approve the Pacifica Recycled Water Project, completed in 2012 at a cost of \$10 Million (paid 78% by San Francisco), for the express purpose of providing recycled water to irrigate the golf course.

At a public hearing on October 28, 2008, with no public opposition testimony, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission voted unanimously to enter an agreement with Pacifica’s North Coast County Water District to construct the Pacifica Recycled Water Project, designed to deliver 78% of the project’s recycled water from Pacifica’s Calera Creek water treatment plant to irrigate the golf course.⁷¹ At the hearing, the only public comment came from Jennifer Clary of the environmentalist group Clean Water Action, who described “a big environmental backlash. . . around red-legged frogs and Sharp Park”, but nevertheless urged the Commissioners to support the recycled water project for Sharp Park:

“I urge you to vote yes on this. This is a very difficult project. . . There was a big environmental backlash. . . some of the problems around red-legged frogs

⁶⁷ California Coastal Commission, Staff Report, *Id.*, at pages 35-36

⁶⁸ Complaint for Administrative Mandamus, Filed June 15, 2015, *Wild Equity Institute vs. California Coastal Commission*, San Mateo County Superior Court, No. CIV 534243: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/WildEq.v.CoastalComm.WritPetitn.6-15-15.pdf>

⁶⁹ Order Denying Motion for Preliminary Injunction, etc., August 20, 2015, *Wild Equity Institute vs. California Coastal Commission*, San Mateo County Superior Court, No. CIV 534243: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGA.W.Eq.v.CCC.Order.Deny.Prelim.Injn.8.20.pdf>

⁷⁰ Request for Dismissal (Entered), October 9, 2015, *Wild Equity Institute vs. California Coastal Commission*, San Mateo County Superior Court, No. CIV 534243 <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/SFPGAWEqCCCDismissal10915.pdf>

⁷¹ Public Utilities Commission, October 28, 2008, Item 11, SFGovTV, at 00:57:16-01:03:31: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=22 .

and Sharp Park that came up, there was a lot of concern about endangered species. . But I think this is a good project and I urge you to approve it.”⁷²

Initially funded with a planning grant from the State Water Resources Control Board, the \$10 Million project had been in the pipeline since the late 1990’s.^{73, 74} In November, 2010, the Public Utilities Commission again voted unanimously – this time, over objection from environmentalist groups – to amend the Pacifica Recycled Water agreement, and to enter a Memorandum of Understanding to manage the project with San Francisco’s Rec & Park Department.⁷⁵ In turn, the Rec & Park Commission at its January 20, 2011 public meeting voted unanimously to enter the Memorandum of Understanding with the PUC for the Pacifica Recycled Water Project.⁷⁶ Construction of the pipelines, pumps, and storage tank was completed in 2012, and in October, 2014, recycled irrigation water was delivered to the four golf holes lying east of the Coast Highway.⁷⁷ Today, thanks to the Pacifica Recycled Water Project, Sharp Park is one of the few golf courses between San Francisco and San Jose with a dedicated recycled water irrigation source.

III. There are no legitimate grounds to “sever” Sharp Park from Final EIR.

A. Sharp Park was not “added late” to the Natural Areas planning process or EIR but has been part of the Natural Areas program since its inception.

Evolution of a plan between the initial notice of preparation and the draft EIR stage does not invalidate an EIR process. Nothing in the California Environmental Quality Act, or the CEQA Guidelines, requires that the project description in the initial Notice of Preparation of EIR must remain static throughout the remainder of the CEQA process.

Indeed, consistent with the purpose of requiring agency and public input, projects often change during the course of the CEQA process. See Kostka & Zischke,

⁷² Public Utilities Commission, October 28, 2008, Item 11, Id., SFGovTV, at 01:02:20-01:03:31. Note: Ms. Clary was, as of 2015, also President of San Francisco Tomorrow.

⁷³ Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, “Pacifica Recycled Water Project Facilities Planning Report, December, 2004, at Cover Letter, Dec. 20, 2004 and Pages 1, 23-25. (Copies of cited pages enclosed as **Exhibit 21**.) <http://www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=2481>

⁷⁴ San Mateo County Times, July 8, 2009, “Pacifica Golf Course, Parks, to Use Recycled Water”: http://www.insidebayarea.com/sanmateocountytimes/localnews/ci_12787178 (Copy attached as **Exhibit 20**.)

⁷⁵ SF Public Utilities Commission Public Hearing, Nov. 9, 2010 (Agenda Items Nos. 11 and 12), SFGovTV video, at 2:51:27- 3:44:04 http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=22&clip_id=11078

⁷⁶ SF Recreation and Park Commission Minutes January 20, 2011, pp. 9-11, Agenda Item #9, Resolution No. 1101-009: <http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/012011minutes.pdf> [Note: the cover page of the minutes incorrectly states the year as 2010, instead of 2011]

⁷⁷ Pacifica Tribune, Nov. 4, 2014, “Recycled Water Now Used on Sharp Park...”: http://www.mercurynews.com/pacifica/ci_26864797/recycled-water-now-used-sharp-park-golf-course (Copy attached as **Exhibit 19**.)

Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act (2d ed., March 2012 update) Section 12.11, citing County of Inyo vs. City of Los Angeles, 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 199 (3rd Dist., 1977) (“The CEQA reporting process is not designed to freeze the ultimate proposal in the precise mold of the initial project; indeed, new and unforeseen insights may emerge during investigation, evoking revision of the original proposal.”); Western Placer Citizens for an Agricultural and Rural Environment vs. County of Placer, 144 Cal.App.4th 890 (3rd Dist., 2006). The fact that aspects of the SNRAMP, including some aspects of the Sharp Park portion, may have changed between the issuance of the Notice of Preparation and the issuance of the Draft EIR, does not invalidate the process.

Sharp Park Golf Course is recognized by the Planning Department to be Historical Resource Property under the California Environmental Quality Act. So any substantial alteration, such as elimination or redesign of the course to a 9-hole format, would require a separate CEQA review. That is not the case with the A-18 Plan and the Final EIR, which retains the historic course and provides for careful work on any changes to the course to accommodate habitat recovery by a golf architect who specializes in historic golf restoration and the work of Alister MacKenzie. Because the Commission did not adopt the “A-9” or “No Golf” alternatives, a separate golf course-centered Environmental Impact Review process was not required.⁷⁸

B. Anti-golf activists made an effort at the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2012 to “sever” Sharp Park from the Natural Areas Program, but that effort died in committee in December, 2012.

On June 26, 2012, then-San Francisco Supervisor Christina Olague submitted a draft Resolution to the Board of Supervisors, captioned “Sever Sharp Park Golf Course from the Natural Areas Plan,” with several “whereas” clauses that closely resemble arguments still being made by anti-golf activists in favor of their current campaign to “sever” Sharp Park from the Natural Areas plan.⁷⁹ The matter was assigned to the Board’s Land Use and Economic Development Committee. But when the bill failed to obtain sufficient support to get out of committee, and at the request of the sponsor, then-Supervisor Olague, the matter was tabled at the Committee’s December 3, 2012 public meeting.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ “Because **redesigning or eliminating** the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.” (emphasis added) Natural Areas Plan Scoping Report, November, 2009 at page 2-5.

⁷⁹ Draft Resolution, June 26, 2012, File No. 120619, “Sever Sharp Park Golf Course from the Natural Areas Plan”: <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/30028085/Olague%5BDft%5DResol.6.26.12.pdf>

⁸⁰ Video of Dec. 3, 2012 public meeting of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Government Committee, at 00:00:01 - 00:03:58. San Francisco Government TV: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=12&clip_id=16465

IV. CONCLUSION: Approve the Final EIR. Don't sever Sharp Park.

Sharp Park Golf Course has been there since 1932—predating Pacifica's incorporation by 25 years--and is the eponym for Pacifica's entire Sharp Park District. It is a beautiful and important property, and a vital historic cultural and recreational resource. Sharp Park is an internationally-significant and extraordinary municipal golf course – one of the very few public courses and the only public seaside links in the world designed by Alister MacKenzie. The golf course is recognized as “Historic Resource Property,” protected under the California Environmental Quality Act, and recognized by the California Coastal Commission as “Sensitive Coastal Resource Area” for its scenic, moderately-priced, public golf recreational qualities.

Since the California Coastal Conservancy-sponsored PWA report in 1992, San Francisco's laudable plan to renovate the golf course while recovering habitat for frogs and snakes has been the subject of exhaustive studies, environmental impact reports, public hearings and comment, decisions, orders, and millions of dollars of expenditures, from, among others, the San Francisco PUC and Rec and Park Departments and Board of Supervisors, Pacifica's North Coast County Water District, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, California Coastal Conservancy, the State Water Resources Control Board, the SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Corps of Engineers.

After all these years, all this study, all these public hearings, and all these decisions by public agencies and courts, it is time to move on with the Natural Areas Program, to certify the Final EIR – importantly, including the 18-hole Sharp Park restoration plan – and adopt the Plan. The 6,500-plus members of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance urge your Commissions to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris



San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Richard Harris, President
Bo Links, Vice President
Co-Founders

cc: See list, next page

Copies sent to

Edwin Lee, Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
Dennis Herrera, San Francisco City Attorney
Congresswoman Jackie Speier
London Breed, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Pacifica City Council
Pacifica City Manager Lori Tinfow
Philip Ginsburg, General Manager, SF Recreation & Park Dept.
Lisa Wayne, Natural Areas Coordinator, SF Rec & Park Dept.
Dawn Kamalanathan, Planning Director, SF Rec & Park Dept.
John Maltbie, County Manager, County of San Mateo
Joe Huston, Ex. Dir., Northern California Golf Association
Kevin Heaney, Ex. Dir., Southern California Golf Association
Lyn Nelson, Chair, San Francisco Mayor's Women's Golf Council
Jeff Volosing, President, Sharp Park Golf Club
Lisa Villasenor, Captain, Sharp Park Business Women's Golf Club
Mike Davis, Exec. Dir., U.S. Golf Association
Steve Mona, Exec. Dir., World Golf Foundation
Nick Zwick, President, Alister MacKenzie Foundation
Gene Zanardi, Alister MacKenzie Society
Jim Lazarus, Sr. Vice Pres., San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Vickie Flores, CEO, Pacifica Chamber of Commerce
Nathaniel Jackson, President, Bay Area Golf Club
Lester Johe, President, Golden Hill Golf Club
Gwendolyn Brown, President, Spear Golf Club
Greg Roja, President, Mabuhay Golf Club
Gabriel De La Torre, President, MAGA, San Jose Chapter
John Major, Big SIR, Sons in Retirement
Jim Emery, San Francisco Deputy City Attorney

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: We Are In Support of the Rec & Park's Areas Plan
Date: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:28:05 PM

From: Levins, Alan S. [mailto:ALevins@littler.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: We Are In Support of the Rec & Park's Areas Plan

Dear Supervisors,

My wife Sharon and I are long-term San Francisco residents, and we vote. The purpose of this e-mail is to urge approval of the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions' decisions regarding Sharp Park. The two Commissions have studied the situation for 20 years, which included public input and environmental review. The appeal of the Commissions' decisions by the anti-golf groups should be denied. The opposition is a misguided effort that will have the effect not only of closing a beautiful golf course, but unnecessarily closing a public course that is reasonably priced and available to those of us who wish to play golf but cannot, or choose not to, pay the high fees of a private course. The fact Sharp Park is easily accessible, serves a diverse clientele, is an historic Alister MacKenzie course, and can be maintained as proposed by the Commissions without adversely affecting the frogs and snakes in the area, means the Commissions' decisions should be approved.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue and our e-mail.

Alan and Sharon Levins
180 28th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message.

Littler Mendelson, P.C. is part of the international legal practice Littler Global, which operates worldwide through a number of separate legal entities. Please visit www.littler.com for more information.

Subject:Re: RPD's Natural Areas Plan

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 11:13:23 -0800

From:Derek Drish <derekdrish@gmail.com>

To:Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisor Sheehy,

I am a San Francisco resident in your District, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan on February 28th. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course. The course, unlike a lot of other park properties, accrues revenue.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Derek Drish

415 Roosevelt Way
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sharp Park
Date: Monday, February 13, 2017 3:50:01 PM
Attachments: [Save Sharp Park Golf .msg](#)
[Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Save Sharp Park Golf Course.msg](#)

Dear Supervisors:

The Clerk's Office has received 3 similar emails regarding Sharp Park (Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan) and all are attached. Thank you.

Regards,

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
(415) 554-5163 fax
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

From: ed_segalsf@comcast.net [mailto:ed_segalsf@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: info@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same antigolf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonablypriced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gatheringplace for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic

18hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Very truly yours,

Ed Segal

From: PShiono@pacbell.net
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save Sharp Park Golf
Date: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:55:17 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Pat Shiono
Resident of Noe Valley, SF

From: [Peter Diggs](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:03:11 AM

Name: Peter Diggs

Address: 2711 18th St. #33, San Francisco, CA 94110

Phone: 415.272.2137

E-mail: peter@diggsphotography.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sharp Park Golf Course is a fine example of a successful cohesion of recreation, sport, exercise, wonderful views and a vibrant habitat for a variety of frogs, snakes and other creatures. Why fight over something that works well? And has worked well for many, many years.

Peter Diggs

email: peter@diggsphotography.com

<http://www.peterdiggsphotography.com>

website:

cell: 415.272.2137

From: [Pitt, Michelle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Save Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Monday, February 13, 2017 10:31:32 AM

February 13, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. I feel it is especially important to the highschool golfers, both boys and girls to have this course available to them. It is also very affordable for the senior golfers.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Michelle

Michelle Pitt
258 Marina Way

Pacifica, CA
psurfermic@sbcglobal.net

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 9:30:04 AM
Attachments: [Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP.pdf](#)

From: Virginia Reinhart [mailto:virginia.reinhart@sierraclub.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 12:29 PM
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Mr. Jalipa,

Please find attached over 330 letters of support for removing the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

We urge the supervisors to vote to remove the multi-million golf course redevelopment that harms endangered species from the EIR. Sharp Park golf course has been losing money for years, and since it's located in Pacifica, it provides little recreational benefit to San Francisco residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Virginia Reinhart
Communications Manager
Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
2530 San Pablo Ave, Suite I
Berkeley, CA 94702
virginia.reinhart@sierraclub.org
(510) 848-0800 ext. 306

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I have read that golf is on the wane in the country. Why in heaven's name would we in San Francisco put precious park and recreation dollars into a golf course now? San Francisco has parks and other recreational areas that need the money for their infrastructure more than our existing golf courses. Please let's not squander our precious funds, particularly after the election of our next president. Also, how many golfers are there in comparison to the residents of the city and county that need scarce and limited recreational resources?

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Fujimoto
9 Landers St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Among the environmental harms of this project are that it would endanger the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog in one of their few remaining habitats.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joel Rubinstein
2023 28th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

As a long time resident of San Francisco, I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the master management plan for the city's natural areas. I am also a consistent voter and active member in my community. I will make sure that that you are all held accountable.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Deborah Mulvaney
425 Market St Ste 950
San Francisco, CA 94105

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

As a native to the Bay Area and living in SF this is important to me. We should not be prioritizing a GOLF course over good stewardship of our natural resources and city property.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Matt Richardson
1855 Green St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

As a resident of San Francisco I am asking you to reject the Sharp Park Golf course redevelopment project.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Doering
1544 Polk St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Golf courses are for a few paying customers. Natural areas are free for all to enjoy.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joy Durighello
62 Martha Ave
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Help birds not birdies.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Anderson
1530 Gough St Apt 603
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

How could members of City government even consider something so inappropriate and stupid?

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Steve Runyon
1819 17th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Finn
375 Catalina Blvd apt 102
San Rafael, CA 94901

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I am proud to be a citizen of a city who's values reflect my own. San Francisco has been an international leader in environmental and social issues. I hope we'll continue a legacy of protecting nature and wild life.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Aurora Soria
583 5th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I am with the critters on this one!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susan Williams
1364 47th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I often go to Pacifica to walk the hills to enjoy the beauty of nature. I have seen a garter snake slither across the trail. So far the frogs have eluded me! Do not destroy the natural habitat (homes) of the resident garter snakes and frogs. You would not approve the redevelopment project if it destroyed YOUR home and community. A golf course is NOT nature! Sincerely, Karen Malm

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Karen Malm
247 Lobos St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I request a focused study that looks to find a better balance with ecology and includes a public process which considers people like me, who live near the site and frequent the Mori Point area for activities other than golf.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Bob Battalio
877 Reina Del Mar
Pacifica, CA 94044

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I vote. And I did not vote for the redevelopment project of Sharp Park Golf Course, Nor will I vote to elect anyone who does support this project.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joan Berman
526 Ellis St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

In addition, we appear to be developing a state of permanent drought, and golf courses are appallingly wasteful of water while many of us have already reduced domestic gardening, showering etc.

Sincerely,

Sandra Sutherland
1482 Page St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

It's absolutely ridiculous to consider this golf course improvement within this environmental review focused on urban natural environmental resources. I am shocked after all the public support for protecting the two endangered species there that this rebuild for the golf course would be included in the master management plan. This undermines any credibility the plan has.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ruth Malone
2823 Pierce St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Leave the few wild or semi-wild areas of this city ALONE!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Gail Henigman
101 Parnassus Ave Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Leave this Park the way it's been for years!! It's natural state!!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Karen Guin
88 Sixth St 403
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Life before money, and that means all life, even the smallest.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

dan richman
4229 21st st
san francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

More open space less golf space.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Baka
116 Portola Dr Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jean Balibrera
1534 Vallejo St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Trey Schmit
1110 School Rd.
McKinleyville, CA 95519

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please do what is right for the environment and not just people and a bottom line.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

J Monfredini
130 Santa Monica Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please don't undermine our natural spaces for business development. A reasonable golf course can and MUST be consistent with the environment where it is situated.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susan Ford
1070 Green St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

please stop caddyshack :)

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Paul Yaninas
144 Eddy St
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please think about the long-term effects of your actions.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Alex Applegate
1266 20th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please--we've had enough of this kind of thing. We need to keep nature and natural spaces.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Shelley Costantini
81 Lansing St
San Francisco, CA 94105

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please. Frogs and garter snakes are not fungible!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Richard Koch
737 Pine St Apt 47
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Protect wildlife and the natural habitats as is your life depends on it.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Oxley
1434 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Redeveloping the Sharp Park Golf Course would jeopardize the survival of two endangered species: the Red Legged Frog & the San Francisco Garter Snake, as well as many others species this rare and important ecosystem. This is not a natural area restoration, it is the loss of an opportunity to restore a vital coastal wetland.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sarah Sawtelle
507 17th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

S.F. should be setting examples not making bad decisions.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Juanita Contreras
181 Bocana St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

San Francisco has given itself a chance to be a leader with the Natural Areas Program. Why are we now shooting ourselves and dirtying our city and areas with useless destruction so a few greedy ignoramuses can play golf. To hell with this. Do the intelligent thing, the more difficult thing (but with more fantastic results) and return this area to its natural magnificence. Less playing and more doing.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Janet Fiore
1857 9th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

San Francisco should be leading the way in natural space protection and innovation and a golf course is NOT a natural resource area. This is not what I expect of my great city. This is not okay, and you must remove this redevelopment from the SNRAMP. Thank you.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Heidi Hill
1142 Jackson St Apt 6
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

SF is supposed to be a great exemplar. Is bulldozing over dwindling species for the sake of yet more golf an example for the rest of the country? If so, then money has won again.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

dan richman
4229 21st st
san francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Shame on you! We need more natural areas for all people to enjoy. A golf course only allows a small group of wealthy people to enjoy a natural area. It also pollutes the land and water because of all the fertilizers and pesticides used to keep the "green" green. People need open spaces. We need to be able to get out into nature where we will all become more healthy, be happier and live longer.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Varellas
35 Carr St
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Since we are a Sanctuary City, it follows that these animals deserve sanctuary as well so they survive in their natural surroundings.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Gail McGowan
1310 Jones St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Sorry I like trees frogs and snakes over golfers....

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman
25 Lisbon St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Thank you for considering this very important issue.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susan Mehrings
1240 Hayes St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Thank you for reading my letter.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Oda
2000 post
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Thank you for valuing biodiversity and doing your part to protect endangered creatures from extinction.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sierra Peterson
1801 Wedemeyer St
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

William Murdoch
1327 26th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

The City has already destroyed a significant natural area and affected the international migratory bird route with the intrusion of the Beach Chalet Soccer Field, for one. Let's leave these species at Sharp Park alone. They are on the brink of extinction and every species that goes extinct is, among other things, a removal of yet another thread in the vital tapestry of life. Many political leaders and business people don't seem to understand this basic reality. But when enough species are made extinct by "redevelopment" and "park improvements" and "extraction of natural resources," in a terrible moment they will understand it, alright.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Dan Richman
4229 21st St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

The extinction of any species means the tearing out of one more thread from the tapestry of life that hangs between us and the cold of infinity. LIFE BEFORE MONEY! AND GOLF, FOR THAT MATTER!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

dan richman
4229 21st st
san francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

The SF blue lizard is in this and other nearby coastal areas. They need their living areas too. How do I know they are there? I've been fortunate in seeing them and rescuing / rehabilitating and returning one to his wilderness home.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Pamela Hollis
1467 Clay St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

This is a very important area biologically speaking and I urge you to respect it.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Alex Hardee
640 Mason St Apt 205
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

We are San Francisco; we are not Trump. Golf courses cannot and must not trump ecosystems and environmental health.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

We have plenty of golf courses, but not so many San Francisco garter snakes and the California red-legged frog. Sharp park is a biologically important site and we need to protect it for all time. I am embarrassed and angry that my city has failed to fulfill restoration at Sharp Park. This is a very special place and must be set aside for protection of these highly endangered animals and for the future enjoyment of residents of the northern peninsula. Golf is something for just a relatively small number of individuals who can afford the fees and expenses of playing. A wildlife oasis is something everyone can enjoy and millions can learn from. We must set aside this special place for all people to enjoy. San Francisco must live up to the promises it has made.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Varellas
35 Carr
San Fran, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

We have such little open space left in the Bay Area. We need to preserve what we can as habitat for our native wildlife.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michelle Mackenzie
980 Berkeley Ave
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

We shouldn't sacrifice an important ecosystem for golf!!

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Fiona Baker
704 Broadway, Suite 301
Oakland, CA 94607

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

We want nature not golf courses.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

F Hammer
1490 Chestnut St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Your responsibility, as part of the City's commitment to achieving climate change goals, is to protect this Ohlone land and promote native plant regeneration, to protect the water and the natural habitat for wildlife, including threatened species like the red legged frog, and to make a bold statement against the Trump administration that San Francisco is really committed to its climate change goals. Trump builds golf courses. San Francisco leads the way in climate change policy. Here's your opportunity to walk your talk. Thank you for doing the right thing and stopping the golf course in Sharp Park.

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kristin Tieche
2277 FULTON STREET, APT 304
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Gregory Taylor
19092 Santa Maria Ave
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Hollis Reed
109 Gambier Street
San Francisco, CA 94134

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carol Drake
38038 Dundee Common
Fremont, CA 94536

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Deryn Harris
722 Orchid Ave
Capitola, CA 95010

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Preston Brown
1114 Castro st
SAN Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Gail Mallimson
252 Moultrie St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Deborah Mulvaney
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Natalie Downe
553 Grove st
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carol Bettencourt
1137 Hyde St Apt G
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Isabel Molloy
759 33rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Beverly Harrington
272 Gates St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Brandon Cooper
3250 Sacramento St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Shishkin
411 44th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Donner
765 Portola St
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Leonard Tremmel
800 Lyon St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Etemad
929 Broderick St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brodsky
2707 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Greg Pennington
798 Post St Apt 500
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Harry Silverstein
1725 Washington St Apt 10
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Thornik Reimer
673 Brannan St Unit 316
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susanne Ellis
1092 Capitol Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joseph Zakrzewski
1450 Golden Gate Ave Apt 301
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Luisa Agostini
839 Garfield St
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Shanae Mairs
2430 Lake St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Brad Goya
774 22nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Brad Goya
774 22nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joe Jah
536 Mason St Apt 305
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jaffa Dayan
23 El Sereno Ct
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Becky Cunningham
418 23rd Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Christophe Smith
801 Wisconsin St Apt B
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ann-Marie Olsson
955 Page St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Amanda Poole
350 Hermann St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Bruce Keegan
43 Keystone Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Bret Walburg
330 Louisburg St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Mosher
349 Howth St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sally Abrams
138 Cortland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carol Carges
3062 Jackson St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Chris
1016 Prague St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kerr
201 Marin St
San Rafael, CA 94901

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Aniko van der Lee
1944 McAllister St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Alex Stephanovich
445 Warren Dr
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Erik Schnabel
219 Velasco Ave Unit B
San Francisco, CA 94134

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carlita Martinez
50 Phelan Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jean Mont-Eton
4333 Ulloa St
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Matthew Iribarne
1953 O'Farrell St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

James Lovette-Black
584 Castro St # 821
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mike Kappus
2328 12th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Christian Colvin
199 Fremont St
San Francisco, CA 94105

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michi Pringle
1767 Alabama St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Maria Mana
8 Marion Pl
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lisa Voss
19 Pearl St Apt 6
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lowell Bergstedt
350 Bay St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sandra Russell
506 Andover St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Deiwert
1828 Webster St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

James Masi
300 Berry St Unit 602
San Francisco, CA 94158

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Esther McEgan
300 Arguello Blvd Apt 201
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kristin Tieche
2261 Market St # 292
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Nathan Vogel
49 Alpine Ter
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Karen Miller
1615 Green St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rachel Gelman
2608 Leavenworth St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lillian Schafgans
218 Flood Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Daniel Slade
588 Sutter St
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Brian Picot
3048 16th St Apt 221
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Charles Wilmoth
290 Napoleon St
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Matthew Kane
240 San Marcos Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lynne Preston
638 Rhode Island St Apt A
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Manning
339 Frederick St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Reginald Stocking
1301 Sanchez St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Nicole Metildi
2495 Sutter St Apt 6
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Roy Miller
1060 Potrero Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Wayne Tomlinson
4023 18th St # 103
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Karen Kirschling
633 Oak St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kristina May
2246 Filbert St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Grace Lawrence
228 Divisadero St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rita Kort
46A Cook St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Dale Wittig
508 Scott St Apt 11
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mitch Dalition
350 Broderick St Apt 415
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Heisler
1908 14th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Schuricht
515 Shrader St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jhene Canody
2554 Balboa St
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Holly Rosenblum
3500 Fulton St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Tansley
PO Box 330351
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Krishna Venkatraman
1505 Pershing Dr
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Saroyan Humphrey
619 Webster St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Fura
7 San Antonio Pl Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michelle Carter
1738 Dolores St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Devorah Zehring
1561 45th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joyce Lavey
593 Potrero Ave Apt C
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Lawrence
107 9th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kagan Mactane
1160 Mission St Unit 604
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Peter Schumacher
1329 5th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:03:11 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Peter Schumacher
1329 5th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John M Haines
164 Clipper St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Donald Dodge
300 Caselli Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jan Blum
2160 Leavenworth St Apt 201
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Morgan
231 Grand View Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stuart Hall
589 Post St
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Paul Masson
671 14th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kay Voyvodich
671 14th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joya Pramanik
193 Graystone Ter
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sean Singleton
45 Westwood Dr
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Emma Arnesty-Good
3694 19th St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Rusky
159 Beaver St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Pat Howson
1767 N Point St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Nicole Savage
6340 Geary Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Timothy Larkin
1515 Sutter St Apt 210
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joan Smith
765F Portola St
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Terry & Mr. Martin Horwitz
1326 23rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mary Salome
1775 Silver Ave
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Evan Mccauley
655 Montgomery St Ste 1705
San Francisco, CA 94111

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Linda Weiner
72 Gates St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jeff Whittington
95 Red Rock Way Apt 310M
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joseph Illick
1015 1/2 Guerrero St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Galen Abbott
835 Carolina St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Choi
1455 Leavenworth St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

James Rogers
922 Valencia St Apt A
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Christine Brazis
10 Appleton Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Steven Collins
555 4th St Unit 712
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Diann Rose
830 Post St Apt 8
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joslyn Baxter
2001 McAllister St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Hurwitz
582 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Diana Vest Goodman
123 Mendosa Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Eric Silverman
55 San Andreas Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susan Gaughan
178 Orsi Cir
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Kemper
1388 California St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ellen Frank
243 Holyoke St
San Francisco, CA 94134

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Scott Bravmann
1305 Buchanan St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jackie Pomies
1271 38th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Susan Mittel
1219 12th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mary Poffenroth
548 Market St
San Francisco, CA 94104

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Laurie Troyer
3435 24th St Apt 12
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Willis
40 Fillmore St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ron Nieberding
88 Perry St Apt 537
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Julie Dilley
61 Fair Oaks St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Brown
1245 California St
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:42:19 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Public spaces should be open to the public, and we need more trees, not fewer.
Kathleen Brown, 1245 California St.
District 3

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Irene Kaufman
298 Genessee St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Martha Larsen
828 30th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Barbara Byrne
739 31st Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kellman
474 Day St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Tomczyszyn
243 Ramsell St
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Savannah Blackwell
330 Parnassus Ave Apt 102
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

J. Gurdin
247 Ortega Street
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joanne Jacobs
955 Innes Ave
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sue Williard
1319 48th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

R. Dene Larson, Jr.
600 Oak Street, 36
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joan Hasselgren
1940 Grove St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mark J. Fiore
1259 14th Ave Apt D
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

L. Olson
225 Bush St
San Francisco, CA 94104

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stewart Wilber
1923A 15th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ellen Price
111 Clifford Ter
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

C O
2712 Pine
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Karl Mauzey
450 Peralta Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carey Suckow
341 Noe St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Bill Petersen
510 Melrose Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Shawna Hedley
1330 Jones St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joy Baker
380 19th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Nan Mcguire
994 Union St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Danders
365 26th Ave Unit A
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Julie Shumate
1922 23rd St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Pekrul
180 Landers St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joe Alvarado
1255 25th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Marc Lieberman, M.D.
711 Van Ness Ave
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sage Johnson
1730 Kearny St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gold
387 Day St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

James Hager
401 43rd Ave Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Terry Hawkins
1505 Gough St Apt 21
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Eduardo Abarca
778 Brunswick St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jude Brennan
2471 25th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Dusty Lombardo
60 Fair Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sunny Walters
220 Quintara St
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Isabelle Schildknecht
2498 Cabrillo street
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kirk White
381 Turk St
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

S Halperin NP
27 Massasoit St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael And Dora Weber
1130 Church St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Lael Robertson
512 Missouri St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Douglas Estes
629 Arguello Blvd Apt 303
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Irene Dillon
240 Edgewood Ave
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Irene Dillon
240 Edgewood Ave
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stuart Rosenthal
304 Genessee St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Perry
1700 Octavia St Apt 301
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mary Betlach
2530 Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Julie Kramer
1288 Church St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ann Morrissey
76 Forest Side Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mark S. Weinberger
391 28th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stephen Bartlett-R_
1474 Sacramento St Apt 204
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mark Cassidy
125 Caine Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Zora Kolkey
PO Box 640484
San Francisco, CA 94164

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mark Gould
432 Belvedere St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Bonner
645 Bush St Apt 108
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Walsh
807 Cabrillo St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sherra Picketts
425 Steiner St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Maureen Oshea
483 Joost Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Oda
1735 Steiner St Apt 471
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Laura Kuo
10 Hemway Ter
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Nancy McGinnis
38 Harper St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Anne Steele
772 27th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Elyse Shafarman
1357 Guerrero St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

William McGuire
258 9th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sonia Cantu
1861 Powell St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Mia Shaw
144 Evelyn Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Rowell
615 Guerrero St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

John Steponaitis
910 Geary St Apt 20
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Melanie Alves
8 Dolores Ter
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Richard Hingel
3073 California St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Thomas Blom
45 Ora Way
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jill Alcantar
86 San Gabriel Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 6:55:03 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Jill Alcantar
86 San Gabriel
S.F., CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Maric Munn
1315 4th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Hugo Kobayashi
1391 8th Ave Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Peter Booth Lee
3910 Fulton St
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:23:05 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Peter Booth Lee
3910 Fulton Street
San Francisco 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Janie Lucas
827 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Teresa Scherzer
PO Box 411403
San Francisco, CA 94141

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Erika Dahlheim
357 19th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Leon Van Steen
154 Dwight St
San Francisco, CA 94134

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jonica Brooks
3804 23rd St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Heidi Smith
28 Valletta Ct
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Eileen Gross
144A Scott St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Richard Sparacino
1023 Irving St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Robert Brown
2119 Bush St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Melvin D. Cheitlin
1661 Pine St Apt 1145
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Tatyana Shats
1521 Sutter St Apt 405
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Cohen
494 2nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Steve Thornburg
234 Hearst Ave
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Beverly Dahlen
15 Mirabel Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Brandon Owens
140 Wood St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Goodyear
503 Ashbury St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Carlos Ferreira
PO Box 884733
San Francisco, CA 94188

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Laura Saunders
170 King St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jane Kilmer
951 Dolores St Apt B
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Barney Olmsted
1400 Geary Blvd Apt 1304
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Thea Boodhoo
1160 Mission St
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Mcallister
1614 Grove St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sharon Wilensky
1355 12th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jack Bowers
650 De Haro St Apt A
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Strong
2011 47th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Rich Hughes
242 Edinburgh St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Daniel Buckler
250 Castro St Apt 8
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jnani Chapman
2638 Post St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Andrew Pierce
259 Eureka St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jack Merk
765 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kemal Erkol
1575 11th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Mailliard
1870 Jackson St Apt 704
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michelle Carter
44 Montgomery Street
Michelle, CA 94104

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michael Kavanaugh
2797 Clay St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sarah L'Etoile
1423D Compton Rd
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

R. Zierikzee
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Brian Armbruster
1924 Cabrillo St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Kelly Lally
100 Broderick St Apt 403
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Connie Mar
2 Garfield St
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Michelle Carter
1738 Dolores Street
Michelle, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Renee Darner
2814 Clay St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Molly Ruhl
401 43rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Senta Tsantilis
2865 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jeff Beck
1551 9th Ave Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Annalee Pineda
1035 Sutter St Apt 24
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

David Kaskowitz
306 Park St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Keiko M.
9 Mayfair Dr
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Will Lowry
308 Hill St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Christopher Boone
49 Hancock St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Patricia Everall
236 Amber Dr
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Shelly Erceg
823 Grove St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

James Lovette-Black
584 Castro St #821
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ronald Zampa
PO Box 27344
Oakland, CA 94602

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Douglas Estes
629 Arguello Blvd. #303
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Spencer Decker
673 Mangels Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Ron Sundergill
585 9th St Unit 453
Oakland, CA 94607

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gold
387 Day St.
Stephen, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Helen Desai
155 15th Ave.
Helen, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Caephren McKenna
64 Fairview Ave
Caephren, CA 94610

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Joanne Mandel
1345 Taylor Street #21
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Matthew Zlatunich
749 8th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Sherree Hill
17315 Lightfoot Way
Nevada City, CA 95959

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jaine Bartlett
2119 167th Ave
San Leandro, CA 94578

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Jenna Brager
9175 Barnett Valley Road
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, originally known as proposal A18, from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP).

If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP environmental review, because the fiscal, environmental, and recreational consequences of the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project are so grave that it will wipe out any and all environmental benefits proposed in all other areas affected by SNRAMP.

Sincerely,

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please reject the FEIR for the proposed SNRAMP
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 11:01:50 AM
Attachments: [2017-02-15 Letter to SF Board of Supervisors from STF.pdf](#)

From: Kerry Kriger [mailto:kerry@savethefrogs.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 10:30 AM

To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@SFGOV1.onmicrosoft.com>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Conor (BOS) <conor.johnston@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Please reject the FEIR for the proposed SNRAMP

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. Please find my official comment attached, and please do submit it to the public record and ensure all relevant government employees see it.

Thank you for protecting the environment and spending taxpayer dollars wisely.

Kerry Kriger, Ph.D.
SAVE THE FROGS!
Founder, Executive Director, Ecologist
www.savethefrogs.com
www.savethefrogs.com/kerry-kriger
Voicemail: 415-878-6525
kerry@savethefrogs.com

SAVE THE FROGS! is the world's leading amphibian conservation organization. We work in California, across the USA, and around the world to prevent the extinction of amphibians, and to create a better planet for humans and wildlife. Since 2008, SAVE THE FROGS! has educated over three million people about endangered amphibians, and frog enthusiasts from at least 87 countries have participated in our programs. Together we can SAVE THE FROGS!

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The Sharp Park Golf Course has been heavily and rightly criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates for the past decade, due to its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife, and its misuse of taxpayer funds that could be more effectively spent on important social and environmental programs.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

SAVE THE FROGS! and the vast majority of non-golfers throughout San Francisco and elsewhere are wholeheartedly opposed to any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,



Kerry Kriger, Ph.D.

15-February-2017



Dr. Kerry Kriger
Executive Director
415-878-6525

1968 S Coast Hwy Suite 622
Laguna Beach, CA 92651 USA
E-mail: kerry@savethefrogs.com

savethefrogs.com

CC:

Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org

Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org

Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org

Katy.Tang@sfgov.org

London.Breed@sfgov.org

Conor.Johnston@sfgov.org

Jane.Kim@sfgov.org

Norman.Yee@sfgov.org

Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org

Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org

Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org

Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Sharps park
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 5:35:11 PM
Attachments: [Please reject the FEIR for the proposed SNRAMP.msg](#)
[Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP it is a whitewash.msg](#)
[Support for Golf at Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Re Re Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E Hearing Feb. 28 2017 .msg](#)
[Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Fw Save Sharp Park we need your help!.msg](#)
[sharp park.msg](#)
[Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Case No. 2005.0912E Hearing Feb. 28 2017.msg](#)
[Support for Natural Areas program and Golf at Sharp Parl.msg](#)
[Re Support Natural Areas Pro gram and Golf at Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Please don't close Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Support for Planning Commission's approval of Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E..msg](#)
[Sharp Park.msg](#)
[Save Sharp Park Golf Course.msg](#)
[Save Sharp Park Golf Course.msg](#)
[Sharp Park - Support the Rec Parks Plan.msg](#)
[Please reject the FEIR for the proposed SNRAMP.msg](#)
[Save Sharp Park Golf Course.msg](#)
[Save Sharp Park Golf Course.msg](#)
[Please reject the FEIR for the proposed SNRAMP.msg](#)

Dear Supervisors:

The Clerk's Office has received similar emails regarding Sharp Park (Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan) and all are attached. Thank you.

Regards,

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
(415) 554-5163 fax
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

From: Jim Krueger [mailto:jakrueger@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: richard Harding Park <richard@sfpublishgolf.org>
Subject: Sharps park

Name: James A Krueger
Address:852 York Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94110

Phone:415-595-3648
E-mail:jakrueger@earthlink.net

February 15th, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

[I would like to revise my prior position submitted 2/14/2017 to the statement below.](#)

Re: Support Natural Areas Pro gram and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of t he Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you

Jim Krueger

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 9:29 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Joyce Barnett. Jebsf@ gmail.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 6:54 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is inaccurate and will hurt San Franciscans.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 12:45 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Matthew HARRIGAN 816 SHOTWELL st. S?F. CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 9:35 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: William Pattengill
415 Bella Vista Way (2 blocks from Mt Davidson which is currently a great park and would be seriously diminished by this mad plan)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Climate change is here and you can't deny it! And there will be unintended consequences, such as erosion which is already causing rock and mudslides!

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. In fact, the only way to maintain Natural Areas in this city is with the continued use of tier 1 herbicides.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims. It contains much information that is best described in today's lingo as "alternative facts."

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Deborah Atkins, 435 Myra Way, SF, CA 94127, District 7, Miraloma Park resident since 1979

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 4:54 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Ashley McDevitt
70 Chaves Avenue
SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 4:44 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Conclusion: I am adding this in addition--Have you thought about recruiting local school children close to Mt. Davidson to remove & clear out weeds & underbrush under the trees that still stand rather than using mass amounts of herbicides? I cannot understand your reasoning as years ago DDT became the lighten-rod to make the USA aware of how unhealthy it was to the environment and to our general health, Please think out of the box & introduce the younger generation the right way to preserve what is still good and also SAVE a vast amount of money too!!!

Signed: Joan Benjamin
900 block of Elizabeth St. (exact house # not given for privacy reasons)
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 1:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Amy McDevitt,
Born and raised on Chaves on Mt. Davidson

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 3:25:32 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Amy M
Born and raised on Chaves on Mt. Davidson

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 12:09 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sudhir Puri
66 Escondido Ave
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2017 9:11:36 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Sudhir Puri
66 Escondido Ave, San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 11:58 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

The EIR for the SNRAMP is bad policy. Every day my six year old son asks me, "why are they cutting down all the trees." That is exactly how it looks at Mt. Davidson along Dalewood--like they are cutting down all the trees. And treating them with herbicides, no less, which is a testament to the fact that these are healthy and strong. And what should I tell him? Because somebody with a tree removal company knows somebody on the board of supervisors? There is no viable, scientifically supported reason to destroy all these beautiful trees that predate every house on Dalewood Way. In point of fact, if these trees are so dangerous, why haven't you moved the power lines along Dalewood under ground? And how many fires have ravaged the area in the past 100 years (none)? And how many people have been injured by those trees in the past 100 years (likely none)? And how do those trees impact the undergrowth--that we can now easily see since they cut down the first 50 or so along the street (obviously no impact)?

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims. Moreover, SF Parks employees lied to my face, saying the EIR was only going to cause the removal of diseased trees so they wouldn't pose a risk anymore. The immediate clear cutting along Dalewood Way proves that was false and intended to cause me to abstain from commenting previously.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Ryan Meckfessel
9 Dalewood Way
SF, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 10:58 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

Dear SF board of supervisors, as a long term San Francisco resident I am very concerned about these plans to cut down this many trees at once. Native or not trees are an enormous benefit to a city. To add insult to injury, using pesticide to do so seems crazy. These people have lost sight of what is important.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Ursula Bendixen
2001 14th Avenue
San Francisco
CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:46:42 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Dear Supervisors, we need more trees in San Francisco, not less! I used to always vote for park bonds, never dreaming the funds would go to such questionable causes.

Ursula Bendixen, 2001 14th Avenue (34 years of San Francisco residency)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 9:31 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 7:57 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Marilyn Teeter
569 Bella Vista Way, SF, CA. 94127
29 years in Miraloma Park. Homeowner.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:55 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

The EIR for the SNRAMP is reckless and harmful to our community. As the City of San Francisco is working so hard to bring more trees and vegetation to our beautiful city, it is absurd and harmful to consider cutting down trees. Perhaps these trees are immigrants and just like people, they add beauty and diversity that is valued by many.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, PLEASE STOP RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Ana Linder
2912 Cesar Chavez Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:42 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Michelle Mongan
326 Kirkham St.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:37 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

I don't want the SNRAMP coming to Pacifica and cutting trees, increasing runoff and erosion, ruining mature habitat for wildlife. I want the Sharp Park golf course to remain and have access to Laguna Salada in the golf course.

Signed: Ted Garber
895 Rockaway Beach Ave
Pacifica

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 3:59 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 3:51 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Margarida MacCormick, District 7
716 Ulloa St., SF
with all of the challenges with the new federal admin- why are we wasting all this money!!!!

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 3:12 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jane Logan, 60 Camp Street, San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 2:30 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Obo Help, 1531 Fulton St. SF CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 1:49 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: David Hover
1998 Pacific Ave. No. 306
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 1:25 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Emilia de Geer
66 Escondido Ave
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 9:56 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Already,losing the big trees on Van Ness!!!

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Lynn Van Dyke
1776 Sacramento #408,San Francisco,CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:17 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Christine Stewart
307 Whippoorwill Glen
Escondido, CA 92026

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 7:53:09 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Christine Stewart, DVM, Escondido, CA 92026

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 4:47 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is extremely misguided.

Fact 1:

I am very concerned about the effect of cutting down 18,000+ trees. The grass and shrubs they are to be replaced with will not sequester carbon monoxide to the same degree.

Fact 2:

Closing nearly 30% of our City's parkland to public access will obviously adversely impact our recreation. You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 3:

Spraying huge amounts of herbicides, which infiltrate the ground and drain into our water, is not the route to go in our parks.

Fact 4:

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the EIR! Send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Roland Trego
349 Cumberland St.
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:47 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Erika Opper
Noe Valley

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:39 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.
SF parks are a RECREATIONAL asset to SF residents, tourists, and local visitors from surrounding communities. Don't restrict access.

Signed: Ted Garber

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:36 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jill D. Inrdohnen
360 Guerrero st # 219 District 8
San Francisco, Ca 94103

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:36 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Alicia Snow
1586 Shrader Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:22 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Gloria Garcia Milhoan, 324 Molimo Drive, SF, CA 94127, District 7

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:21 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Gloria Garcia Milhoan

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:00 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Brian Luenow - San Francisco resident

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 1:14 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Christina Y. Chen

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:47 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is not sound

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

Implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Julie House, 1407 Douglass St., San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 8:52 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Terry Oxford 650 Post St, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 8:39 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Michael D Bullard

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 7:59 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Judith Mattingly
646 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:59 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. Plus it is my understanding that off/ leash dog area will be severely impacted.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks, the net result is non- natural control of plantings which may negatively affect wildlife and dogs.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists. And doing so when more and more people are biking makes no sense.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Felicia Aron
201 Fair Oaks St
SF, Ca. 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 11:39 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Grass and shrubs do not a forest make!

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. I rely on the City parks for quality solitude and exercise.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. I don't want to breath herbicides.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Susan Levy
74 Vista Verde Court

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 11:26 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: David Bullard
86 Arroyo Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 10:36 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Lisa Harms
1651 Market St #312 94103

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 9:24 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Victor W. Milhoan
324 Molimo Drive
San Francisco, CA 94127
Underrepresented in District 7

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 9:02 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jonathan Roman
Outer Richmond District
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:55 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Norma J F Harrison

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:56 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Norma J F Harrison 1312 Cornell Ave., Berkeley, Ca. 94702

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 7:51 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Nathalie Paven
1534B Shrader St
SF, CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:06:53 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Nathalie Paven
1534B Shrader St
SF 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 6:45 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Emil Oatfield
3525 Twenty-Third Street
SF, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:21:18 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Emil Oatfield
3525 23rd Street
SF, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 6:13 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Deanna and Kurt Schwartz
132 Gonzalez Dr.
San Francisco, 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:29:29 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Deanna and Kurt Schwartz
132 Gonzalez Dr.
SF 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 5:37 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: James Rustigan 39 Rockwood Court SF 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 5:28:10 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: James Rustigan 39 Rockwood Court S.F. 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 4:04 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. You cannot claim that herbicides don't affect the health of the people exposed to them, especially children.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims. This certainly sounds like a Trump-Era politician would say.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan. Please don't use alternative facts to get people to accept environmental destruction.

Signed: Julian Hess
Valencia St.
SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 8:28 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Lia Milhoan
PS- please do not be fooled by those who claim to be helping Mt. Davidson. Listen to those who live there and are directly impacted!

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 8:21 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: pam gill

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 8:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Cassius Glikshtern
60 Cumberland Street

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 7:58 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

I don't understand how this organization has usurped most of the input of the community and is planning to implement a plan which is so contrary to the wishes of the citizens of the City.

Signed:
Susan Luce
185 Bocana Street
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP should be approved as is.

Fact 1:

Cutting down the trees will open up the park fortress and promote native species to grow.

Fact 2:

Any closure is temporary.

Fact 3:

The use of herbicides will help with reducing invasive species.

Fact 4:

Bicycles should be taken off the pedestrian trails to eliminate hazards to hikers and eliminate erosion.

Fact 5:

Conclusion:

Please approve the certification of the EIR for the SNRAMP and proceed with implementing the Plan.

Signed:

JP Torres, Hazelwood Ave, SF, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Emily Meehan

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 12:59 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Suzanne Butler
325 south Maple Ave,
So San Francisco ca 94080

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 12:20 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Nor can you replace the habitat that this clear cutting - let's call it what it is - destroys. Why let natural wildlife die on the vine in the interest of recreating a faux past?

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. We live right off Glen Canyon, we walk our dog daily and neither she nor we need herbicides in our environment. Particularly now when it's so healthy and lush.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists. We have made SF a haven for bicycles. What is the thinking behind banning them from our parks?

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Tod Elkins 25 Craggs Court SF 94131 . FYI, Craggs is a much used access way to Glen Canyon, and by the sheer numbers of people walking in by our house, I can assure you our local park is well loved and well treated.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 11:49 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Carol Drobek

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 10:54 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: S Tomsen

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:58 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Eileen Ambre, West of Twin Peaks resident
151 Urbano Drive
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:49:45 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Eileen Ambre
151 Urbano Drive
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 3:33 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Max Valerio

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 1:01 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. I oppose any increase in the use of herbicides and would like a plan to work towards eliminating our use of it.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Barbara Butler
2051 45th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:42 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Beth pruit, District 1 resident and avid user of the parks for walking my dog, cycling, running, etc.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:35 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jason Jungreis

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 12:05:32 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Jason Jungreis
527 47th Avenue

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:33 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Phil Siegel
235 Cresta Vista Dr

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:29 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sigrid Bull-McCarthy
324 Font Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:51:08 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Sigrid I. Bull-McCarthy
324 Font Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 7:49 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: CLARE HERMAN 602 DOVE CT PLEASANT HILL, CA 94523

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:07:55 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: CLARE HERMAN

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 7:06 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Wendy Brown
San Francisco, CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 3:08 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

I am writing on the record to express my strong opposition to the the Environmental Impact Report for the SNRAMP. This to be an improper interpretation of public policy and I would like to demand a policy review and an immediate stop to the deforestation, bicycle ban, and use of toxic herbicides in an environmentally sensitive watershed area, particularly Mt. Davidson Park.

a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1:

The removal of 18,000 trees with replacement of grass and shrubs will cause a huge release of greenhouse gas and a massive net loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

Closing 28% of our City's parkland to public access is not an acceptable policy.

Fact 3:

A new plan that is dependent on herbicide use will increase, not decrease, herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

Banning bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas has a very damaging effect on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

The EIR claims are not credible when taking into account the actual facts on the ground and in the plan being considered.

Conclusion:

I ask that you reject the certification of the EIR and return to Planning to assess the true impacts of the SNRAMP. IN the meantime, the only prudent action is to halt RPD's premature implementation.

Signed:

Michael Lipson
Miraloma Park Resident

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 12:59 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Patricia F. McManus
357 Bocana St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 11:32 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash", to put it mildly.
Here is real facts based WHY:

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists. Even though the bicyclists need to be more disciplined and orderly. That's a different story.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Lev Ayzner,
1590 29th Ave, SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:33 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: 13 year volunteer for Friends of the Urban Forest.
Susanna G. Russo D.V.M.
District 8

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:05:30 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Susanna G. Russo, D.V.M.
District 8

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:55 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Eugene Bachmanov
418 Arch Street, SF CA9132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:39 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Cutting that many trees would be considered a crime if it was done by an individual.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. Just incredible nerve and dishonesty to claim this.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an HONEST evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Alexa Levy
4101 Lakeshore
Oakland, CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 6:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Margaret Vickers
2388 40th Ave SF CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 5:29 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Purely native plants are not the only, or necessarily best, habitat for birds and other wildlife. Eradication of introduced plants has done demonstrable harm to ecosystems and native bird species. Favor good habitat over strict "native only" plants.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Karen C. Burke-Hill
349 27th Street
SF, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:48 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: avatar
1409 shrader sfca 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Robert Gee
9 Bella Vista Way
San Francisco, CA 94127 (District 7)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:43 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: KC Murphy
435 Lansdale Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 11:02 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Melinda McMurray
2115 Wawona St.
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 1:48 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 8:39 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Melissa Mandel
230 Wayne Ave
Oakland CA 94606

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 9:19 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. Roundup and similar products have been documented as poisonous and should NEVER be used again. There's a good reason why these chemicals are illegal in much of the modern world. Time to stop putting money in Monsanto's pockets at the expense of the health and well-being of the residents.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Ian Dogole
Mill Valley, CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:32:00 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Ian Dogole

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 10:24 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: There is no sane excuse for this destructive genocide of SF trees.
John Chirico

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 5:56:12 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: John Chirico

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 10:55 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Natalie Nurnberg

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 11:45 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Chris Parkes, resident SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 12:17 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: The bias against trees in the SF Bay Area is baffling and seems deliberately intended to wound the deeply felt love and attachment most Bay Area residents have to our urban forests. In the face of global warming which is exacerbated by deforestation, which includes misguided "thinning", it is absolutely wrong and moreover, an act of aggression to cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. The herbicide regimen will include known carcinogens such as glyphosate.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Julie Long Gallegos
652 Congo St.
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:50 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Bret Walburg
330 Louisburg St
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:52 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Robert Mayer

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:02 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.
The "Native Lands" movement does not have popular support; this is a group of nut-jobs. They should get a sandbox far from SF to play with, and stop ruining our public forests.

Signed: Kenneth Sarocky
431 Ellsworth Street
Bernal Heights Neighborhood
San Francisco, 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Slutsky Simona

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:04 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Swotsky Gregory

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:08 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:15 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: suzanne r. dumont
841 Rockdale Drive, SF, 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:17 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Flora Davis
5020 California, SF, 94118

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:31 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash"
Please REJECT the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP.

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mary Chase
1092 Noe ST
SF CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:35 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash." SF does not want this radical, wasteful regressive agenda.

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: M Klien

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:03:21 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: M Klien

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:35 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mike Rustigan

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:54:31 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Michael Rustigan

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.
The fact of you using herbicides and chain saws to KILL the flora and fauna of our city is DISGUSTING and UNNECESSARY. We are all a group immigrants and non natives so deal with non native trees if possible. BE DIVERSE. DO NOT USE POISONS- THEY KILL

Signed: Lance Mellon
Hamilton Street
San Francisco
650 826 1723

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:42 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Peter Rothe

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 10:51 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Lucile J Taber
560 Rockdale Drive - on the side of Mt. Davidson!
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 11:16 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Gretchen Sterenberg

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:13 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mark Luiso

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:57 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dirk Hoekstra
work in District 5
lived in San Francisco 1990-2014 until priced out

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:00 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Maria Molloy

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:32 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: valenteen ignatovsky
1733 7 ave san francisco ca 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:35 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash."
From Wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data."

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Please reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. In the meantime, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Kerry Vineberg
429 Dellbrook Ave,
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:16:59 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Kerry Vineberg
429 Dellbrook Ave
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:44 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Svetlana Savchuk
1733 7th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:08 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.
We must save as many trees as possible because of the carbon they store--no other vegetation species stores as much carbon as large trees. When we save trees, we help to save our planet.

Signed: Madeline Travers Hovland

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:20 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:20 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jennifer Winograd

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:21 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Rita Molloy

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:56 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mary Etta Moose
1962 Powell St
S.F. 94133

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:04:17 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Mary Etta Moose
1962 Powell St
94133

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:26 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Nancy Edmonson
555 John Muir Drive
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:30 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mendy Marks

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:31 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data."

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Please reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: S Wheeler
swheeler4hs@hotmail.com
San Francisco 94123

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:50 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Susan Strommer
5214-F Diamond Hts, #302
San Francisco, CA. 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Joanne Scott
2563 33rd Ave (District 4)
SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:10 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Diane Goldman
163 Robinhood Drive

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:55:57 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Diane Goldman
163 Robinhood Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 4:26 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: Do you really believe that to cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs can occur without causing a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration? Not to mention the trees aesthetic value.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim that there is no impact on our enjoyment of and recreation in them.

Fact 3: You cannot believe that implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks, and further endanger living creatures, both human and wild/domestic.

Fact 4: A ban of bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas WILL impact bicyclists despite the EIR/SNRAMP assertions.

Fact 5: MAYBE you should take a closer look, and reevaluate the EIR claims, then decide MAYBE you should reevaluate their claims and then determine what is really in the best interests of San Franciscans (who vote here) and visitors (who spend money here).

Conclusion: PLEASE reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an HONEST evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, please halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan, particularly the cutting down trees and pesticide use. portions.

Signed: Toni P. Estrella
393 Arbor St
S.F. CA 94131
sfstarmom@yahoo.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:26:06 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong - it's been proven that older, large trees reduce greenhouse gasses and grasses & shrubs are not nearly as efficient.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use. One of the plants most often receiving herbicide treatments is what we call "sourgrass" - something kids pick, put in their mouths, and chew on. Why are we poisoning a plant that attracts children (and bees).

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area. It's not possible to replace mature, healthy large trees - it will take decades for newly planted trees to grow big enough to make a difference - to improve air quality, provide sound dampening, and to enhance the landscapes and our overall quality of life.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle

use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure. Please do what's right for us - the SF citizens who live here -

Signed:

Toni P. Estrella
393 Arbor Street
S.F. CA 94131
sfstarmom@yahoo.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:21 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Laura

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:37 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jennifer Stanley
230 Ashbury Street
SF 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:40 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Matthew E. Ramirez

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 5:52:59 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Matthew E. Ramirez

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:47 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:14 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mike Foti

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 5:54:14 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Mike Foti
1363-39th Ave.
San Francisco
94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:30 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a whitewash! You cannot turn back the clock - you cannot create viable, early-1800 nature preserves in the middle of today's urban, climate-changed, residential and industrial city. In trying to do so, you waste money and time that could be used to foster green, welcoming natural environments. San Francisco has a small amount of aging forest cover - it needs management not replacement with small shrubs and barren ground.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Mary Thomas
1863 32nd Ave
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:12:18 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Mary Thomas
1863 32nd Ave
District 4

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:40 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Bonnie Wach
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:44 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Shannon Rossiter

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:47 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Save our trees!

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. Studies are now showing that RoundUp is carcinogenic!

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Diane Fenster
287 Reichling Ave, Pacifica, CA 94044
I work at SF State University and frequently visit parks in San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Prabha Milstein
791 Myra Way

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:48:18 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure. I live on Mt. Davidson and I think

removing the bench is ludicrous.

Signed:

Prabha Milstein
791 Myra Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:52 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists. Cycling is our livelihood and this is a travesty for ALL who want to enrich their lives with exercise and nature.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan. PLEASE!!!! It is the right thing to do, NOW!

Signed: Katherine Albrecht
77 Teresita Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:01 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dorothy Yuki
226 Virginia ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:54 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Robert Burman, 32 Melrose Avenue, SF 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:07 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Janie Lucas
827 Capp St
San Francisco, 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 8:54:04 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Janie Lucas
827 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 8:58 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" lie, like all of the other lies the corrupt public officials push down our throats. Like President Trump, for instance.

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation, unless you are a criminally corrupt public official.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on tons of cancer causing herbicides and claim it is not there to kill small children, our dogs and wildlife. Ask the state of California.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.
Is this what YOU support?

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP, with actual, open public notice and input. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: James Walsh
66 Marietta Drive
San Francisco 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:11 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Marie M. Conroy
130 Meadowbrook Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 12:27:18 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Marie M. Conroy
130 Meadowbrook Dr.
San Francisco CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:12 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: marcia spitz
728-8th avenue
9118

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:22 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

deanne delbridge
499 marina blvd. #205
san francisco ca 94123
it is so sad what is being done to uglify this beautiful city!! as if visual beauty doesn't count
at all!! - ripping down all the trees on van ness for a gain of a few minutes of time riding the
bus - when our streets are in horrible disrepair and getting worse every year -
HORRIBLE!!
YOU are doing this to our city!!! - YOU are allowing it to happen!!! the night herons,
barn owls,
and other birds have dwindled and all but disappeared from the marina green from your
awful
and unnecessary herbicide spraying - what are you THINKING!???

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:28 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: The EIR obscures the negative impacts of the Plan. Please have Planning fix it so we all know what we are agreeing to when the Plan is adopted.
Thanks,
Tom Borden
District 7

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:31 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: James Showalter
120 Evelyn Way
SF CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 5:06:32 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

James Showalter
120 Evelyn Way
SF CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 9:48 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mary Sherwood
874 urbano dr

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:14 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash"

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Nancy McGinnis
38 Harper St
94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:19 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Holley Wysong
377 Monticello St.
San Francisco CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:23 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Amy Klee
54 Dartmouth St
San Francisco, CA. 94134

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Vivian Turner
101 Casitas Ave
San Francisco, Ca 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:47 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Debra Moore
79 Ulloa St.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:06:29 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Debra Moore
79 Ulloa St
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:48 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sally George
79 Ulloa St
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 8:13 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mark Gould 432 Belvedere street 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 8:36 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Tomasita Medál
P.O. Box 22551
San Francisco, CA., 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 8:55 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

While planning corrects the error, please, as a minimum:

- Remove the forested areas of the "Natural" Areas from the NRD management, stop the nonsense of grassland "restoration", let foresters take care of the trees.
- Ban the use of all toxicity category I & II herbicides in our parks; stop poisoning - it hurts "native" species as much as "non-native." It is bad for people, particularly children, pets, and wildlife.

Conclusion:

As you know,

- the plan to poison Farallon Islands has been stopped;
- the GGNRA dog management plan has been put on indefinite hold;
- the FEMA funding for destruction of 450,000 "non-native" trees withdrawn because it would actually increase the fire danger according to the US Forest Service.

So, sometimes environmental conscience and common sense prevail.

It's about time to stop wasting taxpayers money on the insanity called "Natural" Resource Management Plan, and place it into where it belongs - into the garbage. It's time to scrap the "Natural" Resource Division as well.

Signed: Anastasia Glikshtern,
150 Chaves Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:00 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Ilya Klebaner
575 Los Palmos Dr
SF CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:07 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

PLEASE DO NOT VOTE TO CUT DOWN MORE TREES IN SF. We really do need them and "replacing them" with tiny shrubs that will only be cut down again is not the answer to having an ecologically sustainable and diverse city. Trees are home to many wonderful creatures and help absorb city pollution. Please do the humane and natural thing by stopping the EIR measure.

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Zach Reed,
San Francisco, CA
PO Box 40930
94140

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:25 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sue Williard
1319 48th Ave.
San Francisco. 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:51 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Max Ventura
www.EastBayPesticideAlert.org

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:36 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Paul Castleman 2 Belgrave Ave., San Francisco, CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:43:53 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: paul castleman 2 belgrave ave. sf

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:37 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mari Eliza
Mission District resident

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:39 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

Sheesh. Please reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to planning and
DON'T LET RPD CUT DOWN ANY MORE TREES.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and replace them with grass and shrubs without a big impact. It's going to look terrible, feel awful, and once those trees are gone, you can't just change your mind later and have things work out the same.

Fact 2:

I'm still crying about what happened to Hawk Hill!

Fact 3:

Trees provide valuable habitat for birds and other creatures. They provide shade and a depth to the city that grass and shrubs simply cannot.

Fact 4:

So what if all the trees aren't "native"? Neither is Coit Tower, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the Transamerica Pyramid. Are they the next to go?

Fact 5:

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Catherine H Woneis
120 Carmel Way
Portola Valley, CA
(Yes, I don't live in the City, but I work in SOMA and I play in the city all time with my City-living friends!)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:38 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Karen Wheeler
148 Hermann St.
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:31:58 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Karen Wheeler
148 Hermann St.
SF CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:51 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: This plan will increase our city's carbon footprint, increase toxic chemicals in our soil and water, and deny residents access to walking and biking and otherwise recreating in our parks. How is this a good thing? PLEASE reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Charity Kahn
2219 39th Ave, SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:57 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Wendy Stock (San Francisco native)
1306 Bay View Pl
Berkeley CA 94708

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:04 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Terri Penn
32 Sequoia Way
SF 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:13 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Norma J F Harrison

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:18 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Michael Kemper
1388 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:18 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Diana Scott
3657 Wawona St.
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:22 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Richard Sanderell
39 Fair Oaks #205
San Francisco, Ca. 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 12:59 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: This plan is seriously flawed and should not move forward. It is not in the best interest of San Franciscans.
JoAnn Yates
2106 48th Avenue

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:28:04 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

JoAnn Yates
2106 48th Ave, San Francisco 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:12 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

Concerning the EIR for the SNRAMP: This so called EIR is no EIR and must be sent back in favor of preparing the real thing.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. In fact scars from tree removal may never actually become replaced by anything but could continue to erode. You cannot destabilize the hillsides by cutting down 18,500 trees and ignore the costs of landslides, mud, dust and mess you have created. You cannot lose 18,500 trees and the creatures that eat those trees, the creatures that live within those trees and how these losses relate to the other creatures and flora of the environment. Without this understanding you cannot claim no significant environmental impact.

Fact 2:

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is based on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. You cannot ignore the impact of herbicides on the capacity of the soil to support plant life by very long term or even forever restricting the uptake of minerals in the soil. You have no accurate data on the actual content of the herbicides, the longevity of the herbicides and the impact of the herbicides on the people who come near, the workers using them or the public in general. In our work testing the fire resistance of uncontaminated vegetation compared to herbicide contaminated vegetation we showed Roundup significantly decreases the fire resistance of non-target vegetation for several hundred feet around even a minor application. Thus the EIR must account for this significantly increased fire hazard from the use of herbicide.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas, making these areas largely inaccessible to an urban population that desperately needs contact with wildlands and say there is no impact on bicyclists or peoples enjoyment of the parks. On the other hand bicycle paths cause significant erosion unless designed properly and maintained will create a heavy impact, so the details of bicycle access is important to know to understand the environmental impacts.

Fact 5:

Conclusion:

An honest and accurate EIR for SNRAMP is required. Please reject the certification of the EIR and return it to Planning. Implementation of the Plan must be stopped until there is an accurate evaluation. If significant impact is found, a finding of overriding public interest must also be found. This EIR is simply not ready.

Signed:

Cheriel Jensen
3315 Cesar Chavez
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 1:40 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Marty Miner, 70 year old, third generation San Franciscan native (7 generations Bay Area)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:02 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Linda Sherwood
523 22nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 2:56 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Travis Van Brasch
1 Longview Court
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:08 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Michael Candelaria 1 Church St #217, San Francisco, CA 94114 ph 415-342-3695.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:13:46 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Pesticides hurt wildlife and runoff hurts sea life, stop trying to restrict access and false EIR data. Michael Candelaria 1 Church St #217 SF 94114.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:10 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Ken Lundgreen
835 O'Farrell Street #513
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 3:09 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Gerald Schonvisky, 1 Church St #217, San Francisco, CA 94114.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 6:06 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mani white

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 6:17 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Robin Sherrer - excelsior

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 6:31 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Genya

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2017 7:14 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. Stop cutting down our healthy trees. Ban poisonous herbicides from our parks.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Tony Holiday
945 Pine, San Francisco 94108

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:19 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. This affects children, families, and individuals who now use our parks.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Erin Caughman
1938 33rd Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 5:59:23 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Erin Caughman
San Francisco resident 94116
Supervisory District Four

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:18 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Martin F. Moran, 7 El Sereno Ct., SF, CA, 94124-1815

Signed: Please cancel this project of replacing any trees.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:22 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Martin F. Moran, 7 El Sereno Ct. , SF, Ca,94127-1815

Signed: Please cancel this project, then spend the money to repair the city streets.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:17 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Kris Brigham. 191 Robinhood drive 94127. This is a gross misuse of our tax dollars. And already has changed conditions at Mt Davidson. Poorly thought through and chemically dependent-not natural. Spend the \$\$ on free wifi for all.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 7:16 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Robert Thomas
78 Sanchez St
San Francisco CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 6:28:53 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Robert Thomas
78 Sanchez St #1
San Francisco CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 6:49 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Artur Bierman
I initiated and led the fight against the freeway through Golden Gate Par.
I initiated and led the fight against the Gellert Bros. grab of Sutro Forest for their shoddy housing. My then wife wife, Susan (Sue) Bierman, fought tenaciously with me.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 6:38 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dr. Jaime Becker

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:01:46 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Dr. Jaime Becker

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 6:02 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. We already have seen the impacts of tree loss, see the latest large cypress trees along sunset blvd. on the western side of Parkmerced, the storms also have taken down more trees.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. We are increasing density daily, therefore with the building of increased housing parks are used more, and this impacts the parks we have they cannot be reduced only expanded...

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. These areas are highly impacted and are often near schools, playgrounds and open space used by children, seniors, and disabled.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Aaron Goodman
25 Lisbon St., SF, CA 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:56 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is not a serious professional effort and cannot be accepted.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a loss of future carbon sequestration and habitats for birds and animals.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

I live in the West Portal area where we already have issues with the city agencies extensively cutting down trees for hard to understand reasons. Please reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, you must halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan or the whole point of sending the Plan for re-evaluation will be lost as the cutting of trees will already have unfortunately been accomplished.

Signed:

Tom Duffy
267 Dalewood Way 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:56 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Poe Asher. 44 Ord Court. SF 94114
The Natural Areas program is poor science.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:42 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Nora Davidson
2956 Delphi Pl. NE
Bremerton, WA
98311

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:23 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. The people of San Francisco purchased the park land that is now McLaren Park with the intent of developing it when they were more people in the area. That time is now and soon to be greater. With the development of the Naval shipyard to candlestick point area in the near future have such a large part of that park slated for no use but walking and bird walking is a huge impact on the public that purchased it. The recreation and parks department needs to recognize that there are other recreation activities besides those that include balls. Bicyclist and disc golf need to be recognized as part of our environmental needs.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. I recently requested that some poison oak that was growing into the pathway in McLaren Park be removed and rather than suiting up and taking it out they snuck in and without posting sprayed something much more than round up. I appreciate the fact they took care of it but they used something that probably would not even be permitted by home gardeners in San Francisco.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Every since proposition 13 the recreation and parks department budget and cut. This has created a sinking ship each administration comes along and put the patch on. When the natural areas program came along and said we can take you to parts of the park department and not bother to hire gardeners or maintain them let's just let them be natural you to peel a great deal to the management. Rather than patch up a sinking ship let's just scuttle it. This is no way to serve the needs of an urban population. There is much natural area within reach for the population of San Francisco. We don't need to take away our recreational areas To save a few native plants that have not been destroyed by grazing or by use of the public.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.
McLaren Park was claimed by natural areas without notification or consultation with either the neighbors or the park staff.

I know this to be true because I was living in the neighborhood and working in the park. There can be no environmental impact report that does not include the way the public is impacted.

Signed:

Michael Sean Smith
Native San Franciscan
479 Naples St. 94112
Retired San Francisco recreation park department gardener
50 year resident of the excess your neighborhood adjacent to McLaren Park

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:00 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data". I honestly can't believe that, in this day our federal government slashing EPA regulations that you would systematically take out what's working in exchange for what won't work! Appalling.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Donna Riley Hoppes, 128 Montcalm St., San Francisco, ca 94110
415 920 9861

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:47 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Doug Landau

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:42 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jeffrey A. Nigh
452 Hazelwood Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:26 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. If trees are diseased, they need to go but to clear cut just because they are "non native" is ridiculous.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation. I regularly visit some of the proposed impacted areas, there is no reason to restrict public access in these areas.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Michele Nihipali
3663 21st St.
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:23:30 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Michele Nhipali

Signed:

Michele Nhipali
3663 21st St.
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Isabel Molloy

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Wendy Oakes
1868 Page Street
San Francisco 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 5:14:26 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

wendy oakes
1868 page street
san francisco ca

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:38 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Margaret Goeden
1969 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:49 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Tim T Turner
101 Casitas Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:58 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Carol Anna Lind, 822 Clayton #7, SF 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:27:48 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Carol Anna Lind
822 Clayton Street, #7
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Teresa O'Carroll

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: It sounds like the EIR needs to do a bit more in-depth research as these plans not sound and will hurt more than help. I can not imagine why anyone could think this is good management.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:28 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: James Showalter
120 Evelyn Way
San Francisco, Ca 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:53 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Carol Slettvedt SLOW ALL OF THIS HYSTERIA down! Haste makes waste. Civilizations come and go...and even mountains over time can cease to exist. We West Portalers love our Mt.Davidson as it has grown to be. There are other problems in SF that require careful concern promptly. See if some of them can be addressed!

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:52 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:06 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

I urge you to reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP.

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Again, I urge you to reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. Please halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan. Thank you.

Signed:

lori m. rillera
1398A 18th Ave.
san francisco, ca
94122-1859

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Renee Pittin
671 28th St., San Francisco 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:57 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Elizabeth Quinn
3739 26th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Elizabeth Rotter
190 Belgrave Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:31 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Carolyn Shuman
37 Claremont Blvd.
SF, CA. 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:38:59 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Carolyn Shuman
37 Claremont Blvd.
SF, Ca 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:19 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan. RPD has been trying for over 15 years to implement this total waste of money. The taxpayers of San Francisco have financed one of the longest running scams in the City's history.

Signed: Avrum Shepard
AShepard@well.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:00 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Destroying trees, restricting recreation, and spraying carcinogens will have a profound effect on our parks. The reason it's being done, i.e. "Make San Francisco native again!" does not justify the risk to humans and other animals. The EIR must identify & address ALL these risks. Please rescind the current, inadequate SNRAMP EIR. Signed, Karin Hu, District 7

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:48 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Ramon Sender
3922 23rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:46 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Kirby settle 1260 Broadway sf 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:43 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Marilyn Whitcher
125 El Verano way
94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:23:27 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Marilyn Witcher
El Verano Way
94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:40 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: The GGNRA has been reducing access to their lands recently too. The board of supervisors in 3 counties have unanimously voted against the restrictive Dog Management plan which reduced access to many trails and acres with and without dogs. This is very similar!!!! You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: Parks are for increasing health in an urban population! You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks. Herbicides are toxic! Recently Round Up has been linked to even more health damage than previously thought. Think of the wildlife that eats the sprayed plants!

Fact 4: City parks are for recreation and making urbanites healthier. You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Claire Mills
2820 Greenwich Street
SF 94123

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:05:21 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Claire Mills
2820 Greenwich St

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:34 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Carol Goerke
1551 S Rural Road
Tempe, AZ 85042

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Richard Barker
11103 SW Davies Road
Beaverton, OR 97007

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sandi Aden
1621 Old Glory Road
Lincoln, NE 68521

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:32 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dianne Douglas
2723 E Valencia Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85042

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:30 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration. Please see PBS Newshour's interview with Geoffrey Donovan, a research forester at the Forest Service's Pacific Northwest Research Station, about the U.S. Forest Service's study that demonstrates an associative causal link between the death of trees and the death of humans. The interview is titled: "How Removing Trees Can Kill You"

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Rae Bordua
P.O. Box 12420
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:04:45 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Rae Bordua
P.O. Box 12420
San Francisco, CA 94112-0420

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Roger Eaton
355 Serrano Dr Apt 4F
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: Hell no! The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Mickey McCarthy

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:53:07 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Mickey McCarthy

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:09 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Christy Cameron
94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Holly Erickson
94133

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:12:52 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Holly Erickson

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:05 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:53 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Jeffrey Hurwitz
582 42nd Avenue
SF 94121

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:02 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: James Brunton

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:05:56 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Jim Brunton

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:53 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Fiona Burgess
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:52 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Cecilia Brunazzi
250 Grand View Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:51 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:43 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Gabrielle Solomon
136 Burlwood Dr
San Francisco 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:14 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Art Zendarski
1591 Jackson St. #2
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash"

From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Ron Proctor

37 yr resident, District 7 (Miraloma Park)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:33 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims. PLEASE DON'T let this EIR certification stand with its patent disregard for factual information and its bias in favor of the Plan. Taking a long time to be published is not the same as being unbiased nor accurate.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dee Seligman
District 5- 2094 Fell St. SF 94117
San Francisco Forest Alliance President

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:28 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Please save our Trees and add new green to our Urban environment.

Signed:
Mari Zatman 3 Sumner S.F. 94103

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:23 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Twyla Meyer

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:19 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

PLEASE REJECT THE EIR FOR THE SNRAMP. THIS IS A TERRIBLE PROGRAM. The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You CANNOT cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Rob Rynski
582 Arguello Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:18 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Janet Kessler
636 Douglass Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 11:12 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Sarah Slaughter

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:56 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash." From Wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data."

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Dee Seligman

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of EmailMeForm <burst@emailmeform.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:54 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Carroll, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Karen Michels
821 Diamond St Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 3:18:59 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Karen Michels
821 Diamond St, Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Larry Thompson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject a golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:51:23 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As a Bay Area resident, I strongly urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), which contains the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment. Sadly, most of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded, and destroyed. Fortunately, Sharp Park is home to federally protected, ENDANGERED CALIFORNIA RED-LEGGED FROGS (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

Will the Board of Supervisors work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea? That pumping will cause the frogs' egg masses to be stuck on dry land and die. I oppose using taxpayer funds in a way that destroys rare wetland ecosystems or degrades important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is plain wrong.

Again, I request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Sincerely
Lawrence Thompson
1069 Felicia Ct
Livermore CA 94550

From: [FD](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [A](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:48:25 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Best regards
And thanks you for your true understanding,

Maya Dodwell
Warden Stanmore Country Park



Spread the word and print this poster! Left-click the image to download the 17 x 23" PDF .

Speak up at San Francisco City Hall [February 28th, 2017](#)

Our Appeal hearing before the SF Board of Supervisors is [on Tuesday, February 28th at 3:00pm](#) in San Francisco City Hall, Room 250. We need you there [at 3:00pm](#) so

that you can speak in support of our appeal and protecting Sharp Park wildlife! Please email Julia Chang Frank at Julia4th@yahoo.com if you can be there, and she will provide you with talking points. Thank you for taking action for amphibians!



California Red-Legged Frog eggs stranded on land.

Thank You for Speaking up for the Frogs in California!

SAVE THE FROGS! depends on the dedication, passion and action of our frog-loving supporters to stand up for the rights of amphibians around the globe. Thank you for being an active part of our movement to protect amphibian populations!

Sincerely,
Michael

--

Michael G. Starkey
SAVE THE FROGS! - International Campaigns Coordinator, Ecologist
www.savethefrogs.com
starkey@savethefrogs.com



A beautiful California Red-Legged Frog (Rana draytonii) from Mori Point (next to Sharp Park Golf Course). Photo by Joshua Asel.

Thanks again for speaking up for and protecting the rights of the California Red-Legged Frogs at [Sharp Park Wetlands!](#)



Sent to: dodwell@fastmail.fm

SAVE THE FROGS!, [1968 S. Coast Hwy Suite 622, Laguna Beach, CA 92651, United States](#)

Don't want future emails? [Unsubscribe](#)

From: [Ruth Van Sciver](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kerry Kriger](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:29:37 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to REJECT the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info. Remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California, but once we destroy the habitat for Red-Legged Frogs they will be gone forever.

--

Regards,

Ruth Van Sciver
resident of California

From: [Brigid Prouse](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:24:34 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Kind regards,

Brigid Prouse

PA/TEAM ADMINISTRATOR

Science System Investment and Performance, Labour, Science and Enterprise
Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment



Email - Imera: brigid.prouse@mbie.govt.nz | **DDI – Waea Totika:** +64 4 901 3993 | **Website – Pae-ipurangi:** www.mbie.govt.nz | **Postal – Poutapeta:** Level 8, 15 Stout Street, PO Box 1473, Wellington 6140

www.govt.nz - your guide to finding and using New Zealand government services

Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. This message and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the

person responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any use is strictly prohibited. Please contact the sender and delete the message and any attachment from your computer.

From: [L. R.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:22:42 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Line Ringgaard

From: [Viviane NERVO](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:13:11 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Viviane Nervo

9 imp delphine

06100 NIce

FRANCE

From: [Amanda Michelle Milster Dewey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:01:21 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

My name is Amanda Dewey I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California and biodiversity is more important than adding one more. The people of California are counting on you to do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Amanda Dewey

From: [Cameron E. Johnston](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 1:56:08 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Cameron Johnston
York University

From: [Genevieve Van de Merghel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 1:27:25 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should protect rather than to kill these frogs, which is what will happen when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea.

My family and I wholeheartedly oppose destroying rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. California already has over 1,000 other golf courses. Where else can the frogs call home?

Kind regards,
Genevieve Van de Merghel

From: [Ronald Bach](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 1:09:01 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Kind regards,

Ronald Bach

From: [maria elvira](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Shickingly Unwise to Endorse Frog Extinction
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 1:06:18 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely

Mari Elvi
Alexander Mills, NC

From: [Carly Eakin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:53:45 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Carly Eakin

--

Carly Eakin
Graduate Researcher, PhD Candidate
Department of Wildlife, Fisheries & Conservation Biology
University of Maine

From: [GEOFFREY STIER](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Wetlands protection and SNRAMP
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:32:33 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see <http://www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park> for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Best,
Geoff Stier

From: [Amanda C](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect the Sharp Park Wetlands!
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:31:52 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am a student in the SF bay area and I frog lover. I writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Amanda Cooper

From: [Raquel Elander](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:23:16 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Raquel Elander

From: [Michael Turco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:16:37 PM

Dear Honorable San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Michael P. Turco
5630 NW 80th Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32653
mike@michaelturco.com
AGPix.com/michaelturco

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Darrow Feldstein](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:13:06 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), **California's official state amphibian**. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

--

Darrow Feldstein
Co-Founder
The Bird School Project
818-633-9157
birdschoolproject.org

From: [Rebecca Powell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:06:15 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time,
Rebecca Powell

From: [Zoila Mata](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:03:00 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Zoila Mata

From: [Marian Vargas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 12:01:40 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your attention,
Marian Vargas

From: sharonreevelamesa@gmail.com on behalf of [Sharon Reeve](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:51:34 AM

SF Supervisors,

I oppose the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan until and unless the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan! I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Best regards,

Sharon Reeve
729 Banks St.
San Francisco, CA 94110
sharon.reevelamesa@gmail.com

From: [ROBIN PRIM](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:47:23 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Save the frogs and wildlife! PROTECT the environment and DO NOT DESTROY IT!

Sincerely,

Ms Dusty Stepanski

PO Bx 97

Richwood, NJ

08074-0097

From: [crueljustice](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:44:05 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

A. Tennant

From: [Jessica Mason](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:35:48 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

From: [Brenda Haig](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Wetlands and Reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:35:15 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Respectfully,
Brenda Haig
California Resident

From: [Alejandra Vega](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:32:43 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Vega

From: [Carrie Staton](#)
To: [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:32:28 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,

Carrie Staton

From: [Stephen Weitz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:31:08 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

thank you.....Stephen Weitz

"Do, or do not. There is no try."
--Yoda

From: [Marie Davis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:30:40 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Marie Davis

Save the Frogs Day - April 29th, 2017
www.savethefrogs.com/day

Life is short. Break the rules. Forgive quickly. Kiss slowly. Love truly. Laugh uncontrollably.
And never regret anything that made you smile.

From: [Sarah Kupferberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: protect wetlands, reject SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:20:33 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am a research ecologist who has studied frogs in the Bay Area for over twenty years and am a Bay Area resident. I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) because as it stands the proposal will have detrimental impacts on species protected by the federal and California Endangered Species Act. In particular I request that the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment be removed from the plan because there is substantial evidence that the wetland draining will have significant and adverse impacts on special status amphibians and the San Francisco Garter Snakes which rely on amphibian prey. In particular, Sharp Park is home to the federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea. When this action causes the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land, there are negative impacts on the ability of the population to sustain itself in the long term and an important link in the food chain is broken. Tadpoles, by consuming algae and detritus and in turn being eaten by aquatic insects, birds and reptiles, are vital to the functioning of the ecosystem. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems, the degradation of important wildlife habitat, and impoverishment of the area's native fauna. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is simply wrong. Using taxpayer dollars to defend this plan through poorly produced EIR's that will be subject to law suits is a further waste of the City's resources. And who benefits? Golfers? There are over 1,000 other golf courses in California. The City should be putting money inot urban parks that benefit more of its citizens than the small group that golfs.

For these reasons I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Please do not repeat such past mistakes. You have a responsibility to manage resources in an enlightened way that befits the progressive and environmental ideals of San Francisco and Bay Area residents.

Regards,
Sarah Kupferberg, Ph.D.

From: [Shannon Catt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:19:48 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,
Shannon Catt

From: [Carol Hoke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Wetlands
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:13:39 AM

February 15, 2017

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to entreat you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan **unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan**. The Sharp Park Golf Course has been heavily and rightly criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates for the past decade due to its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife, as well as its misuse of taxpayer funds, which could be more effectively spent on important social and environmental programs.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded, and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), **California's official state amphibian**. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm, and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

SAVE THE FROGS! and the vast majority of nongolfers throughout San Francisco and elsewhere are wholeheartedly opposed to any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for nonessential purposes is wholly unethical. As such, I implore you not to approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info. Remember that there are more than 1,000 *other* golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Hoke

5092 Gold Leaf Trail

Conover, NC 28613

From: [Iona Ali](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:18:52 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

--

(:8 iona 8:)
Frog Hollow Studio
and
Silver Strings Mandolin Ensemble
San Francisco

From: LazyLinePainter@gmx.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:32:20 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more information, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephanie E.

From: [Holly Kennedy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protecting Wetlands
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:35:22 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you!

Holly Kennedy

From: [Elana Frank](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:09:17 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

--

Elana Frank
College of William & Mary '16
B.S.

From: [stuti v](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:05:13 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California

From: [CristolKat](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:01:56 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

From: [Gillian Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:59:35 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Gillian Miller (Mrs)

From: [bocagii](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:53:16 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

***Sincerely,
J Gagnon***

From: [frogribble](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:45:38 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
S. Volk

From: [Marce Walsh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:43:35 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

*Thank you,
Mrs. Marce L. Walsh*

From: [Talila Stan](#)
To: [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:33:11 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Talila Stan

From: [MerryRun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:29:58 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

As an avid hiker and nature lover, I urge you to protect the California Red-Legged Frog!

Sincerely,

Carole Hossan

From: [Diane G Woodcock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:26:02 AM
Attachments: [D36C7DE9-A8C5-4CAC-95BE-EF9110C56CA0F51.png](#)

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors ,

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Woodcock



Associate Professor
Liberal Arts & Sciences/English
Virginia Commonwealth University in Qatar
PO Box 8095, Doha, Qatar
dgwoodcock@vcu.edu | P +974 4402 0612

[Under the Spell of a Persian Nightingale](#)

[Swaying on the Elephant's Shoulders](#)

[Beggar in the Everglades](#)

[Desert Ecology: Lessons and Visions](#)

[Tamed by the Desert](#)

[In the Shade of the Sidra Tree](#)

[Mandala](#)

[Travels of a Gwai Lo](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. Thank you!

From: [Jenifer Steele](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:15:46 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Who needs golf? We need more wetlands and wildlife. Thank you.

Jenifer Steele

2411 Jefferson Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94703

From: [Valerie Quercia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:11:41 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Quercia

From: [Lisa Koehl](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:10:09 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Animals have been regarded as property for way too long. It's high time we took on a more loving and responsible relationship with our kindred beings in the web of life on this beautiful planet. I always think and act as a guardian towards my kindred beings, never as their owner.

Sincerely,

Lisa M Koehl

From: [Karen Quaritius](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:59:56 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,
Karen Quaritius

From: [Dashiell Dunkell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:58:52 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As an environmental scientist and concerned resident of the Bay Area, I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Dashiell Dunkell M.S.
Santa Cruz, CA

From: [Mindy Meadows](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:56:50 AM

U.S. Forest Service, the Center for Wetland & Stream Restoration, the American River Conservancy, the Amphibian & Reptile Conservancy and biologists from several other state and federal agencies, created nine wetlands for California Red-Legged Frogs in or near the El Dorado National Forest. All this time, money and energy spent and you are going to further degrade an existing habitat. California typically sets the bar for conservation efforts. you know your constituents don't want this so vote for them and not for the big money behind this ecological catastrophe of golf course.

Mindy Meadows

From: [mark.hollinrake](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:56:05 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Mark Hollinrake

From: [Politis, Hilary Lee Morgan \(Hilary Lee Morgan Polit\) \(Im9xc\)](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect the California Red-Legged Frogs
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:55:23 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Lee Politis

*Lee Morgan Politis
Associate Dean of Admission
University of Virginia*



From: [Karim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please! protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:51:25 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Respectfully
Karim Ennouri
Redwood City, CA USA

From: [Ray MacDonald](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:49:19 AM

Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Respectfully,

Ray

Raymond MacDonald
32 West Street
Braintree MA 02184
781-849-8320
ray.mac@verizon.net

From: [Kristin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:48:21 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

***From a concerned citizen and lover of frogs,
Kristin Kelsoe***

--

Kristin Kelsoe | Customer Service

9950 Horn Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

t 916.369.0491 x 120 | f 916.431.5820 | e kristins@sierrabg.com



</htmlxmlns="http:>

From: [Denise Stadnik](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject SNRAMP
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:47:56 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Don't we have enough golf courses? Could we start to protect the environment and all the creatures that live in it??? Isn't time we start to think about how destroying our animals will effect out lives in years to come. How many more zika like episodes do we need to happen to understand that killing one thing effects all things???

sincerely,
Denise Stadnik

From: [KE Hones](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please stop putting golf first & save the California Red-legged Frog!!!
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:47:42 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

K. E. Hones, NBCT Librarian

"Judge a man by his questions rather than his answers." Voltaire

Cada cabeza es un mundo-Every head is a world of its own

Conference WIKI: <http://will2change.pbwiki.com/>

Civic Center Library 727 Golden Gate Ave, SF 94102 (415) 241-3000
Downtown Library 693 Vermont St., SF, 94107 (415) 695-5860
Hilltop Library 1325 Florida St, SF, 94110 (415) 695-5606

From: [Dan Silver](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Bruce Horowitz](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:45:18 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Dan Silver, Executive Director
Endangered Habitats League
8424 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite A 592
Los Angeles, CA 90069-4267

213-804-2750
dsilverla@me.com
www.ehleague.org

From: dougkrause@mymts.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:39:10 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Doug

*The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good people do nothing!
If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor!
Being defeated is often a temporary condition. Giving up is what makes it permanent!
Until he extends the circle of compassion to all living things, man will not himself find peace.
I won't eat anything with a face or a mother!
Be the change you want to see in the world!
When the power of love overcomes the love of power, the world will know peace!
Truly man is the king of beasts, for his brutality exceeds theirs!
Truth is a battle of perceptions. People only see what they're prepared to confront. It's not what you look at that matters, but what you see!
Don't do nothing because you can't do everything. Do something!*

From: [Amandeep Jawa](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf & the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:51:36 PM
Attachments: [BOS_2017_02_15_SharpPark.pdf](#)

Please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR!

Amandeep Jawa
SF League of Conservation Voters
deep AT sflcv DOT org

<http://www.sflcv.org>



February 16, 2017

RE: Please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR

Dear Board of Supervisors

We are writing to urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into the City's Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. When the scope of the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR was defined, Recreation and Park Department promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review."

Despite this promise, the golf course redevelopment project was inserted into the EIR and was not subject to mandatory public hearings or early, formal oversight by regulatory agencies. Moreover, independent scientists have criticized the redevelopment at harming the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake and California Red-legged frog -- proposed changes will destroy and fill parts of the wetland to improve the golf course and will confine snake and frog habitat to the areas most vulnerable to sea level rise.

By approving the plan, the City is committing to spend even more taxpayer dollars on a Pacifica-based golf course that loses several hundred thousand dollars a year, is of little recreational benefit to San Francisco residents, and ultimately harms endangered species. (See attached table)

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

On February 28, please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR. If you are not able, please reject the entire EIR.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amandeep Jawa".

Amandeep Jawa • President

Sharp Park Golf Course Operating Costs

Fiscal Year	RPD Sharp Park Golf Course Losses¹
04/05	– \$110,299.00
05/06	– \$338,025.60
06/07	– \$64,685.80
07/08	– \$119,758.00
08/09	\$29,446.40
09/10	– \$134,699.80
10/11	– \$161,217.20
11/12	– \$245,007.40
12/13	– \$111,289.20
13/14	– \$151,269.80
14/15	– \$358,333.40*
TOTALS	– \$1,765,138.80

*Based on additional payroll records for FY 14/15 obtained from Recreation and Park, losses in 14/15 may be as high as \$750,000.²

Projected Costs of Golf Course Redevelopment:

\$6 to \$11 million for proposed project³ in Natural Areas Management Plan

Eventual additional costs of \$8.5 million⁴ or more for eventual seawall repair

Source:

1) <https://wildequity.org/2015-another-year-of-losses-at-sharp-park-golf-course/>

2) <https://wildequity.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Dingley-H.-2017-Financial-Appraisal-of-Sharp-Park-Golf-Course-2005-%E2%80%902015.pdf>

3) Tetra Tech, “Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report,” November 2009

4) ARUP North America Ltd., “Sharp Park Sea Wall Evaluation”, Dec. 17, 2009

From: [Alan Olander](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:36:45 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Alan Olander

From: [Antonella Nielsen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 4:18:21 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely
Antonella Nielsen

From: [indra.devi](#)
Subject: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Katy.Tang@sfgov.org, London.Breed@sfgov.org, Conor.Johnston@sfgov.org, Jane.Kim@sfgov.org, Norman.Yee@sfgov.org, Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org, Hillary.Rone...
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:00:48 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Yours sincerely

Dr J princees
Canary Islands
Spain

From: [Caroline Sévilla](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 1:03:18 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Caroline Sévilla
France

From: [Boaz Shacham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 12:50:32 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Shalom!

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Golf is cool... but destroying wildlife habitat is NOT!

As a wildlife professional here in Israel, I am well aware of the difficulties and conflicts arising from clashes between public & private interests regarding the management of land resources. You must keep in mind that as public leaders, you have responsibility in assuring that natural habitats and the wildlife associated with them are protected for future generations.

Thanks for your attention.
Cheers,
Dr. Boaz Shacham

Boaz Shacham, PhD

Herpetological Collection Manager

National Natural History Collections

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

From: [Wendy Hartwig](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 11:53:25 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed.

Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Yours Faithfully,

Wendy Hartwig

From: [Sylvia - Central Solar Systems](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:58:08 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you

Sylvia Cooper

From: [Koyomi Waki](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:48:59 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.



Spread the word and print this poster! Left-click the image to download the 17 x 23" PDF.

Speak up at San Francisco City Hall [February 28th, 2017](#)

Our Appeal hearing before the SF Board of Supervisors is [on Tuesday, February 28th at 3:00pm](#) in San Francisco City Hall, Room 250. We need you there [at 3:00pm](#) so that you can speak in support of our appeal and protecting Sharp Park wildlife! Please email Julia Chang Frank at Julia4th@yahoo.com if you can be there, and she will provide you with talking points. Thank you for taking action for amphibians!



California Red-Legged Frog eggs stranded on land.

Thank You for Speaking up for the Frogs in California!

SAVE THE FROGS! depends on the dedication, passion and action of our frog-loving supporters to stand up for the rights of amphibians around the globe. Thank you for being an active part of our movement to protect amphibian populations!

Sincerely,

Koyomi Waki

From: [Barbara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:08:01 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Dr. Barbara Anne Kidd-Hoffmann
4381 Fair Meadow Lane
Pike Road, Alabama 36064-2603

From: [virginia haddad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:06:27 PM

Dear Supervisor,

I am a golfer and a city taxpayer as I have a vacation property on Powell St. that I stay at each summer. However I oppose any action to drain Sharp Park of its strip of marsh/wetland. I was there a few summers ago and saw the little CA red legged frogs under the bridge. They deserve protection, not only because they're our state amphibian (extinct for years now from the Santa Rosa Plateau in Riverside County near my main home), but also because they are a food source for the rare SAN Francisco garter snake, a snake of the most beautiful colors, IMHO. There must be a better solution than destroying the habitat of the state amphibian.

V. Haddad

Btw did you know that no other group of animals is going extinct faster than the amphibians? Habitat loss is reason #1.

Sent from my iPhone

From: russweisz@baymoon.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:00:47 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

thanks,

Russell Weisz
319 Laguna St.
Santa Cruz CA 95060

From: [Michelle Hayward](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 8:27:25 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely

Michelle Hayward, UK

From: [Eric Fosburgh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 7:57:26 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,
Eric Fosburgh
Seattle WA

From: [Gail Gester](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 7:50:39 PM

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to please reject the proposed draining of the Sharp Park wetlands. The Red-Legged frogs are an important California native amphibian who depend on wetland areas for existence. The continued draining of wetlands is unwise for many reasons. To destroy Sharp Park wetlands for a non essential golf course is unconscionable. Undoubtedly you have heard the Save the Frogs presentations on the folly of draining Sharp Park. Please do not ignore the science behind their presentation. Please consider that your decision will deprive future generations of their natural heritage. Please do not use taxpayer money to fund the destruction of this important wetland environment.

Sincerely,

Gail Gester

From: [Joseph Barnett](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 7:03:59 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Joseph Barnett

From: [Janet Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: protect Red-Legged Frogs !
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 6:47:44 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

sincerely,

Janet Smith

From: [Kimberly Douglass](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 6:43:45 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

I live in Australia and dream of the day that I'll travel to California and see all the beautiful natural wonders in California. Please don't destroy a beautiful home for these iconic frogs just so that you can build a boring golf course that is the same as any other golf course. Californian wetlands are unique don't jeopardize that uniqueness for a stretch of grass with holes in it.

Sincerely,
Kimberly

From: poetictragedy13@comcast.net
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 6:14:55 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Cristina Anderson



From: [Ellen O'Connor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No on killing federally protected California Red-Legged Frogs
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:59:30 PM

Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

PLEASE SAVE THE FROGS. Each creature has a place in the ecosystem, we depend on our environment for life.

Thank you
Ellen O'Connor
95618

From: [Yvette Tapp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:42:31 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Yvette Tapp

From: [Melissa Hammerbeck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:38:31 PM

From: Me <missyhammerbeck@hotmail.com>
Date: February 16, 2017 at 8:34:41 PM EST
To: missyhammerbeck@hotmail.com

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Respectfully,

Melissa Hammerbeck

Sent from my iPhone

From: emmettdvm@netzero.net
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf courses e redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:36:20 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Emmett L. Blankenship, DVM,MS
224 Transart Pkwy
Canton, GA 30114

This Herb Stops Balding Immediately And Restarts Hair Growth

Regrow Hair Protocol

<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3232/58a65388b7b8e538817east03duc>



From: [Bruce Abbott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 4:33:13 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

From: [Chris Lynch](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: Treasure Island - Notice of Special Tax Lien
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 4:28:06 PM

I am traveling on February 14 and will have limited access to email or voice mail.

I will be out of the office and have periodic access to email/voice mail beginning on February 15 and continuing through February 17.

If you need immediate assistance during this period, please contact Michelle Castillo at 415-391-5780. Thank you.

From: [Natalie Van Leekwijck](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Wetlands
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 4:21:33 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Natalie Van Leekwijck

From: m3magda@buziaczek.pl
To: m3magda@buziaczek.pl
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 4:03:45 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Kind regards,
Magdalena Szaszorowska
London, United Kingdom.

From: [Rob Saulino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 3:37:12 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,

Robert Saulino

From: [bronwyn.evans](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 3:02:39 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for taking the time

B.Evans

From: [Keever, Marcie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: ["Julia Chang Frank"](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please remove Sharp Park from Natural Areas EIR
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 3:40:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[FoE letter to SF Board on Sharp Park Feb 16 2017.pdf](#)

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter from Friends of the Earth regarding Sharp Park and our request that you remove this project from the Natural Areas Program EIR. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Marcie Keever

Marcie Keever, Legal Director
Oceans & Vessels Program Director

 **Friends of the Earth**

www.foe.org

NEW ADDRESS - Berkeley office: David Brower Center, 2150 Allston Way, Suite 360, Berkeley, CA 94704

510-900-3144 (p) : 510-900-3155 (f)

NEW ADDRESS - Washington DC office: 1101 15th Street, NW, 11th Floor, Washington, DC 20005
202-783-7400 (p) : 202-783-0444 (f)

The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.



February 16, 2017

Supervisor London Breed, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

By email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Please remove Sharp Park Golf Course from the Natural Resource Areas
Management Plan EIR

Dear President Breed & the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Friends of the Earth appreciates all of your work to promote environmental stewardship in San Francisco. Now we are urging you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Sharp Park Golf Course is plagued with controversy, is a liability for San Francisco taxpayers and the General Fund, and deserves closer scrutiny by the public and the Board of Supervisors, as previously promised in writing by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD).

Friends of the Earth is deeply concerned about the inclusion of a Pacifica-based Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project within what is supposed to be a San Francisco “natural areas plan.” The golf course has lost more than \$1.75 million in the last 11 years, drawing scarce resources away from San Francisco coffers that could instead be invested in San Francisco neighborhood-based recreation and parks, including the five golf courses within the City.

In 2009, in response to public scoping comments on the EIR, the RPD stated:

“Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review” (emphasis added)

However, when the RPD released its Draft EIR, it included a golf course redevelopment project that would redesign golf course holes, redevelop numerous areas of the course, and dredge the wetlands. This redevelopment is projected to cost San Francisco \$11 million, and is expected to lead to the future armoring of the sea wall to protect this significant investment, costing San Francisco millions of more dollars. Less expensive alternatives exist, including options created by RPD and the engineering firm that helped develop the Ocean Beach Master Plan, but those were not reviewed in this EIR.

Scientists from institutions such as the University of California and San Francisco State University have criticized the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, stating that it harms endangered species and damages the wetlands. The golf course was built upon wetlands, and the RPD pumps freshwater from the natural areas into the ocean, wasting more than 100 million gallons of fresh water each year.

The Sharp Park Golf Course is a burden on the San Francisco General Fund, and highlights the misalignment of funds towards recreational activities that are close to San Francisco neighborhoods and provide recreation that is in demand by our communities.

We urge the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment from the EIR on February 28.

Sincerely,



Marcie Keever
Legal Director
Oceans & Vessels Program Director
Friends of the Earth

From: [Our Kids First Program](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Ahsha Safai](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Our Kids First Program](#)
Subject: Objections to Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:48:11 PM
Attachments: [OKF Signed Sharp Park Objective 2_17.pdf](#)

Good afternoon, Supervisors:

Thank you for your leadership in San Francisco and your support of our City's neighborhood, youth, social, and recreational services. We are writing to urge you to vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

We are organizations that support and prioritize a healthy and equitable San Francisco budget – one that supports those in our society who are most at-risk of being left behind by anticipated budget cuts. In the next budget, San Francisco-based recreation centers, youth services, after-school programs, and services for the homeless and the elderly may be cut.

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into a Natural Areas Resource Management Plan. By approving the plan, the City is committing to spend even more taxpayer dollars on a Pacifica-based golf course that loses up to several hundred thousand dollars a year. (See attached table)

We do not support a proposal to spend more City resources in places that provide little benefit to San Francisco residents. We ask that fiscally responsible decisions be made to protect San Francisco's neighborhood services.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jackie Manion
Executive Director

OUR KIDS FIRST Program
5845 Mission Street, Suite 301
San Francisco, CA 94112

Office: (415) 585-1104
Email: okfprogram@yahoo.com
Website: www.ourkidsfirstsf.org



Stressing Educational Excellence in Our Youth

5845 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 585-1104
OKFProgram@Yahoo.com

February 16, 2017

Supervisor Ahsha Safai

City Hall - 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689
(415) 554-6975 - voice
Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

RE: Objections to Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Supervisor Safai:

Thank you for your leadership in San Francisco and your support of our City's neighborhood, youth, social, and recreational services. We are writing to urge you to vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.


We are organizations that support and prioritize a healthy and equitable San Francisco budget – one that supports those in our society who are most at-risk of being left behind by anticipated budget cuts. In the next budget, San Francisco-based recreation centers, youth services, after-school programs, and services for the homeless and the elderly may be cut.

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into a Natural Areas Resource Management Plan. By approving the plan, the City is committing to spend even more taxpayer dollars on a Pacifica-based golf course that loses up to several hundred thousand dollars a year. (See attached table)

We do not support a proposal to spend more City resources in places that provide little benefit to San Francisco residents. We ask that fiscally responsible decisions be made to protect San Francisco's neighborhood services.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,


Jackie Manion
Executive Director
Attachments

Emailed 2/16/17:

- Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org
- Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org
- Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org
- Katy.Tang@sfgov.org
- London.Breed@sfgov.org
- Conor.Johnston@sfgov.org
- Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
- Norman.Yee@sfgov.org
- Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org
- Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org
- Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
- Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org
- brent.jalipa@sfgov.org
- Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Sharp Park Golf Course Operating Costs

Fiscal Year	RPD Sharp Park Golf Course Losses
04/05	– \$110,299.00
05/06	– \$338,025.60
06/07	– \$64,685.80
07/08	– \$119,758.00
08/09	\$29,446.40
09/10	– \$134,699.80
10/11	– \$161,217.20
11/12	– \$245,007.40
12/13	– \$111,289.20
13/14	– \$151,269.80
14/15	– \$358,333.40*
TOTALS	– \$1,765,138.80

*Based on additional payroll records for FY 14/15 obtained from Recreation and Park, losses in 14/15 may be as high as \$757,641.

Projected Costs of Golf Course Redevelopment:

\$6 to \$11 million for proposed project in Natural Areas Management Plan
Eventual additional costs of \$8.5 million for eventual seawall repair
Source: <https://wildequity.org/2015-another-year-of-losses-at-sharp-park-golf-course/>

From: [Virginia Reinhart](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 7:55:08 AM
Attachments: [Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP.pdf](#)
[Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Development in SNRAMP.pdf](#)

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Mr. Jalipa,

In addition to the 330 letters I sent you on Tuesday, I've attached an additional 270 letters received since Wednesday showing support for removing the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

Thank you for your consideration,

Virginia

Virginia Reinhart
Communications Manager
Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
2530 San Pablo Ave, Suite I
Berkeley, CA 94702
virginia.reinhart@sierraclub.org
(510) 848-0800 ext. 306

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Virginia Reinhart** <virginia.reinhart@sierraclub.org>
Date: Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 12:29 PM
Subject: Letters Opposing Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment in SNRAMP
To: brent.jalipa@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Mr. Jalipa,

Please find attached over 330 letters of support for removing the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.

We urge the supervisors to vote to remove the multi-million golf course redevelopment that harms endangered species from the EIR. Sharp Park golf course has been losing money for years, and since it's located in Pacifica, it provides little recreational benefit to San Francisco residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Virginia Reinhart
Communications Manager
Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
2530 San Pablo Ave, Suite I
Berkeley, CA 94702

virginia.reinhart@sierraclub.org
 [\(510\) 848-0800 ext. 306](tel:(510)848-0800)

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Both frogs and the golf course can exist together.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

William McGuire
258 9th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

CAN BIG MONEY AND BIG INFLUENCE FOR ONCE NOT WIN IN SAN FRANCISCO?

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dale Riehart
86 S Park St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Come on!

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Deborah Stratmann
463 Buena Vista Ave E # 3
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

First of all, thanks for speaking at the Corbett Heights Neighbors meeting on January 26th. Really appreciated having you there!

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mike Kappus
2328 12th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Douglas Estes
629 Arguello Blvd Apt 303
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I volunteer regularly at Mori Point to restore the habitat for our two endangered species. So I was devastated to hear of this misguided misdirection.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sarah Letoile
1423 Compton Rd Apt D
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

I'm a native to the Bay Area and take pride in our physical landscape as well as all the species that live here. This is very important to me.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gold
387 Day St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michael Kensinger
315 Valencia St
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lynne Eggers
221 Mullen Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Peter Booth Lee
3910 Fulton St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lael Robertson
512 Missouri St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dennis Scacco
PO Box 225224
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sharon Beals
PO Box 410986
San Francisco, CA 94141

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Fujimoto
9 Landers St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dan Richman
4229 21st St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jack Merk
765 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jeannette Sofer
1950 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mia Shaw
144 Evelyn Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rod Lowe
68 Ashton Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ann-Marie Olsson
955 Page St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Andrea Graff
226 30th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alex Hardee
640 Mason St Apt 205
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Leonard Tremmel
800 Lyon St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michael T. & Lucinda Morlin
165 College Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Beverly Lehr
1850 20th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Karil Daniels
2477 Folsom St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Diana Goldstein
8 Charlton Ct
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Barbara Samii
2405 15th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sage Johnson
1730 Kearny St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mary Etta Moose
1962 Powell St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Charles Ray
15 Guerrero St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joslyn Baxter
2001 McAllister St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lance Carnes
722 Lombard St Apt 201
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ben Russo
1937 Page St Apt 6
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mitch Dalition
350 Broderick St Apt 415
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Devin Romero
485 8th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kathy Howard
1243 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Nancy Nielsen
17 Mabrey Ct
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Nan McGuire
994 Union St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jan Blum
2160 Leavenworth St Apt 201
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lynne Preston
638 Rhode Island St Apt A
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Susan Mehrings
1240 Hayes St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hyde
2548 Pine Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Laurie Farnam
1876 15th St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

James Hatch
4521 20th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Saroyan Humphrey
619 Webster St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

John Tansley
P.O. Box 330351
John, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Matthew Iribarne
1953 Ofarrell St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Charles Wilmoth
290 Napoleon St
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Svetlana Filipson
416 Locust St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jessica Rudholm
150 Franklin St Apt 110
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Timothy Larkin
1515 Sutter St Apt 210
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bailey
45 Lincoln Way Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Holly Rosenblum
3500 Fulton St Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Maria Mana
8 Marion Pl
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

David Williams
27 Bucareli Dr
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Eric Silverman
55 San Andreas Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Diann Rose
830 Post St Apt 8
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Shirley Yuen
3333 California St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Irene Glassgold
155 Jackson St
San Francisco, CA 94111

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Irene Glassgold
155 Jackson St
San Francisco, CA 94111

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alex Applegate
1266 20th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joyce Lavey
593 Potrero Ave Apt C
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sally Abrams
138 Cortland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Etemad
929 Broderick St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michelle Barry
2299 Sacramento St Apt 19
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Mcinroe
383 King St Apt 715
San Francisco, CA 94158

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

J. Barry Gurdin
247 Ortega Street
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ray Min
367 Panorama Dr
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mary Betlach
2530 Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Matthew Kane
240 San Marcos Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ray Grimsinger
374 11th St Unit 3
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Janie Lucas
827 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

J Monfredini
130 Santa Monica Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

James Lovette-Black
584 Castro St # 821
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Geo Gaile
46 Alpine Ter
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sharon Steuer
300 Highland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christina Ridenhour
5140 Geary Blvd Apt 11
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Karil Daniels
2477 Folsom St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Zach Mattocks
3455 Ortega St
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sarah Dorrance
2956 22nd St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Angela Mcallister
1614 Grove St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Neoh
1490 Sacramento St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Robert Sanchez
6 Locksley Ave Apt 7B
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Fabiola Cobarrubias
38 Ord St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

R. Dene Larson, Jr.
600 Oak St Apt 36
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Henry Rabinowitz
3380 20th St Apt 404
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ryers
698 Connecticut St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Matt Richardson
1855 Green St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alvin Sion
300 Laguna Honda Blvd Apt 305
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joy Maulitz
1211 Stanyan St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christine Brazis
10 Appleton Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Hallie Sinor
431 Naples St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Gallegos
652 Congo St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Angus Whyte
230 Scott St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dawn Judd
888 Minnesota St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anna Yang
709 6th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alan Bent
536 Roosevelt Way
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Betsy Bannerman
827 York St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Diana Amodia
390 Chapman St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christine Lynn Harris
1095 Natoma St Unit 8
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Dumont
841 Rockdale Dr
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

dan richman
4229 21st st
san francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Ortega
818 York St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Karl Mauzey
450 Peralta Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carly Cassano
330 Irving St
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dale Wittig
508 Scott St Apt 11
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jenny Qi
1474 5th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Elaine Huff
1926 Anza St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michelle Carter
1738 Dolores St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman
25 Lisbon St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Deborah Stratmann
463 Buena Vista E
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Wendy Oakes
1868 Page St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Julia Carpenter
733 Frederick St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anne Steele
772 27th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anne Steele
772 27th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anne Steele
772 27th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anne Steele
772 27th St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Fidel Mora
1414 30th Ave Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sylvie Josel
1225 York St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Laura Ware
479 37th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

David Hirtzel
500 Crestlake Dr
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jackie Pomies
1271 38th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Fujimoto
9 Landers Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michael Kemper
1388 California St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Gregory Miller
1243 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Galen Abbott
567 Pennsylvania Ave
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mark Garza
1450 Broadway Apt 8
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Willis
40 Fillmore St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Hurwitz
582 42nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

J Dent
3826 22nd St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joyce Farber
2874 Jackson St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Melissa Huang
2408 Polk St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Olga Mandrussow
4351 17th St Apt A
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

David Doering
1544 Polk St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Gail Abrams
2976 26th St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Tatyana Shats
1521 Sutter St Apt 405
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christine Oda
1735 Steiner St Apt 471
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Libby Ingalls
2565 Washington St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Steve Thornburg
234 Hearst Ave
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sara Tresslar
4514 California St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Erna Elias
536 40th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mariano Marquez III
955 Bay Shore Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94124

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joshua Lawrence
1941 Turk St Apt 3
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christine Patch-Lindsay
1879 21st Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kirk White
381 Turk St
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

David Goodyear
503 Ashbury St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

David Donner
765B Portola St
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carrell Mccarthy
801 Chestnut St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carrell Mccarthy
801 Chestnut St
San Francisco, CA 94133

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sarah L'Etoile
1423D Compton Rd
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kathleen And Corey Raffel
21 Ora Way
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joy Baker
438 25th Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Oxley
1434 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dennis Scacco
POB 225224
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alex Stephanovich
445 Warren Dr
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jaume Pons
4598 17th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joe Jah
536 Mason St Apt 305
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Catherine Regan
2132 15th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Young
1427 Baker St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ann Rovere
120 Madrid St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Terry & Mr. Martin Horwitz
1326 23rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joan Berman
526 Ellis St
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carl Connell
342 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Barbra Paul-Elzer
2331 34th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carol Carges
3062 Jackson St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Sam Sullivan
499 Alabama St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Bart Admonius
4019 18th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Val Laurent
1680 Clay St Apt 14
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joan Smith
765F Portola St
San Francisco, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joan Smith
765F Portola Street
Joan, CA 94129

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dusty Lombardo
60 Fair Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Susan Tome
34 Tucker Ave
San Francisco, CA 94134

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Monica VanBladel
2623 Folsom St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Laura Kuo
10 Hemway Ter
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Thomas Blom
45 Ora Way
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

John Oda
2000 Post St
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kristen Pantl
2682 Folsom St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Robert T Dahm
234 Staples Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Thea Boodhoo
1160 Mission St
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christina Braun
351 Richland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Robert T Dahm
234 Staples Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Julie Kramer
1288 Church St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joan Van Rijn
185 Los Palms Dr
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Julia Baltrip
333 Gonzalez Dr
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ardath Kirchner
164 Sadowa St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Maureen Oshea
483 Joost Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mike Kappus
2328 12th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Linda Weiner
72 Gates St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Patrice Catanio
1317 Utah St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Shawn Lindahl
228 Randall St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michelle Parodi
142 Sears St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jordan Winehouse
99 ashbury heights
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Judith Goldstein
1325 20th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ron Nieberding
88 Perry St Apt 537
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

F Hammer
1490 Chestnut St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Bonner
645 Bush St Apt 108
San Francisco, CA 94108

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Billy Ragsdale
3288 21st St # 108
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Robert Danders
365 26th Ave Unit A
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Homewood
225 Miramar Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Joel Rubinstein
2023 28th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Alicia Snow
99 Saint Germain Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Susan Harmon
1559 Sloat Blvd # 237
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Susan Harmon
1559 Sloat Blvd # 237
San Francisco, CA 94132

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Gary Allen
3497 16th St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Arvin Panganiban
638 19th St Unit 6
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ian Haddow
536 Laidley St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Peter Lee
3910 Fulton Street 4
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Catherine Tanimura
666 30th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Shana Mahaffey
519 Webster St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Donna Hayes
362 Mullen Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Laura Saunders
170 King St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

L. Olson
225 Bush St
San Francisco, CA 94104

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Leah Olson
756 Page Street
Leah, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rulon Smith
1518 Castro St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Daria Iaconi
PO Box 77288
San Francisco, CA 94107

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Brittney Oconnor
2039 35th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Edward Walsh
1919 33rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carlita Martinez
2635 23rd St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Randy Weled
220 Liberty St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Laticia Lonon
5087 Mission St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Eric Poelzl
1618 Judah St
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Leonard
2352 Fulton St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Brice Davis
1128 Lake St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Christian Yunker
2531 32nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rich Hughes
242 Edinburgh St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Gloria Lee
1228 7th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Annalee Pineda
1035 Sutter St Apt 24
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Shishkin
411 44th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Monica Romero
427 Point Lobos Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Evan Mccauley
655 Montgomery St
San Francisco, CA 94111

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ricardo Magallon
2001 41st Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Belfiore
54 Anzavista Ave
San Francisco, CA 94115

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jeff Beck
1551 9th Ave Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Greg Pennington
798 Post St Apt 500
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Shanae Mairs
2430 Lake St Apt 1
San Francisco, CA 94121

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Leslie Richey
70 Conrad St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Maxwell
1400 Geary Blvd Apt 2304
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Karen Kirschling
633 Oak St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Michael Coon
520 Bartlett St Apt 2
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Charles Levine
1786 Filbert St
San Francisco, CA 94123

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Carey Suckow
341 Noe St
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Heggie
532 Flood Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

R. Zierikzee
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Heidi Smith
28 Valletta Ct
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Melvin D. Cheitlin
1661 Pine St Apt 1145
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ileana Labergere
705 Natoma St Apt 521
San Francisco, CA 94103

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Anne Veraldi
21 Lapidge St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kenyon
2263 40th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kanchana Rao
601 Van Ness Ave Apt 49
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Wendy Cowles
89 Banks St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Victor Kamendrowsky
203 Hoffman Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Irene Maestri
779 Duncan St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Caroline Ayres
3739 26th St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Scott Madden
32 Lloyd St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ben Holmes
404 Broderick St
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Dirk Obudzinski
1231 6th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Kimberlee Stryker
200 Fair Oaks St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Shoemaker
333a Willard North
San Francisco, CA 94118

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Henry Tasto
2500 33rd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Edwina Smith
258 Caselli Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Tim Butler
1520 Gough St. #505
San Francisco, CA 94109

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Elaine Katzenberger
749 Niagara Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Shawna Hedley
1330 Jones St Apt 705
San Francisco, CA 94109
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, and Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors:

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project from the environmental review for San Francisco's Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan ("SNRAMP"). If you do not, you must reject the entire SNRAMP and its accompanying environmental review.

The environmental review for SNRAMP is inadequate because it contains a golf course redevelopment that was inserted years after the public process that defined the scope of the

project. Thus the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment project was never subjected to mandatory public hearings, and did not benefit from early, formal oversight by other public agencies with subject matter jurisdiction.

Importantly, a Recreation and Park Department Scoping Report promised: “Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.” Despite this promise, the environmental review for SNRAMP included the golf course redevelopment project.

Sharp Park is home to two endangered species: the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. Development has reduced the habitat for these species to just a fraction of what once existed. The golf course redevelopment would further jeopardize the survival of these endangered species and many others in a rare and important ecosystem.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the most informed environmental decisions possible.

I strongly urge you to remove the Sharp Park golf course redevelopment from the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:12:51 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94115.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94114.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94112.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 3 pdfs containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:50 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Zips 94112, 94114, 94115

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, and opposing the Appeal, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94112, 94114, and 94115. There are a total of 25 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94112 (13)

Tim Griffin

Sandra A. Driscoll

Jare Driscoll

Howard Jiang

Mary Ann White

Garrett O'Reilly

Tom Yee

Ray Oliver

Hung Day Nguyen

Jack Herr

Eva Chu

Chris Weber

Mark Sutton

94114 (7)

Derek Drish

Michael Kelley

Ian Silber

Demetrius X. Lambrinos

Matt Clementz

Zubin Bhattay

Consuelo Downing

94115 (5)

Geoff Herman

Stuart Read

Beau Scroggins

Ben Swift

Ellen Klutznick

Name: J. A. Griffin

Address: 537NA ST, S.F. CA, 94112

Phone: 415-533-9173

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. A. Griffin". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the beginning and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: *Sandra A Driscoll*
Signature

Name: *Sandra A Driscoll*
Address: *151 Judson Ave*
City: *SF CA 94112*
Phone: *(415) 586.6207*
E-mail: *SandraDriscoll@gmail.com*

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: JARE DRISCOLL

Address: 151 Judson

City: SF CA 94112

Phone: 415-586-6207

E-mail:

Name: Howard Jiang
Address: 35 Rome St. SF, CA 94112
Phone: 415-940-1469
E-mail: yangguangjiang@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Mary Ann White
Signature

Name: MARY ANN WHITE

Address: 150 SHAWNEE AVE

City: S.F. CA, 94112

Phone: 415-333-3580

E-mail: mawhite59@sfglobal.net

Name: *Garnett O'Reilly*
Address: *11 Rottick, SF 94112*
Phone: *415 986-2718*
E-mail: *oreilly@hdcco.com*

February *9* 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Tom YEE

Address: 139. LOWELL ST, San Francisco 94112

Phone: 334-1964

E-mail:

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Tom Yee

Name: Ray Oliver

Address: 548 Staples Ave, SF, CA 94112

Phone: 510-332-9881

E-mail: ray.oliver@att.net

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Raymond Oliver

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Hung day Nguyen*

Address: *333 Maynard St*

City, Zip: *94112*

Phone: *(415) 696-2116*

E-mail: *thenameese@gmail.com*

Name: JACK HEER
Address: 209 SANTA ROSA AVE
SF CA 94112
Phone: 415 819 9759
E-mail: JACKHEER@COMCAST.NET

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Eva Chu
Address: 250 Tara
City: San Francisco, CA 94112
Phone: (415) 469-4909
E-mail: eva.chu250@gmail.com

Name: CHRIS WEBER

Address: 3942-B MISSION STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

Phone: (415) 246-0814

E-mail: c.stopher.weber@gmail.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Mark Sutton
Signature

Name: Mark Sutton
Address: 230 Sackara St
City: SF, CA 94112
Phone: 646 295 7914
E-mail: strutman2@yahoo.com

Subject:Re: RPD's Natural Areas Plan

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 11:13:23 -0800

From:Derek Drish <derekdrish@gmail.com>

To:Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisor Sheehy,

I am a San Francisco resident in your District, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan on February 28th. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course. The course, unlike a lot of other park properties, accrues revenue.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Derek Drish

415 Roosevelt Way
San Francisco, CA 94114

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Michael Kelley
Signature

Name: Michael Kelley
Address: 615 Castro St
City: San Francisco CA 94114
Phone: 415 819 7458
E-mail: mskelley43@gmail.com

Name: Ian Silber

Address: 4014 25th St. SF CA 94114

Phone: 408 691 9539

E-mail: iasilber@gmail.com

February 9, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Demetrios X. Lambrinos

Address: 345 Gato St.

City: SF, CA 94114

Phone: 855 451 1099

E-mail: dlambrinos@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:

Signature

Name: MATT CLEMENTE

Address: 4336 21st St

City: SF CA 94114

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: Z. Shelley
Address: 50 Hancock St SF, CA 94114
Phone: 510 508 9526
E-mail: zshelley@gmail.com
February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

Name: Consuelo Downing

Address: 3998 18TH ST SF. 94114

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Subject:SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 10:33:08 -0800

From:Geoff Herman <geoff@riskguardins.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

CC:info@sfpublishgolf.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Regards

Geoff Herman

VP- Sales and Marketing

Phone: [415-447-4212](tel:415-447-4212)

Fax: [415-447-4181](tel:415-447-4181)

422 Presidio Ave, San Francisco, CA 94115

geoff@riskguardins.com

www.riskguardins.com

Your referrals are the highest compliment you can give us. If you know of someone who can benefit from our services please let us know

A proud affiliate of Pacific Interstate Insurance Brokers (PIIB)

E-MAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, copying, or storage of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited.

Name: STUART READ
Address: 1800 TURK ST
APT 403
Phone: SAN FRANCISCO
94115
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Beau Scroggins

Address: 1400 McAllister Apt. 15 SF 94115

Phone: 469 323 6339

E-mail: beau@qvr.com

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: Ben Swift

Address: 2536 Sutter St., SF, CA 94115

Phone: 908 752 -0165

E-mail: ben.swift39@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'BSW', written in a cursive style.

Name: Ellen Klutznick

Address: 200, Fillmore - SF - 94115

Phone:

E-mail: eklutznick@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: D. Klutznick

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:14:09 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94111.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94110.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94109.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 3 pdfs containing a total of 21 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:36 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Zips 94109, 94110, 94111

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94109, 94110, and 94111. There are a total of 21 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94109 (11)

Robert Turley

Carol R. Kaufman

Trevor Rief

Aaron Wilson

Jeff Phillips

Austin Glosme

Chris Pueland

Tom Clark

Joseph Wostowicz

Fusheng Wang

David Morgan

94110 (8)

Christian Divis

Pete Buckley

Margaret L. Dolan

Robert Reedy

Dustin Smethurst

Robert Togonon

Barry Kusumo

Dennis Tiernan

94111 (2)

Peter Gandell

Steve Enos

From: Robert Turley [mailto:robert.s.turley@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:21 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Warm regards,

Robert Turley
45 Glover Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
[415-964-1222](tel:415-964-1222)

Subject:Letter in Support of Sharp Park Golf; Please reject the appeal to your decision on Feb. 28th

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 18:48:35 +0000

From:Carol Kaufman <ckaufman@cooperco.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

CC:info@sfpUBLICgolf.org <info@sfpUBLICgolf.org>, Carol Kaufman <ckaufman@cooperco.com>

Dear SF Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of Sharp Park Golf and express my concern over frustrating, never-ending efforts that could overturn the Supervisors' decision and harm the city's historic golf course. We are so fortunate to have Sharp Park, one of SF's treasures, a stunningly beautiful, affordable, and accessible golf course and I hope to will help protect SF golfers and this very special and historic place for all SF residents.

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Carol R. Kaufman
1688 Pine St.
San Francisco, CA 94109

Name: Trevor Rief

Address: 1245 Green St San Francisco CA 94109

Phone: 805-720-0940

E-mail: trevorrief@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Aaron Wilson

Address: 1890 CLAY STREET SF 94109

Phone: 415 690 0331

E-mail: aaronwilson7@hotmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping, slanted strokes, positioned above a horizontal line.

Name: Jeff Phillips

Address: 1860 Jackson St, SE, CA 94109

Phone: 310-903-7285

E-mail: Jeffrey.K.Phillips@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: Austin Gosme

Address: 1441 & Jones St #403, SF, CA 94109

Phone:

E-mail:

February 7, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Chris Puelich
Address: 550 Leavenworth St Apt. 21, SF, CA 94109
Phone: 415 834 5754
E-mail: cpuelich@sfgov.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: TOM CLARK

Address: 1455 UNION ST., SF, CA 94109

Phone: 925-278-0016

E-mail: TCCCLARK4@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you

By:  _____

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:

Signature

Name: Joseph Wostowicz

Address: 1368 SACRAMENTO ST APT 3

City: SF, CA 94109

Phone: 415.609.6099

E-mail: JWOSTOWICZ@GMAIL.COM

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name:

Fusheng Wang

Address:

1333 Bush St

City:

SF, CA 94109

Phone:

415 292 8888

E-mail:

fusheng@oulak.org

Name:

Address:

Phone:

E-mail:

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



David Morgan

1250 Bush

San Francisco, CA 94109

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Christian Dims*

Address: *378 PARK ST*

City, Zip: *SF 94110*

Phone: *415.420.3498*

E-mail: *christian@davisconsulting.com*

Name: Pete Buckley

Address: 237 San Jose Ave SF, CA 94110

Phone: 415-318-6333

E-mail: peterjohnbuckley@hotmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: *Margaret L. Dolan*

Address: *300 Richland Ave., SF, CA 94110*

Phone: *415-649-3942*

E-mail: *∅*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Margaret L. Dolan*

Name: ROBERT BREEDY
Address: 103 PINEHURST AVE SF, CA, 94110
Phone: 415-826-9607
E-mail: RBREEDY@COMCAST.NET
February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: DUSTIN SMETHURST
Address: 2180 HARRISON ST. SF CA 94110
Phone: 415.760.5956
E-mail: CASV@PGE.COM

February 3, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Smethurst', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Name: *Roland Togonon*
Address: *80 Cortland Ave, SF, CA 94110*
Phone: *415-336-4858*
E-mail: *ritogonon@yahoo.com*

February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: Barry Kusumo
Address: 320 ALABAMA ST, SF, CA 94110
Phone: 415.252.7036
E-mail: barry.kusumo@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Dennis Tiernan
Address: 675 Hampshire St
S.F. CA 94110
Phone: (415) 821-4959
E-mail: dtiernan@pacbell.net

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Subject:Fw: Sharp Park
Date:Sat, 28 Jan 2017 18:31:49 +0000 (UTC)
From:Pete Gandell <peteandmilli@yahoo.com>
Reply-To:Pete Gandell <peteandmilli@yahoo.com>
To:info@sfpublicgolf.org <info@sfpublicgolf.org>

On Saturday, January 28, 2017 10:27 AM, Pete Gandell <peteandmilli@yahoo.com> wrote:

What can be more environmentally correct than a golf course? The Sharp park course is again under attack to be closed by Extreme environmentalists despite all the extra efforts to further protect all the wild life in the area. I am one of thousands of golfers who enjoy the course and feel that a solution of compromise should certainly be able to be found. Please support the Natural Areas Plan as approved by the Dec. 15 by the Planning and Rec. and Park Divisions as this culminated an intensive study of the situation and appeared to resolve the issue.

Thank you for your Community service and for considering this request.

Peter Gandell
640 Davis Street #24
San Francisco CA. 94111

Name: STEVE ENOS
Address: 101 CALIFORNIA, SF, CA 94111
Phone: 415-487-2089
E-mail:

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:15:56 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94108f.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94107.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupportNAP,SharpPk94105.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupportNAP,SharpPk94103.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94102.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 5 pdfs containing a total of 16 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office. Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:rharrisjr1@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:23 PM
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; london.breed@sfgov.org; sandra.fewer@sfgov.org; mark.farrell@sfgov.org; aaron.peskin@sfgov.org; katy.tang@sfgov.org; jane.kim@sfgov.org; norman.yee@sfgov.org; jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org; hillary.ronen@sfgov.org; malia.cohen@sfgov.org; asha.safai@sfgov.org
Cc: conor.johnston@sfgov.org; nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org; margaux.kelly@sfgov.org; lee.hepner@sfgov.org; ashley.summers@sfgov.org; barbara.lopez@sfgov.org; jen.low@sfgov.org; andres.power@sfgov.org; carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org; yoyo.chan@sfgov.org; cathy.mulkaymeyer@sfgov.org; phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org; melinda.hue@sfgov.org; jessica.range@sfgov.org; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf. and in Opposition to Appeal / Board of Supervisors hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 5 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94102, 94103, 94105, 94107, and 94108. There are a total of 16 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94102 (3)
Chung Seung
Adam Pierce
Byron Lee

94103 (2)
Lars Savage
Chung Min

94105 (5)
Ron Reis
Bart Mallon
Lucy Lin
Stephen Valencia
Chris Choi

94107 (5)
Maurice Monserez
Lee Blaylock
Sheila Von Driska
Sunny Schwartz
Bob Bernie

94108 (1)
David Cleary

Name: CHUNG, SEUNG
Address: 855 MCALISTER ST S.F 94102
Phone: 415-203-0612
E-mail:

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Adam Pierce

Address: 265 Eddy St. *AP*

City, Zip: SF, 94102

Phone: (805) 886-6757

E-mail: pierce71@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Bryan Lee
Signature

Name: Bryan Lee
Address: 855 McAllister St SF 94102
City:

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: DAVID CLEARY

Address: 1042 WASHINGTON ST #2 SE, CA 94108

Phone:

E-mail: cleary.7.2@gmail.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal, BoS File 170044 / Board of Supervisors Hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:19:01 AM
Attachments: [huston.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 1 public comment letter, which we filed with the Clerk of the Board, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departmentns, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 5:08 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Letter from Northern California Golf Association in the matter of SNRAMP FEIR, BoS File 170044 / Board of Supervisors Hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Letter from Northern California Golf Association, support NAP, oppose appeal

Attached above is pdf of a letter to the Board from the Northern California Golf Association. We ask the Clerk to make this part of the Board's record in the matter.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718



OFFICERS

PAT QUINN
President

TOM BONE
Vice President

GAIL A. ROGERS
Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN RONCA
Immediate Past President

DIRECTORS

STACEY BABA
RAY COATES
JOHN DODSWORTH
TERRY FITZWATER
GARY FOX
SCOTT GEBHARDT
BOB GOLDSTEIN
SAM GROSS
SUSAN MORSE
DAVID PEARSON
ED QUINN
JAY B. SILVERBERG
MIKE WEEKS
RICHARD M. WISE

JOE HUSTON
Executive Director

STAFF

JIM BRADY
Human Resources

R.J. CERAME
Communications

JIM COWAN
Course Rating and Handicapping

RYAN FARB
Rules and Competitions

AANA FITZGERALD
Controller

LENNY FUDENNA
IT

RYAN GREGG
Operations

ADAM HEIECK
Youth on Course

KRISTEN NOSTRAND
Chief Marketing Officer

RICK RANGEL
Membership

February 13, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
c/o Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
City Hall, Room 244
2 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Re: Northern California Golf Association supports
Natural Areas Plan and Sharp Park Golf Course, and
urges San Francisco Supervisors to deny the appeal from
the Planning Commission's Certification of the Final EIR.
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: February 28, 2017

Honorable Supervisors,

Sharp Park is a unique, highly-significant golf course and historic resource, whose preservation is of highest priority for the NCGA and for the world of golf. It is also a significant coastal recreational asset, providing healthful, scenic, reasonably-priced public seaside recreation and a popular community gathering place for residents and visitors to San Francisco and the Peninsula.

For these reasons, and as explained further below, the Northern California Golf Association ("NCGA") supports San Francisco's Natural Areas Program, which includes certain habitat enhancements for endangered species at Sharp Park in the context of maintaining the 85-year-old, 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Accordingly we urge Your Board to deny the appeal of Wild Equity Institute and other organizations from the Planning Commission's December 15, 2016 Order Certifying the Final EIR for the Natural Areas Program.

Opened in 1932, Sharp Park was designed by Dr. Alister MacKenzie, one of history's very best-known and best-loved golf architects, and an inductee into the World Golf Hall of Fame. His other courses – mostly private – includes several of the world's most distinguished golf courses including Augusta National, home of the annual Masters Tournament, Cypress Point Club, and Royal Melbourne, widely regarded as the world's greatest golf course south of the Equator.

Sharp Park is a "seaside links," a specific and extremely rare type of course, built in the sand by the sea -- the original type of golf course, on which the game originated in Scotland in the 15th Century, at places such as St. Andrews, which is today regarded as the "home of golf."

Re: Northern California Golf Association supports
Natural Areas Plan and Sharp Park Golf Course, and
urges San Francisco Supervisors to deny the appeal from the Planning
Commission's Certification of the Final EIR.
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: February 28, 2017


Dr. MacKenzie was an expert on seaside links courses, having been the consulting architect at the Old Course at St. Andrews in the early 20th Century. When they announced their preliminary designs for a golf course at Sharp Park in 1930, Dr. MacKenzie and his assistant Chandler Egan – himself a prominent early-20th Century architect – declared their mutual intent to model Sharp Park after the Scottish seaside links courses, and specifically St. Andrews.

We have for several years followed with great interest and concern the efforts of certain activist organizations to use San Francisco administrative and political processes in an attempt to close the Sharp Park Golf Course. And we and other golf organizations – including among others the United States Golf Association, World Golf Association, Southern California Golf Association, PGA of America, and the Alister MacKenzie Society – have on several past occasions written letters to San Francisco and other governmental entities in support of maintaining the Sharp Park Golf Course.

The NCGA is the largest regional golf organization in the United States, representing over 150,000 golfers and over 400 golf clubs, both public and private, from San Luis Obispo and Fresno in the south, and north to the Oregon border.

We reiterate our support for Sharp Park Golf Course and for San Francisco's NAP program and its Final EIR. And we reiterate our request that Your Board deny the appeal from the Planning Commission's decision to certify that Final EIR.

Best Regards,



Joe Huston
Executive Director

cc:
Mayor Ed Lee
Congresswoman Jackie Speier
State Senator Scott Wiener
Assemblyman Phil Ting
Assemblyman David Chiu
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley
Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, San Francisco Rec & Park Department
John Rahim, Director, San Francisco Planning Department
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal, BoS File 170044 / Letters opposing appeal / Board of Supervisors Hearing Feb. 28, 3 p.m.
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:31:18 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOutsideCA.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOutsideUS.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 9 public comment letters, which we filed with the Clerk of the Board, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:46 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal, other-than-California / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing a total of 9 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from residents of states outside of California (8) and for residents of foreign countries (1). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Tim Grunke*
Address: *2721 E Drexler*
City, Zip: *Tucson AZ 85716*
Phone: *520 444 3936*
E-mail: *tgrunke@gmail.com*

Name: *Cristian Streeton*
Address: *125 Nadine Way, AZ*
Phone: *520-299-5566*
E-mail: *cristian.streeton@gmail.com*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Cristian Streeton*

Name: M. SAN
Address: PO Box 805701
CHICAGO, FL 60605
Phone:
E-mail:

February 27, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *James Ah*
Address: *180 Chestnut St.*
City, Zip: *Andover MA 01810*
Phone:
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Kevin Gilbert*

Address: *PO Box 6348*

City, Zip: *Lincoln, MA 01773*

Phone: *781/724-4226*

E-mail: *KMGilbert@PLHGHotels.com*

Name: MIKE GHESS
Address: 11205 KNOXVILLE LN, DALLAS TX
Phone: 972-824-2100
E-mail: MGHESS78@GMAIL.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Mike Makowka*

Address: *908 Brazos Dr*

City, Zip: *South Lake TX 76092*

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: Jeffrey Kingstott

Address: 714 E Pike Street, 520, Seattle, WA 98122

Phone: 415-819-0545

E-mail: Jeff.Kingstott@gmail.com

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Kjell Gustafsson

Address: Stockholm, Sweden

City, Zip:

Phone: +46 70 526 3478

E-mail: kjell.gustafsson@gmail.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:39:48 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOtherCA1.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOtherCA2.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 49 public comment letters, which we filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb. 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:36 AM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. California misc. / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing a total of 49 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from California residents outside of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Tanya Ochoa
Address: 106 Jemis Bay
City, Zip: Alameda (CA 94502)
Phone: 510 343 8637
E-mail:



Name: JOHN MEYERSIECK

Address: 4630 H. STONE RD BETHEL ISLAND, CA

Phone:

94511

E-mail:

February 11 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:



February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Hugh COYLE*
Address: *4 VERONA PLACE*
City, Zip: *CORTE MADERA CA 94925*
Phone: *415 272-7873*
E-mail: *skeets17@earthlink.net*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Steve Oglesbee
Address: 536 G St,
City, Zip: Davis, CA 95616
Phone: 310 487-8017
E-mail: Soglesbee1@hotmail.com

Name: BLAKE BUNETIC
Address: 7849 BARN HOLLOW CT.
Phone: DUBLIN, CA. 94568
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: BLAKE BUNETIC

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *SIM SIMPSON*

Address: *7798 KELLY CANYON DR.*

City, Zip: *DUBLIN, CA*

Phone: *925 321-3718*

E-mail: *1451RJAMES@COMCAST.NET*

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Eamonn Coughlin

Address: 8001 Glenbar way

City, Zip: Fair Oaks, 95628

Phone: (916) 799-0236

E-mail: acecog@prodigy.net

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: CARLOS A DOMINOVÉZ
Address: 1518 MONTEBELLO DR FAIRFIELD
City, Zip: CA
Phone: 650 248 3934
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Leo Karsner*

Address: *PO Box 3041*

City, Zip: *Grant Bay, CA 95746*

Phone: *Grant Bay*

E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

TIM TRETJEV

Address:

6 DIABLO CIRCLE

City, Zip:

LARAGETTE, CA. 94549

Phone:

925-297-9899

E-mail:

Name: 8 Dave Lane
Address: Larkspur CA 94939

Phone:

E-mail:

February¹², 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *AYMAN ZAITON*
Address: *16111 Reservoir Ave*
City, Zip: *CANWINDERS, CT 90260*
Phone:
E-mail:

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Richard Middleton

Address: PO Box 1825

City, Zip: Laytonville CA 95454

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Krista Rogers

Address: 1641 Green Ravine

City, Zip: Lincoln Ca 95648

Phone: 916 331 9030

E-mail: ~~#~~ Kahlua.the.dog@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Azi YASSINI*

Address: *2480 ANCONA CIR*

City, Zip: *LIVERMORE 94550*

Phone: *510 825 0085*

E-mail: *YASSINI@GMAIL.COM*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Cyrano Adlawan*

Address: *2040 Glenview Dr*

City, Zip: *Lamita, CA 90717*

Phone: *310-600-9818*

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

FABRICE FLORIN

Address:

337 RICHARDSON WAY

City, Zip:

MILL VALLEY, CA 94941
Mill Valley

Phone:

E-mail:

fabrice.florin@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: John M. Spilman
Address: 22 Fairway DR
City, Zip: Mill Valley, CA 94941
Phone:
E-mail:

February 18 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Tom Deady
~~John Deady~~

Address:

P.O. Box 6396

City, Zip:

Moraga, CA 94563

Phone:

E-mail:

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Thomas W Malone

Address: 1943 Amalfi

City, Zip: Mountain View, CA

Phone: 650 - 465 - 8820

E-mail: pat-malone@sba-global.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Tim Brown

Address:

265 N BING STUART #21

City, Zip:

MT VIEW CA 94043

Phone:

650 279 2901

E-mail:

BLURTB@SKATEBOARDING.COM

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *W. Aseron*
Address: *473 Dell*
City, Zip: *Mt View 94043*
Phone:
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John Malone

Address: 10 Piper Ct

City, Zip: ~~San Francisco~~, Novato, CA

Phone: 415-892-2834

E-mail: jvmalone@msn.com

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ALASDAIR HENDERSON

Address: 7963 SUNRISE DR,

City, Zip: OAKLAND, CA, 94605

Phone: 415 948 1238

E-mail: aw-henderson@yahoo.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: THOMAS SHEA JR
Address: 10 ALBO COURT
City: ORINDA CA
Phone: 94563
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *ROGIN SMITH*

Address: *270 TENNYSON AVE*

City, Zip: *PALO ALTO, CA 94301*

Phone: *650-327-7323*

E-mail: *RVSMITH67@YAHOO.COM*

Name: Terry Exner
Address: 2666 Sanderling Way
Phone: Pleasanton CA 94566
E-mail: a.exner@comcast.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Brian Miller

Address: 2232 Delucchi Dr, Pleasanton, CA, 94588

Phone: 415 575 8450

E-mail: ONAFRIATY@hotmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____



Name: Curtis Wang.

Address: 14429 Temple Ave, Pomona, CA

Phone: 310 962 1384

E-mail: curtis.wang10@gmail.com.

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: DAVE SANCHEZ

Address: 922 SUNLITE DR

City, Zip: SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

Phone: 408-313-4836

E-mail: amsinc2@earthlink.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Keith Casanovi

Address: 1031 Lincoln Ct

City, Zip: San Jose CA 95125 San Jose

Phone:

E-mail:



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: KETH BERMAN
Address: KTB
535 HYDE PARK DR.
City, Zip: SAN JOSE 95136
Phone:
E-mail:

February 11 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: TODD MEEKER

Address: 878 LAKE MILLWRE DR.

City, Zip: SAN JOSE CA, 95125

Phone: 408-309-7786

E-mail: teammeek@sbcglobal.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Matt McDonald

Address:

City, Zip: San Jose, CA 95126

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Drew Marino

Address: 1139 Westwood Dr.

City, Zip: San Jose, 95125

Phone:

E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: MARK KRAIL

Address: 7193 CAHEN DRIVE

City, Zip: SAN JOSE 95120

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John Franz *John F. Franz*

Address: 1368 Boquet Dr.

City, Zip: San Jose, CA 95118

Phone:

E-mail: FRANZahcc@s@yahoo.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

JIM MARINO

Address:

6912 AZALEA DR.

City, Zip: SAN JOSE, CA 95120

Phone: (408) 927-0896

E-mail: jimlizmarino@sbcglobal.net

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: KEVIN JONES

Address: 1190 OLD OAK DR

City, Zip: SAN JOSE, CA 95120

Phone: (408) 294-1594

E-mail: UPSKEVIN@SBCGLOBAL.NET

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Keith Candor

Address: 903 McBride Loop

City, Zip: San Jose, CA 95125

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: WILLIAM HELLER

Address: 2009 BRIDLE LN

City, Zip: SAN MARTIN, CA 95046

Phone: 408 821-9023

E-mail: heller242@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

JAMES HIMLER

Address:

925 CRESTA WAY

City, Zip:

SAN RAFAEL, CA.

Phone:

650-888-5564

E-mail:

JHIMLER@ATT.NET

Name: MATTHEW DAVEY
Address: 1051 HARNESS DRIVE
SAN RAMON CA 94583
Phone:
E-mail:

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Matthew Davey

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: GARY VICK

Address: 14137 SQUIRREL HOLLOW LANE

City, Zip: SARATOGA CA 95070

Phone: (408) 772-9795

E-mail: GARY.VICK@SBCGLOBAL.NET

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Steven Schroeder
Address: 30 Booker Avenue
City, Zip: Sausalito CA 94965
Phone: 415 331-3167
E-mail: sschroeder@inheritancefundy.com

Name: Robin Kramer
Address: 1062 Robbia Dr.
Sunnyvale CA 94087
Phone: 408 242 9253
E-mail: robinkramer@sbcglobal.net

February 4, 2017
||

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Robin Kramer

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Bill Smith
Signature

Name: BILL SMITH
Address:
City: 1014 GRAPE AVE
SUNNYVALE CA 94087
Phone:
E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Kevin Bayly

Address: 1117 Rawner Lane

City, Zip: Walnut Creek, CA

Phone: 925-413-3369

E-mail: KevBayly@yahoo.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:42:55 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkFosterCity.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkSanMateo.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 14 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICgolf.org]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:26 AM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Foster City, San Mateo / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing a total of 14 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from residents of Foster City (3) and San Mateo (11). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: Grace Zhang (Foster City)
Address: 700 Tender Ln Foster City
Phone: 656 631 3516
E-mail:

February¹², 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Liz Murdoch
Address: 662 Celestial Ln Foster City, CA
Phone: 510-299-5328
E-mail: lizmurdoch01@gmail.com
February 8, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Kofa Schmetter

Address: 700 Tender Ln, Foster City

Phone: 650 2008421

E-mail: Kofa@schmetter.org

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: MIKE BENHAM
Address: 3031 HALEWYDA ST.
City, Zip: SAN MARY, CA - 94403
Phone: 650 618-3516
E-mail: ACEBENHAM@GMAIL.COM

Name: Marianne Hayes

Address: 1312 Parrott Dr., San Mateo CA 94402

Phone: 650 525 9776

E-mail:

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:



Address:

Phone:

650 344 4519

E-mail:

None

February 15, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

 2/13/17

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Don Ot

Address:

1754 LOS ALTOS DR

City, Zip:

SAN MATEO, CA 94402

Phone:

650-349-1832

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ryan Ortega

Address: 11
#25 Pebblewood way

City, Zip: San Mateo Ca

Phone: 650 436 8436

E-mail: rto2015@gmail.com

Name: George W. Smith

Address: 136 11th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94401

Phone: 650-349-7146

E-mail: smfd72@gmail.com

February 08, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: CANDICE NISHIMURA

Address: 617 CONNIE AVE

City, Zip: SAN MATEO CA 94402

Phone: 650 339 4544

E-mail: Candice.nishimura@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Steve McKay

Address: 422 Porcott Dr.

City, Zip: San Mateo 94402

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Zach McKay*

Address: *422 Parrott Dr.*

City, Zip: *San Mateo 94402*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Jamie Nakao

Name: *Jamie Nakao*

Address: *1 Creekridge*

City, Zip: *San Mateo 94402*

Phone: *650-341-1552*

E-mail: *j-list@prodigy.net*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Nancy Alden*
Address: *1235 SHAFER ST.*
City, Zip: *SAN MATEO, CA 94402*
Phone:
E-mail:

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:42:56 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOtherSanMateoCo.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:31 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Misc. San Mateo County / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 25 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from residents of miscellaneous cities and towns in San Mateo County. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: RICK NOVAK [mailto:rjnov@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 9:32 AM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Fw: Save Sharp Park we need your help!

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sharp Park is an important public recreational asset, and needs to remain so. As well, to golfers it's a creation of Alistair MacKenzie, who is arguably the most famous golf course architect in history. Destroying Sharp Park is akin to destroying a Van Gogh.

Rick Novak, MD
Adjunct Clinical Associate Professor of Anesthesia
Stanford University
70 McCormick Ln.
Atherton, CA. 94027

February 11, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: LINPA MOORE

Address: 1000 IRWIN ST

City, Zip: Belmont, CA 94002

Phone: 650 222-8213

E-mail: lam@lecomcast.net

Name: Jim Skeels
Address: 169 Lake St. Brisbane

Phone:

E-mail: jimskeels@gmail.com

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Matteo Rizzi
Address: 701 Winchester Dr.
City, Zip: Burlingame, 94010
Phone: 650 759 3996
E-mail: doublertz@comcast.net

Name: JESSE BEYER

Address: 1125 EL CAMINO REAL APT 4
BURLINGAME CA 94010

Phone: 415-9129948

E-mail: JBAYER023@GMAIL.COM

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x  _____

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Adam Neill



Address: 828 El Camino Real #2

City, Zip: Burlingame, CA 94010

Phone: 650 291 2969

E-mail: neill.adam74@gmail.com

Name: Karen Rossi
Address: 1216 Floribunda Ave #4
Burlingame, CA 94010
Phone: 650.759-0933
E-mail: cocchimom3@yahoo.com

February 15, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Greg Games

Address: 1060 Carolan Blvd Burlingame, CA 94010

Phone: 650 238 8026

E-mail: gregory_games@outlook.com

February 15, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Joyce De Soto
Address: 1812 Ashton Ave
Burlingame, Ca 94010
Phone: 650-219-7797
E-mail:

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Sandra Chisholm

Address: 156 Sylvan Way, Emerald Hills, CA 94062

Phone:

E-mail: sandyual@aol.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Sandra Chisholm

Name: DAN Chisholm
Address: 756 Sylvan way, Emerald Hills
Phone: 650-366-3348
E-mail: dkcuette@aol.com
94062

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Angelo Fusaro
Address: 1360 Tuolumne Rd
Millbrae, Ca 94030
Phone: 650 766-1143
E-mail: luceedude56@yahoo.com
February 8, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Angelo Fusaro", is written over a solid horizontal line that spans the width of the page.

Name: MARIAN GOLDMAN

Address: 845-PINON AVE. MILLBRAE

Phone:

E-mail:

February 9 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marian Goldman". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a solid horizontal line that spans the width of the signature.

Name: BRUCE GOLDMAN
Address: 845 PINON AVE Millbrae.

Phone:

E-mail:

February 15 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Huster Doi
Address: 885 Ocean Blvd., Moss Beach, CA 94038
Phone: 650-728-5245
E-mail:

February ~~9~~ 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,
By: 

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Gilles Duguay*
Address: *560 Flynn Av*
City, Zip: *Redwood City CA.*
Phone:
E-mail: *OGDuguay@Yahoo.com*

February 11, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: John F. Brown

Address: 1010 Vera Ave

City, Zip: Redwood City 94061

Phone: 650-255-9303

E-mail: jibby11@gmail.com

Name: Susan Wisnia
Address: 2399 Valleywood Dr.
San Bruno, Ca.
Phone: 650-589-5947
E-mail: susienisnia@yahoo.com
February 15, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Kristy Wisnia

Address: 2399 Valleywood Dr., San Bruno, CA 94066

Phone: (650) 303-7043

E-mail: kristywisnia@gmail.com

February 6, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



2/7/17

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Zack Ariga

Address: 1031 cherry AVE #80

City, Zip: San Bruno, CA 94066

Phone: 415 509-1959

E-mail: zariga@hotmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E; Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

George Fenech

Name: George Fenech

Address: 2343 Shelter Creek Lane

City, Zip: San Bruno 94066

Phone: 650-873-1189 [E-mail: georgefenech695@gmail.com](mailto:georgefenech695@gmail.com)

It was the construction of the Sharps Park golf course that introduced fresh water to the area which attracted the frogs and snakes in the first place.

Name: GRETCHEN WALTON
Address: 170 Tehama Ct, San Bruno, CA
Phone: 650 873 7935
E-mail: poozhang@aol.com
February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Frank Parcell

Address: 2935 Eaton Ave

City, Zip: San Carlos, CA 94070

Phone: (650) 787-5322

E-mail: fparcell@gmail.com

Name: BRIAN OLIVOLD
Address: 1120 EGTON AVE #14, SAN CARLOS
Phone: 650-646-8445
E-mail: BRIANPATRICK5@YAHOO.COM

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Brian Olivold

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Joan Purcell
Address: P.O. Box 620429
City, Zip: Woodside, CA 94062
Phone: (650) 851-8336
E-mail: joaniepurcell1@gmail.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:57:26 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkPacifica.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkDalyCity.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkSouthSF.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 3 pdfs containing a total of 49 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:21 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Pacifica, Daly City, South SF / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing a total of 49 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from residents of Pacifica (22), Daly City (20), and South San Francisco (7). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Anthony John Marotto Sr

Address: 10 Bryce Canyon

City, Zip: Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: X

E-mail: X

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Garry D. Smith*

Address: *1281 Park Pacific Ave.*

City, Zip: *Pacific Ca 94044*

Phone: *650 388 1772*

E-mail: *garry_94@yahoo.com*

Name: James "Seamus" Whitley

Address: 127 McKinney Ave.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: 415.203.4010

E-mail: seamu_w@yahoo.com

February 10, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. There has to be a way to make this work.

Thank you,

- Seamus Whitley

From: john young <jpyoung19@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2017 8:49 PM
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Subject: Save sharp park

94044

My name is john young and i live at 1651 higgins way in pacifica...phone is 650 359 5688. My email is jpyoung19@sbcglobal.net

I support the planning commissions approval of the final EIR for the rec/park depts natural plan which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes while maintaining the historic 18 hole sharp park golf course.
Please deny the appeal from the commissions decision.

Sent from my iPad

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Robert Harp

Address: 1351 Desolo Drive

City, Zip: Pacifica 94044

Phone: 415 902 1954

E-mail: robertharp54@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *DON DILUZZIO*

Address: *792 ODDSTAD BLVD PACIFICA*

City, Zip: *94044*

Phone: *650-355-9655*

E-mail:

Name: Maurice Scaaron
Address: 704 Prairie Creek, Pacific
Phone: 415-355-6000
E-mail: cityprops@add.net

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Maurice Scaaron

704 Prairie Creek
Pacific

Name: LAURACE SCIARONI
Address: 706 PRAIRIE CREEK DR
Phone: PLEICHTA, CALIF 94044
E-mail: NORSEWOLLY 99 @ ATT.NET

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Michael Abeyta
Address: 683 Linda Mar Blvd, Pacifica

Phone: 650 359-5157

E-mail:

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: PHILIP SECAL
Address: 9 ANDORRA CT PALMISTON, CA
Phone: 415 533 4454 94044
E-mail: PHILIP@KEONLAW.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

PHILIP SECAL


February 27, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Ross Shkurafed

Address: 153 Outlook Ct

City, Zip: Pacific CA, 94044

Phone: 680-291-7145

E-mail: rshkurafed@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: PATRICK JORGE BEZINGA

Address: 221 FOREST PARK DRIVE

City, Zip: PACIFICA, 94044

Phone: 415 200 5539

E-mail: PJBESINGA@GMAIL.COM

Name: Wallace Conneen
Address: 1176 Cresp. Drive Pacific
Phone: 650 303-3251
E-mail: ✓

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Wallace Conneen

Name: JAMES MULLALL
Address: 7 BARDWAY Pacifica
Phone: 650 359-4648
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: ANGELA CUNNEEN
Address: 1176 Cresp. Dr Pacific
Phone: 650 303-3686
E-mail: walccc@yahoo.com

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Christine Cooney*
Address: *219 MARVILLA CR*
City, Zip: *PACIFICA CA 94044*
Phone: *650-278-3479*
E-mail: *Cooney - C@MSN.COM*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Mike Callahan*

Address: *1596 Rosita Rd*

City, Zip: *PACIFICA - 94044*

Phone: *(650) 892-4086*

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Carol Little

Address: 18 Judson Place

City, Zip: Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail: cdlittle@flash.net

Name: Tom Harlan

Address: 859 Lind Man Blvd, Pacific

Phone: (650) 738-1532

E-mail: tomharlan@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Nicole Harlan

Address: 859 Linda Mar Blvd

City, Zip: Pacific, CA 94044

Phone: (650) 738-1532

E-mail: ntharlan@sbcglobal.net

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John Alberton

Address: 1107 Park Pacifica

City, Zip: Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: (650) 355-2400

E-mail:

February^v, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *FABIO MENZIVAR*
Address: *6 Brooks Pl. Pacifica CA 94044*
City, Zip: *94044*
Phone: *650/557 6454*
E-mail:

Name: RICHARD HARTLE
Address: 63 ALTA VISTA WAY
Phone: DALY CITY
415-587-5637
E-mail: RHARTLE@PACBELL.NET

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Paul J. Hutto

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: SEUNGJAE YUN

Address: 162 Crestview Circle

City, Zip: Daly City 94015

Phone:

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Thomas B. Duffy*
Address: *72 Glenbrook Ave*
City, Zip: *Daly City, Ca 94015*
Phone:
E-mail: *DuffyT.72@G-Mail*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: MANUEL TUMANENG
Address: 215 SOUTH HILL COURT
City, Zip: DALY CITY, CA 94014
Phone: 415-235-3330
E-mail: MANNY-TUMANENG@YAHOO.COM

Name: **ROBERT DRUCKER**
Address: **24-Belford Dr, Daly City 94015**
Phone: **(650) 756-3455**
E-mail: **dbldrbl@sbcglobal.net**
February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Robert K. Drucker

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Bene Flores*

Address: *203 Marlow Dr.*

City, Zip: *Daly City CA 94015*

Phone: *(415) 595-2900*

E-mail:

Name: Josh Yezorski
Address: 705 Skyline Pr. Daly City CA

Phone: 415-254-5645

E-mail: jyezorski@yahoo.com

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: NITA ZEE-WERKEMAN
Address: 1145 SKYLINE DRIVE DALT CITY CA 94105
Phone: 650-755-3969
E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Nita Zee-Werkeman

Name: W. R. LOEBKEMAN

Address: 1145 Skyline DR, Daly City, CA 94015

Phone: 650-755-3969

E-mail:

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X William R. Loebkeman

Name: J. Barzoni
Address: 276 Northgate Ave DC CA 94015
Phone: 650 756 2994
E-mail: judy.han.OA@gmail.com
February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Steve Borzon
Address: 276 Northgate Ave, Daly City Ca 94015
Phone: 650 823 4024
E-mail: sborez@pacbell.net

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Alvin Paez
Address: Daly City
Phone: 650-424-7382
E-mail: AlvinPaez88@DalyCo.ca.gov

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Mary Lew
Address: 4007A Callan Blvd, Daly City Ca 94015
Phone: 415-222-7449
E-mail: mlew92a@yahoo.com

February¹⁷, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: EFREN DE LOS ANGELES

Address: 187 WARWICK ST

City, Zip: DUNY CITY, CA 94015

Phone: 650-291-9432

E-mail: ehdelor@gmail.com

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Francisco Belauban

Address: 193 Northridge Dr, DCB

City, Zip: 94015

Phone: 415 491 4568

E-mail: —

Name: Bernadette Walter

Address: 631 Pointe Pacific Apt 10 Daly City CA
94014

Phone:

E-mail: bwalterdc@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Bernadette Walter

Name: RICKY AGBAYANI

Address: 33 PARKROSE AVE.
DALY CITY CA 94015

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: HARRY LEW
Address: 165 PIERCE ST.
City, Zip: DALY CITY, CA.
Phone: 650 731 6085
E-mail: HARRYLEW@AOL.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Jared Sherwood

Address: 912 Saint Francis Blvd.

City, Zip: Daly City 94015

Phone: ~~312 600~~

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Rey Guarin

Address:

33 Belknap Ave.

City, Zip:

Daly City, Ca. 94015

Phone:

(650) 993-8949

E-mail:

guarin_reynaldo@yahoo.com

Rey Photomoto6791 Facebook

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Lee Lara

Address: 2208 Westborough Blvd

City, Zip: SF, CA 94104

Phone: 650-244-9452

E-mail: llara2@gmail.com

Name: TONY FUSARO
Address: 204 Westview Dr SSF.
Phone: 650 455.3787
E-mail: TFS9SSF@YAHOO.COM

February 15, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Otto Pasaro*
Address: *253 Westview DR, SFR 94080*
Phone: *650 438 4249*
E-mail: *OttomEJR @ Yahoo. Com*

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

Address: 130 Lomas Ave
City, Zip: South San Francisco CA 94080

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: MICHAEL CRIVELLO
Address: 126 ARROYO DR., SSF, CA
Phone:
E-mail: swbei23@gmail.com
February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: *Romero Espino*
Address: *3776 Palos Verdes Way S S F Ca 94080*

Phone:

E-mail: *reespinos1@comcast.net*

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Romero Espino', written over a large, loopy scribble.

Name:

Janette Wang

Address:

2248 Derry Way SSF 94080

Phone:

650-873-7778

E-mail:

meechie22@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Janette Wang

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:01:24 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94133.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94134.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 20 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:15 AM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94133, 94134 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing a total of 20 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94133 (15) and 94134 (5). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94133 (15)

Matthew Perrone

Ben Streeter

Ben Diaz

Jeff McGarvey

Douglas Cameron

Amber Merrigan

Ryan Crawford

Mike Baldaramos

Ian Kloville

Chris Bayliss

Christian DiCarlo

Luigi Pinotti

Joan Pinotti

Ryan Lamvik

Joe DeLeon

94134 (5)

Ike Takahashi

Jayden Jew

Michael Martin

Sharon Kelly

Michael T. Kelly

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: PERRONE, MATTHEW

Address: 414 CHESTNUT ST

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133

Phone: (408) 309 7516

E-mail: perronematt@yahoo.com

Name: BEN STREETER
Address: 33 Bernard St, SF 94133
Phone: 520-248-8547
E-mail: benji.streeter@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ben Day
Address: 600 Chestnuts #308
City, Zip: SF CA 94133
Phone: 415 559 1069
E-mail: Ben@baycoverdeng.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JM McGarvey

Address: 2355 Leavenworth St, SF

City, Zip: 94133

Phone:

E-mail: Jeff66M@Yahoo.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Douglas Cameron

Address: 2131 Taylor St, SF

City, Zip: 94133

Phone: 415 898-7966

E-mail: dougbeet.cameron@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Amber Merigan

Address: 1852 Stockton Street

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94133

Phone: 619-757-8912

E-mail:



6806

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ryan Crawford

Address: 886 Greenwich St

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94133

Phone: (650) 722-2561

E-mail: rcrawford86@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Mike Balderamos

Address: 460 A Union St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94133

Phone: 707 480-0319

E-mail: m balderamos@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John Kloville

Address: 45 Vassar

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94133

Phone: 415-370-9951

E-mail: JKloville@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Chris Bayliss

Address: 650 Chestnut St Apt 208

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94133

Phone: 203 536 5375

E-mail: cbayliss2012@gmail.com

From: Christian DiCarlo <dicarlo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 10:53 PM
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: richard@spublicgolf.org; HPGC Tournament Committee
Subject: Please don't close Sharp Park

Christian DiCarlo
1288 Columbus Ave, #186
San Francisco, CA 94133
415-602-1777
dicarlo@gmail.com

February 13, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident for the past 10+ years, I highly value our access to incredible outdoor activities and have spent many weekends with friends at family playing golf at Sharp Park. It's an incredible course -- an icon of San Francisco that was designed by one of golf's greatest course designers ever.

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Best regards,
Christian

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Luigi Pinotti*

Address: *747 Filbert St #A*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94133*

Phone: *(415) 265-9197*

E-mail: *lou@pinotti.net*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Joan Pinoth



Address:

747 Filbert St

City, Zip:

SF 94133

Phone:

415 265 9198

E-mail:

joan.pinoth@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ryan Lamvik

Address: 2133 Stockton St

City, Zip: San Francisco, 94133

Phone: 831-2392-6366

E-mail: rylamvik@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JOE DE LEON

Address: 2210 Steepleton St. #2059

City, Zip: SF, CA 94133

Phone:

E-mail: JDELEON@PRESIDIOGOLF.COM

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ike Takahashi
Address: 1243 Sunnydale Ave. SF, CA 94134
City, Zip:
Phone: 415-420-0299
E-mail: GOLF IKE@HOTMAIL.COM

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jayden Jew

Address: 1940 Burrows St.

City, Zip: SF, CA 94134

Phone:

E-mail: JewMD@hotmail.com

February 11, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Michael Martin

Address: 216 Yale St

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94134

Phone: (415) 585-8824

E-mail: bigmke@303@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Sharon Kelly
Address: 501 Crescent Way #5304
City, Zip: S.F., CA 94134
Phone: 415-467-5155
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael T. Kelly

Address: 501 Crescent Way # 5304

City, Zip: S.F. 94134

Phone:

E-mail:

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:03:48 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94131.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94132.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 30 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:11 AM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94131, 94132 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing a total of 30 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94131 (8) and 94132 (22). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94131 (8)

Michael Ouellette

Lauren Elliot

Jane White

Curtis Yee

Todd Lammie

David Pang

Mitchell Lam

Hayden Klaeveman

94132 (22)

James McGilley

Bradley Jann

Ofelia Cabatic

Serafin Cabatic

Dave Chen

John Chen

Ann Tittiger

John McIntyre

Xiaoyan Chen

Daniel Ceccoli

Jennifer Alley

William Dubayah

Dmitriy Dusheyko

Felix Solomon

Kenny Wong

William F. Quince Jr.

Andrew C. Ng

Sunny Ho Lee

Patrick Feeney Jr.

Yim Lee

Ashby Wolfe, MD

Mark Becker

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael Ouellette

Address: 173 Christopher Drive

City, Zip: S.F. 94131

Phone: (415) 297-6239

E-mail: mro2@sbcglobal.net

Name: Lauren Elliot

Address: 2720 DIAMOND ST

SF CA 94131

Phone: 415 586-4475

E-mail: Lauren-elliott@outlook.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Jane White
Address: 2720 DIAMOND ST
SF CA 94131
Phone: 510-476-2904
E-mail: Jwhite@wgpp.com
February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jane White", is written over a solid horizontal line.

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Curtis Yee

Address: 781 Carbett Ave #2

City, Zip: SF, CA 94131

Phone:

E-mail:



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Todd Lammie*

Address: *821 Corbett*

City, Zip: *SF, CA 94131*

Phone: *415 648-4300*

E-mail:

Name: David Pang
Address: 10 Devonshire Way, SF, CA 94131
Phone: 415-661-6470
E-mail: dpang@scastatel.net
February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Pang". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "D" and a long, sweeping tail.

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: MITCHELL LAM

Address: 125 MARQUESS WAY

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131

Phone:

E-mail: MITCHELLAMM@HOTMAIL.COM

Name: HARDEN Klaeveman

Address: 148 CARMELIAN WAY
SAN FRANCISCO 94131

Phone: 415 874-3086

E-mail: HKlaeveman@comcast.net

February 16, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JAMES MCGILKY

Address: 34 ARELLANO

City, Zip: SF CA 94132

Phone: 415-528-1026

E-mail: JIM@BRIDGewaterCPAS.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Bradley Jann

Address: 174 Middlefield Drive

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94132

Phone: 415-360-1050

E-mail: br222matar27@yahoo.com

Name: OFELIA CABATIC
Address: 520 Garfield St - SF CA 94132
Phone: 415 586 7560
E-mail:

February 14 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Ofelia D. Cabatic

Name: SERAFIN O. CABATIC

Address: 520 GARFIELD ST., SF 94132

Phone: (415) 776-7060

E-mail: scobatic@comcast.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Dave Chen

Address: 2918 21ST AVE SF CA 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: John Chen

Address: 760 Head Street, San Francisco, CA 94132

Phone: 415-586-8126

E-mail: Jayc1108f@yahoo.com.

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you

By: _____



February 28, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ann Tittiger

Address: 118 middlefield Dr

City, Zip: SF 94132

Phone:

E-mail: ann.tittiger@comcast.net

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John McSOTYRE

Address: 221 FORT BL

City, Zip: SF CA 94132

Phone: 415 589-2954

E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Xiaoyan Chen

Address: Summit 800, 71 Summit Way

City, Zip: San Francisco 94132

Phone:

E-mail: cchen_cms@yahoo.com

Name: Daniel Cecchi
Address: 325 Stratford Drive, SF 94132
Phone: 415 412 9185
E-mail: daniel.cecchi@gmail.com

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Daniel

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jennifer Alvey

Address: 603 Arabelle Drive

City, Zip: SFO CA 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: William Dubaya h
Address: 55 OLMASERO DR. # 25, SF, CA 94132
Phone: 415 - 786-2259
E-mail: JOANINGERSOLL@SBE.GLOBAL.NET

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: FELIX SOLOMON

Address: 454 VERNON ST

City, Zip: S.F. CA 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: *Kenny Wong*

Address: *2047 22nd Ave, SF*

City, Zip: *94132*

Phone: *(415) 757-1087*

E-mail:



February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *William F. Quinn Jr.*

Address: *3085 20th Ave.*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94132*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ANDREW C. NG
Address: 410 GELLERT DR
City, Zip: SF, CA 94132
Phone: andrewng@yahoo.com
E-mail: 650 766 3032

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Seung Ho Lee*

Address: *261 Beverly St ~~CA. 94132~~*

City, Zip: *San Francisco CA 94132*

Phone: *415 509 2814*

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Patrick Feeney Jr.

Address: 98 crestlake Dr.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94132

Phone: (707)-396-9385

E-mail: pjamesfeeney@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Yim Leo

Address: 366 Bright St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94132

Phone: (415) 239-4945

E-mail: Yleung@gmail.com

Name: ASHBY WOLFE, MD

Address: 354 RALSTON STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132

Phone: 631 285 2799

E-mail: ASHBYWOLFE@GMAIL.COM

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision



Name: MARK BECKER
Address: 354 RALSON ST. S.F. CA 94132
Phone: 650-255-2773
E-mail: markybecker@hotmail.com
February¹³, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:06:37 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94124.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94127.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94129.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 3 pdfs containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:06 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94124, 94127, 94129 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94124 (2), 94127 (19), and 94129 (4) . There are a total of 25 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94124 (2)
Brian McAuliffe
Andrew Yakas

94127 (19)
Linda Werner
Kevin McDonough
Bob Golton
Louis Doroux
Terry Norbury
Carol Kocivar
Ronald P Giannini and Janet Giannini
Harry Huberman
Evan Harrison-Wong
Ron Schivo and Ronnie Schivo Jr.
Helen Dilworth
Carol Lee
Daniel Louie
Jeff Dodds
Brendan Spiers
Steve Mellinger
Cynthia L. Mitchell
Richard Florez
Jim Retzlaff

94129 (4)
Abbas Qabazard
Sean Carroll
Charles A. Kitchen
Nancy Johnsen

Name: BRIAN MCAULIFFE
Address: 921 INGERSON AVE SF 94124
Phone:
E-mail: Beezah@MNR.COM

February 13, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Brian McAuliffe

February 1st, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ANDREW YAKAS
Address: 95 SANTA FE AVE
City, Zip: SF 94124
Phone:
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Linde Werner

Address: 344 Sante Ana Ave.

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94127

Phone: 415-585-6169

E-mail: njlw@comcast.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *KEVIN McDONOUGH*

Address: *240 San Leandro Way*

City, Zip: *SF. CA 94127*

Phone: *415-564-6787*

E-mail: *KJMcDONOUGH77@gmail.com*

February 11, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Bob Golton*

Address: *104 Miraloma Dr.*

City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127*

Phone: *415 661-8280*

E-mail: *rgolton@gol.com*

Name: LOUIS D'ONORATO
Address: 170 BORICA ST, SF. CA. 94127
Phone:
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: TERRY NORBURY

Address: 115 Terrace Drive

City, Zip: S.F., CA 94127

Phone:

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Carol Kocwa
Address: 115 Terrace Drive
City, Zip: S.F. Ca 94127
Phone:
E-mail:

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Janet Giannini
Ron Giannini

Address: 56 Euclid Ct.

City, Zip: San Francisco 94127

Phone:

E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: HARRY Huberman

Address: 170 Hernandez Ave

City, Zip: S.F. ~~94127~~ 94127

Phone: 415-994-0909

E-mail: horsevan@yahoo.com

Name: *Evan Harrison-Wong*
Address: *267 Ulloa St., SF 94127*
Phone: *415-350-0423*
E-mail: *ehw0423@gmail.com*
February¹², 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Ron Schivo & Ronnie Schivo Jr.
Address: 298 Casitas Ave SF, CA 94127
Phone: 415 664-1469
E-mail: _____

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Helen Diworth
Address: 687 Los Palms Dr., SF, CA 94127
Phone: 415-519-5498
E-mail: na

February^{1st}, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Helen Diworth

Name: Carol Lee

Address: 798 Monterey Blvd #3D, SF, CA 94127

Phone: 415 749 4689

E-mail: mKc1@yphoo.com

February¹⁷, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Carol Lee

Name: Daniel Louie
Address: 110 Del Vale Ave, SF, CA 94127
Phone: (415) 586-2985
E-mail: dltaxes@icloud.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X D. Louie

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Jeff Dodds

Address:

110 Pinchurst Way

City, Zip:

SS, CA 94127

Phone:

E-mail:

doddsjeff@yahoo.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: BRENDAN SPIERS
Address: 739 ROCKDALE AVENUE
City, Zip: SF CA 94127
Phone:
E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Steve Mellinger

Address: 88 ENTRADA COURT

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127

Phone: 510-812-9581

E-mail: stevetmc@pacbell.net

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Cynthia L. Mitchell
Address: 25 Upland Dr
City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94127
Phone: 415 - 585 - 4530
E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Richard Florez

Address: 134 ADTOS AVE

City, Zip: S.F. 94127

Phone: 415 722 7627

E-mail: rflorez@supplyworks.com

From: Jim Retzlaff [<mailto:jimretz@me.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 9:09 AM

To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Cc: richard@sfpublishing.org; Mike Ippolito

Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Case No. 2005.0912E Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please accept this message of support for Sharp Park Golf Course. It is a beautiful course planned by arguably the most famous golf course designer in history. The course is a wonderful resource for San Francisco and the Bay Area and allows people of all socio-economic strata to play golf at a reasonable price. In addition, Sharp Park is the home course of a large group of African-American golfers, whom the golf community respects and admires. It would be a shame to lose this course for so many reasons.

The City of San Francisco and course managers have put a lot of thought and effort into a plan to mitigate the environmental concerns, which experts agree are good and sufficient.

Please support the Planning Commission's approval of the final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely,

Jim Retzlaff

240 Yerba Buena Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127
(415) 448-6498
jimretz@me.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Abbas Qabazard

Address: 300 Finley Rd

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94129

Phone: 415-561-4661

E-mail: aqabazard@presidiogolf.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: SEAN CARROLL

Address: 345B INFANTRY TERR

City, Zip: SF, CA 94129

Phone: 415-440-4277

E-mail: SEANCCARROLL@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: CHARLES A. KITCHEN

Address: 338A INFANTRY TERRACE

City, Zip: SF, CA 94129

Phone: 415-906-9796

E-mail: drewkitchen@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Mary Johnson*
Address: *344 SANTA ANA*
City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO 94127*
Phone: *415-585-6169*
E-mail: *NJLW9046@yahoo.com*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:08:29 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94123.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 24 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:01 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94123 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 24 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94123. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94123 (24)
Chad Stassel
Paul Watts
Caitlin Swanson
Jono Swanson
Nilo Mia
Bryan Knox
Michael Mathieu
Adam Pecocaró
Jacob Erdnan
Jeremey Waltz
Michael Grady
Carson Weiss
Luke Sprague
Brad Cogswell
Brad Kinnish
Gregory A VandenBosch
Colin Hughes
Cathe Picconi
C. David Viviani
John Engster
Mario Lozano
Owen Kane
Michael Mueller
Harold Levy

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Chad Stassel

Address:

2225 Green St, San Francisco, CA 94123

City, Zip:

Phone: (415) 375-2953

E-mail: chadstassel@gmail.com

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Paul Watts

Address: 2341 Chestnut St., Apt. 102

City, Zip: S.F. CA 94123

Phone:

E-mail: pmwatts50@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Caitlin Swanson

Address: 1995 Chestnut St., #202

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 303-829-4403

E-mail: cdenhams@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Jana Swanson*

Address: *1995 Chestnut St Apt 202*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94123*

Phone: *303-829-1501*

E-mail: *jswan11@gmail.com*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Nilo Miñ

Address: 3035 Baker St

City, Zip: SF, 94123

Phone: 415.602.0998

E-mail: nilomina@outlook.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: BRYAN KNOX

Address: 3238 SCOTT ST APT A

City, Zip: SF 94123

Phone: 415 359 5481

E-mail: MRKNOXSF@GMAIL.COM

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael Mathieu
Address: 125 Cervantes Blvd #4
City, Zip: SF, CA 94123
Phone: (323) 599-7592
E-mail: Mathieu323@yahoo.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Adam Pecocaro

Address: 1565 Green St Apt 204

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94123

Phone: 858-735-3584

E-mail: adam.pecocaro@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:


Jacob Erdner

Address: 1506 Lombard St. #4

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 415-203-8666

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jeremy Waltz

Address: 3037 Steiner St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: (831) 578-2083

E-mail: jeremyjwaltz@gmail.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Michael Grady Grady
Address: 2600 ceferia st
City: San Francisco, CA 94123
Phone: 415-422-7477
E-mail: grady.michael@sfed.org

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Carson Weiss

Address: 1525 Chestnut St. 94123

City, Zip: SF 94123

Phone: 650-888-4755

E-mail: CarsonWeiss@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Luke Sprague*

Address: *1525 Chestnut Street Apt.*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94123*

Phone: *916-716-7088*

E-mail: *luke.sprague22@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Brad Coswell

Address: 2237 Bay St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, 94123

Phone: 925.330.5473

E-mail: brad.c.coswell2@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Brad Kinnish

Address: 3124 Gough Street

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 415 430 7646

E-mail: brad.kinnish@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: GREGORY A VANDEN BOSCH
Address: 2525 CHESTNUT ST
City: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123
Phone: 646-522-9546
E-mail: bosch100@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Colin Hughes

Address: 2754 Pierce St. #12

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 530 902 0011

E-mail: cmhughes21@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: CATHIE PICCONI

Address: 1661 Fillbert St.

City, Zip: SF, Ca 94123

Phone: 415-440-2771

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: C. DAVID VIVIANI

Address: 1517 North Point St. #449

City, Zip: SF 94123

Phone:

E-mail: C DAVID VIVIANI @ gmail . com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *John Eugster*

Address: *1852 Jefferson St*

City, Zip: *SF, CA 94123*

Phone: *415-531-3280*

E-mail: *JOHN.EUGSTER@GMAIL.COM*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *MARIO LOZANO*

Address: *2290 N. Point #204*

City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123*

Phone: *925-525-2324*

E-mail: *mlozano2005@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

OWEN RANE

Address:

2041 VALLEJO ST

City, Zip:

SF CA 94123

Phone:

415 922 2662

E-mail:

JTR@OWENRANE.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael Mueller

Address: 2710 Filbert St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Harold Levy
Address: 2225 Green St.
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94123
Phone: 949-510-2228
E-mail: hlevy27@gmail.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:10:01 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94122.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 30 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 5:58 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zip 94122 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 30 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94122. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94122 (30)
Brian Choy
Paul Donlon
Margaret O'Sullivan
Griffin Lowenthal
Antonio Anastasio
Michael Vella
Lynn Vella
Jesse Nishihaga
Van Fendyan
Scott MacDonald
Alexander Kvyat
Justin Basara
Elaine Wang
Bruce Austin Lilly Jr.
Sameer Pangrekar
Michael W. Thomas
Philip Coats
Ann Reilly
Michael Michela
Barney Michela
Gregg Zywicke
Jack Henneberry
Simon P. Tao
Jeff Barrett
Mitch Lowe
Alejandro Diaz
David Love
Mary Lee
Rob Kitchens
Mike Lem

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *BRIAN CHOI*
Address: *1501 34th Ave*
City, Zip: *S. F Ca 94122*
Phone: *650-438-9127*
E-mail: *brianchoi@kottune.com*

From: Donlon, Paul L [<mailto:Paul.Donlon@jpmorgan.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 7:43 AM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: richard@sfpUBLICgolf.org; mippolitosf@hotmail.com
Subject: Support for Natural Areas program and Golf at Sharp Park

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Sharp Park has great history and provides an affordable round of golf for the children and adults of San Francisco and the people all over Northern California.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank You,

Paul Donlon
1830 Great Highway
SF CA. 94122

Paul L. Donlon | Vice President | **J.P. Morgan Securities**
560 Mission Street, Suite 2400 San Francisco, CA 94105 | T: 415 772 3049 | F: 212 881 9150 |
paul.donlon@jpmorgan.com

<http://www.jpmorgansecurities.com/pauldonlon>

J.P. Morgan Securities LLC
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Margaret O'Sullivan*

Address: *1709 - 16th Ave*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94122*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: GRIFFIN LOWENTHAL

Address: 1607 39TH AVE

City, Zip: SF CA 94122

Phone: 415 940 3412

E-mail: GRIFFIN_LOWENTHAL@HOTMAIL.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Antonio Anastasio

Name: Antonio Anastasio

Address: 1670 36th Avenue, SF

City, Zip: 94122

Phone: (415) 606-1088

E-mail: ~~aanastasio@~~

aanastasio19@siprep.org

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Michael Vella

Address:

304 Irving Street

City, Zip:

SF, CA 94122

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Simon Kilk*
Address: *304 Irving St*
City, Zip: *SF CA 94122*
Phone: *925 513 6658*
E-mail:

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jesse Nishinaga

Address: 302 Irving St.

City, Zip: S.F., CA 94122

Phone: (415) 656-6842

E-mail: jnshinaga@gmail.com

Name: Van Fendyan
Address: 1260 32nd Ave, SF 94122
Phone: 415 350 4919
E-mail: vanfendyan@yahoo.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: SCOTT MACDONALD

Address: 1801 23rd AVE #11

City, Zip: S.F. 94122

Phone: 415 913 0620

E-mail: scotmacd@yaho.com

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Alexander Kryat

Address: 1458 34-th Avenue

City, Zip: S.F. CA 94122

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: JUSTIN BASARA

Address: 1270 29TH AVE, SE CA 94122

Phone: 415-666-6143

E-mail: JBASARA@GMAIL.COM

February 17, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Elaine Wong
Address: 1754 21st Ave, San Francisco CA 94122
Phone: (415) 665 3678
E-mail: JeffandJus@aol.com

February¹⁷, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 1², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Bruce Austin Lilly Jr.

Address: 1529 10th Ave

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94127

Phone: 607-968-4962

E-mail: austin.lilly@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Sameer Pangrekar

Address: 1374 5th Ave Apt 7

City, Zip: SF CA 94122

Phone: 415 723 0385

E-mail: Sameer.pangrekar@gmail.com

Name: Michael W. Thomas

Address: 1464 23rd Ave
SFCA 94122

Phone: 415-902-3842

E-mail: Micklthomas@gmail.com

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

Philip Coats

Address: 1714 9th Ave 94122

City, Zip: SF, CA

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ANN REILLY

Address: 1488 - 34th AVE

City, Zip: SF CA 94122

Phone: 415 710 - 4471

E-mail: SFNATIVEX3@GMAIL.COM

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Michael Michela

Address: 1674 17th Avenue

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94122

Phone: (415) 517-0985

E-mail: mike.michela12@yahoo.com

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: BARNEY MICHELA

Address: 1674 17TH AVENUE

City, Zip: SF CA 94122

Phone: 415 681-9900

E-mail: barneymichela@hotmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Gregg Zywicko

Address: 1032 Irving 424 JSP

City, Zip: CA 94122

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jack Henneberry

Address: 1229 7th Avenue

City, Zip: San Francisco 94122

Phone: 661-978-0169

E-mail: irishgolfer978@aol.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Simon P. TAO

Address: 1271 3rd Ave

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122

Phone: (415) 740-1230

E-mail: SIMON.TAO@DOT.GOV

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jeff Barrett *J. Barrett*

Address: ~~7600~~ 4674 Ave

City, Zip: SF, CA 94122

Phone: 415 596-7447

E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Mitch Lowe*

Address: *1216 23rd Ave*

City, Zip: *SF 94122*

Phone: *209 351 0630*

E-mail: *MLP6A@yahoo.com*

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Alejandro Diaz 
Address: 700 Parnassus Ave apt #2
City, Zip: SF CA 94122
Phone: 415 661 9185
E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: David Love

Address: 1686 17th Av

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94122

Phone: 415 407 8320

E-mail: davidlovepianos@comcast.net

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: MARY Lee

Address: 628 MORAGA ST

City, Zip: SF Ca 94122

Phone: 415-661-0188

E-mail: PNKPIG826@AOL.com



February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Rob Kitchens

Address: 1830 46th avenue

City, Zip: San Francisco; 94122

Phone: ~~(415)~~ (415) (831)-925-1831

E-mail: robpgc33@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Mike Lem Mike Lem
Address: 1274 28th Ave
City, Zip: SF 94122
Phone:
E-mail:

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:11:56 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94121.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 22 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 17, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 5:54 AM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94121 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 22 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94118. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94121 (22)

Deven DeLuca

Ben Strubridge

Ryan Villasin

Jonathan Levalley

Alexandra Mitchell

Kevin Fitzpatrick

Ramin Soheili

Robert Laessing

Adam Ochart

Kelly Dugan

Nicholas Meyers

Randall Riegler

Brandon Coakley

Davis Yates

James Jahn

Kelwin Young

James Madden

Ashok Notaney

Geoffrey F. Brown

Simon Harrington

John Cawley

Todd G. Choy

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Deven DeLuca

Address: 2141 Clement St. #1

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94121

Phone: 619.990.8732

E-mail: deluca.golf88@gmail.com

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Ben Strubridge

Address: 358 24th Ave

City, Zip: SF, 94121

Phone: 415-420-4089

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:  Ryan Villasin

Address: 174 20th Avenue #104

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94121

Phone: (650) 740-1434

E-mail: ryan_villasin@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Jonathan Levalley

Address: 770 29th Ave.

City, Zip: SF CA 94121

Phone: (415) 680-4329

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Alexandra Mitchell*

Address: *2116 halie*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94121*

Phone:

E-mail: *Sashascheili@gmail.com*

Name: Kevin Fitzpatrick

Address: 395 25th AVE #3 SF 94121

Phone: 716-572-1655

E-mail: kfitz93@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____



Name: Ramin Soheili
Address: 2416 LAKEST. SE 94121

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: ROBERT LAESSING

Address: 822 41st Ave, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

Phone:

E-mail: ROBERT.LAESSING@GMAIL.COM

February¹⁴, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Adam Oberst
Address: 497 20th Ave, SF. 94121
Phone: (415) 438-2649
E-mail: adam.oberst@gmail.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Kelly Dugan
Address: 1914 Clement St
City, Zip: SF 94121
CA
Phone:
E-mail:

Name: NICHOLAS MERZ

Address: ~~41824~~ ~~415 317 3076~~
4127 Clement St SF 94121

Phone: 415 317 3074

E-mail:

February 1st, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Randall Riegler
Address: 342 24th Ave, apt 104
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94121
Phone: 904 891 2304
E-mail: rieglera1@gmail.com

Name: *Brandon Coakley*
Address: *608 38th Ave, San Francisco, CA, 94121*
Phone: *550-330-8532*
E-mail: *Brandon.Coakley@gmail.com*

February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Davis Yates

Address: 641 35th Avenue, SF 94121

Phone: 415 917 7340

E-mail: Davis.yates@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Davis Yates", written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and includes a small flourish at the end.

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:



JAMES JAHN

Address: 401 Q6th Ave, #3

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO 94121

Phone: 559-639-8675

E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: KELWIN YOUNG

Address: 552 41st AVE

City, Zip: SF CA 94121

Phone: 415-668-6695

E-mail: Kelwin.Young@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JAMES MARDEN

Address: 448 22ND AVE

City, Zip: S.F. 94121

Phone:

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Ashok Notaney
Address: 233 26th Avenue #A
City, Zip: San Francisco, 94121
Phone: 415 386 9615
E-mail: Notaney@gmail.com

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Geoffrey F. Brown 

Address: 850 - 40th

City, Zip: S.F. Ca. 94121

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Simon Harrington*
Address: *850 31st Ave*
City, Zip: *SF CA 94121*
Phone: *(415) 810 6455*
E-mail: *HARRISI123@HOTMAIL*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

JOHN CRAWLEY

Address:

545 36 TH AVE

City, Zip:

S.F, CA 94121

Phone:

E-mail:

JOHN@PONTINGSF.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

 02/12/2017

Name: Todd G. Choy

Address: 722-32nd Avenue

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94121

Phone: 415-668-3531

E-mail: SF Todd @ Hotmail . Com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:16:09 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94118.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:14 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zip 94118 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 4 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94118 . There are a total of 25 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94118 (25)
Robert Guarino
Teerawuth Manchunakorn
Matt Rados
Kevin Kennis
Arthur Mansbach
Jeremy Garbutt
Justin Lee
Anna Lam
Jonathan K. Wong
Patrick McManus
Evon Z. Vogt
Todd McKenna
Phillip Kalsched
Helen Lee
Phu Lam
Ryan Brooks
Gladstone Liang
Leslie Bauer
Ernst Bauer
Patrick Loughran
Christopher Derr
Meghan Matthews
Parker Danneberg
Edd Burton
Patrick Hubregsen

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Robert Guarino

Address: 125 4th Ave Apt 2

City, Zip: San Francisco , CA 94118

Phone: 925-708-1247

E-mail: rnguarino@yahoo.com

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Teerawuth Manchunakorn

Address: 3445 Geary Blvd. # 305

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone: 415 580 9994

E-mail: thamesy-th@hotmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Matt Rados

Address: 539 Spruce Street

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA, 94118

Phone: (510) - 321 - 0584

E-mail: matt@rados.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Kevin Kennis
Address: 535 Spruce St
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94118
Phone: —
E-mail: —

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Arthur Mansbach

Address: 538 Spruce Street

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA ~~94104~~ 94118

Phone: 415-613-5713

E-mail: abm224@correll.edu

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jeremy Garbutt

Address: 1 Cabrillo St

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone: 602-510-2114

E-mail: jeremy.garbutt@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Justin Lee
Address: 148 Blake St #3
City, Zip: SF 94118.
Phone: 408 362 1312
E-mail: justin.lee67@gmail.com

Name: Anna Lam
Address: 148 Blake St #3
SF 94118
Phone: 408-382-1312
E-mail: annalamb@grail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____


Name: JONATHAN K. WONG

Address: 573 10TH AVE., SF CA 94118

Phone: 415-992-1751

E-mail: j.kwong@mindspring.com

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: PATRICK McMANUS

Address: 79 IRIS AVENUE

City, Zip: SF CA 94118

Phone: 415-752-7623

E-mail: PMCMANUS4@NETZERO.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Evan Z. Vogt*

Address: *777 4th Ave*

City, Zip: *San Francisco CA 94118*

Phone: *415-386-4235*

E-mail: *ferry.vogt@gmail.com*

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Todd McKenna

Address:

2 Collins St.

City, Zip:

SF CA 94110

Phone:

415-816-1102

E-mail:

tmckenna SF@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: 
Phillip Katsched
Address: 3450 Sacramento St.
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94118
Phone: 
E-mail: 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Helen Lee*

Address: *970 ANZA ST.*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94118*

Phone: *415-668-0181*

E-mail: *helenlee sf@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Phu Lam*

Address: *145 Cook St*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94118*

Phone: *415-729-4748*

E-mail: *phu@gscsf.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Ryan Brooks

Address:

659 9th

City, Zip:

94118

Phone:

(415) 425-7926

E-mail:

RBCityHall2@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: GLADSTONE LIANG

Address: 970 ANZA ST.

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118

Phone: 415-812-5286

E-mail: gliangsf@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *LESLIE BAUER*
Leslie Bauer
Address: *211 9th AVENUE*
City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118*
Phone: *415-221-1214*
E-mail: *BAUER@FRANCISCOPARTNERS.COM*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ERNST BAUER

Ernst Bauer

Address: 211 9th AVENUE

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118

Phone: 415-716-6680

E-mail: bauer.ernst@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: PATRICK LOUGHRAN

Address: 3995- Washington St. SF,

City, Zip: S.F. 94118

Phone: 415 (810-2805)

E-mail: PFLUGRAN@HotMail

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Christopher Durr

Address: 15 Anzavista Ave

City, Zip: SF 94118

Phone: 619-954-2694

E-mail: chrisdurr11@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Meghan Matthews*

Address: *651 LAKE ST.*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94118*

Phone: *650-520-6688*

E-mail: *matthews.meghan21@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: PARKER DANNEBERG

Address: 651 Lake st

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone: 650-520-6688

E-mail: PARKER.DANNEBERG@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: EDD BURTON

Address: 4540 CALIFORNIA

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO 94118

Phone: 415 690 0358

E-mail: eddburton01@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Patrick Hvbregsen

Address: 125 4th Ave Apt 2

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94116

Phone: (303) 818-5831

E-mail: patrickhvbregsen@yahoo.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SRNAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:17:29 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94117.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 15 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:08 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zip 94117 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 4 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94117 (15) . There are a total of 16 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94117 (15)

Richard Harris

Roderick Villasin

Alex Emslie

Steve Gordon

Kevin Buck

Matt Meznick

Gordon Atkinson

Sean Joyce

Sun Lee

Greg Zipp

Gordon Atkinson

Michael Smiley

Joe Boyle

Clinton Guitierrez

Cody Towner

February¹¹, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, friendly, easily-walkable golf course, accessible by freeway to San Francisco and San Mateo County, and reasonably-priced. It is a place where friendships are made and camaraderie is created.

Name: *RICHARD HARRIS*

Address: *1370 MASONIC AVE.*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94117*

Phone: *415-290-5718*

E-mail: *rharrisjr1@gmail.com*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: RODENAC VILLANUEVA

Address: 2041 OAK ST, APT #1

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

Phone:

E-mail: slimlove@hotmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Alex Emslie*

Address: *675 Cole #5, San Francisco*

City, Zip: *94117*

Phone: *650-269-2314*

E-mail: *aremslie@gmail.com*

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Steve Gordon

Address: 848 Ashby #3

City, Zip: San Francisco, 94117

Phone: 415-212-5506

E-mail: Steve.gordon.86@gmail.com

February 17 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: KEVIN BUCK
Address: 400 BAKER ST. ~~ST.~~
City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117
Phone: 949 - 202 - 7717
E-mail: KBUCK949@YAHOO.COM

Name: MATT MENICK
Address: 750 DIVISADERO ST. APT. A
Phone: SF, CA 94117
E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Gordon Atkinson

Address: 156 Belvedere St.

City, Zip: SF CA 94117

Phone:

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

SEAN JOYCE

Address:

200 BARNASS AVE APT #102

City, Zip:

S.F. CA. 94117

Phone:

(415) 637-1875

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Sun Lea
Address: 518 Hatfield St
City, Zip: SF CA 94117
Phone: 510 301 2422
E-mail: sunleenara@gmail.com

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: GREG ZIPP 

Address: 255 UPPER TER #1 94117

City, Zip: S.F.

Phone: (415) 225-8708

E-mail: gregzipp@yahoo.com

From: Gordon Atkinson [mailto:atkinsongc@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 10:40 AM
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; richard@sfpublicgolf.org; mippolitosf@hotmail.com
Subject: Sharp Park

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Regards,

Gordon Atkinson

156 Belvedere Street

SF, CA 94117

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael Swilay

Address: 1240 Grove St. #302

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94117

Phone: 831 246 3678

E-mail: alpha75i57@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *JOE BOYLE*

Address: *218 EDENWOOD AVE*

City, Zip: *SF, CA. 94117*

Phone: *415-441-5544*

E-mail: *JBOYLE@HERSHAW.COM.*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Clinton Gutierrez

Address: 830 Page St #2

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94117

Phone: 415-999-1165

E-mail: clint_vado@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Cody Towne*

Address: *975 Clayton St*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, 94117*

Phone: *707-290-5248*

E-mail: *ctowne4sf@gmail.com*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:19:12 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94116.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 33 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:02 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94116 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 33 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94116 (33). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94116 (33)
George Aherne
Roman Peregrino
Bill Louie
Herb Bautista
Harper Alexander
Zack Anawalt
Stephen Schwarz
Brian Quinn
Palmira Nina Clima
Dennis O'Donnell
Paul V. Simpson
Marie Simpson
Pat Vella
Pamela and Horace Green
Frances Fok
Carol Martucci Spencer
Alex Mak
Niall Sheeran
Kevin Murphy
Ryan Kuss
Zach Lent
Randolph Chase
John Farley
Francesca Lettieri
Niall Madden
Joan Luo
Henry Shishmanian
Samuel Lee
Joe McNamara
Patrick Verra
Pat Grech
Thomas Moore
Mike Ippolito

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: George Aherne

Address: 475 Magellan Ave

City, Zip: San Francisco 94116

Phone: (415) 374-1618

E-mail: Georgeaherne@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Roman Peregrino

Address: 2207 Cecilia Ave

City, Zip: San Francisco, 94116

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: BILL LOUIE
Address: 2906 YORBA ST
SF CA 94116
Phone: 415-412-1828
E-mail: YAL789@YAHOO.COM.

February 14 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: HERB BAUTISTA

Address: 2206 27th AVE

City, Zip: SF, CA 94116

Phone: 415-260-7572

E-mail: HERBSANSI@GMAIL.COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: HARPER ALEXANDER

Address: 2031 47TH AVE

City, Zip: SF, CA 94116

Phone:

E-mail: mha@apple.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Zack Anawalt

Address: 303 MABELLAN AVE

City, Zip: SF CA 94116

Phone: 707-292-3152

E-mail: ZANAWALT@gmail.com

Name: Stephen Schwarz
Address: 2214 24th AV
SF CA 94116
Phone: 415 564-6010
E-mail:

February 11, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Brian Quinn

Address: *3001 Willow St*

City, Zip: *S.F. 94116*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Palmira Nina Clima*
Address: *3533 Santiago SF*
City, Zip: *SF 94116*
Phone: *415 566 4782*
E-mail: *PALMIRACLIMA@AOL.COM*

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Dennis O'Donnell

Address:

2566 27th Ave

City, Zip:

SF. Ca. 94116

Phone:

415-661-8945

E-mail:

dennis-odonnell@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Paul V. Simpson*
Address: *95 Lomas Ave.*
City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116*
Phone: *415 665 5280*
E-mail: *psimpson@sgiglaw.com*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Marie Simpson

Address: 95 LINARES AVP

City, Zip: SF CA. 94116

Phone:

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Pat Vella*
Address: *2561 - 22nd Ave*
City, Zip: *S.F., CA 94116*
Phone:
E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Pamela + Horace Green

Address: 179 Mendosa Ave.

City, Zip: SF, CA 94116

Phone: 650 255 2044

E-mail: pamelaw05680@yahoo.com

Name: *Frances Jek*
Address: *1930-31st Ave. SF 94116*
Phone:
E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x *Frances Jek*

Name: CAROL MARTUCCI Spencer
Address: 2020 14th Ave SF 94116
Phone: 415 759 1387
E-mail: carolannspencer@outlook.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Carol Martucci Spencer

Name: ALEX MAK.
Address: 2511 - 25th Ave SF CA 94116
Phone: (415-333)-3322
E-mail: AlexKcMak@gmail.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: Niall Sheeran

Address: 3032 Ulloa, San Francisco, CA, 94116

Phone: (415) 852-0443

E-mail: NJSheeran@GMAIL.COM

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104


Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Kevin Murphy
Address: 2945 Union St. SF CA 94116
Phone: 415-297-6096
E-mail: MurphyK123@gmail.com
February 12 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Ryan Kuss
Address: 1919 9th Ave, SF 94116
Phone: 415 828 2508
E-mail:

February¹², 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Zach Lent
Address: 2713 44th Ave, SF, CA 94116
Phone: 415-595-8167
E-mail: zachlent@yahoo.com

February^v, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

K 

Name: RANDOLPH CHASE
Address: 75 MARCELA AVENUE, SF. 94116
Phone: 415 601-4388
E-mail: rhchaseand@yahoo.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Randolph Chase

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

John Farley

Address:

2334 18th Ave

City, Zip:

SF 94116

Phone:

415 793 1893

E-mail:

John.Farley@gmail.com

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *FRANCESCO LETTIERI*

Address: *260 DORANTES AVE*

City, Zip: *S.F. CA 94116*

Phone:

E-mail: *FRANK@LETTIERI.COM*

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *NATALIE MADDEN*

Address: *1910 32nd Ave*

City, Zip: *SF - CA 94116*

Phone: *415 - 846 - 1722*

E-mail:

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Joan Leo

Address: 1943 25th Ave

City, Zip: San Francisco. CA 94116

Phone:

E-mail: mjiama@yahoo.com.

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

HENRY SHISHMANIAN

Address:

2143 28TH AVE

City, Zip:

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94116

Phone:

415 661-4551

E-mail:

SHISHMANIANH@AOL.COM

February 17, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: SAMUEL LEE

Address: 2445 YORBA ST.

City, Zip: SF CA 94116

Phone: 415-300-0202

E-mail: SAMUEL - LEE @ MAC . COM

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *JOE McManis*

Address: *2711 35th AVE*

City, Zip: *SF 94116*

Phone: *415-992-2909*

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Patrick Veria

Address: 2501 22ND AVE.

City, Zip: S.F. 94116

Phone:

E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Pat Grech
Address: 2618-33rd Avenue
City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO 94116
Phone: (415) 731-4053
E-mail: PLgrech@yahoo.com

From: Tom Moore [mailto:tomgate34@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 6:56 PM
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; richard@sfpublishing.org
Subject: Sharp Park

Name: Thomas Moore
Address: 2328 15th Ave, SF, CA 94116
Phone: 415 999-1149
E-mail: Tomgate35@hotmail.com

February 13, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

The Sharp Park Golf Course is a Bay Area gem, which is an historic park design from a well- established Golf Course designer.

We have to preserve this course for future generations to enjoy. I use this course quite often with friends and family. I love the convenience, location and price of the course.

Hope we can stop these crazy people from trying to close this historic course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

From: Mike Ippolito [<mailto:mippolitosf@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 8:04 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Support for Planning Commission's approval of Final EIR, Case No. 2005.0912E.

Name: Michael Ippolito

Address: 2649 34th Ave SF, CA 94116

Phone: 415-731-2863

E-mail: mippolitosf@hotmail.com

February 13 , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") certified by the Planning Commission and approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission, as well as the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project in the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan ("SNRAMP"), Case No. 2005.0912E.

This EIR includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. This seems like a reasonable and fair solution to a long and contentious matter.

Sharp Park is a historical treasure that supports the recreational activities of tens of thousands of San Francisco residents from all ethnic and financial stratum.

Please do not allow this decision to be appealed.

Please let's us get going on this important project. The frogs and snakes will thank you, the golfers will thank you, environmentalists in the know will thank you.

Thank-you,

Mike Ippolito
President, Harding Park Golf Club

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:20:49 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94112.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94114.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94115.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 3 pdfs containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:57 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94112, 94114, 94115 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94112 (14), 94114 (6), and 94115 (5) . There are a total of 25 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94112 (14)

**Niki Herr
Anthony Ficher
Manarii Lilin
Charin Saelee
Rafael Quant
Patrick Hegarty
Thomas Williams
Matthew Lefkowitz
Rich Giosso
Jim Griffin
Jiahong Zheng
John Ching
Daire Lyne
Dennis Mok**

94114 (6)

**Allan Willam Palmer
Albert So
Darrin Turmel
John Lloyd
Justin Currie
Bob Molke**

95115 (5)

**John Huelskamp
Juan Carlos Escobar
Frasher Kempe
Tim Savinar
Anh D Pham**

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Niki Herr

Address: 221 Foerster St

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94112

Phone: 425-681-2110

E-mail: niki.herr@gmail.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Anthony Ficher
Signature

Name: ANTHONY FICHER
Address: 1869 SAN JOSE AVE.
City: S.F. CA 94112

Phone: 415 827-8271

E-mail:

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Manarji Lalin

Address: 54 Valmar Terrace

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94112

Phone: 415-518-1886

E-mail:

February //, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: CHARLIN SAELEE

Address: 22 LEO STREET

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94112

Phone: 415 3189381

E-mail: leecharin@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Rafael Quant

Address: 271 Santa Rosa AV

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94112

Phone: (415) 606-6735

E-mail: rafquant250@hotmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

PATRICK HEGARTY

Address:

52 NEWTON ST

City, Zip:

SF 94112

Phone:

415 279-2347

E-mail:

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Thomas Williams

Address: 14 Cawier St.

City, Zip: SF. 94112

Phone: 415-720-7909

E-mail: williams285@yahoo.com

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Matthew Leftkowitz
Address: 342 Granada Ave
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94112
Phone: 415/305-8502
E-mail: mleftkowitz@sprintmail.com

Name: Jerry Bors

Address: 227 Montana St SF CA 94112

Phone: 760 529 6440

E-mail: Jerry512@msn.com

February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Rich Grosso

Address: 515 Russia Ave #10 SF, CA 94112

Phone: 415 334-9805

E-mail: Rich.grosso@sbcglobal.net

February^V, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: *Jim Griffin*
Address: *83 TNA CT.*
S.F. CA. 94112
Phone: *415-533-9173*
E-mail:

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Griffin". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the beginning and a long tail.

Name: Jiahong Zheng
Address: 1 Northwood Dr., SF 94112
Phone: 415-686-4874
E-mail: waynezheny516@gmail.com

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February⁷, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: John Ching

Address: 392 Polaris Way

City, Zip: S.F. 94112

Phone: 314-0739

E-mail: JohnChing80@gmail.com

February 17, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: DAIRE LYNE

Address: 800 BRAZIL ST

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO CA 94112

Phone: 415 793-0357

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: DENNIS MOK

Address: 230 CONCORD ST

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

Phone: 415 799-7025

E-mail: dmok1@mail.ccsf.edu

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Allan William Palmer

Address: 195 Villa Terrace

City, Zip: San Francisco 94114

Phone: 415-806-3477

E-mail: apalmer415@yahoo.com



February //, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Albert So*

Address: *4239 21st Street #A*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94114*

Phone:

E-mail:



February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: DARRIN TURNER

Address: 981 ELIZABETH ST. #8
SF CA 94114

City, Zip:

Phone: 415-308-9537

E-mail:

EDMOND@COMCAST.NET

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

John Wloyd

Address:

3964 25th Street

City, Zip:

SF 94114

Phone:

415 948 6451

E-mail:

johnnyfowne66@gmail.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:



JUSTIN CURRIE

Address:

586 Jersey St

City, Zip:

SF, CA 94114

Phone:

415-568-6914

E-mail:

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Bob Molke

Address: 10 Vicksburg St

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94114

Phone: 415-648-4356

E-mail: rmolke@leaderventures.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JOHN HUELSKAMP
Address: 2595 WASHINGTON ST.
City, Zip: SF CA 94115
Phone: 646-675-4328
E-mail: john.huelskamp@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: JOAQUIN CARLOS ESCOBAR

Address: 2165 McAllister

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115

Phone: 415 321 7033

E-mail: X_escobar@yahoo.com



7065

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Frachel Kempe
Address: 2214 Fillmore St.
City: San Francisco 94115
Phone: (804) 543-4531
E-mail: fracherkempe@gmail.com

From: Tim [mailto:mirugai01@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 3:59 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@sfpUBLICgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park

Sharp Park golf course is the only recreational athletic facility owned by the City that seniors can use. Seniors only have walking as their crucial exercise (most doctors recommend 10,000 steps per day as a complete exercise program for seniors). That means golf is the appropriate sport to accomplish this. The other golf courses owned by the City are not appropriate for seniors to use: Lincoln is beautiful but way too hilly to climb up and down, especially with clubs. As is Gleneagles and Golden Gate (and it and Fleming are only 9 holes). And Harding is a wonderful course, not too hilly, but a senior resident must pay \$38 to play Harding, and that's too expensive for most seniors. Sharp costs less than half of that to play.

Who are these seniors who play Sharp? Go over there sometime...see for yourself. The image of rich white males as golfers is completely not the case. Most players, and there are lots of women playing there, are Asian, Hispanic, Filipino, and all, without exception, are blue collar working people or retired workers on pension or social security. Many are former City and County employees.

I am 73, have lived in San Francisco for 52 years, and play Sharp Park all the time. It is a recreational treasure for everyone my age who wants to get some needed exercise, and enjoy the aspects of sport. Please retain Sharp Park in its current condition.

Tim Savinar
GHIN#6689940
3019 Washington St.
San Francisco 94115

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: ANH D PHAM
Address: 2340 PACIFIC AVE #204
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94115
Phone: 415-346-6474
E-mail: youngphamy@yahoo.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:22:32 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94110.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94111.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 13 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:50 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94110, 94111 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94110 (12), and 94111 (1). There are a total of 13 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94110 (12)

Nancy Noonan

Minh Trinh

Andrew Moeller

Leel Peesapati

Gary Lanza

Cory Wang

Giancarlo Nucci

Kevin Keeker

Kathryn Bodle

James Miller

Eric Newman

Gerald Spica

94111 (1)

Caitlin Slattery

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Nancy Noonan

Address: 436 Utah Street

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94110

Phone: 415.934.0006

E-mail: nancynoonan@mail^{org}~~.com~~

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,


I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Minh Trinh
Address: 334 San Jose Ave
City, Zip: SF CA 94110

Phone:

E-mail:



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Andrew Moeller
Address: 1156 Hampshire st, SE
City, Zip: 94110
Phone: 207-478-9616
E-mail: Moeller_Andrew@yahoo.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Leel Peesapati

Address:

66 Bradford St

City, Zip:

SF, CA 94110

Phone:

415 254 0932

E-mail:

leelpeesapati@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Gary Lanza
Address: 10 B Prospect Ave
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA. 94110
Phone: (415) 648-9206
E-mail: garytrilan@myastound.net

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Cory Wang
Address: 480 Potrero Ave
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA, 94110
Phone: 951 667 9583
E-mail: Cory.Wang1@gmail.com

Name: Giancarlo Nucci

Address: 1784 Dolores St Apt 2, SF, CA 94110

Phone:

E-mail: gnucci@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Kevin Keeker
Address: 1386 Utah St
City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94110
Phone: 650-483-6976
E-mail: kevin301@hotmail.com

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

Kathryn Badle

Address:

1384 Utah St

City, Zip:

SE CA 94110

Phone:

E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *James Miller*

Address: *562 Peralta*

City, Zip: *SF Ca, 94110*

Phone: *415-203-9290*

E-mail:

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Eric Newman

Address: 730 Florida St, Apt. 25

City, Zip: SF, 94110

Phone: 305-487-8484

E-mail: NewmanEricH@gmail.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Gerald Spica

Address: 105 Bradford Street

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94110

Phone:

E-mail: gerald.spica@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Name: Caitlin Slattery

Address: 949 Page St. #4

City, Zip: San Francisco 94111

Phone: 415 579 5970

E-mail: ~~Est~~ caiti.slattery@gmail.com



7083

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:24:25 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94109.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 38 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:44 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zip 94109 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 4 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94109 . There are a total of 38 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94109 (38)
Evan Judd
Michael Cianelli
Jose Lopez
Ben Steed
Herman Kim
Rich Rodman
Mark Breen
Derek Rahn
Oskar Frick
Michael Martis
Julie Jordan
Hilary Popeck
James Hammond
Greg Yankun
Alex Goldberg
Glenn Lyndsay
Jeff Weddell
Jeffrey Caldwell
Michael W. Beatty
Jack Scott
Susan Ewens
Major Lightner
Kent Keilwitz
Jacob Murphy
Elan Hawkins
Sterling Hawkins
Mike Berg
Brandon Service
Jodey Glaser
D. Hettenbach
Mike Costello
Colin Hall
Megan Barron
Maria Traboulsi
Saraid Donnelly
James Moore
Kyungduk Rho
Benjamin Church

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Evan Judd*

Address: *San Francisco, CA*

City, Zip: *94109*

Phone:

E-mail: *ejudd@yahoo.com*

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Michael Cianelli

Address: 1855 Pacific Ave

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94129

Phone:

E-mail:

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Jose Lopez*

Address: *825 Sutter street*

City, Zip: *94109*

Phone: *415 412 0696*

E-mail: *pepe-969@hotmail.com*

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Ben Steed

Address: 1900 Washington St #104

City, Zip: San Francisco 94109

Phone:

E-mail:

February//, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *HERNANI KIM*

Address: *825 Sutter St*

City, Zip: *SAN FRANCISCO, 94109*

Phone: *941 773 2708*

E-mail: *hernankim98@hotmail.com*

Name: Rich Rodman

Address: 200 Pine St Apt 6 SF 94109

Phone: 415 941 6123

E-mail: rich@growbots.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____



Name: Marc Green
Address: 2065 California Street, SF 94109
Phone: 415 814 7154
E-mail: mgreen26@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Derek Rahn

Address: 1201 Green St

City, Zip: ~~Tucson~~ ~~AZ~~ San Francisco CA 94109

Phone: 520-492-2524

E-mail: drah83@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Oskar Frick

Address: 1080 Bush St, SF

City, Zip: 94109

Phone: (415) 606 3125

E-mail: oskar.frick95@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Michael Morris

Address: 2955 Van Ness Ave Apt #5

City, Zip: SF, CA 94109

Phone: 414-803-9688

E-mail: mmorris07@gmail.com

Name: *Julie Jordan*
Address: *1400 Geary Apt. 701, SF 94109*
Phone: *(415) 310-3561*
E-mail:

February^v, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X *Julie Jordan*

Name: Hilary Popeck

Address: 1448 pine st CA 94109

Phone:

E-mail:

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: JAMES HAMMOND

Address: 1700 CALIFORNIA ST, APT 612, ~~SE, CA~~

City, Zip: SAN FRAN, CA 94109

Phone: 415-481-1312

E-mail: jhammond@tpg.com

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: greg yankun

Address: 1285 Sutter st

City, Zip: SF, CA 94109

Phone: 617-698-8013

E-mail: gregoryls2@msn.com

Name: ALEX CRODBERY
Address: 1515 Sutter St. #214, SF 94109
Phone: 626 375 4213
E-mail: ary83191@gmail.com

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Glenn Lyden

Address: 1700 Broadway #505-

City, Zip: SF CA 94109

Phone:

E-mail:

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jeff Wendel
Address: 1730 Jackson St.
City, Zip: SF CA 94109
Phone: 858-205-0478
E-mail: jwendel@gmail.com

February 12, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jeffrey Caldwell

Address: 1246 FILBERT ST

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

Phone: (206) 697-2458

E-mail: Jeffrey.Caldwell15@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: MICHAEL W. Beatty

Address: 1124 Eddy #D

City, Zip: SF CA 94109

Phone: 415-350-6455

E-mail: Duffermike@comcast.net

From: Jack Scott [<mailto:jackscot@pacbell.net>]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 2:38 PM
To: 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org'
Cc: Richard Harris (info@sfpublicgolf.com)
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

You all have been successful in winning the election that you ran for to make our city and county a strong and secure place to raise our kids and enjoy the many features of San Francisco.

Among those features is a place called SHARP PARK golf course. SHARP PARK is an historic golf course designed by the legendary Allister MacKenzie and it is available and affordable to every level of player and every age group from school kids to super senior players.

I urge you to REJECT the appeal proposed by the Wild Equity Institute. Sharp Park has gone through years of planning, studies, investigations and conclusions that have proved beyond question that SHARP PARK, The PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE, SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARKS, The SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION, The CORPS OF ENGINEERS, The U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, The CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION, STATE AND FEDERAL TRIAL AS WELL AS THE APPELLANT COURTS have all approved the Natural Areas Plan, The Laguna Salada Restoration Plan and the Sharp Park habitat improvement plan for the Red Legged Frog and the California Garder Snake.

My name is Jack Scott I live at 1200 Gough Street, San Francisco and I believe in low cost family entertainment and the availability of a sensational, locally available, world class golf course for ALL of the San Francisco/San Mateo residents and visitors alike.

Jack Scott, a registered voter.

94109

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Susan Ewers
Address: 1335 Union St
City: apt
SF CA 94109
Phone:
E-mail: susewers@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

MAJOR LIGHTNER

Address:

1418 LEAVENWORTH ST #11

City, Zip:

SF, CA 94109

Phone:

310 666 1224

E-mail:

→ D@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: KENT KELLWITZ
Address: 1601 Pacific Ave #404
City: SF CA 94109
Phone:
E-mail: Kellwitz33@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: JACOB MURPHY

Address: 2649 POLK ST

City, Zip: SF 94109

Phone: (415) 294-6940

E-mail: JWMURPHY9@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Elan Hawkins

Address: 655 Sutter St,

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO 94109

Phone: (415) 765-5056

E-mail: elan.hawkins@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Sterling Hamba

Address: 1153 Bush St, S

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, 94109

Phone: (408) 594-9795

E-mail: sterling-manga@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Mike Berg*

Address: *1970 Sacramento #202*

City, Zip: *SF 94109*

Phone: *415 775-7861*

E-mail: *berggolf2@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Brandon Service*
Address: *935 Sutter St #6*
City, Zip: *SF, CA 94109*
Phone:
E-mail: *baservice34@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Jodey Glaser

Address: 935 Sutter Street

City, Zip: San Francisco CA 94109

Phone: 415 346 0840

E-mail: jodey@smithnovelty.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *D. Hettenbach*

Address: *1701 Jackson St.*

City, Zip: *San Francisco Ca 94109*

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name:

Mike Costello

Address: 1310 Greenwich St

City, Zip: SF 94109

Phone: 415-527-9921

E-mail: Mike.Costello07@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Colin Hall

Address: 1125 Francisco St. 94109

City, Zip: San Fran

Phone: 707-280-0698

E-mail: Colinhall22@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Megan Barron*

Address: *1357 Clay St Apt 6*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94109*

Phone:

E-mail: *Megan.barron@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Maria Treaboussi

Address: 737 Post St. 624

City, Zip: San Francisco, 94109

Phone: 4155276442

E-mail: mftl_20@hotmail.com.

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Sarah Donnelly

Address: 64 Glover St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: 347 889 1935

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: James Moore

Address: 61 Glover St.

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: (626) 616 - 2151

E-mail: jbmoore123@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Kyungduk Rho*

Address: *1828 Broadway*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94109*

Phone: *518 - 275 - 8759*

E-mail: *kr362@cornell.edu*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Benjamin Church*
Address: *2701 Van Ness Ave #306*
City, Zip: *San Francisco 94109*
Phone: *415 412 8347*
E-mail: *thegolfbud@gmail.com*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:26:09 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94102.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94103.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94105.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94107.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 4 pdfs containing a total of 16 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 16, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:37 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94102, 94103, 94105, 94107 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board

Natural Areas Plan / Bd of Supes File No. 17044 / Support NAP, Oppose Appeal

Attached above are 4 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94102 (7), 94103 (5), 94105 (1), and 94107 (3) . There are a total of 16 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94102 (7)

Vicky Kuo

Noah Wisnia

Merri A. Baldwin

Kris Hermanns

Brett Highley

Alberto Avila

Kevin Shin

94103 (5)

Matthew Cardoso

Yakov Lozovatskiy

Atsushi Yoshioka

Frank Slovenel

Elaine Harris

94105 (1)

John Apgar

94107 (3)

Steve Groccia

Craig Cucinella

Christine Carolan

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Vicky Kuo

Address: 620 Sutter St.

City, Zip: San Francisco . 94102

Phone: 415 964 6550

E-mail: vickykuo168@yahoo.com.tw

Name: Noah Wisnia
Address: 750 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, 94102
Phone: 650 589 5947
E-mail: nwisnia@yahoo.com

February 6, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Merri A. Baldwin

Address: 216 Waller

City, Zip: SF CA 94102

Phone: 415 412 4908

E-mail: merribaldwin@gmail.com

February 11, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: KRIS HERMANN S

Address: 216 WALLER ST.

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

Phone: 206-445-9775

E-mail: kris.hermanns@gmail.com

Name: Brett Highley

Address: 444 Irving Street, SF CA 94102

Phone: 317-418-8857

E-mail: bhighley99@gmail.com

February 12, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February¹², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Alberto Avila

Address: 1 Park St Unit 303

City, Zip: San Francisco Ca 94102

Phone:

E-mail: avila21st@gmail.com

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Kevin Shin

Address: 764 McAllister, SF, CA

City, Zip: 94102

Phone: 415-926-1708

E-mail: mpbrkdgs@hotmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Matthew Cardoso*

Address: *56 Moss St Apt 2*

City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94103*

Phone: *973-868-9203*

E-mail: *matthew.cardoso@gmail.com*

February 17, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Yakov LOZOVATSKY

Address: 169 Duboce Ave

City, Zip: San FRANCISCO Ca 94103

Phone: (415) 531-9846

E-mail: LOZOVAT.

Name: Atsushi Yoshioka
Address: 290 Dolores #235 SF, CA 94103
Phone: 415 407 9483
E-mail: atsushi.yoshioka.0319@gmail.com

February 17, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February², 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: FRANK SLOVENEL

Address: 175 LANGTON ST

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

Phone: 415 297 9048

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Elaine Harris*

Address: *215 Guerrero St. #4*

City, Zip: *SF CA 94103*

Phone: *415-247-4404*

E-mail: *elaine.roberta.harris@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: John Apgar

Address: 16 Jessie St Apt 411

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94105

Phone: 716 7131011

E-mail: apgar.john@gmail.com

February 2, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Steve Groccia

Address: 2459 Polk st #5

City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94107

Phone: 203 524 1961

E-mail: sgroccia@gmail.com

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: CRAIG CUCINELLA

Address: 250 KING ST #406

City, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

Phone: 773 220 4653

E-mail: cucinella@gmail.com

February 17, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Christine Carolan

Address: 1 S. Park St

City, Zip: SF CA 94107

Phone:

E-mail: cmcarolan@yahoo.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS Hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:32:17 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOutOfState.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 22 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:17 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, from outside California

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 22 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from outside of California. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Subject:Sharp Park Golf Course / Feb. 28th, 2017 Board Meeting

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 13:01:49 -0700

From:Forrest Richardson <forrest@golfgroupltd.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

CC:SF Public Golf Alliance <info@sfpublicgolf.org>

**City of San Francisco
Board of Supervisors**

January 27th, 2017

Dear Board:

Firstly, let me say that I find it nearly incredible that you have yet again been asked to consider your opinion of the preservation and improvement of the overall habitat of the Sharp Park Golf Course, as well as the golf course itself. I find the continual opposition to your previous reasonable and rationale decisions to be a form a badgering. Frankly, the appeal you have been asked to hear next month nearly amounts to an abuse of the legislative process, especially when it gets to the point of arguing points that have been fully testified to, explained, proven and decided upon previously --- and on more than one occasion.

On the matter of the Sharp Park Golf Course not being considered "historic" allow me to, once and for all, set the record straight for your consideration. Dr. Alister MacKenzie was indeed the original golf course architect and his original design remains in many facets.

- 1) The routing of the golf course, which is the anatomy of any golf course, is more than 75% per MacKenzie's earliest plans with the exception being only the holes that had to be re-accommodated due to two events: (i) the very early erosion of the coastline and construction of a levee; and (ii) the c. 1960s work to construct the highway.
- 2) The record of the earlier replacement holes is that MacKenzie and his assistants were well a part of considering where some replacement holes would eventually go. This was due to the fact that it was well known that these ocean holes would very likely be compromised by nature, and this realization became evident not long after the course opened.
- 3) To suggest otherwise -- that the golf facility is not a MacKenzie design --would be akin to suggesting that work now ongoing to add elevators and disabled access to Grady Gammage Concert Hall in Arizona, a Frank Lloyd Wright design, somehow makes the significant building not Wright's. Absurd.

As I wrote for an early study for you (the City) in 2006:

"The history of Sharp Park begins with Mackenzie's well-intentioned design of an 18-hole course along the dunesy coastline of Pacifica. With Lincoln Park and Harding Park busy on weekends, another course was needed. The City of San Francisco purchased lots in San Mateo County from 1929 to 1930, paving the way for creating another golf course.

Jack Fleming was Mackenzie's assistant at the time. The approach to the Sharp Park site was to dredge material in order to build up fairway grades. This work took a reported 14 months.

In mid 1930, Robert Hunter was appointed to direct construction of Sharp Park Golf Course. Hunter had relocated to California (Oakland to be specific) after a career teaching sociology. Hunter was still teaching occasionally and had, by this time, written several books on sociology. One, Poverty, was a best-seller in America during 1904. Hunter is thought to have a great deal to do with the creation of Sharp

Park, assisting MacKenzie and carrying out his design philosophy. Hunter took the lead of field work at many of Mackenzie's northern California projects. Just a few years earlier, in 1926, Hunter authored The Links, still today an acclaimed book on golf course design."

I have spent considerable time studying the work of both MacKenzie and Hunter. Our restoration work in El Cerrito, California at Mira Vista Country Club was to the only sole design effort ever by Hunter. Through this process I researched and have gained a great deal about the work of both golf architects. I relate this so you will know that these are not as much opinions as they are factual recounts of what actually occurred in California golf history.

Without any doubt, the history record shows that Sharp Park is a MacKenzie design and remains among only a very few of his golf courses worldwide that are publicly owned and operated for the benefit of the ordinary golfer. It is an historic golf course regardless of the changes made, and it is my understanding that the plans for its future will restore even more of the original design. This is a proud point to weigh, and it should be a heavy weight indeed.

You have in your archives a very handsome blueprint on linen (dated 1931) that shows work to the course and the pipelines that formed the old irrigation works. By overlaying this to plans from the 1960s you can easily see that a majority of the golf course remains per the MacKenzie design, not only in terms of the footprint, but also the corridor formed by the holes. Golf courses are always evolving -- changing. The key here is that the basis of the golf remains, despite the natural and man-caused changes that were simply unavoidable at various times in its history.

Old buildings are the same. They need to be changed and revised, but this does not diminish their historic roots.

You will do well to look straight into the eyes of those who are now coming before you to argue this silly point and to ask them to simply get on with it. For their argument that Sharp Park is not an Alister MacKenzie design, or that it has been so significantly changed as to not be considered his valuable work, is pure rubbish.

Sincerely,

//s//

Forrest L. Richardson, ASGCA
Golf Course Architect

Forrest Richardson & Associates
Los Angeles California • Phoenix, Arizona

p 602-906-1818, Ext. 202

Name: David Walsch

Address: 35 Ivy, Denver, CO

Phone:

E-mail: Dave.walsh78@hotmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X



Name: Shannon-Marie King
Address: 5855 Marble Cir. Johnston, IA 50131
Phone: 319-350-5321
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: BERT LEON

Address: CHICAGO IL 825 OLD ELM LANE

Phone:

E-mail: bateoldelmclub.com

February 9 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: TED STRAND
Address: 503 W. BRIND PL
City: CHICAGO, IL
Phone: 312-735-2020
E-mail: ted.strand@sfb.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Gary A. Ochs
Signature

Name: GARY OCHS
Address: 3644 N. FARMONT
City: CHICAGO, IL
Phone: 847.922.8437
E-mail: g.ochs@comcast.net

Name: Kevin Marion
Address: 600 Old Elm Rd. Highland Park, IL
Phone: 647 903 4227 60035
E-mail: Kevin@oldelmrds.com
February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: JASON MOSS

Address: 6316 RIO VERDE AVE OAK FOREST IL
60452

Phone: 708 267 3112

E-mail: jmoss4688@gmail.com

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Julie Wolf
Signature

Name: Julie Wolf
Address: 1202 Lake Ave.
City: Wilmette, IL 60091
Phone: 847-251-7104
E-mail: juliewolf922@gmail.com

Name: *Thomas E. Roszak*
Address: *6401 Verona Rd*
Phone: *Missouri 417, KS 66208*
E-mail:

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: David Nassif
Address: 1010 W. Minnehaha Pkwy
City: Mpls 55419 NW

Phone:

E-mail:

February ⁵, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: MONICA MAGRIP

Address:
City: MPLS, MN

Phone:

E-mail:

TRINITYIF@COMCAST.NET

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: John Chase
Signature

Name: John Chase
Address: 1220 Nighthawk Blvd
City: Stillwater, MN
Phone: 651-432-4157
E-mail: JChase27@hotmail.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: *Cisco Gonzales*
Signature

Name: *Cisco Gonzales*
Address: *4702 Tajo Ct. SE*
City: *Rio Rancho NM 87124*
Phone: *505-917-3408*
E-mail: *Fgonza22@gmail.com*

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Philip J. Regan
Signature

Name: PHILIP REGAN
Address: 719 SOUTHWINDS DRIVE
City: BRYN MAWR PA 19010
Phone: 610 527 8879
E-mail: PHILANOVA719@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Michael W. Burnett
Signature

Name: Michael W. Burnett
Address: 5625 Malone Dr.
City: Plano, TX 75093
Phone: 214-927-6612
E-mail: Burney22@yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:

Signature

Name:

Mark Caprio

Address:

1920 Creek meadow CV

City:

Spice wood TX 79669

Phone:

763-227-7050

E-mail:

markocaprio@gmail.com

Name: MATTHEW BORSQUET

Address: 156 PIONEER LANE
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA. 22903

Phone: 703-543-6426

E-mail: borsquet24@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

Name: Daniel Mahoney
Address: 809 S. Liberty Dr., Liberty Lake, WA 99019
Phone: 415-640-0001
E-mail: dmahoney79@aol.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Daniel Mahoney

Name: MIKE OPPINSKI
Address: 3603 SW MANNING, SEATTLE WA
Phone: 206 585 3853
E-mail:

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: *Peter J. CHURCH*

Address: *N.Y. N.Y.*

Phone:

E-mail:

February *5*, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Peter J. Church*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:37:47 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOtherCalif.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 19 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:13 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / California outside San Francisco and San Mateo counties / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 19 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from California residents outside San Francisco and San Mateo counties. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Subject:Yet another Fight for Sharp Park?

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 20:51:44 +0000 (UTC)

From:MJG <jay_san@yahoo.com>

Reply-To:MJG <jay_san@yahoo.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

CC:info@sfpublishgolf.org <info@sfpublishgolf.org>

Dear Supervisors,

I was previously a San Francisco resident. I am a Sharp Park golfer who greatly appreciates that old course designed by MacKenzie.

I support the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the **Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal and to end the incessant harassment of our course by those crazy eco-fanatics.**

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park **Department's** carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jay Greenberg
66 Poppy Lane
Berkeley, CA 94708

Name: Nelson Laswell

Address: 3030 College Ave Apt A

Berkeley, CA 94705
Phone: (713) 598-5853

E-mail: NELASWELL@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Barbara Albers
Signature

Name: Barbara Albers
Address: 2600 Tuolumne Av
City: Chico CA 95923

Phone:

E-mail:

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Gary Albers
Signature

Name: GARY ALBERS
Address: 2600 TUOLUMNE DR
City: CHICO
Phone: 530-894-3177
E-mail:



Alfred D. Oppenheim, MD, Inc.

Tel: (415) 686-7331 (Linda) • (415) 606-3333 (Dr. Opp)

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park and urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR. Case No. 2005.0912E; Hearing February 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the FINAL EIR for the Park and Rec Department's Natural Areas Plan. This includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes while maintaining the historic and important 18 hole Sharp Park Golf Course. I implore you to likewise support this and our ongoing efforts to save this masterpiece for all residents to enjoy for decades to come.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Alfred D. Oppenheim, M.D.

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:

Signature

Name:

James Sung

Address:

2261 Grapevine Ter

City:

Fremont CA

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: *ARMANDO URBINA*

Address: *4787 W. OSWEGO FRESNO, CA*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Armando Urbina

Name: DAVE RAMARO

Address: 6954 W. OSWEGO FRESNO, CA 93723

Phone: 559-271-2272

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: BEN WRIGLEY
Address: 462 FLORENCE DR.
City: LAFAYETTE CA 94549

Phone: 415.912.7196

E-mail:

Name: *Gene Banorte*

Address: *854 Folson St
Livermore CA.*

Phone:

E-mail:

February *4*, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X *Gene Banorte*

Subject: Uphold the Approval of Recreation and Parks' Natural Areas Plan - Hearing
Date: 2/28/2017

Date: Fri, 27 Jan 2017 21:54:59 +0000

From: Evans, David W <devans@HBBLAW.com>

To: 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org' <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

CC: 'SF Public Golf Alliance' <info@sfpublicgolf.org>

TO: SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Dear Supervisors,

I was a San Francisco resident for 22 years and continue to work in the City every day; I'm also someone who enjoys golf at Sharp Park and am a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. I have been a volunteer Course Rater for the Northern California Golf Association for thirteen years and, during that period, have rated and played dozens of public and private golf courses throughout Northern California. This has made me appreciate even more the spectacular benefits offered to the golfers of Northern California, and San Francisco in particular, of having access to such a wonderful and historic golf course like Sharp Park; one doesn't typically see a public course designed by golf architects like Alister MacKenzie, a highly accomplished historical figure who designed Sharp Park in the early 20th century, along with many other well-known golf courses, including Augusta National, where the Masters is played every spring, and Cypress Point on the Monterey Peninsula, both of which naturally encompass and complement their surroundings.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal

Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Regards,

David Evans
24 Heuters Lane
Mill Valley, CA 94941

David W. Evans | [Profile](#)
Partner
D: [415.281.7624](tel:415.281.7624)
DF: [415.766.6006](tel:415.766.6006)
devans@hbblaw.com

Haight Brown & Bonesteel LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94111
O: [415-546-7500](tel:415-546-7500)
F: [415-546-7505](tel:415-546-7505)
www.hbblaw.com

The contents of this email message and its attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) hereof. This email transmission may be confidential and it may be subject to privilege protecting communications between attorneys and their clients. If you are not the named addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are directed not to read, disclose, reproduce, distribute, disseminate or otherwise use this transmission. Delivery of this message to any person other than the intended recipient(s) is not intended in any way to waive privilege or confidentiality. If you have received this transmission in error, please alert the sender by reply e-mail. We request that you immediately delete this message and its attachments, if any.
UNAUTHORIZED INTERCEPTION PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL LAW (18 U.S.C 2510-2522).

Name: Jennifer Pang

Address: 438 W Grand Ave #528, Oakland CA 94612

Phone: (562) 650-7363

E-mail: Jennifercpang@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: David Leede
Address: 618 Escudido Road, Palo Alto, CA

Phone:

E-mail: dleede@stanford.edu

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Will Stork
Address: 778 Hillcrest Way
Redwood City, CA
Phone:
E-mail:

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Chih-Tung Chen
Signature

Name: Chih Tung Chen

Address: Capistrano Ave

City: San Jose

Phone:

E-mail: chih_tung_chen @ Yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Michael Kamnitzer
Address: 201 S. Winchester Blvd
City: San Jose
Phone: 858-449-3152
E-mail: Mdkamnitzer@gmail.com

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: *PETER NOONE*
Address: *648 LAS COLINAS RD.*
City: *SAN RAFAEL, CA. 94903*
Phone: *415-606-6408*
E-mail: *pnoone@ameritech.net*

Name: Kim Watson

Address: 202 Las Flores Ave
San Rafael, CA 94903

Phone: 415-269-8605

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Kim Watson

Name: MARZAN CROMPTON
Address: 2514 HAYWARD DR
SANTA CLARA CA
Phone: 408-260-8709
E-mail: bjc_mdc@icloud

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: *Ken Seebey*
Address: *594 OASIS DE SANTA ROSA 95407*
Phone: *707 236 5822*
E-mail:

February *4* 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X *Ken Seebey*

Subject: Consideration of Sharp Park
Date: Fri, 27 Jan 2017 14:38:29 -0800
From: Stacey Baba <sbjvfoundation1@comcast.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
CC: info@sfpUBLICgolf.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am an environmentalist with a degree from UC Berkeley in the Biology of Natural Resources, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course. I have spent my years supporting the environment and our natural resources.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. It was Alister's gift to our community and has incredible historical significance. It is tragic the each year we read about the demise of areas that have brought many folks joy over so many years because of some folks who are well meaning but misguided. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Stacey Baba
13553 Old Oak Way
Saratoga, CA 95070

Name: Robert Scagliola

Address: 5230 Blank Rd SEBASTOPOL, CA 95472

Phone: 650 359 2019

E-mail: bobscagliola@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Scagliola". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Name: TOOD SAUBER
Address: 7443 Chaminade Ave. West Hills, CA 91304
Phone: 213-220-8455
E-mail: toosauber@gmail.com
February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: Blane Robertson
Address: Willits, Ca. PO Box 459 Hopland.
Phone: 707 459 4945
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 


Signature

Name: Kyle Mickaelian

Address: 129 Johnson St.

City: Windsor CA

Phone:

E-mail: Mickaelian ~~@~~ 

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:39:21 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkOtherSanMateoCo.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 20 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:07 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / San Mateo County misc. / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,


Attached above is 1 pdf containing 20 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from miscellaneous cities in San Mateo County (other than Pacifica, Daly City, So SF, San Bruno, and San Mateo). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Gerald Williamson Stratford



650.367.9027
g@stratford.us
One Arthur Lane, Berkeley, California 94707

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR.
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Honorable Supervisors,


As a fourth-generation San Franciscan, whose grandfather introduced him to the game of golf on the historic course at Sharp Park, I implore you to recognize the heritage this course represents, and its essential service to so many bay area residents.

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which while providing for the recovery of habitat for frogs and snakes, maintains the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the ill-considered appeal to reverse the Commission's decision.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald W Stratford



Subject:Sharp Park Golf Course Natural Areas Plan

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 11:54:06 -0800

From:James Feichtl <kkidguy@gmail.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

CC:info@sfpUBLICgolf.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jim Feichtl

2036 Lyon Ave

Belmont, CA 94002

Name: ROD KHO
Address: 1060 Hiller St. Belmont ca. 94002
Phone: (650) 544-4802
E-mail: rhoo@comcast.net
February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Rod Kho', written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

Name: DANIEL KIM

Address: 1101 O'NEILL AVENUE ~~ST~~ BELMONT, CA
94002

Phone: 415-254-5967

E-mail: SANFRANCISCO DAN @ GMAIL.COM

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Mary L. Fawcett
Signature

Name: Mary L. Fawcett
Address: 1300 Adeline Dr
City: SF CA 94110
BURLINGAME
Phone:
E-mail:

Name: Tom Shea
Address: 2204 EASTON DRIVE
Phone: Burlingame Ca. 94010
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Tom F Shea

Eugene P. Marsh

147 Sonora Ave
El Granada, CA 94018
208 891-6389
Lmmarsh9@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park.
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. I am a "coastsider" and have been a property owner in El Granada since 1990. The golf course is only ten minutes away. Our family has been enjoying Sharp Park Golf course for over 26 years. We love our beaches and our affordable beautiful golf course. Please keep this special legacy with us while also acknowledging the snakes and frogs too.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely



Eugene P. Marsh

Lisa Marsh

147 Sonora Ave
El Granada, CA 94018
208 891-6389
Lmmarsh9@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. I am a "coastsider" and have been a property owner in El Granada since 1990. The golf course is only ten minutes away. Our family has been enjoying Sharp Park Golf course for over 26 years. We love our beaches and our affordable beautiful golf course. Please keep this special legacy with us while also acknowledging the snakes and frogs too.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely


Lisa Marsh

Name: SUSIE ROSE TEMPISTA
Address: POB 2439
E.G. 94018-2439
Phone: 650 726-5557
E-mail: stroses7@aol.com

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: MICHAEL DUSKINS

Address: 234 BILMARCAVE LANE, ~~ST~~ FOSTER CITY, CA 94404

Phone: 415 586 8257

E-mail: MICHAELDUSKINS@YAHOO.COM

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: *FRANCES LOW*
Address: *389 Menhaden St, Foster City CA 94024*
Phone: *650.867.6762*
E-mail: *francesmelter @ sbcglobal.net*
February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: MILTON LOW

Address: 389 Menhaden ct. Foster City

Phone:

E-mail: mlow@marvell.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Subject:Sharp Park Golf Course

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 15:20:05 -0800

From:George Young <gfyoun@earthlink.net>

To:info@spublicgolf.org

I have been a member of Sharp Park for many years and have enjoyed many years of golf. This course has a history which dates way past our generation. Please keep Sharp Park not only for the golfers but many families walk their dogs late in the day enjoying the time with dog and family.

George Young,
409 Granelli Ave, Half Moon Bay, Ca 94019

Name: Shirley Deng
Address: 1160 Murkison dr. Milbrae, CA 94030

Phone: 415 225 8839
E-mail: shirlydeng@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Ed Garcia

Address: 7415 Morningstar Dr., Millbrae Ca 94030

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Helen Liu

Address: 199 California Dr # 200, Millbrae CA 94030

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Helen Liu

Name: DAVID ZHANG
Address: 1160 MILLBRAE, Millbrae, CA
Phone: 415-225-8839
E-mail: dzhang280@gmail.com
dzhang280@gmail.com
February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Dorothy Maurer*
Address: *P.O. Box 452*
Moss Beach
Phone: *728-3415*
E-mail: *dolamouse@Coastside.net*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Dorothy Maurer*

Name: Swanson Family; Lynn Swanson
Address: 615 Vue De Mar, Moss Beach, CA
94038
Phone:
E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Please save Sharp Park
Our family from Pacific Grove
played & worked here for many
years.
There is no Recreation for people
except dog walking. WE WANT GOLF!!
Thank you
John + Lynn Swanson
P.O. Box 1212
Pacific Grove, CA

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:41:21 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkSanMateo.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkSanBruno.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 19 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:02 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / San Mateo and San Bruno residents / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 19 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from residents of San Bruno (10) and the City of San Mateo (9). We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: NANCY FARRELL

Address: 1272 LAUREL HILL DR SAN MATEO CA 94408

Phone: 650-593-1829

E-mail: njfarrell@comcast.net

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Bernie Delan
Address: 601 Bermuda Dr SAN MATEO, CA 94403
Phone: 650-570-5017
E-mail: bejod@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____



Name: *Ralph C. Gutierrez*
Address: *72 Lakewood Circle*
San Mateo, CA.
Phone: *415-370-0692*
E-mail:

February³, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Ralph C. Gutierrez

Name: Todd McClure
Address: 117 23RD AVE, San Mateo, CA. 94403
Phone: 650-619-5138
E-mail: Tmcc0207@Hotmail.com

February 2 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Todd McClure

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Marvin Choa

Address: 1008 Rosalie St

City, Zip: San Mateo 94403

Phone: 651-759-3026

E-mail: marvin.g.choa@gmail.com

Name: Jane Dolan

Address: 601 Bermuda Dr. San Mateo, CA 94403

Phone: 650-507-5701

E-mail: jodolan@gmail.com

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Jane Dolan

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Mary Jo Fischl
Signature

Name: Mary Jo Fischl

Address: 2311 Alameda de las Pulgas
City: San Mateo, CA 94403

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: Stephanie Singer
Address: 1308 Palos Verdes dr #4, San Mateo
Phone: 650 520-6599
E-mail: wine4slupho@yahoo.com
February 4 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: MARK SHAW

Address: 1336 EL CAMINO REAL, San Mateo County

Phone:

E-mail: MSHAWIN@YAHOO.COM

February 4, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: FRANCIS LEE
Address: 2800 MERION DRIVE
Phone: SAN BRUNO, CA 94066
650-392-5025
E-mail: fleenatlee@yahoo.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Francis Lee

From: Dave Wisnia <davewisnia@yahoo.com>

Date: January 28, 2017 at 4:07:19 AM PST

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

To the attention of the Board of Supervisors

My name is David Wisnia & I'm a San Francisco native now living in San Bruno. The constant harassment that environmental activists are continually causing is counterproductive to the operation & revenue that the Sharp Park Golf Course produces for San Francisco. The golfing & other patrons of this long standing public facility are the ones who should be listened to in this battle over the continued use of the Sharp Park Golf Course property. I feel it is more responsible to serve the needs of people that are willing to spend their hard earned dollars to support the course & the wildlife that make it their home. Please continue to keep the public golf course & the environmentally sensitive area contained within it as is, coexisting harmoniously!

Thank you for supporting this Pacifica gem & please keep up the good work.

Sincerely

David Wisnia

2399 Valleywood Dr

San Bruno, Ca 94066

Sent from my iPad

Name: Kathleen Kelly-Breitler

Address: 3001 Longview Dr
San Bruno, CA 94066

Phone:

E-mail: KKalto@aol.com

February 2 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Kathryn Kelly Breitler

Name: DALE LEE
Address: 2800 MERION DR SAN BRUNO, CA
Phone: 650-291-6348 94066
E-mail: mmousebd@gmail.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: MARK STEFANI
Address: 260 FERNWOOD DRIVE, SAN BRUNO, CA 94066

Phone: 650-452-4481
E-mail: MARKSTEFANI69@YAHOO.COM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: *SPENCER GREGORY*
Address: *953 GREEN AVE*
City: *SAN BRUNO CA 94065*
Phone: *650-589-3451*
E-mail: *spencer.gregory@HotMail*

February⁵, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: VAUGHN GREGORY
Address: 953 GREEN AVE
City: SAN BRUNO, CA 94066

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name: Dale White

Address: 2000 Crystal Springs Rd #3-18

City: San Bruno, CA 94066

Phone: 530 304-3938

E-mail: dalewhite6@gmail.com

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Vanessa Samayoa
Address: 2000 Crypta Springs Ln #318
City: San Bruno 94064

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Stephen Stauter
Signature

Name: Stephen Stauter

Address: 143 Piccadilly Pl. #E
City: San Bruno, CA. 94066

Phone: 650 588 2640

E-mail: Stephen Stauter@[^]gmail.com
2017

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / Bof S hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:42:47 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkSouthSF.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 15 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:56 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / South San Francisco residents / Bof S hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 15 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from South San Francisco residents. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: Brian Michelson
Address: 411 Hazelwood Dr., So SF, CA 94080
Phone: 650-224-1064
E-mail: moonzebra82@aol.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Bob Cook

Address: 227 Arroyo Dr S. SF, CA 94080

Phone: 650 359-2511

E-mail: frisky@pacbell.net

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Salwa Jarrar

Address: 2670 Shannon Dr. SO. San Fran 94080

Phone: (650) 834 2180

E-mail: salwa.jarrar@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

From: Homer Hudelson <[hhudelson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:hudelson@sbcglobal.net)>
To: "Venkman62@yahoo.com" <Venkman62@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 1, 2017 11:48 AM
Subject: Fw: Sharp Park Golf Course

On Wednesday, February 1, 2017 11:43 AM, Homer Hudelson <[hhudelson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:hudelson@sbcglobal.net)> wrote:

Dear SF Board of Supervisors: Please reject the latest of many appeals by the Wild Equity Institute etc., regarding the closure of Sharp Park Course. I personally have played there over 50 years. Golfers respect and protect the environs, not harm them. These are needless tactics. This famous and beautiful course is enjoyment to so many people, especially the elderly, like myself. It keeps us active and healthy. Please reject this appeal. Thank you for your commitment to doing what is right. Respectfully, Homer Hudelson, 2684 Sean Ct. South SF, CA 94080

Name: *Adeline Taylor*
Address: *337 Aerojo Dr South San Francisco CA*
Phone: *650 925 4480*
E-mail: *261 - 9625*

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Adeline Taylor*

Name: Chuck Andre

Address: 350 Catherine Dr S.S.F. CA 94080

Phone: (650) -273-1711

E-mail: cna03@aol.com

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chuck Andre", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Name: Nancy Andree
Address: 350 Catherine Dr
Phone: SSF CA 94080
E-mail: cna03@astound.net

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Rob Dino
Address: 18 Canyon Ct.
SSF. CA 94080
Phone: 650-872-6653
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X


Name: DEXTER BRUCE

Address: 809 Hillside Blvd 94080 South San Francisco

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Dexter Bruce

Name: *Francis Ingersoll*

Address: *337 Arroyo De South San Francisco CA 94080*

Phone: *650 952 4480*

E-mail: *stingersoll7@comcast.net*

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Francis Ingersoll
MA Stanford University

Name: Alexa Sundberg
Address: 762 Commercial Ave
South San Francisco, CA 94080
Phone: 503-737-7155; 415-262-3035
E-mail: alexa.sundberg@hotmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Alexa Sundberg

Name: VINCENT ZERTUCHE
Address: 162 COMMERCIAL AVE ^{Sa} JSF
Phone: 415 559-7534
E-mail: VZERTUCHE66@GMAIL

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Tom de Campos

Address: 30 spruce Ct. JSSF

Phone: (650) 732-2055

E-mail: tdecampos@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom de Campos", written over a horizontal line.

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:



Signature

Name: BERNARD BITANGA

Address: 2223 KENNY WAY

City: S.F., CA 94080

Phone: 415 - 810 - 0441

E-mail: BBATANG@YAHOO.COM

Name: GONZALO RAPAPOS

Address: 700 PARKWAY S.S.F. CA 94080

Phone: 650.438.6144

E-mail: gonzalo.rapapas@sjsu.edu

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: _____

A handwritten signature is written over a horizontal line. Below the signature, there is a hand-drawn smiley face with two exclamation marks to its right.

Power to
the park!

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:45:44 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkDalyCity.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 32 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:52 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Daly City residents / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 32 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from Daly City residents. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: ADRIAN DUGGAN

Address: 95 OAKRIDGE DRIVE, DALY CITY.

Phone: 415-260-7500

E-mail: dugplum@gmail.com.

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x  _____

Name: *Howard Bernstein*
Address: *6 Wilshire Ave. City*

Phone:

E-mail:

February *7*, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Tom SAMUELSON
Address: 44 CRESTVIEW AVE D. C.
Phone: 650-743-8078
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Tom Samuelson

Name: MARINA ANAYA

Address: 355 HALF MOON LN #13 SF
DALY CITY, CA 94015

Phone: 650-993-4249

E-mail: marina@hotmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Marina Anaya

Name: JOE NEWHOFF
Address: 48 Garden Grove Drive
Daly City CA. 94015
Phone: (408) 888-7625
E-mail: Bayarea Car Care Products @ Yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Joseph Newhoff

Name: Kyran Milton

Address: 831 S. Mayfair Ave. Daly City, CA 94015

Phone: (650)^{HM} 993-8809 (650)^{cell} 290 4937

E-mail: Kyranmilton@hotmail.com

February 7, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kyran Milton". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Name: Victoria Allen

Address: 174 Alta Vista Way Daly City, CA 94014

Phone: (415) 584-3114

E-mail: vallen0072009@yahoo.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Victoria Allen

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Iven Tan

Address: 128, West Moltke Street

City, Zip: Daly City, 94014

Phone: 415 - 360 - 4238

E-mail: apmfafa@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Jacob Schwartz*

Address: *32 Palerose Ct.*

City, Zip: *Paly City CA 94014*

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Yosher Tamara*

Address: *624 Marissa St*

City, Zip: *DE 94015*

Phone:

E-mail: *ytamara404@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: ERNESTO JIMENEZ JR

Address: 7 FAIRLAWN CT

City: DAIY CITY

Phone:

E-mail: ESIMENEZJR@COMCAST.NET

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Marianne A. Viani
Signature

Name: Marianne A. Viani
Address: 265 Verano Drive
City: Daly City, CA. 94015
Phone: 650.256.0324
E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Marilyn Miller
Signature

Name: Marilyn Miller

Address: 265 Texano Dr.

City: Daly City, CA 94015

Phone:

E-mail: mmiller 0324 @ gmail. com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: ZON KAU

Address: 20 CRESTVIEW AVE

City: DALY CITY, CA 94015

Phone: (650) 504-3161

E-mail: ZONKAU@aol.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Daphne Chu
Address: 20 Crestview Ave
City: Daly City, CA 94015
Phone: 650-992-1991
E-mail: dchu1972@gmail.com

Name: JERRY SPOONER

Address: 275 ESTELLE LN. DALY CITY, CA. 94014

Phone: 650-755-7943

E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jerry Spooner". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "J".

Name: HEATHER SPOONER

Address: 275 ESTELLE LN. DALY CITY, CA. 94014

Phone: 650-755-7943

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Heather Spooner

Name: ASHLEY SPOONER
Address: 275 ESTELLE LN. DALY CITY, CA. 94014
Phone: 650-755-7943
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Ashley Spooner

Name: JULIE SPOONER

Address: 275 ESTELLE LN. DALY CITY, CA. 94014

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Julie Spooner

Name: Scott Gillette
Address: 290 Olympian I, Daly City
Phone: 650-738-1338
E-mail: scott@sgillette.com

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Scott Gillette

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: Sean Halter
Address: 395 Imperial way Apt. 234
City: Daly City
Phone: (925) 470-6779
E-mail: austinhalter@pacbell.net

Name: Sylvia Hackett

Address: 1831 Sweetwood Drive DALY CITY, CA 94015

Phone: 650-991-1078

E-mail: mhackett06@aol.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Sylvia Hackett

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: LINDA K GOWND

Address: 6717 MISSION ST

City: DALY CITY CA 94014

Phone: 650 756-1000

E-mail:

Name: *BILL WILLIAMS*

Address: *299 POLARIS Way DALY CITY 94014*

Phone: *415 584-0475*

E-mail: *_____*

February *4* 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x *Bill Williams*

Name: Flor Medina
Address: 1220 Edgeworth Ave. #303 Daly City, CA. 94015
Phone: (650) 898-4941
E-mail: FlorMedina5@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Flor Medina

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Manfred Lee
Address: 951 Bradley Dr
City: Daly City CA 94015
Phone: 415-652-8192
E-mail: thecmlee@aol.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: James Curry
Address: 871 S. Mayfair Ave
City: Daly City, CA 94015
Phone: 510-601-9191
E-mail: James51863@yahoo.com

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Jim Kohmann

Address:

City: 60 Cliffside, Daly City, CA

Phone: 650 257 1906

E-mail: Jim.Kohmann@SFGov.org

February 9, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Rick Orellana
Signature

Name: Rick Orellana
Address: 174 N. Mayfair Ave
City: Daly City
Phone: (650) 576-7314
E-mail: Rickster@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Kevin Kohmann

Address: 60 Cliffside Drive

City: Daly, City

Phone: (650) 433-0750

E-mail:

kevin.kohmann@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Valerie McGrew
Signature

Name: Valerie McGrew
Address: 58 Dorchester Dr
City: Daly City
Phone: 650-991-3129
E-mail: vtmcgrew@comcast.net

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name: *Charles Rinaldi*
Address: *46 Westpark Dr.*
City: *Daly City, CA 94015*
Phone: *650-219-5923*
E-mail: *yawel/chas@yahoo.com*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:48:25 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkPacifica4.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 24 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:48 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Pacifica residents (#4) / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 24 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from Pacifica residents. This is the fourth of 4 Pacifica installments. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: Martin Genato

Address: 1032 Cresp Dr., Pacifica CA 94044

Phone: 650 438 9002

E-mail: Martingenato@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: JUDY GILBRIDE

Address: 1344 Adobe Dr #4 PACIFICA 94044

Phone: 650-738-0230

E-mail: None

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

Name: Elizabeth McCann
Address: 120 LORRY Lane, Pacifica
Phone: 650 290-1609
E-mail: irish3trip@yahoo.com
February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Elizabeth McCann

Name: *Chris Coole*
Address: *1233 Sheila Lane*
Phone: *Pacifica Ca 94044*
E-mail: ~~*ChrisCoole*~~ *Chrisk@Coole*

February ⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X *Chris Coole*

Name: Matt Baumann
Address: 5007 Palmetto #37, PACIFICA
Phone: 415 244 4009
E-mail: Baumann_matt@outlook.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Joe Browne
Signature

Name: JOE BROWNE
Address: 324 AVALON ST
City: PACIFIC
Phone: 650 290 0492
E-mail: JOEBROWNE@GMAIL.COM

Name: Jeff Smith

Address: 207 Montesev Rd. Pacifica, CA 94064

Phone: 415-254-5908

E-mail: jeffkiesel@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X  2-4-17

Name: *Ilsa Gramer*
Address: *468 Manor Dr., Apt B2*
Pacific CA 94144
Phone: *6208-406-9181*
E-mail: *gramerster@gmail.com*
February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Nick Fortner

Address: 320 Avalon Dr Pacifica Ca 94044

Phone: 650 219 9076

E-mail: _____

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Nick Fortner

February 9, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Mary Steinkamp
Signature

Name: Mary STEINKAMP
Address: 640-C Crespi Dr
City: PAC CA 94044
Phone: 650 291-0419
E-mail: MSTEINKAMP5319@gmail.com

February 7, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Anthony Hall

Address: 185 Verona Ave.
City: Pacifica

Phone: N/A

E-mail: hallfran85@gmail.com

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: MATT STRACHAN
Address: 2562 FRANCISCO BLVD NPT E.
City: PACIFICA, 94044
Phone: 415 601 6973
E-mail:

Name: John Savaglia
Address: 1180 Barcelona Dr, Pacific

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Jorge Rodriguez

Address: 1180 Barcelona dr, Pacifica

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Kevin Gilbride
Address: 1344 Adobe Dr #4 PACIFICA 94044
Phone: 650-826-0786
E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Reiner Binsfeld
Address: 1523 Rosita dr, Pacifica
Phone: 650-359-5521
E-mail: Reinerbinsfeld@sbcglobal.net
February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Reiner Binsfeld

Name: *BERNADETTE CHURSIAN*
Address: *1350 FLORES Dr., Pacifica*
Phone: *650-355-5138*
E-mail: *Schoolmon@comcast.net*

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Bernadette M. Chursian*

Name: Joseph Lopez
Address: 1340 Crespi, Pacifica
Phone: 415 725 3987
E-mail: J Lopez @ pacific carpentry . com

February 5 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph Lopez". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

1/5/2017

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: RON HANSEN
Address: 306 Reichling Av
City: Pacifica Ca 94079

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: *Karen Larroche*

Address: *239 Arroyo Dr*

City: *Pacifica*

Phone: *650 355 2637*

E-mail: *beadingal42763@yahoo.com*

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Wendy Downing
Signature

Name: WENDY DOWNING
Address: 957 FASSLER AVE
City: PACIFICA, CA 94024

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Lesli Owen
Signature

Name: Lesli Owen
Address: 623B Hickory Blvd.
City: Pacific CA 94044
Phone: 650 451 - 8258
E-mail: lesliowen@comcast.net

February 6 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: William Hartig

Address: 899 Standish Ct

City: Pacifica, Ca. 94044

Phone: (650) 270-4191

E-mail: WHartig@gmail.com

February 6, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Cheryl L Smith
Signature

Name: Cheryl L Smith
Address: 899 Standish Ct
City: Pacifica CA 94044
Phone: 650 270-5436
E-mail: _____

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 2
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:49:56 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkPacifica3.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:46 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Pacifica residents (#3) / BofS hearing Feb. 2

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 25 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from Pacifica residents. This is the third of 4 Pacifica installments. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: *GINO GONZALES*

Address: *5015 PALMETTO AVE #6 PACIFICA, CA 94044*

Phone: *650-994-8875*

E-mail: *GONZO PACIFICA@GMAIL.COM*

February⁴, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:



Name: *Brian Vesting*

Address: *14 Spring St., Pacifica*

Phone: *650-388-1000*

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: George Fox

Address: 1159 Mason Drive Pacifica, Ca 94044

Phone: 415-794-2302

E-mail: harleyfox2@comcast.net

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "George Fox". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "G" and a long, horizontal stroke for the "y" in "Fox".

Name: Laurie Fox

Address: 1159 Mason Drive Pacifica, Ca 94044

Phone: 415-794-2302

E-mail: harleyfox2@comcast.net

February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Laurie Fox". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed text of the letter.

Name: GRANT EWALD
Address: 1161 FASSLER AVE
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone: 650 455 8059
E-mail: BALDEWALD@aol.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

This golf course is a gem and utilized by thousands of people each year with wildlife co existing on the grounds.

Grant Ewald
Feb 3, 2017
7313

Name: JEFF MCGORD
Address: 205 FOREST PARK DR.
PACIFICA, 94044
Phone: 650-755-4636
E-mail: jeff.mcc670@gmail.com

February 1, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jeff McGord". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "J".

Name:
Address:

Phone:
E-mail:

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x *Ron Saisi*

RON SAISI
1131 CRESPI DR.
PACIFICA, CA. 94044

Name: MARIA P ANDERSON
Address: 1100 ODDSTAD BLVD
PACIFICA CA 94044
Phone: 650-359-3916
E-mail: JMITSAWRAP@GMAIL.COM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


Sharp Park Final

Name: Paul Jaques
Address: 1154 Gabez Pr.
Pacifica, Ca.
Phone: 1-650-759-0520
E-mail: Paul Jaques 5 @ F Cloud.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: JOSE D. ANTONIO, JR.
Address: 696 FOOTHILL DR
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone: 650-359-9327
E-mail: ectb3jda@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Patton Lee
Address: 1123 Valencia Way, Pacifica
Phone: 650 359-7084
E-mail: dailyhacker@sbcglobal.net

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Patton Lee

Name: Nick Fortier

Address: 320 Avalon Drive, Pacifica, CA

Phone: 650 219 9070

E-mail: Jayden82910@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Nick Fortier

Name: *Dwight M Laroche Sr.*
Address: *1490 Flores Dr. Pacific CA 94044*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Dwight M Laroche*

Name: Debbie Larrache

Address: 1490 Flores Dr. Folsom CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: BOUCE MAROTTO

Address: 1147 Mason Dr. Pacific CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Bouce Marotto

Name: Michelle Marotto

Address: 1147 Mason Dr. Palmdale CA 93504

Phone:

E-mail:

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Michelle Marotto

Name: DANIELL FLETCHER

Address: 320 AVALON DRIVE, PACIFICA CA 94044

Phone: 650 745 5503

E-mail: DANIELL - FLETCHER@YAHOO.COM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: JOHN DEGUNTO

Address: 1520 ADOBE DR PACIFICA CA 94044

Phone: 650-201-4920

E-mail: JOHNNYD6712@GMAIL.COM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Lisa Cotter
Address: 1520 Adobe Dr.
Pac, Ca 94044
Phone: 650-359-2956
E-mail: LisaCotter1520@gmail.com.

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Lisa Cotter

Name: *CHRISTINA MITHALAS*
Address: *1220 Peralta Road, PACIFICA*
Phone: *415 793 9261*
E-mail:

February 21, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you

By: 

Name: Ray Ford
Address: 423 Belfast Pacifica 94044
Phone: 650-307-0831
E-mail: _____

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Ray Ford

Name: Marco Genato

Address: 30 Spruce Ct. Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Daniel Pitt

Address: 1032 Cresp; DR Pacifica Ca 94044

Phone: 650 580 5415

E-mail: DanielPitt23@gmail.com

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: *Jennifer Lenato*
Address: *30 Spruce Ct.*
Pacifica, CA 94044
Phone: *650-922-9402*
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Jennifer Lenato*

Name: Catherine Griffiths

Address: 490 Moana Way, Pacifica, CA, 94044

Phone: 650 784 1595

E-mail: cgriffiths0711@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:51:31 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkPacifica2.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:42 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / from Pacifica residents (#2) / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 25 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from Pacifica residents. This is the second of 4 Pacifica installments. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Name: *Elen Sievert*
Address: *283 Charing Cross Way*
Pacifica, Ca. 94044
Phone: *650-355-9237*
E-mail: *glsievert@yahoo.com*

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: MANUEL ROBERTO
Address: 251 MARINA WAY
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone:
E-mail: FANDS@YAHOO.COM
February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

 2-3-17

Name: MARK DUANE
Address: 315 OLYMPIAN WAY DUBLIN CA 94568
Phone: 415 559-2627
E-mail:

February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



2/3/17

Name: DIRK BERGMAN
Address: 702 CARMEL AVE
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone:
E-mail: DBNB@ICLOUD.COM

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. /

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dirk Bergman". The signature is written over a horizontal line and extends across most of the width of the page.

Name: Bob Downing
Address: 675 Rockaway Beach Ave
Phone: 650-898-8227
E-mail: bobd@matagrano.com
February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: DWAYNE M. LARROCHE JR
Address: 239 ARROYO DE PACIFICA CA 94044
Phone: 650 438 9380
E-mail: WENKMAN 62 @ YAHOO.COM

February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *PETER M. CHURSIM*

Address: *1350 FLORES DR. PACIFICA CA*

Phone: *415-813-8696*

E-mail: *pchursin@sfjafc.com*

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: *Kevin A Currier*
Address: *1585 Adobe Dr, Pacifica*
Phone: *650 296 2703*
E-mail: *QCURRIER01@gmail.com*

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Paul F. Curley Jr.
Address: 1585 Adobe Dr, Pacific
Phone: 650-359-6080
E-mail: chefplc@yahoo.com
February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Paul F. Curley Jr.
1585 Adobe Dr.

Name: Kevin Ramsay
Address: 220 Seaside Dr, Pacifica
Phone: 650 243-8291
E-mail: TLEONEON63@YAHOO.COM

February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kevin Ramsay', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Name: RICK LECHLEITNER
Address: 396 GENEVIEVE AVE., Pacifica, CA
Phone: (650) 274-7854
E-mail: rick.lechleitner@gmail.com

February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rick Lechleitner", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Name: RICH CHANEY
Address: 19 OVIEDO COURT, PACIFICA 94044
Phone: 650-243-8311
-E-mail: RICH_ALBEE@MSN.COM

February 8, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Richard A. Chaney

Name: ALBERTA M. ACOSTA
Address: 19 QUIEDO COURT
PACIFICA 94044
Phone: 650-303-8045
E-mail: RICH_ABBE@MSN.COM

February 3, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: JOHN D. HALL
Address: 1159 ENCANTO WAY, Pacifica
Phone: 650 355 9230
E-mail: JDHALL14@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

Name: Joe Garubba
Address: 1320 Odessa Blvd
Pacifica, Ca
Phone: (650) 922-7647
E-mail: Joe-J6@SBCGlobal.net

February } 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: NORA BERGMAN
Address: 702 CARMEL AVE.
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone: 415 307-9580
E-mail: ~~NORA.BERGMAN@MADON~~ dbnb@icloud.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: David Dozier
Address: 955 Fessler Ave.
Pacifica, CA 94044
Phone:
E-mail: dmdozier@yahoo.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

David Dozier

Name: ROBERT J MOORE
Address: 142 CALAVERAS AVE
PACIFICA CA 94044
Phone: 650 243 7121
E-mail: N/A

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



3-3-17

Name: RAYMOND J. BECKER
Address: 1326 EVERGLADES DR
Phone: PACIFICA, CA 94044
E-mail: 650-359-6725

February 2 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

RJ Becker
03 FEB 2017

Name: WAYNE BOYKIN
Address: 1560 MADEIRA DR PACIFIC CA 94040
Phone: 650 438 2202
E-mail: boykinreal@sbccolor.net
February 3 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Gayla Applegate
Address: 955 Fessler Ave. Pacific
Phone: 415-254-6594
E-mail: gayla-applegate@yahoo.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: SANDRA CAMACHO
Address: 876 MONTEZUMA DR
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone:
E-mail: Camachosandra@hotmail.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: C. Malcolm Thompson

Address: 750 ODDSTAD BLVD # 301 B

City, Zip: Pacific CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail: MTGOLF16@YAHOO.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Kimba Chiu
Address: 230 Beaumont
City: Pacifica CA 94024
Phone: 415-731-0303
E-mail: Kimbalionwhite@gmail.com

Name: *Charles W. Hartig*
Address: *899 Standish Ct*
Pacific Ca. 94041
Phone: *650 355-0314*
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Charles W. Hartig*

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:53:13 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPkPacifica1.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 24 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:37 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Pacifica residents (installment#1)

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 24 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from Pacifica residents.

This is the first of 4 Pacifica installments. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

Subject: Email in support of Natural Areas Plan and Sharp Park

Date: Tue, 31 Jan 2017 01:00:47 -0500

From: Lisa Villasenor-Volosing <lavillasenor744@aol.com>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a Pacifica resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

My husband Jeff's family has a long history of playing and enjoying Sharp Park Golf Course. When we married 10 years ago I was lucky to be introduced to Sharp Park and appreciate that legacy. I am not an old, white, rich guy golfer! I am not the face that anti-golf rhetoric would have you visualize. I am a 59 year old Hispanic female who loves everything about golf and especially at a muni course like Sharp Park. I appreciate that I can walk into Sharp Park for a round of golf and feel unintimidated, pay reasonable rates, and enjoy a beautiful old course with a wonderful variation of men, women and junior golfers. Please do not let anti-golf activists ruin decades of public access to municipal golf at Sharp Park. We are one of the most affordable, welcoming and historic courses in our geographical area. This gem that belongs to SF County is one that should not only be kept alive, but nurtured and protected for SF and San Mateo County residents for years to come. So many resources have already been invested in the prior approval by Planning and Rec & Park, not to mention the time already spent by SF Board of Supervisors in hearing the SAME OLD ARGUMENTS. This is just a repackaging of old, failed anti-golf arguments. It's time to move forward and allow the users of Sharp Park to show that they/we can take care of the animals and environment that surrounds us at the course. As players and users of it, we are the best ones to guard our gem - we want its beauty and environment to survive! We are motivated to care for it - contrary to the false and misleading rhetoric you have heard in the past, and will hear again, by haters of golf and golf courses.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Lisa Villasenor-Volosing
1019 Zamora Drive
Pacifica, CA 94044

Lisa A. Villasenor-Volosing
Law Offices of Lisa A. Villasenor
Business/Cell: (415) 518-8479
lavillasenor744@aol.com

Subject:Support the Park and Rec Plan
Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 13:41:49 -0500
From:Jvdrills@aol.com
To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
CC:info@sfpUBLICgolf.org

Dear Supervisors,

I have been a second generation Sharp Park golfer for more than twenty years, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan. This plan among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal so we can move forward not backwards.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie.

Since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

Please vote to deny the appeal, and approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jeff Volosing
1019 Zamora Dr.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Subject:Save Sharp Park Golf Course

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 10:39:18 -0800

From:Pete Shoemaker <bentshoe@igc.org>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors,

I am a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

**Sincerely,
Pete Shoemaker**

Subject: Please Vote to Save Sharp Park Golf Course

Date: Mon, 30 Jan 2017 19:30:14 +0000

From: Gerry Tom <Gerry.Tom@synopsys.com>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

CC: info@sfpublicgolf.org <info@sfpublicgolf.org>

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am currently a Pacifica resident, a native San Franciscan born here and attending all my education in San Francisco from Kindergarten through college...attending schools such as Lowell High School, City College of San Francisco, and San Francisco State University, a frequent golfer at Sharp Park Golf Course through all those years and still am today. I'm too am also a lover of nature and the preservation of natural resources. I'm an avid outdoors person who enjoys fly fishing (I'm a member of the Golden Gate Park fly casting ponds), backpacking, camping, and grew up learning to fish locally at Lake Merced and was part of the Friends of Lake Merced preservation effort. Suffice it to say, I love San Francisco and the outdoors.

I'm also a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course. The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

One additional point I'd like to make is you'd be hard pressed to find such a quaint, affordable, and relaxing setting for beginners and youngsters alike to learn the game and the sportsmanship and life lessons golf can offer. And it also has a huge following of seniors who come out daily to meet with friends and enjoy a round during the week. As beautiful as this course is, you won't find many courses like this anywhere in the US with this type of following, stature, and beauty. It's truly a gem, let's work to keep it that way.

Thank you for your service and for considering my request.

Gerry Tom
1040 Zamora Dr
Pacifica, CA 94044

Subject:Sharp Park Golf Course

Date:Tue, 31 Jan 2017 09:46:41 -0800

From:susangrace203@gmail.com

To:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

January 31, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny any and all appeals of this decision.

My family and I have lived in Pacifica since 1986. My children were raised on Sharp Park Golf Course, and I am now taking my grandchildren to Sharp Park Golf Course. It truly is a multi-generational recreational gem in our little town, and deeply beloved by people from all over the Bay Area. It is beyond our understanding why we need to keep writing letters begging for the protection of our golf course.

We hope you will consider the desires and preferences of the people in Pacifica and all across the Bay Area who have patronized the Sharp Park Golf Course for generations. Pacifica is a town that holds the environment in high esteem – we repeatedly vote down high end commercial development to keep our town a beautiful haven by the ocean. We have done a good job in establishing refuge for wetlands, snakes and frogs. There's the wetlands near Rockaway Beach, Mori Point, and the Coastal Conservancy trail as well and now the Devils Slide Trail. Yet, there are outsiders who would try to deny us the golf course that is so rich with history and tradition and which thousands and thousands of people over the years have enjoyed and cherish.

You can see we've done a good job in putting the environment first in Pacifica. Yet one of our most prized recreational outlets, the Sharp Park Golf Course, has come under repeated attack by outsiders. They want to take away our joy and traditions. We respectfully request that you deny the appeal by the environmental group seeking to shut down Sharp Park Golf Course. Can we finally say enough is enough?

Respectfully submitted,

Dan and Susan Macaulay
929 Oddstad Blvd
Pacifica, CA 94044-4447
Tel. [650 359 0444](tel:6503590444)

Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Date: Sun, 29 Jan 2017 17:23:44 -0800

From: bob-jean@sbcglobal.net

To: boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>, info@sfpublicgolf.org <info@sfpublicgolf.org>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors

I have been playing golf at Sharp Golf Course for over 65 years, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister Mackenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Fontes
1138 Barcelona Dr.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Paul Murillo <pmurgolf@yahoo.com>
Date: January 27, 2017 at 8:02:04 PM PST
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Paul Murillo
280 Winwood Ave.
Pacifica, CA

Name: Brian W. Leigh

Address: 1 TIoga Way PACIFICA, CA 94044

Phone: 408-398-5372

E-mail: bwrleigh@skglobal.net

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: David Moore

Address: 1138 Evergreenes drive PACIFICA, CA 94044

Phone: 650 359-6509

E-mail: drmoore4@yahoo.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Vanessa Canas
Address: 1530 Flores Drive Pacifica, CA 94044
Phone: 650-888-1623
E-mail: vanessamcanas@gmail.com

February 3, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: GARY HEISER

Address: 1008 MONTE VERDE DR PACIFICA, CA 94044

Phone: 650-355-2697

E-mail: _____

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Gary Heiser

Name: CLIFFORD SMETHURST

Address: 1210 PARK PACIFICA AVE PACIFICA, CA 94044

Phone: 650 255 0388

E-mail: CLIFFSMETHURST@COMCAST.NET

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.


2/3/17

Name: C. SMETHURST

Address: 248 REICHLING PACIFICA, CA 94044

Phone: 650.303.5985

E-mail: CHUCKSMETHURST@GMAIL.COM

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

C. ~~SMETHURST~~
2/3/17

Name: Kevin Blume

Address: 1057 Rainier Ave, Pacifica CA. 94044

Phone: 680-359-5270

E-mail: KBlume10@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Duke Yong Yoo
Address: 660 Heather Ct Pacifica CA 94044
Phone: 650-347-7470
E-mail: dukyongyoo@hotmail.com
February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: *LEE BYRD*
Address: *928 LINCOLN PLACE*
PACIFICA, CA 94044
Phone: *650-922-9955*
E-mail: *JENSEI-FHACOP@ATT.NET*
February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Herb Hornsball
Address: 1545 Crespi Dr
Phone: Pacifica CA 94044
E-mail:

February , 2017 3rd.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Dave Larroche

Address: 1490 Flores Dr. Pacific CA 94044

Phone:

E-mail:

February 3, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Larroche". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Name: MIKE GILBRIDE
Address: 1344 Adobe Dr #4
Pacifica, Ca. 94044
Phone: 650-784-1718
E-mail: Flydagreen@aol.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Gilbride". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Name: *John Mendelsohn*

Address: *1321 Rosita Rd - PACIFICA CA. 94044*

Phone: *415-515-2122*

E-mail: *John.Mendelsohn*

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you -



Name: Anthony Marotto Sr
Address: 5 Elm Ct - Pacifica, Ca 94044
Phone: 650-296-3258
E-mail: TMarotto@yahoo.com

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Deborah Downing
Address: 625 Rockaway Beach Ave
Phone: 450-898-8227
E-mail: _____

February 2, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: Rich Bondarod

Address: 1147 Valencia Way, Pacific, CA

Phone:

E-mail:

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rich Bondarod", written in a cursive style. The signature is positioned below the text "Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision." and extends across most of the width of the page.

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:55:16 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94158.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94134.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94133.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94132.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 4 pdfs containing a total of 25 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:32 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Zips 94132, 94133, 94134, 94158 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94132, 94133, 94134, and 94158. There are a total of 25 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94132 (17)

Mike Yeh

Michael Mason

Diana Mason

Patrick Montemayor

Xavier Margado

Vadim Kitsis

Mary Graham

Virginia Stefanelli

Joe DeLucchi

Carlton B. Gearhart

Constance Benas

Marshall Benas

Susan J. Leurey

Douglas N. Leurey

Karen Lee

Berry Anderson

Kazuyo Kato

94133 (4)

Carla Webster

Andy Corves

Robert Webster

Matt Scharf

94134 (1)

John La

94158 (3)

Nelson Wong

Douglas Ludolph

Aric Kushiya

From: Michael Yeh <mikeyehsf@icloud.com>
Date: February 2, 2017 at 10:57:33 PM PST
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

As a long time resident (48 plus years) of San Francisco, I urge the Board to support the recommendation of continuing operation of Sharp Park with minor changes. Hopefully, this will be the end of this matter. All the years I played at Sharp, I have not seen a single snake or frog. Maybe they only come out after dark.

Mike Yeh
1450 Sloat Blvd
San Francisco

94132

From: mdmason@mindspring.com [mailto:mdmason@mindspring.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 2:58 PM

To: Norman Yee, Supervisor, District 7

Subject: Sharp Park and the Natural Areas Plan

Dear Supervisor Yee:

As District 7 residents for the past 40 years, and golfers at Sharp Park for the past 37 years, we support the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan which reconfirms the Department's commitment to keep the 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course open while improving the habitat in the wetlands for frogs and snakes.

The Planning and the Rec & Park Commissions jointly approved the Natural Areas Plan at their December 15 meeting. Again, anti-golf groups continue to try to close the golf course and are going to appeal the Commissions' decisions to the Board of Supervisors.

Beautiful Sharp Park, which was designed by Alister MacKenzie in 1929, is an historical golf course in the Bay Area and has been played by golfers of many ages for multiple generations of families.

Please provide your support to keep Sharp Park open for future generations. We ask that you do not allow the anti-golf groups to cause any further delay in obstructing the City's plans to improve the habitat while keeping the golf course open. The anti-golf groups' arguments have been rejected not only by Rec & Park and Planning Departments, but also by the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Coastal Commission, and state and federal courts in San Francisco and San Mateo county.

May we ask for your vote to deny the appeal and to approve the Natural Areas Plan.

Thank you

Michael and Diana Mason
333 Stratford Drive
San Francisco, CA 94132

February 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: PATRICK MONTMAYOR

Address: 3050 19th Ave.
City: SF CA 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: Xavier Morgado

Address: 310 Arballo Dr. Apt 1e, SF 94132

Phone: (415) 542-8195

E-mail: x.morgado@hotmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Vadim Kitsis
Address: 111 Clearfield Dr.
City: San Francisco CA. 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: MARY GRAHAM

Address: 750 GONZALEZ #6K, SF 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Mary E. Graham

Name: VIRGINIA STEFANELLI
Address: 2960-22ND AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA.
Phone: 1-415-731-0766 94132
E-mail: —

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Virginia Stefanelli

Name:

JOE DELUCCHI

Address:

3080 25th Ave. SF 94132

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:



Name: Carlton B Geanhart

Address: 750 Gonzalez Dr., ~~San~~ 94132
SAN FRANCISCO

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Carlton B Geanhart

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: *CONSTANCE BENTS*
Address: *100 SOLAKE MERCED HILL*
City: *S.F. 94132*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: M. A. B. B. B.
Signature

Name: M. A. B. B. B.
Address: 100 Lake Merritt
City: S.F. Calif 94132
Phone: (415) 885-5114
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: SUSAN J. LEUREY
Address: 180 CLEARFIELD DRIVE
City: SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94132
Phone: 415-936-4338
E-mail: SLEUREY@OUTLOOK.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Douglas N. Leurey
Signature

Name: Douglas N. Leurey
Address: 180 Clearfield Dr.
City: S.F. 94132
Phone: (415) 481-5739
E-mail: dleureye@hotmail.com

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Karen Lee
Address: 60 Elmhurst Dr
City: SF, CA 94132
Phone:
E-mail: karenlee199buva@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: BETTY ANDERSON
Address: 535 GONZALEZ DR
City: SF, CA 94132
Phone: 415-469-7471
E-mail: BSA911@a@sbcglobal.net

Name: Kazuyo KATO

Address: 4220 Cesar Chavez St, SF 94132

Phone: (650) 266-0079

E-mail: kellywolf@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Kazuyo Kato

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Carla Webster
Signature

Name: CARLA WEBSTER
Address: 1085 GREENWICH ST
City: S.F. CA 94133

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: ANDY CORWES
Address: 2140 TAYLOR ST #304, SF 94133
Phone: (415) 629-1371
E-mail: ANDYCORWES34@icloud.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Robert C. Webster
Signature

Name: Robert Webster
Address: 1085 Greenwich
City: S.F. 94133
Phone: 415-885-6097
E-mail: RobertCWebster@gmail.com

Name: *Matt Scharf*

Address: *340 Concord St. SF, CA 94133*

Phone: *206-718-5894*

E-mail: *mattscharf@hotmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: John La
Address: 535 Bowdoin St
City: San Francisco 94134
Phone: (415) 837-8045
E-mail: johala228@yahoo.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Nelson Wong
Address: 738 Long Bridge St. #811
City: San Francisco, CA 94158

Phone:

E-mail: spreen219@yahoo.com

Name: Doug Ludowick
Address: 185 CHANNEL ST. #659
SF, CA 94158
Phone: 415.308.9995
E-mail: DLUDOWI@COMCAST.NET

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Aric KUSHYAMA
Address: 718 Long Bridge, SF 94158
Phone: aric.kush@hotmail.com
E-mail: (707) 449-2400.

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:57:53 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94131.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 28 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:28 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Zip 94131 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 28 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94131. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94131 (28)
Vicki Perez

**Thomas Dittmann
Jay Johnston
Julie Gonzalez
Daniel S. Carlin
Berry Moss
John Solomon
David Witten
Eugene Barsotti
Patricia Barsotti
Louis Chan
Christine Hansson
Glen Wolf
Roger Mantz
Won Jae Lee
William Foley
June Drake
Chris Matthews
Mike Larroche
Lori Quan
Nancy Shea
Daniel Shea
Koji Masuda
Hans Hanssen
James Stein
Helen Duffy
Betty Wong
Bernice Musante**

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Vicki Perez
Signature

Name: Vicki Perez
Address: 261-27th St.
City: S.F. CA 94131
Phone: (415) 24-7395
E-mail: vikki.perez@sfglobal.com

From: Thomas Dittmann [mailto:thomas.dittmann@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 12:00 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: richard@sfpublicgolf.org; HPGC Tournament Committee
Subject: Save Sharp Park

Name: Thomas Dittmann
Address: 1491 Sanchez Street, San Francisco, CA 94131

Phone: [408-313-1917](tel:408-313-1917)
E-mail: thomas.dittmann@gmail.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

I am an avid golfer and play Sharp Park several times per year and support local restaurants after my round. If Sharp Park closes I do feel as if local businesses will suffer as well.

Best regards,

Thomas Dittmann

Subject:Save Sharp Park

Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 19:50:27 +0000

From:Johnston, Jay <Jay.Johnston@morganstanley.com>

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

CC:info@sfpublishgolf.org <info@sfpublishgolf.org>

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

**Jay Johnston
385 Day Street
San Francisco, CA 94131**

From: Julie [mailto:julie_g@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 2:45 PM
To: "Board of Supervisors"@sfgov.org; Richard H Harris
Subject: Support of Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a member of the USGA Western Regional Affairs Committee; Pacific Women's Golf Association; Women's Golf Association of Northern California; San Francisco Mayor's Women's Golf Council; Captain of the Half Moon Bay Women's Golf Club; Sharp Park golfer; and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan.

I urge you to deny the appeal of the Natural Areas Plan and support your Recreation and Park Department's plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands. By doing so, you will also be saving the beautiful and historic 18-hole golf course patronized by so many recreational golfers.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Respectfully submitted by,
Julie Gonzalez
155 Whitney Street
San Francisco, CA 94131

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Daniel S. Carlin
Address: ~~2114~~ 130 FLOOD AV
City: S.F. Ca 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Betty Moe
Signature

Name: Betty Moe
Address: 181 Forest Knolls Dr.
City: San Francisco 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: John Solomon
Address: 15 Crestmont Dr San Francisco, CA
94131

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name:

DAVID WITTEN

Address:

45 ORA WAY, SF, CA 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X David Witten

Name: Eugene Danksott

Address: 577 Oak Park Dr. SF 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Patricia Balsotti
Address: 577 Oak Park, SE 94131
Phone: 415 564 9397
E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Patricia Balsotti

Name: LOUIS CHAN
Address: 45 BURNETT AVE, SF 94131
Phone: 415 821 9728
E-mail: LOUIS CHAN SB@ME.COM
February, 2017 4th

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Christine Hansson
Signature

Name: Christine Hansson
Address: 570 Oak Park Dr
City: SF 94131

Phone: 415 823-4570
E-mail: christinehansson@mac.com

Name: Glen Wolf

Address: 4220 Cesar Chavez, SF 94131

Phone: 510 695 4595

E-mail: glenwolf@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: ROBERT MANTZ
Address: 65 ORA WAY #C106 SF 94131
Phone: 415 282-1621
E-mail: RMANTZ@SBCGLOBAL.COM

February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: WON JAE LEE
Address: 6 Mountview ct. San Francisco, CA 94131
Phone: (415) 215-0869
E-mail: wjl1007s@yahoo.com
February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X W. J. Lee

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: William Foley
Address: 4040 26th St
City: SF CA 94131
Phone: 650-796-3371
E-mail: wjfgolf@yrcod.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: June M. Drake

Address: 241 Glenview Dr.

City, Zip: S.F. 94131

Phone: 415-282-5048

E-mail: junedrake@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: CHRIS MATTHEWS
Address: 525 DELLBROOK AVE
City: SE 94131
Phone: 415 810-4697
E-mail: QACCHRIS@GMAIL.COM

Name: MIKE LAROCHE
Address: 636 CONGO ST SF CA ~~94112~~
Phone: 650 438 3444 94131
E-mail: WIPBL@YAHOO.COM

February 3 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By 
Signature

Name: Lori Duan
Address: 43 Cityview Way
City: SF CA 94131
Phone: 510-333-9158
E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Nancy Shea
Signature

Name: NANCY SHEA
Address: 160 Beacon St
City: SF CA 94131
Phone: 415-586-767
E-mail:

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Samuel T. Shear
Signature

Name: Samuel Shear
Address: 100 Beacon St.
City: SF Ca 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

February 6, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: MASUDA, Koji
Address: 177 JOOST AVE SF
City: S.F CA, 94131
Phone: 415-586-1706
E-mail:

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: _____

Signature

Name: HANS HANSSON

Address: 570 Oak Park Dr

City: S.F. CA. 94131

Phone: 415-517-2589

E-mail: HANS@STARBORNE.net.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: _____

Signature

Name:

James Stein

Address:

134 Heurst Ave

City:

San Francisco CA 94131

Phone:

E-mail:

Name: Helen Duffy
Address: 39 Mangels Ave
SF, CA 94131
Phone:

E-mail: hmduffy@comcast.net

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Betty Wong
Address: 39 MANGELS AVE.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94131
Phone: (415) 334-8868
E-mail: ~~Bywong~~ Bywong²@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Bernice Musante
Signature

Name: Bernice Musante
Address: 444 Warren Drive #6
City: San Francisco, CA 94131-1053
Phone: n 415-664-3905
E-mail: bernicemusante@att.net

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:59:37 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94130.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94129.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94127.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 21 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:23 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, Opposing Appeal. Zips 94127, 94129, 94130 / BofS hearing Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94127, and 94129, and 94130. There are a total of 23 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94127 (21)

Douglas C. Morgan

Dennis Ruel

Stuart Etzner

James Sullivan

Jerry Lynn Sullivan

Clark Henry

Marisa B. Orzoni

Dorothy Praeger

Stu Douglas

Paul Walsh

Joanne Mandel

Marianne Armenta

Thomas P. Grey

Inez Marciano

Jonathan Gould

Jason Tognetti

Steve Anderson

Richard J. Kenny

James Chen

Nina Hagiwara

John Major

94129 (1)

Gyorgy Ordody

94130 (1)

Donald McGee

From: Doug Morgan [<mailto:Doug@CyberMorgans.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 5:14 PM
To: Norman.Yee@sfgov.org
Cc: rharrisjr1@gmail.com; yywong88@aol.com
Subject: RE: Save Sharp Park / Can you write e-mail to your Supervisor, Norman Yee ?

Dear Supervisor Yee,

I have been a homeowner in the District 7 area of San Francisco for nearly 40 years. I am an avid golfer and strong proponent of continued recreational use of San Francisco's established open spaces whether it be for hiking, walking with dogs, or other traditional uses. While I was dismayed with the increasing restrictions imposed by "Natural Areas Plan (NAP)", I do support many of its intentions and provisions, including maintaining the use of historic Sharp Park as one of San Francisco's few accessible and affordable golf venues. It is where I relearned the game of golf in the 1980's and still enjoy this tribute to Allister McKenzie's unique architectural skills.

I now understand that despite the adoption of the NAP, the same anti-golf groups that have been badgering the Board of Supervisors and others for many years to close or severely limit access to Sharp Park are still pursuing their ill-advised agenda. In the past several years, I have personally attended several of their presentations to the Board. In a word, these presentations have been largely bogus and without consideration of being harmful to those who enjoy the game of golf at Sharp Park. Despite continued rejections of their arguments by many ecologically committed agencies, they just keep on pushing.

In the past, you have supported maintaining Sharp Park for its value to the people of San Francisco. With your recent reelection, I hope that we residents of District 7 can continue to count on your strong support for our golf course. Anything less would be a great disappointment to a great many of your constituents. Thank you for your consideration and Happy New Year to you and your family.

Sincerely,

Douglas C. Morgan
75 Maywood Drive
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: denpr@aol.com [mailto:denpr@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; richard@sfpublishing.org.
Subject: Sharp Park

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

The frogs and snakes need help from people who know a lot more about environmental statistics than I do; but I do have a clear perception that all such creatures are an important element in the natural community of living things, and that I always come away from a morning at Sharp with an almost ecstatic appreciation for the few hours of direct communing with these sadly shrinking but still vital islands of harmony and sanity.

Golf and golfers are easy prey for ridicule, but so is Yoga and other pursuits of peaceful coexistence with this planet and other human beings. Golf courses are natural peace pockets, and their intrusion into the natural order of things is always outweighed by the benefits to the preservation of scenic harmony and mental health.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Dennis Ruel
236 West Portal Ave SF. Ca 94127

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: Stuart Eizer

Address: 509 Ulloa St

City: SF 94127

Phone: 415-319-8503

E-mail: stuetzler@gmail.com

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: JAMES SULLIVAN

Address: 185 DORCHESTER WAY

City: SF 94127

Phone: 415-661-7930

E-mail: B10JAGBY@SBC6UBAC.NET

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: JERRY LYNN SULLIVAN
Address: 185 DORCHESTER WAY
City: SF 94127

Phone: 415-661-7330

E-mail: BJA684@SBC6WBA.CA.NE.T

Name: CLARK HENRY

Address: 62 Rosewood Dr 58 94127

Phone: 415 337 8233

E-mail: Clark@0302.sll.net

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: MARISA B ORZONI

Address: 62 ROSEWOOD DR SE 94127

Phone: 415-606-4161

E-mail: NONNIE.MARISA1@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Mauree Boyzen

Name: DOROTHY PRAEGER

Address: 59 SAN BENITO WAY, SF 94127

Phone: 415-564-3970

E-mail: dpraeger@earthlink.net

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Dorothy C.P. Praeger

Name: *Stu Douglas*
Address: *743 Foerster St SF 94127*
Phone: *443 4720223*
E-mail: *stuartdouglas@gmail.com*

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: PAUL WALSH

Address: 236 WEST POETAL AVE SAN FRANCISCO 94127

Phone: 650-219-6896

E-mail: COACHTOAD@AOL.COM

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Paul Walsh

Name: Joanne Mandel
Address: 12 MARNE AVE, SF 94127
Phone: 415 - 663 - 7329
E-mail: jmandel6@aol.com
February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Joanne Mandel

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Marianne Armenta*
Address: *51 Brentwood Dr.*
City, Zip: *San Francisco, CA 94127*
Phone: *415-309-0703*
E-mail: *marianna.armenta@gmail.com*

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Thomas P. Grey
Address: 34 Wawona St.
City: San Francisco, CA - 94127
Phone: (510) 393-1928
E-mail: thomasgrey@juno.com

Name: INEZ MARCIANO
Address: 86 SAN ANDREAS WAY SF 94127
Phone: 415- ---
E-mail: - - -

February 6, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X Inez Marciano

Name: Jonathan Gould

Address: 170 El Verano Way SF, CA 94127

Phone: 415-846-3443

E-mail: gouldjg@gmail.com

February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Jason Tognetti
Address: 17 Hernandez Ave
City: SF, CA 94127
Phone: 415-568-3606
E-mail: jtognetti@sfdsl.net

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name: *Steve Anderson*
Address: *236 West Point St #162*
City: *SF CA 94127*
Phone: *415 564.9330*
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Richard J Kenny
Address: 40 Santa Paula Ave
City: San Francisco, CA 94127
Phone: 408-807-8032
E-mail: rkenny @ stapleton-spence.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: James Chen
Address: 400 Melrose Ave.
City: San Francisco, CA 94127
Phone: 510-364-5009
E-mail: chunkydentist@gmail.com

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Nina Hagiwara
Signature

Name: Nina Hagiwara
Address: 330 W. Portal Ave
City: SF CA 94127

Phone:

E-mail: nina dot 4 @ yahoo.com

Richard Harris

From: Jack Major <jemajor@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2017 10:41 AM
To: norman.yee@sfgov.org
Cc: Richard Harris
Subject: Retain Sharp Park Golf Course - Case No. 2005.0912E

Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisor Yee,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you for your efforts to Save Sharp Park,

John Major
109 Idora Ave
San Francisco CA 94127
415-566-2243

Name: GEORGE ORDOY
Address: 1525 STICHELL RD, SF 94129
Phone: 415 617 1323
E-mail: gordo@ymail.com

February of 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name:
Address:

Donald McGEE
1437-B Alameda Ct

Phone:
E-mail:

SF. Cal 94130

February 3, 2017

415-730-4575


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BofS Hearing, Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:01:11 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94124.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94123.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 10 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:15 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal, Zips 94123, 94124 / BofS Hearing, Feb. 28

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94123 and 94124. There are a total of 10 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94123 (6)
Mike Walsh
Michael Christian
Andrew Kreitzer
Rick Santore
Jeff Chang
Brian Fader

94124 (4)
Marquez L. Jones
Dina Austin
Reyhan Griffin
Joanne Kluck

From: Mike Walsh [mailto:mihol33@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 12:41 PM
To: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: richard@sfpublishgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course

Name: Mike Walsh
Address: 1592 Union Street #86
San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: [415-823-1056](tel:415-823-1056)
E-mail: mihol33@gmail.com

February 3, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Sharp Park is great course and needs to be kept available for Bay Area golfers.

It is also one of the courses where I recorded a "hole in one", so, it has special sentimental value to me.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

--
Mike

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:



Signature

Name: MICHAEL CHRISTIAN

Address: 4 HARRIS PLACE

City: SF CA 94123

Phone: 415 931-4586

E-mail: mchristian3@yahoo.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Andrew Kreitzer

Address: 1626 Chestnut St., San Francisco

City: San Francisco 94123

Phone:

E-mail: Andrew.Kreitzer@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: Rick Santore

Address: 2151 North Point St.

City: SF 94123

Phone:

E-mail: Richard.Santore@gmail.com

Name: Jeff Chang

Address: 3636 Boudinck St SF CA 94123

Phone:

E-mail:

February 7, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Brian Fader

Address: 1937 Greenwich ST
San Francisco, CA 94123

Phone: 707-332-4118

E-mail: fadelocage@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017


Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Fader', written over a horizontal line.

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: MARQUEZ L. JONES

Address: 6276 3RD STREET

City: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF 94124

Phone: (415) 672-7274

E-mail: marquezjones@gmail.com

Name: Dina Austin
Address: 2076 Conoll Avenue, SF 94124
Phone: (415) 652-2331
E-mail: Dinalish@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Dina Austin

Name: Reyhan Griffin

Address: 1442 Palou Avenue SF, CA 94124

Phone: (415) -632-2411

E-mail: regniffina@hotmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:



February^S, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Joanne
Address: KLUCK
City: SF 94124
Phone: 51 Topetka SF 94124
E-mail: 4KLUCK@gmail.com

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:05:44 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94122.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94121.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs [Note: the covering 3-mail, below, incorrectly states there were 3] containing a total of 27 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:09 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal, Zips 94121, 94122

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 3 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94121 and 94122. There are a total of 27 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94121 (15)

Grant Ingram

John Bird

Damon Hope

Mark O'Brien

Cat Mallon

Matt Mallon

Rob Fewer

Paul Harvey

Charles Thompson

Anthony Belway

Sandra Santos

Paul Merino

Elaine Choy

James Bruce

Richard Phillips

94122 (12)

Bo Links

James Millar

Rosemary Comisky Culiver

Arden Chan

Paul Signorelli

Gloria Pizzinelli

Khoi Nfuywn

Larry Lee

Lynn Lee

Lisa Buster

Stephen Smalley

Kathy Gallagher

Subject:Sharp Park
Date:Sat, 28 Jan 2017 01:25:37 +0000 (UTC)
From:Grant Ingram <grant.ingram@yahoo.com>
Reply-To:Grant Ingram <grant.ingram@yahoo.com>
To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
CC:Sfpublicgolf Info <info@sfpublishgolf.org>

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the **Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan**, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been **trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board.** Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a **15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods.** Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the **City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course.** Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park **Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands; while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.**

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Grant Ingram
106 Point Lobos Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94121

From: John Bird [mailto:jjbirdiii@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2017 10:04 AM

To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Cc: richard@sfpublishing.org

Subject: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR Case No.005.0912E Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Name: John J Bird III

Address: 565 18th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94121

Phone: [415-221-3065](tel:415-221-3065)

E-mail: jjbirdiii@gmail.com

February 5th, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall, Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA. 94104

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. It is true gem of a public course and one that is accessible to all. This is a fair and good compromise.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Sincerely,
John Bird

Name:Damon Hope
Address: 6743 California St., SF , CA. 94121
Phone:510-682-3786
E-mail: damonhope@hotmail.com

February 3rd , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final
EIR

Case No. 2005.0912E

Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final
EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which
includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while
maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,
Damon Hope

You are receiving this message because you are a member of Harding Park Golf Club and a subscriber to email notifications. To unsubscribe, please click on the URL in the following line: <http://www.golffusion.com/hardingparkgolf/lm.php/u/2558155> This message was sent to: damonhope@hotmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: MARK O'BRIEN
Address: 2546 LAKE ST.
City: SF, CA 94121
Phone: 949 683-8428
E-mail: markobrien@me.com

Name: Cat Mallon
Address: 742 43rd Ave
SF Ca 94121
Phone:
E-mail: matcat412@msn.com

February 7, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping, sweeping lines that form a stylized, elongated shape.

Name: *MATT MALLON*

Address: *742 43rd Ave, SF. 94121*

Phone:

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Name: ROB FEWER
Address: 731-41st S.F. CA 94121
Phone: (415) 559-0710
E-mail:

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: PAUL HARVEY

Address: 772 22ND AVE

City: SF 94121

Phone: —

E-mail: PIPE-HARVEY@GMAIL.COM

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Charles Thompson
Address: 211 19th Ave
City: SF / CA 94121
Phone: 415 - 221-6074
E-mail: c.thompson@twsglaw.com

Name: Anthony Belway
Address: 631-35th Ave SF CA 94121
Phone: 415 386 5407
E-mail: apbelway@pacbell.net

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

Name: Sandra Santos

Address: 731 41st Ave SF CA 94121

Phone:

E-mail: ssantos@smuhsd.org

February 4 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x Sandra Santos

Name: PAUL MERINO
Address: 561 41ST AVENUE #1 SF, CA 94121
Phone: 415 265 7319
E-mail: paulivino@gmail.com
February , 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x 

Name: **ELAINE CHOY**

Address: **1985 LAKE ST, SF CA 94121**

Phone: **415 468-2832**

E-mail: **ELAINECH8@YAHOO.COM**

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By:  _____

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name:

JAMES BOWIE

Address:

78 22ND AVE

City:

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121

Phone:

E-mail:

jim.the.miner@gmail.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name: RICHARD PHILLIPS

Address: 454 34TH AVE

City: SF, CA 94121

Phone:

E-mail: RICK.PHILLIPS3909@6MAIL.COM

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / Bos File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:07:44 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94118.pdf](#)
[LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94117.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above are 2 pdfs containing a total of 18 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpublicgolf.org]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 4:04 PM

To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'

Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'

Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Zips 94117 and 94118

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above are 2 pdf's containing signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, and opposing the Appeal, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip codes 94117 and 94118. There are a total of 18 letters attached to this e-mail. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94117 (9)
Kay Cockerill
Maureen Reardon
Gage Davis
Tosca Giorgi
Alston Laughlin
David Opel
Marissa Gonzales
Sam Halse
Martin Goodman

94118 (9)
Stephen Molinelli
Rocky Unruh
Joshua Plesky
Max Ortiz
Jesse Barker
Margo Sims
Christopher Mendez
Rajkumar Dhasmer
Michael Garza

Stephen Molinelli
353 Tenth Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone: 650-347-3546
E-mail: molinelli@aol.com

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. Residents of San Francisco and the Bay Area simply need access to what is a limited supply of publicly accessible and affordable golf options. And Sharp Park provides such an outlet. There is not a better opportunity to provide such a resource that not only creates revenue and a positive impact on the area than a golf course at Sharp Park.

Sincerely,

Stephen Molinelli

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name:

Rocky Unruh

Address:

720 9th Ave

City:

SF CA 94118

Phone:

E-mail:

Rocky.Unruh@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Joshua Prosky
Address: 345 10TH AVE
City: SF 94118
Phone: 415 963 2172
E-mail: JP21@CORNELL.EDU.

Name: MAX OLTIZ

Address: 111 2nd Ave
SF, CA 94118

Phone: (626) 372-5323

E-mail: meoltiz86@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Love Sharp Park ? Lincoln

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: JESSE BARKER
Address: 676 4th AVENUE
City: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118
Phone: 415 751 6949
E-mail: jessebarker5@yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: M¹³⁰ Sims
Address: 514 11th Ave
City: S. F CA 94118

Phone:

E-mail: UNLIMITEDPRODUCTIONSMS@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: _____

Signature

Name: Christopher Mendez
Address: 3380 Sacramento St
City: San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone:

E-mail: vtmenendez@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Rajkumar Dharmar*
Address: *216 Clement St*
City, Zip: *San Francisco 94118*
Phone: *510 209 0600*
E-mail: *rajkumar.usa@gmail.com*

Feb 8th, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I have been a San Francisco resident since 1989, a Sharp Park golfer since 2001, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board.

Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. My Friends and I have enjoyed the course and consider it a very important asset to The City for its scenic views, convenient location, and, of course it's beautiful layout. The loss of Sharp Park Golf Course would be a significant loss for citizens wishing to enjoy outdoor recreation in our neighborhoods.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Michael Garza,



3701 Sacramento St. #171,

San Francisco, CA 94118

Stephen Molinelli
353 Tenth Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone: 650-347-3546
E-mail: molinelli@aol.com

February 1, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision. Residents of San Francisco and the Bay Area simply need access to what is a limited supply of publicly accessible and affordable golf options. And Sharp Park provides such an outlet. There is not a better opportunity to provide such a resource that not only creates revenue and a positive impact on the area than a golf course at Sharp Park.

Sincerely,

Stephen Molinelli

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Rocky Unruh
Address: 720 9th Ave
City: SF CA 94118
Phone:
E-mail: Rocky.Unruh@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:



Signature

Name:

JOSHUA PROSKY

Address:

345 10TH AVE

City:

SF 94118

Phone:

415 963 2172

E-mail:

JP21@CORNELL.EDU.

Name: MAX OLTZ

Address: 111 2nd Ave
SF, CA 94118

Phone: (626) 372-5323

E-mail: meoltz86@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.



Love Sharp Park ? Lincoln

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 

Signature

Name: JESSE BARKER
Address: 676 4th AVENUE
City: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118
Phone: 415 751 6949
E-mail: jessebarker5@yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: M¹³⁰ Sims

Address: 514 11th Ave

City: S. F. CA 94118

Phone:

E-mail: UNLIMITEDPRODUCTIONSMS@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:


Signature

Name: Christopher Mendez
Address: 3380 Sacramento St
City: San Francisco, CA 94118

Phone:

E-mail: vtmenendez@gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: *Rajkumar Dharmar*
Address: *216 Clement St*
City, Zip: *San Francisco 94118*
Phone: *510 209 0600*
E-mail: *rajkumar.usa@gmail.com*

Feb 8th, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I have been a San Francisco resident since 1989, a Sharp Park golfer since 2001, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board.

Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. My Friends and I have enjoyed the course and consider it a very important asset to The City for its scenic views, convenient location, and, of course it's beautiful layout. The loss of Sharp Park Golf Course would be a significant loss for citizens wishing to enjoy outdoor recreation in our neighborhoods.

Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Michael Garza,



3701 Sacramento St. #171,

San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Richard Harris](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SNRAMP Final EIR Appeal / BoS File 170044 / Letters Opposing Appeal / BoS hearing Feb. 28
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 11:10:22 AM
Attachments: [LettersSupesSupport NAP, SharpPk94116.pdf](#)

Brent Jalipa
Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Attached above is 1 pdf containing a total of 30 public comment letters, which we previously filed with the Clerk of the Board on Feb 10, with copies to the Supervisors and their AA's, and staff personnel in the Planning and Rec Park Departments, as you can see from the covering e-mail, below. We ask that you include this material in the online Legislative File for the Board's upcoming Feb. 28 hearing in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, BoS File 170044. Please advise whether I need to circulate copies to anyone other than your office.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

From: Richard Harris [mailto:richard@sfpUBLICGOLF.ORG]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 3:58 PM
To: 'board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org'; 'london.breed@sfgov.org'; 'sandra.fewer@sfgov.org'; 'mark.farrell@sfgov.org'; 'aaron.peskin@sfgov.org'; 'katy.tang@sfgov.org'; 'jane.kim@sfgov.org'; 'norman.yee@sfgov.org'; 'jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org'; 'hillary.ronen@sfgov.org'; 'malia.cohen@sfgov.org'; 'ahsha.safai@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'conor.johnston@sfgov.org'; 'nick.pagoulatos@sfgov.org'; 'margaux.kelly@sfgov.org'; 'lee.hepner@sfgov.org'; 'ashley.summers@sfgov.org'; 'barbara.lopez@sfgov.org'; 'jen.low@sfgov.org'; 'andres.power@sfgov.org'; 'carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org'; 'yoyo.chan@sfgov.org'; 'cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org'; 'phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org'; 'melinda.hue@sfgov.org'; 'jessica.range@sfgov.org'; 'Bradley, Stacy (REC)'
Subject: SF Public Golf Alliance / Natural Areas Plan Appeal / Letters in Support of NAP and Sharp Park Golf, and Opposing Appeal / Zip 94116

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Board President London Breed, and Members of the Board,

Attached above is 1 pdf containing 30 signed letters to the SF Board of Supervisors in support of the Natural Areas Plan Final EIR and Sharp Park Golf Course, and opposing the Appeal, from the below-listed San Francisco residents from zip code 94116. We ask the Clerk to make these part of the Board's record in the matter, and for Board members to consider them.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Phone: (415) 290-5718

94116 (30)
Weyland Lum

**Julius Yap
Kenneth Christopher
Norma M. Etzler
Greg Fujii
Kevin Cunnane
Declan McKeivitt
Michael Barry
Sang Yuo
Anthony Purcell
Rich Wong
Ryan Hicks
Janus Hong
James Lopez
Matt Monfredini
Jason Lincoln
Ella Mei Lincoln
Tina Walsh
Eugene Thomas
John Buckley
Roger Barreneche
Dan Ake
Timothy P. Hornbecker
Ed Cavagnaro
Tom Ghishan
Hong Kim
Chris Whitmore
Colin Daly
Bernie Schneider
Louis Kolonda**

From: Lum Weyland <lwumdds@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2017 4:12 PM
To: "Norman Yee SF Supervisor"
Subject: Saving Sharp Park Golf Course and Environment

To the Honorable Norman Yee, Supervisor District 7

Dear Supervisor Yee,

I have been a resident of Golden Gate Heights for the almost 34 years. Our group of 12-20 golfers, mostly senior citizens and many in District 7, have been playing golf regularly for more than 20 years at Sharp Park Golf Course enjoying healthy physical, social, mental and good quality of life.

I am contacting you to ask for your support of the Park and Recreation Department's Natural Areas Plan which reconfirms their commitment to retaining the 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course open and improving the habitat for the wetlands for frogs and snakes.

I am very concerned with anti-golf groups continuing efforts to close down Sharp Park Golf Course entirely even though the Natural Areas Plan was approved by both the Planning and the Park and Recreation Commissions at their December 15, 2016 joint meeting. The anti-golf groups who have been trying for years to close Sharp Park plans to appeal (again !!) the Commissions' decisions to the Board of Supervisors. See: SF Examiner, Dec. 16, 2016 - [SF appeal likely following commission approval of Natural Areas Management Plan](#)



SF appeal likely following commission approval of Natural Areas Management ...

A plan to manage a number of natural areas in San Francisco and San Mateo counties was approved by planning and ...

Please help and do not allow these anti-golf groups to continue to waste important Supervisor time by continuing to obstruct the City's plan to continue to improve the wildlife habitat while keeping the golf course open. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years as the record will show, and their arguments have been rejected not only by the Park and Recreation and Planning Departments, but also by the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Coastal Commission and state and federal courts in San

Francisco and San Mateo Counties. This is more than enough evidence to indicate that Sharp Park Golf Course can co-exist within a habitat protecting wildlife.

Sharp Park Golf Course is a affordable-priced healthy exercise venue and enjoyment for thousands of golfers each year. In fact, the Charity Golf Tournament of the Chinatown YMCA is held there annually which is beneficial to the participants as well as the YMCA. The Sharp Park location is close by, easy to reach and fuel saving thus helping to protect the environment for us District 7 golfers.

Please vote to deny the appeal of the anti-golfing groups and approve the Natural Areas Plan and move on.

Thank you for your consideration.

Weyland Lum
64 Rockridge Dr.
San Francisco, CA. 94116

Subject:Natural Area Plan for Sharp Park
Date:Fri, 27 Jan 2017 11:10:59 -0800
From:Mr. Julius Yap <jyap@siprep.org>
To:info@sfpUBLICgolf.org

S.F. Board of Supervisors,

As a golfer, Pacifican, and coach of San Francisco's St. Ignatius College Preparatory's Boys and Girls golf team's I am appealing to you to keep the Natural Area Plan in place for Sharp Park Golf course. The Boys and Girls golfers of S.I. have been allowed to practice, play, and compete at Sharp Park for twenty years at an affordable price. We share the course with Terra Nova High School and several other public schools in the area. For our children and the golfers of San Francisco and Pacifica I ask that you put a stop to the attempts to shut down a golf course that allows red-legged frogs and garter snakes to co-exist with the golfing population with no harm to either. Thank you for considering all of us in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Julius Yap

--

*Mr. Julius Yap
AP US History Teacher
Varsity Girls Golf Coach
Varsity Boys Golf Coach
Kairos Director
St. Ignatius College Preparatory
2001 - 37th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
415-731-7500, ext. 768*

From: Ken Christopher

Sent: Sunday, January 01, 2017 8:59 AM

To: 'Norman.Yee@sfgov.org' <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisor Yee –

You will probably get a lot of these emails as the text was suggested by SF Public Golf Alliance. I agree with them however and while I am using their suggested text, I want you to know some additional things about me. I have voted in every election since I turned 21 and have lived in the Bay area since I came to college at USF in 1967. My paternal Grandparents lived at 80 Liberty Street. My wife and I are living in the house her grandparents owned since 1929. We will not be moving ever again. This issue is a very important one to me as I get ready to retire and go on a fixed income. I will be voting in the future for anyone who leaves Sharp Park as a golf Course. I would like to be able to vote for you.

I am a District 7 resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things reconfirms the Department's commitment to keep the 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course open, while improving habitat in the wetlands for frogs and snakes.

That Natural Areas Plan was approved by both the Planning and the Rec & Park Commissions at their December 15 joint meeting. Now it appears that the same anti-golf groups that have been trying for years to close the golf course, are going to appeal the Commissions' decisions to the Board of Supervisors: SF Examiner, Dec. 16, 2016: <http://www.sfexaminer.com/sf-appeal-likely-following-commission-approval-natural-areas-management-plan/>

Sharp Park is a beautiful place that provides reasonably-priced enjoyment and healthful exercise to thousands of golfers each year. It is convenient to me and other residents of District 7 and the City's southern neighborhoods -- just a 15-minute freeway drive from Stonestown. Please keep it open. Please do not allow these anti-golf groups to delay and obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while keeping the golf course open. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years and years, and their arguments have been rejected not only by Rec & Park and Planning Departments, but also by the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Coastal Commission, and state and federal courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move on. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan.

Kenneth Christopher

1931 18th Avenue San Francisco 94116

February ⁵, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Norma M. Etzler
Signature

Name: NORMA M. ETZLER

Address: 1724 RIVERS ST.

City: S.F CA 94116

Phone: (415) 566-8501

E-mail: NormaEtzler@gmail.com

Name: Grey Fujii

Address: 1422 Taraval St, SF, CA 94116

Phone: 415 345-3542

E-mail: gfujii@gmail.com

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Kevin CUNNANE

Address: 2520-24TH AVE, SF, CA 94116

Phone: (415) 566-3240

E-mail:

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: Kevin Cunnane

Name: DECLAN Mc KEVITT
Address: 2534 28th Ave, SF. 94116
Phone: 415 816 7562
E-mail: andunconstruction1@gmail.com.

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: 

Name: Michael Barry
Address: 2327 37th Ave, SF 94116

Phone: 415 519 1020

E-mail: mike_barry123@yahoo.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Barry". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Name: Sang Yuo
Address: 2083 15th Ave., SF, CA 94116
Phone: 415-255-7337
E-mail:

February 4 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: A. Purrell
Signature

Name: Anthony Purrell
Address: 2151 31st Ave
City: San Francisco, CA 94116
Phone: 415 218 8344
E-mail: Purrell42@msn.com.

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: _____

Signature

Name:

Rich Wong

Address:

1125 Vicente

City:

SF CA 94116

Phone:

415 566-3838

E-mail:

rich888rich@aol.com

February 5 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Ryan Hicks
Address: 1968 Great Hwy Apt. C
City: San Francisco, CA 94116
Phone:
E-mail: rhicks823@gmail.com

Name: James Hong
Address: 2076 14th Ave, SF, CA 94116
Phone: 415-507-5200
E-mail: ~~xxxxxx~~ jxhong@yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X  _____

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: JAMES LOPEZ

Address: 2584 35th AVE

City: S.F. CA 94116

Phone: 925 759-3767

E-mail: STUFFJLBUGHT @ GMAIL.COM

Name: Matt Monfredini

Address: 2207 39th Ave, SF, CA, 94116

Phone: 415-609-0104

E-mail: mattmonfredini@yahoo.com

February 4 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M Monfredini', is written in a cursive style.

Name: JASON LINCOLN

Address: 2151 47th Ave. SF, CA. 94116

Phone: 415-260-7457

E-mail: lincoln.jason@gmail.com

February 14, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X 

Name: Ella Mei Lincoln

Address: 2151 47th ave, SF, CA 94114

Phone: 415-309-9504

E-mail: emei55@gmail.com

February 4, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104


Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

x

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

February 9, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By:



Signature

Name:

Tina Walsh

Address:

3150 Rivera St

City:

S.F. C.A. 94116

Phone:

415 686-1695.

E-mail:

timwalsh26@hotmail.com

Name: *Eugene Thomas*

Address: *2838 TARAVAI ST SF, CA 94116*

Phone: *415-759-1351*

E-mail: *etcobra63@AOL.COM*

February¹, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thank you,

By: *Eugene Thomas*

Name: *J. D. Buckley*

Address:

Phone:

E-mail:

45 ALTON AVE

879416

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

X *J. D. Buckley*

February 5, 2017


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Rogo Barroneche

Address: 2454 14th Ave, SF, CA 94116
City:

Phone: 415-412-1772

E-mail: Bukmaster@AOL.com

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: DAN AILE
Address: 1914 47TH AVE
City: SF. CA 94116
Phone: 415 250 2174
E-mail: DANAILES50@COMCAST.NET

February 5 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Timothy P. Hornbecker
Address: 1724 Vicente St.
City: San Francisco, CA 94116
Phone: (415) 850-8037
E-mail: thornbecker@yahoo.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: ED CAVAGNARO
Address: 190 CASTENKRA
City: SF CA 94116
Phone: 415-828-4015
E-mail: edcav@ gmail.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Tom Ghishan
Signature

Name: Tom Ghishan

Address: 2533 18th AVE

City: San Francisco CA 94116

Phone: 415 235 0716

E-mail: tghishan@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: HONG KIM

Address:
City: 2358 34th Ave, SF 94116

Phone: 415-613-8533

E-mail: HWKIM27@GMAIL.COM

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: Chris Whitmore

Address: 1021 Vicente St

City: SF 94116

Phone:

E-mail: novato415@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Name: Colin Daly
Address: 1954 31st Ave
City, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94116
Phone: 415-939-5273
E-mail: colinbdaly@gmail.com

February 5, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: Bernie Schneider
Signature

Name: BERNIE SCHNEIDER

Address: 2324 FUNSTON AVE

City: SAN FRANCISCO 94116

Phone: 415-564-4564

E-mail: btschneider@yahoo.com

February , 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

By: 
Signature

Name: LOUIS KOCENDA
Address: 1335 JULLOA
City: SE CA 94116

Phone:

E-mail:

From: [brandi farrar](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:26:43 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,
Brandi Farrar

From: [Audra Barrios](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Wetlands
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 7:27:11 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Audra Barrios

(510) 776-0132

<http://www.lickyoureyeballs.com> | <http://facebook.com/lickyoureyeballs>

From: [Satya Vayu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:39:25 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Satya Vayu

From: [Monica Stupaczuk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:01:34 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

From: [nina clausen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:33:34 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **L. R.** <miss_bmw2007@hotmail.com>
Date: 2017-02-16 23:22 GMT+01:00
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
To: "onehousedragon@gmail.com" <onehousedragon@gmail.com>

VIDERESEND TAK

Emne: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

nina clausen

From: [Daniel Segerlind](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 2:12:54 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Best regards

Daniel Segerlind

Naturvårdsbiolog, Ecocom AB
+46 706-98 63 46 | daniel@ecocom.se
Södra Strandgatan 16, 802 50 Gävle



Vi planerar, inventerar, följer upp och återställer ingrepp i natur och kulturmiljöer.

HQ: Ecocom AB, Stortorget 38, 392 31 Kalmar, Sweden

WEB: www.ecocom.se

From: godonrelyfully@juno.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands & reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment -Thank You
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 8:47:35 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan - there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is wasteful, unnecessary and thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your time and attention to this serious issue.

Holly Wartell
GODONRELYFULLY@JUNO.COM

Unique Method Regrows a Bit of Hair Every Night

Regrow Hair Protocol

<http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3142/58aa74c57237274c51837st01duc>



From: [Rose Rowe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 4:21:48 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Regards,
Rose Rowe
Fresno, California

From: [Jen B. Connors](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Save The Frogs Michael Starkey](#)
Subject: California Wetlands Protection
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 11:51:56 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board should work to protect these frogs when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

Although I am not a resident of California, I oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please visit www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Very Sincerely,

Jennifer Connors
Fairfax Station, VA

From: [Ann DeBolt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect wetlands, reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 7:38:15 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely, Ann DeBolt

From: [Nancy Neumann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 6:02:50 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Neumann

Graugasse 1

55270 Zornheim

GERMANY

P.S. Don't be put off by my overseas address. I'm a voting American citizen living and working abroad.

From: [Larry Stalnaker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); ahsha.sofai@sfgov.org; [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: draining Sharp Park Wetlands
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 4:02:16 AM

Dear Board,

The SF Board of Supervisors has taken action to approve a long-term management plan that includes draining the Sharp Park Wetlands, home to the endangered & federally protected California Red-legged Frog & other wildlife. You want to create a golf course. Please protect these wetlands & reject the FEIR for SNRAMP. We must preserve our environment with its wildlife & endangered species. When they are gone, they are gone forever. We only have one chance.

Please consider my comments before the meeting on February 28th. There are over 1,000 golf courses in CA. Don't destroy the land for another course.

Thank you,
Marilyn Evenson
An animal advocate in Ohio

From: [Vanessa Carbia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 8:43:07 PM

San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California red-legged frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more information, and remember that there are more than 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you,

Vanessa Carbia

From: [Susan Green](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Wetlands
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 2:49:06 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,
I urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, not kill, harm, or harass these frogs, which is what will happen when the Sharp Park Wetlands are drained, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I totally oppose the use of taxpayer funds for the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is unethical. So please do not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more information, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Green

From: [Thomas Pintagro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 1:59:22 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Yours truly,

Thomas J. Pintagro

From: [GALLO Giorgio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 12:50:26 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed.

Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Giorgio Gallo

From: [Doris Potter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 10:20:30 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Doris Potter

990 St-François-Xavier #605
St-Laurent, QC
H4L 5E7

From: [Claire Sefiane](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 9:03:55 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Sefiane

From: [le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 8:31:00 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

Wetlands are essential for a healthy environment. They provide habitat for fish, wildlife and plants, recharge groundwater, reduce flooding, provide clean drinking water, regulate our climate. Unfortunately, over half of America's wetlands have been lost since 1780, and wetland losses continue today. There is an urgent need to protect wetlands today.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any development that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. To drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.

As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Respectfully,

L.E. Slattery
Saint-Lazare, QC,
Canada

From: [Lynette Lobien](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 9:04:39 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. **Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical.** As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

- LYNETTE LOBIEN

From: [Marlena Lange](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); Ronen@sfgov.org; [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 6:57:38 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Marlena Lange

From: [Lisa T.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject SNRAMP golf course and protect wetlands
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:05:24 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As a property owner in San Francisco, I urge you to reject the FEIR for the SNRAMP as drafted because it includes re-development of the Sharp Park Golf course. The golf course re-development will involve the drainage and degradation of some of the last remaining habitat in the city for many species including the red-legged frog. This will undoubtedly cause the death of not only these threatened frogs but other native species as well.

A golf course that loses revenue for the city is not where we need to be putting our efforts, especially when it involves the killing of native species. A golf course is not open wild space- it requires constant maintenance and chemicals for upkeep. Taxpayer money put into a golf course is not a good example of what San Francisco and the Bay Area stand for, which is eco-friendly and environmentally aware development.

I urge you to reject any version of the SNRAMP plan that involves wetlands drainage and golf course support.

Thank you,
Lisa Tucker, Esq.
2030 3rd St.
San Francisco, CA

From: [Roland](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 12:53:02 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management

Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian.

The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your consideration

J. Roland

From: vlouie42@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 12:50:09 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

From: [Kevin Oury](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Wetlands
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 12:31:59 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The Sharp Park Golf Course has been heavily and rightly criticized by scientists, conservation groups, and community park advocates for the past decade, due to its harmful impacts on imperiled wildlife, and its misuse of taxpayer funds that could be more effectively spent on important social and environmental programs.

The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land.

SAVE THE FROGS! and the vast majority of non-golfers throughout San Francisco and elsewhere are wholeheartedly opposed to any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Oury

From: [Andrie Bon Flores](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); Ronen@sfgov.org; [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Sunday, February 19, 2017 7:02:53 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

-Thank you

From: [Julia Chang Frank](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sharp Park Golf Course Appeal
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 3:00:49 PM
Attachments: [OKF Signed Sharp Park Objective 2 17.pdf](#)
[SFYD letter.pdf](#)
[USF Eco Restoration Club - Board.pdf](#)

Please find attached three (3) additional letters of support for the appeal to remove Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Our Kids First
San Francisco Young Democrats Club
University of San Francisco Eco Restoration Club

Thank you

February 17, 2017

**RE: Remove Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project at 2/28/17
Board of Supervisors Appeal Hearing**

Dear Supervisor,

The San Francisco Young Democrats' Executive Board writes to urge you to remove the controversial Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report (NRAMP EIR). This project, for a golf course located in Pacifica, is not a wise investment for San Francisco residents and taxpayers, and is well outside the scope of a plan focused on "natural areas."

The Sharp Park Golf Course is a financial drain for San Francisco, having lost more than \$1.75 million in the last 11 years. San Francisco already manages five golf courses within its own City and County boundary, and our communities want and need reinvestments in neighborhood park and recreation amenities.

Removing the redevelopment project from the NRAMP EIR is consistent with what the Recreation and Park Department promised the public and policy-makers in 2009 when it stated:

*"Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, **it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR.** Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, **they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.**"* (emphasis added) Source 2009 NRAMP EIR Scoping Report.

Despite this promise, the NRAMP EIR now includes a golf course redevelopment project that would redesign golf course holes, redevelop numerous areas of the course, and dredge the wetlands. This redevelopment is projected to cost San Francisco taxpayers \$11 million, not including millions more in future repairs to armor the sea wall. Less expensive, more environmentally-friendly alternatives exist, but they were not reviewed in this EIR. Scientists from Bay Area universities and institutions have criticized the redevelopment project.

We hope you agree with us and that you'll uphold the prior written commitment by the Recreation and Park Department that this golf course redevelopment project has no place in this NRAMP EIR, and will accordingly support removing it.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Young Democrats Executive Board

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The University of San Francisco's Eco Restoration Club urges you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report (NRAMP EIR).

As you may be aware, USF students live throughout San Francisco, and we enjoy the many public recreational amenities that the City offers. But this redevelopment of a golf course, which harms the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake and California Red-legged frog, and is located in Pacifica, is a problematic use of City funds.

We're also concerned that the Recreation and Park department, by inserting the golf course redevelopment into the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan EIR, did not honor their written promise:

"Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review." Source 2009 NRAMP EIR Scoping Report.

Scientists from the University of California and San Francisco State have criticized the golf course redevelopment has further harming the habitat for the endangered snake and frog. We are also concerned that less expensive, more environmentally-friendly alternatives were not reviewed in this EIR.

By including the golf course redevelopment in the plan, the City is not only breaking the public trust, but will also be exporting millions of recreation dollars to subsidize cheap golf in Pacifica. San Francisco already manages five golf courses within its own City and County boundary that do not harm endangered species.

We hope you agree with us and that you'll uphold the prior written commitment by the Recreation and Park Department. We urge you to vote to remove the golf course redevelopment from the NRAMP EIR. Thank you very much.

Best,

Jackie Isbell, President
Hannah Sawyer, Member



Stressing Educational Excellence in Our Youth

5845 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 585-1104
OKFProgram@Yahoo.com

February 16, 2017

Supervisor Ahsha Safai

City Hall - 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689
(415) 554-6975 - voice
Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

RE: Objections to Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Supervisor Safai:

Thank you for your leadership in San Francisco and your support of our City's neighborhood, youth, social, and recreational services. We are writing to urge you to vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.


We are organizations that support and prioritize a healthy and equitable San Francisco budget – one that supports those in our society who are most at-risk of being left behind by anticipated budget cuts. In the next budget, San Francisco-based recreation centers, youth services, after-school programs, and services for the homeless and the elderly may be cut.

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into a Natural Areas Resource Management Plan. By approving the plan, the City is committing to spend even more taxpayer dollars on a Pacifica-based golf course that loses up to several hundred thousand dollars a year. (See attached table)

We do not support a proposal to spend more City resources in places that provide little benefit to San Francisco residents. We ask that fiscally responsible decisions be made to protect San Francisco's neighborhood services.

Please remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Sincerely,


Jackie Manion
Executive Director
Attachments

Emailed 2/16/17:

- Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org
- Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org
- Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org
- Katy.Tang@sfgov.org
- London.Breed@sfgov.org
- Conor.Johnston@sfgov.org
- Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
- Norman.Yee@sfgov.org
- Jeff.Sheehy@sfgov.org
- Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org
- Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
- Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org
- brent.jalipa@sfgov.org
- Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Sharp Park Golf Course Operating Costs

Fiscal Year	RPD Sharp Park Golf Course Losses
04/05	– \$110,299.00
05/06	– \$338,025.60
06/07	– \$64,685.80
07/08	– \$119,758.00
08/09	\$29,446.40
09/10	– \$134,699.80
10/11	– \$161,217.20
11/12	– \$245,007.40
12/13	– \$111,289.20
13/14	– \$151,269.80
14/15	– \$358,333.40*
TOTALS	– \$1,765,138.80

*Based on additional payroll records for FY 14/15 obtained from Recreation and Park, losses in 14/15 may be as high as \$757,641.

Projected Costs of Golf Course Redevelopment:

\$6 to \$11 million for proposed project in Natural Areas Management Plan
Eventual additional costs of \$8.5 million for eventual seawall repair
Source: <https://wildequity.org/2015-another-year-of-losses-at-sharp-park-golf-course/>

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW: Uphold the Planning Commission's certification of the NRMP's adequate EIR
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 5:09:10 PM
Attachments: [2017.02.21 NRMP Walk SF Support.pdf](#)

From: Josie Ahrens [mailto:josie@walksf.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 11:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Nicole Ferrara <nicole@walksf.org>; Randolph, Alex (REC) <alex.randolph@sfgov.org>
Subject: Uphold the Planning Commission's certification of the NRMP's adequate EIR

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter requesting you uphold the Planning Commission's certification of the NRMP's adequate EIR and reject the EIR repeal.

Please reach out if you have any questions or comments.

Best,
Josie

--

Josie Ahrens
Neighborhood Organizer

333 Hayes St, Suite 202, San Francisco, CA 94102
415.431.9255 x 5# | walksf.org

Support the call for a Vision Zero goal to eliminate ALL traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024 - [join or renew as a Walk SF member today.](#)



February 21, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Uphold the Planning Commission's certification of the NRMP's adequate EIR

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of Walk SF, I urge you to reject the appeal of the Environmental Impact Report of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. This important document outlines how the San Francisco Recreation & Park Department (RPD) can actively protect the City's urban forest, support and protect its biodiversity, and promote environmental justice.

Walk San Francisco understands that the land the Recreation and Parks Department stewards is integral to making our community healthier and more livable. These lands allow people to get away from the hustle and bustle of city life, to get mental and physical breaks, and to experience nature without having to have the resources to travel outside the city. The quality of San Francisco's trails, vistas, and forests are unmatched in urban settings throughout the nation, and San Francisco's residents and visitors deserve a healthy environment.

These natural areas also support an array of native habitats and species, some found nowhere else in the world, such as the San Francisco garter snake and mission blue butterfly. In total, 140 species (67 animals & 73 plants) are sensitive species presently or historically known to occur in these particular areas. Some of these species have state or federal protections. Responsible maintenance, as outline in the management plan, of these lands will enhance biodiversity and maintain populations of sensitive species.

Lastly, the plan provides guidelines for education, research, and stewardship programs. These landscapes offer a myriad of learning opportunities without having to leave San Francisco. Various schools and colleges, academies, museums, and children's programs use the natural areas for environmental education. This management plan further promotes these opportunities as a call for environmental justice.

While some members of the public are concerned with the proposed tree management, the plan focuses on trees that are in poor or fair condition (80% of trees slated for removal), and replaces them with a younger, healthier tree that supports the urban forest and the overall environment over a 20 year period.

The Planning and Recreation and Park Commissions, after hearing testimony from more than 100 members of the public, voted to certify the NRMP's final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the Recreation and Park Commission unanimously adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings and approved the plan.

Please reject this EIR appeal and uphold the Commissioners' certification of the adequate EIR and the adoption Plan so that remnant landscapes and our ability to promote our forest, biodiversity, and recreational programming within the City limits are not compromised.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Josie Ahrens". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Josie Ahrens
Neighborhood Organizer

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 1:33:03 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Dema Grim District 9, owner of two dogs, SF resident for 23 years.

150 Santa Marina SF CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 1:22:10 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Please send this EIR back to Planning. It's not doing what it's supposed to do - provide a fair assessment of the environmental impact of this Plan.

Rupa Bose

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 1:18:20 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact--really? We need access to GREEN areas living in an urban environment.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address. I use these areas all the time.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen

bias: Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Debra Chasnoff, 863 Elizabeth Street, SF 94114

From: [Kerry Kriger](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Bradley, Stacy \(REC\)](#); [Julia4th@yahoo.com](#); [SFForestNews@gmail.com](#); [bo@slotelaw.com](#); [bplater@wildequity.org](#); [deesel91@gmail.com](#); [desai@npca.org](#); [ggas@goldengateaudubon.org](#); [office@sequoia-audubon.org](#); [richard@spublicgolf.org](#); [tom@intrinsicdevices.com](#)
Cc: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Byrne, Marlena \(CAT\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Givner, Jon \(CAT\)](#); [Hue, Melinda \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Stacy, Kate \(CAT\)](#); [Starr, Aaron \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Re: APPEAL RESPONSE - SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 1:17:32 PM

Hi Brent Jalipa.

Thank you for sending this appeal response. It's interesting that the City of San Francisco states that "under existing conditions, the pumps manage water levels in Horse Stable Pond to maintain California red-legged frog habitat...", given that in 2011, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department was forced to re-locate at least 107 California red-legged frog egg masses from areas where the egg masses were laid, due to the RPD pumping the wetlands out to sea (<http://www.savethefrogs.com/actions/sharp-park/images/egg-mass-movement-emails.pdf>). This almost certainly resulted in frog death as the eggs were taken to suboptimal sites and placed in artificially crowded conditions. It is also unknown how many egg masses died directly of dessication before being rescued and thus were not even included in the count of affected frogs. Furthermore, USFWS biologist David Lee Kelly states in the last page of the documented linked to above that he expects egg mass strandings to occur indefinitely so long as pumping operations continue.

As such, the City and its employees should cease to ever speak of pumping and protecting California Red-Legged Frogs in the same sentence, as the two activities are thoroughly incompatible.

Thank you.
Kerry

On Tue, Feb 21, 2017 at 5:56 PM Kerry Kriger <kerry@savethefrogs.com> wrote:

The pumphouse operations received a Biological Opinion from USFWS on October 2, 2012. Currently, under existing conditions, the pumps manage water levels in Horse Stable Pond to maintain California red-legged frog habitat...

On Tue, Feb 21, 2017 at 5:01 PM BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org> wrote:

Good morning,

Please find linked below the appeal response received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the Planning Department, concerning the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report Appeal for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project (SNRAMP). Also linked below is a reference copy of the SNRAMP FEIR.

[Planning Appeal Response - February 17, 2017](#)

[Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan FEIR](#)

Please also note that we received supplemental materials to the SF Forest Alliance letter received February 16, 2017. You may review the updated document with new Appendix listing and Appendix A-1 linked below.

[SF Forest Alliance Supplemental Appeal Letter - February 16, 2017 - LARGE FILE](#)

The appeal hearing for this matter is scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on February 28, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

--

#####

Dr. Kerry Kriger
SAVE THE FROGS!
Executive Director
www.savethefrogs.com

From: [Kerry Kriger](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [bplater@wildequity.org](#); [desai@npca.org](#); [ggas@goldengateaudubon.org](#); [office@sequoia-audubon.org](#); [deese191@gmail.com](#); [SFForestNews@gmail.com](#); [tom@intrinsicdevices.com](#); [bo@slotelaw.com](#); [richard@sfpublishing.org](#); [Julia4th@yahoo.com](#); [Bradley, Stacy \(REC\)](#); [Givner, Jon \(CAT\)](#); [Stacy, Kate \(CAT\)](#); [Byrne, Marlena \(CAT\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Starr, Aaron \(CPC\)](#); [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Hue, Melinda \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 2:45:32 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi John Carroll and the Board of Supervisors,

SAVE THE FROGS! and the vast majority of non-golfers throughout San Francisco and elsewhere are wholeheartedly opposed to any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetlands ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such I request you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities.

Sharp Park would provide significantly more financial and recreational benefit to the SF Bay Area community if it were (1) freely accessible and (2) managed for its scenic beauty and biodiversity.

I suggest:

- removing the fences and walls that are built to keep out those who cannot pay the grounds fees;
- restore the habitat so that it is not a barren mowed green;
- stop draining the wetland;
- create hiking trails;
- promote the area to hikers, walkers, runners, outdoor enthusiasts and youth;
- allow people to enjoy the scenic beauty of Sharp Park without fear of being hit on the head by a golf ball, and without having to wonder if their tax dollars are contributing to the extinction of native California wildlife.

Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Sincerely,
Kerry Kriger, Ph.D.
SAVE THE FROGS!
Founder, Executive Director, Ecologist
www.savethefrogs.com
www.savethefrogs.com/kerry-kriger
Voicemail: 415-878-6525
kerry@savethefrogs.com

SAVE THE FROGS! is the world's leading amphibian conservation organization. We work in California, across the USA, and around the world to prevent the extinction of amphibians, and to create a better planet for humans and wildlife. Since 2008, SAVE THE FROGS! has educated over three million people about endangered amphibians, and frog enthusiasts from at

least 87 countries have participated in our programs. Together we can SAVE THE FROGS!

On Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 4:16 PM, BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org> wrote:

Good morning,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, to hear an appeal regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Please find the following link to the hearing notice for the matter:

[Hearing Notice - Dated February 14, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Thank you,

John Carroll

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

[\(415\)554-4445](tel:(415)554-4445) - Direct | [\(415\)554-5163](tel:(415)554-5163) - Fax

john.carroll@sfgov.org | bos.legislation@sfgov.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 1:11:40 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

One need not be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Linda Feldman
2598 14th Avenue
West Portal, San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 12:57:47 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Dave Emanuel

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 11:00:12 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Jacquelyn Paul
147 Hamerton Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 10:14:02 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

I agree with all of the above. Especially the fact there are NO TREE REPLACEMENTS!! There should be tree replacements included in this plan.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 9:41:58 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Thank you for protecting the environment and the people

Signed:

Varda Wilensky
116 majestic ave
San Francisco, Ca 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 9:04:01 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Meg Rosenfeld, Inner Sunset

From: [Ross Hammond](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: nadine.weil@gmail.com
Subject: Letter to BoS Re Mt. Davidson
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 12:00:44 PM
Attachments: [Stand NAP.pdf](#)

Dear John Carroll -- please see our letter to the Board of Supervisors regarding Mt. Davidson.

Thank you,
Ross Hammond

Ross Hammond

US Campaigns Director

www.stand.earth

visit us on [FaceBook](#)

tel. 415.559.5082

Twitter: [@RossHammondSF](#)



February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

Stand.earth, formerly ForestEthics, is a leading environmental organization based in San Francisco.

We are concerned that the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan will create climate change because it fells over 18,000 large trees without adequate replacement.

The Environmental Impact Report for the plan contains math errors, incorrect assumptions, and outdated science. For example, the Greenhouse Gas calculations confuse rates with stocks, assume that 90% of the existing trees are not absorbing carbon, and presume that all new trees will survive. The tree replacement rate for the entire plan is only 0.19. Correcting these problems in accordance with best available science shows that the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan creates significant Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the San Francisco Bay Area that must be mitigated.

Please refer the EIR back to the Planning Department so that it can provide an accurate picture of Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the California Environmental Quality Act and include further mitigation for the environmental harm to climate and public health. Please ensure that the City of San Francisco continues to be a global leader in the fight for climate resilience.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Hammond", written over a horizontal line.

Ross Hammond
US Campaigns Director
Stand.earth

Footnotes & Sources:

Tree Growth Never Slows

Idea debunked that young trees have the edge on their older siblings in carbon accumulation, U.S. Geological Survey, Nature Journal, January 2014

<http://www.nature.com/news/tree-growth-never-slows-1.14536>

Carbon Capture: Tree Size Matters

Yale Environment Review, July 2015

<http://environment.yale.edu/yer/article/carbon-capture-tree-size-matters#gsc.tab=0>

Increasing Wood Production Through Old Age in Tall Trees, Eucalyptus and Redwood, Stephen Sillett, Forest Ecology and Management Journal, February 2010

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900872X>

Mayor Ed Lee signs Mayors' National Climate Action Agenda Letter

November 2016

<http://www.climate-mayors.org/our-letter-to-the-presidentelect-november-2016/>

Compensating for the Loss of a Healthy Tree: How Many Trees Do You Owe Me?

Dr. David Nowak, U.S. Forest Service, November 2016

<http://www.slideshare.net/arbordayfoundation/compensating-for-the-loss-of-a-healthy-tree-how-many-trees-do-you-owe-me>

From: [Salli Lundgren](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 10:03:22 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California. PROTECT ENDANGERED SPECIES NOT BUSINESSES!!!

Sincerely,
S. Lundgren

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:35:04 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Jane & Jerry Risk
64 El Sereno Court
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:23:06 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Dan German

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:10:10 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Cindy goldfield
76 Martha Ave SF

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:52:08 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Albert Garrison
601 Rockdale Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:43:05 AM

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

I support the issues brought up below. My concern is that there is a lot of false information about eucalyptus trees so people tend to hate them. Yet parks without trees are not good places for recreation and I don't want our parks returned to dunes. I am also gravely concerned about the use of pesticides to kill the tree roots and the loss of carbon dioxide mitigation. We have much to fear from global warming. Let's not make it worse. This is a very important issue and I will look carefully at your vote!

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

**1. Public access
restrictions:**

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

**2. Increase in
greenhouse
gases:**

I'm especially concerned about this!! You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

**3. Increase in
herbicides:**

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

**4. CEQA
process
violations:**

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

**5. Trail
closures:**

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

**6. No required
tree
replacement in
Project area:**

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area. Shrubs and trees, especially mature trees do not have the same ability to sequester carbon!!

**7. Project
implementation
before EIR
violates
CEQA:**

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Marilyn Scholze
3563 Mission St
San Francisco, CA 94110 (415)826-3815

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:25:27 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Carmen Vega
57 Stillings Avenue, SF, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:18:17 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Walking through living forests is a blessing, please preserve our lands.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 6:38:52 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Nicole Cavanaugh, 610 Balboa

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 6:34:54 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 6:05:07 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Michael Tassone

Born in CA, raised in SF. Many generations of family in SF and surroundings. Please stop this horrible program.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 5:53:31 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

From: [Nadine Weil](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comment on EIR Appeal for SNRAMP
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 12:57:50 AM
Attachments: [BOS Comments for Appeal EIR SNRAMP.pdf](#)

Dear John,

I hope you are surviving the avalanche of documents and doing ok!

As promised, attached please find comments to the Board of Supervisors about the Appeal for the Final EIR for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

RE: Board of Supervisors File No. 170044 to be heard on February 28, 2017

Thank you so much for your help.

Warm regards,
Nadine

--

Nadine Weil
Thornton Foundations
San Francisco District 2 Resident

Recipient: SF Rec and Park, Phil Ginsburg, Norman Yee, Jane Kim, Malia Cohen, Hillary Ronen, London Breed, Mark Farrell, Sandra Fewer, Katy Tang, Ahsha Safai, and Jeff Sheehy

Letter: Greetings,

PLEASE SUPPORT THE EIR APPEAL FOR SNRAMP

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your public service to the City of San Francisco.

We ask you to please support the appeal of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan per Board of Supervisors File No. 170044 on February 28, 2017.

The EIR does not make a good faith effort to estimate greenhouse gas emissions using best available information as is required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Rather, the EIR presents alternative facts and math errors to conceal the truth – that the Plan will cause climate change for San Francisco.

Please stand up for public safety and public health. Please send EIR number 2005.0912E / SNRAMP back to Planning to correct the inadequacies and perform the Greenhouse Gas calculations in good faith as required by law. Please add mitigation for the significant environmental harm this plan will cause.

SF Rec and Park plans to use chainsaws and toxins to kill over 18,000 large trees and is misleading the public about climate change in order to do it. We cannot believe this is happening in San Francisco.

The environment is about to be decimated at the federal level. Why would we willingly destroy our own?

I am writing to ask for your help in saving the 18,448 trees slated for deforestation by SF Rec and Park in areas including the popular Mt. Davidson Forest. I ask you to please help halt the use of toxic herbicides like Roundup and Garlon which are being deployed in parks where children play to kill the trees permanently.

I am very concerned about the negative effects this plan will have on public safety, public health, children, wildlife, and climate change in San Francisco.

Saving healthy large trees in our urban parks is vitally important to me. This plan is a hazardous use of taxpayer dollars in a time of scarce resources. Under this plan, 18,448 trees out of the total 117,433 would be removed. This is a significant 16%.

The Replacement Rate is only 0.19. The plan kills 18,448 trees and only replants 3,448 of them over time. This is unacceptable to the public and will cause climate change. The minimum Replacement Rate must be 1:1 actual trees to mitigate global warming. Best practice per the U.S. Forest Service would be 3:1 to compensate for the inevitable partial mortality of saplings and the loss of mature carbon sequestration.

It is shocking that the SF Planning Department is trying to rely upon a "disagreement among experts" excuse to avoid protecting its citizens from climate change. Please help.

PUBLIC SAFETY: The proposed deforestation plan to remove 16% of the trees in the Natural Resource Areas poses a serious risk to public safety because it poisons children's recreation areas with toxic herbicides like Roundup and Garlon that will bioaccumulate, it increases the risk that trees will fall on hikers from windthrow, it degrades air quality with NOx pollutants, it elevates mudslide risk to homes, and it causes climate change and harms San Francisco's resilience by removing one of our last defenses against climate change -- large stature trees -- without adequate replacement. The City could be held liable for these public safety consequences at great cost.

INCORRECT CARBON CALCULATIONS: The Greenhouse Gas calculations in the EIR are wrong. By law, CEQA Section §15364.5 requires San Francisco to determine the significance of impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Greenhouse gases include but are not limited to carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Per the law, the lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project.

CEQA requires the lead agency to answer these questions in good faith:

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Initially, SF Rec and Park only assessed greenhouse gas impacts for San Francisco qualitatively using a Compliance Checklist and found them “not to be significant.” This checklist does not contain any questions about saving park trees for carbon sequestration. This qualitative approach was not legal in Pacifica. The deforestation of the 15,000 trees in Sharp Park had to be assessed with GHG numbers.

In 2013, SF Rec and Park hired Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to help perform the greenhouse gas calculations for the EIR. These calculations are not adequate for at least 3 reasons:

: Math Errors: The Greenhouse Gas calculations contain pure math errors where the analyst confuses annual rates with stocks and adds them together, producing an invalid number that SF Rec and Park uses in the EIR. This is inadequate and not disclosed.

: 90% of Trees Deleted: The EIR assumes 90% of the existing trees are absorbing zero carbon because they are over 20 years old. According to best available science from 2010 Forest Ecology and Management and the 2014 U.S. Geological Survey, older trees continue to actively sequester more carbon than younger trees. To be good faith and complete, the Greenhouse Gas Emission calculations must include all 18,448 trees.

: 100% Tree Survival: The Greenhouse Gas calculations presume that 100% of the newly-planted trees are live oaks and will survive at least 20 years. This is overly optimistic. Per the Department of Public Works, oaks are known to be uneven survivors in San Francisco because they prefer heat, wind protection, and good drainage. This is why in the 1800s, oak trees were found in San Francisco only in limited numbers in creek beds. To be good faith and adequate, the EIR needs a more realistic tree survival rate when estimating net Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The EIR is relying on math errors, gross omissions, and material misstatements to come to false conclusions about Greenhouse Gases for Sharp Park in Pacifica and in total. The EIR erroneously states that the plan would result in a “Net Sequestration Gain of approximately 202 MT of CO₂ per year.” It continues, “The proposed project would have a net GHG benefit and would not conflict with California’s goal of reducing GHG emissions set forth by the timetable established in AB 32.” This is written in the EIR Responses to Comments, Chapter 4, page 301, November 2016.

When the math errors are corrected using best available science and the same methodology, the truth begins to emerge. The plan would result in a Net

Sequestration Loss of -2,401 MT of CO₂ per year. This exceeds the threshold for significance under CEQA. The plan would also result in Total Net Carbon Emissions of 65,101 MT of CO₂ from the deforestation.

Subsequently, a top sustainability and greenhouse gas verification firm was hired to re-assess the carbon calculations using best practices in accordance with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32) and the California Air Resources Board U.S. Forest Project Offset Protocol. They found that felling the 18,448 trees per the plan would result in a loss of carbon sequestration over the life of the project of -44,275 MT of CO₂e and would release total carbon emissions of 177,572 MT of CO₂e.

Therefore, we are concerned that the Greenhouse Gas Emissions caused by the plan are significant under CEQA, violate AB 32, and must be mitigated.

By presenting Greenhouse Gas calculations in the EIR that contain both fundamental math errors and incomplete assumptions that have been disproved by available science, SF Rec and Park did not make a good-faith effort to estimate and disclose the greenhouse gas emissions from this project as required by law. This leaves the City vulnerable to future action under CEQA. Please refer the EIR back to Planning to remedy this.

METHANE EMISSIONS MISSING: Methane is absent from the EIR. Per the CEQA guidelines for Greenhouse Gases (§15364.5), "Greenhouse gases include but are not limited to carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide." CA Senate Bill 1383 signed by Governor Brown in September 2016 requires a 40% reduction in methane emissions by 2030 versus 2013 levels. Decomposing wood releases equal amounts of carbon and methane. Per the EPA, over the 20-year time frame, methane is 84-87 times more powerful and dangerous than carbon.

The EIR is inadequate and incomplete because it ignores the potent methane emissions from the 18,448 trees that would be felled. The plan conflicts with CA Senate Bill 1383 signed into law to reduce methane. Please send the EIR back to Planning so that methane emissions can be included, calculated and mitigated.

ALTERNATIVE FACTS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE: At the joint SF Planning and SF Rec and Park Commission hearing on December 15, 2016, a Commissioner asked if the greenhouse gas calculations in the EIR were wrong. SF Rec and Park said the quantitative analysis in the EIR showed that the plan would be beneficial for the climate and concluded, "What you have is a disagreement among experts." This enabled the Commissioners to approve the EIR.

There is no disagreement about math. There is no disagreement about the law. The analysis of Greenhouse Gases in the EIR was not complete, not adequate,

and not done in good faith to fully disclose the impacts. SF Rec and Park is presenting alternative facts about climate change to justify a deforestation and pesticide plan that is dangerous and that will cause climate change in its current form. We urge the Board of Supervisors to reject this travesty. For the sake of public safety, please support the appeal of the EIR.

AIR POLLUTION: The Natural Resource Areas Plan would cause air pollution that is currently unmitigated. The EIR states that the Sharp Park deforestation of 15,000 trees “would result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts as a result of exceeding the BAAQMD thresholds for NOx pollutant emissions.” (EIR pages 438-440). It concludes that “cumulative impacts associated with criteria air pollutants would be significant and unavoidable.” Per Friends of the Urban Forest on January 24, 2017, roadside trees reduce nearby air pollution by more than 50% (Environmental Science and Technology Journal). The air pollution in the plan is currently not offset. Please send the EIR back to Planning so that mitigations for the degradation in air quality can be added.

INADEQUATE TREE REPLACEMENT: There was no replacement rate in the original official plan. If San Francisco wants to be a climate resilient city, then SF Rec and Park’s proposed new 0.19 replacement rate needs to be increased to a minimum of 1:1 with trees. Per the current plan, SF Rec and Park would replant only 3,448 trees out of 18,448 felled. The 15,000 large carbon-sequestering trees in Sharp Park would be killed and not replaced. This will cause climate change. At the hearing on December 15, 2016, SF Rec and Park mentioned that many of these 15,000 trees are in an “inaccessible canyon” in Sharp Park that would be out of sight of the general public.

We request that the minimum replacement rate be 1:1 or 18,448 trees. Best practice per the U.S. Forest Service 2016 would be 3:1 to account for the loss of carbon sequestration and the inevitable partial mortality of the saplings. Forests absorb 10x the carbon of perennial grasslands. Bushes are unacceptable to the public as replacement. If the replacement rate is not raised from 0.19 to a guaranteed 1:1 or higher with trees, then this plan will cause climate change and threaten public safety.

FOREST RESOURCES: The EIR inaccurately states that the impact on Forest Resources would be the same and less than significant across all of the options, from the most deforestation to the least. There is a significant difference between cutting down 18,448 trees and none. For example, the 1,600 healthy trees targeted for removal on Mt. Davidson would not be replanted on the mountain, and this is significant as 82% of the trees in a 3.5-acre area would be removed without reforestation. The 15,000 trees in Sharp Park would not be replanted at all. “Trees removed in Sharp Park would be replaced with native grassland and scrub species.” This is very significant and requires mitigation.

According to the USDA, "Of all the species sampled, eucalyptus stores and sequesters the most carbon, approximately 24.4% of the total carbon stored in San Francisco." Eucalyptus trees are a valuable part of San Francisco's green infrastructure and must be preserved as such.

INSUFFICIENT MITIGATION: Overall, mitigation in the EIR for the environmental harm is inadequate, and much more is needed. The EIR admits that this proposed large-scale deforestation experiment would cause significant unavoidable negative impacts on Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Recreation. The proposed 0.19 tree replacement rate across the entire plan is insufficient by orders of magnitude. Please send the EIR back to Planning for additional mitigation for greenhouse gas emissions (carbon and methane), loss of forest resources, NOx air pollution, destruction of cultural landmarks, and clearing of essential active forest carbon sinks needed to save San Francisco's valuable waterfront from flooding and sea level rise.

SUPPORTING STUDIES:

Here are the links to the studies requested by the Board of Supervisors in order of chronology:

Green Carbon: Re-evaluation of forest biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests, Keith et al, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, PNAS Early Edition, March 2009

<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2009/06/24/0901970106.full.pdf>

Eucalyptus Forests Sequester 10x the Amount of Carbon as Grasslands, Australian Government Chief Scientist, December 2009:

<http://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2009/12/which-plants-store-more-carbon-in-australia-forests-or-grasses/>

Increasing Wood Production Through Old Age in Tall Trees, Eucalyptus and Redwood Trees Study, Stephen Sillett, Forest Ecology and Management Journal, Accepted December 2009, Printed February 2010

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900872X>

Tree Growth Never Slows

Idea debunked that young trees have the edge on their older siblings in carbon accumulation, U.S. Geological Survey, Nature Journal, January 2014
http://www.nature.com/news/tree-growth-never-slows-1.14536

Carbon Capture: Tree Size Matters

Yale Environment Review, July 2015

http://environment.yale.edu/yer/article/carbon-capture-tree-size-matters#gsc.tab=0

The EIR relies on opposite conclusions which were disproved by modern available science.

PUBLIC HEALTH: Our urban forests with tree canopy are significantly improving public health in San Francisco. Thousands of residents visit these sanctuaries for rejuvenation, exercise, and mental health every week. Doctors are issuing parks prescriptions for people to visit urban forests. Destroying 18,000 trees will hurt public health and well-being.

BIODIVERSITY and WILDLIFE: A tremendous biodiversity of 40 bird species including Great Horned Owls and Red-tailed Hawks make their home in SF Rec and Park areas including the Mt. Davidson Forest. The public does not want the sanctuaries of so many birds and animals to be destroyed.

Per Harvard University and the U.N., climate change is expected to become the greatest threat to biodiversity, the very goal of Natural Resource Areas. Killing 18,448 large trees without adequate replacement and causing climate change is sadly counterproductive to the Department's end goal of biodiversity.

FUNDING: SF Rec and Park has \$1 billion in unfunded deferred maintenance. We ask San Francisco to please spend taxpayer dollars on critical basis maintenance needs in the City's parks instead of removing green infrastructure like our urban park forests that are providing so many benefits to people, wildlife, and local climate resilience.

OUTDATED PLAN: The origin of the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan is 20 years old. The plan's goal is to return sizable portions of the San Francisco-owned landscape to how it looked in the 1700s. It was explained to the public on December 15, 2016 that because so much time had gone into this plan, it simply had to be approved. In the business world, a 20-year-old plan would be obsolete. Two decades ago, very few people cared about global warming. Now stopping climate change is an urgent priority. San Francisco is a city on the water threatened by sea level rise. We cannot afford to lose over 18,000 large trees and

replace them with bushes. That would put San Francisco on an accelerated path to climate catastrophe.

ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF SAVING THE TREES:

Center for Environmental Health
ForestEthics (Stand.earth)
International Bird Rescue
WildCare
Breathe California
Rod Mast, President, Oceanic Society
Rev. Canon Sally G. Bingham
Shannon O'Leary Joy, Oceans 5, Sylvia Earle Alliance
Paul Hawken
Bill Weihl, Director of Sustainability, Facebook
Jayni Chase
Wendy Schmidt, The 11th Hour Project
Peter Coyote
Nikki Reed, Ian Somerhalder Foundation

Please support the appeal of the EIR for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. Please send the EIR back to Planning to assess the greenhouse gas emissions in good faith and to add mitigation for the environmental harm.

We ask you to please consider removing Mt. Davidson and Sharp Park from the deforestation and habitat conversion plans. Please save as many trees as possible in the Mt. Davidson Forest and halt the associated spraying of toxic herbicides in parks where children play.

Please increase the tree replacement rate from 0.19 to a minimum of 1:1 or ideally 3:1 and replant a minimum of 18,448 trees to help prevent climate change.

San Franciscans treasure their wooded urban forests and do not want to see them harmed with chainsaws and pesticides. We ask the City of San Francisco - please do not destroy the sanctuaries of so many people, children, and wildlife.

Thank you very much for your consideration and help.

Comments

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Robert We	San Jose, CA	2016-11-29	Because I love the trees there when I go hiking.
Brook Sutton	San Francisco, CA	2016-11-30	Mt Davidson is a beautiful natural sanctuary and a San Francisco gem. Destroying any more of the trees there than rec and park has already done, is a travesty and increased waste of our taxpayer money that should be used elsewhere. Keep all the trees and preserve the environment instead of recklessly stripping the mountain and spraying toxins to appease a few zealots that don't want trees in SF, simply because they weren't here 500yrs ago. Please preserve Mt Davidson!
Steve C	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-11-30	Protecting natural habitat is vital; birds, wildlife and people all benefit from tree covered hills. Spraying toxic herbicides threatens wildlife and park users. Preserve and protect the Mt. Davidson forest.
Helen We	San Jose, CA	2016-11-30	These old trees give so much peace, tranquility, and shade to everyone who commits to them, as well as being a precious resource for all the native life. They are irreplaceable and critically important to the green environment of San Francisco.
Bennett Cottone	San Francisco, CA	2016-11-30	I grew up on and played on Mt. Davidson. I have a photo of it from the 1880s which shows it to have been bare rock. I don't see how that would be preferable to the forest as it is now.
Maria Van Gee	Zdrsko, Poland	2016-11-30	Getekend
Shelds Woody	Forest Hill, CA	2016-11-30	Born and raised in SF, lots of good memories on Mt Davidson
Katherine Button	Alameda, CA	2016-11-30	I grew up on Daewood, across the street from the park. I still visit many times a year, since I work in the city. My family recently held a reunion there. The park is a sanctuary, a happy place for me and my family. Please don't destroy it.
Marga Star	Endhoven, Netherlands	2016-11-30	Save the Mt. Davidson Forest in San Francisco.
Russ Button	Alameda, CA	2016-11-30	I'm a native San Franciscan and want to see our city forest spaces preserved.
Giovanni Vassallo	San Francisco, CA	2016-11-30	I love the forest as it is and enjoy it. Please don't destroy this forest
Roberta Capobianco	San Francisco, CA	2016-11-30	Mt. Davidson is one of my favorite places in the city. Destroying the forest would ruin a peaceful, beautiful, and natural space for exercise, reflection, dog-walking, and family outings as well as a travesty to the local environment.
Zack Edwards	Washington, DC	2016-11-30	It's a beautiful haunting forest in the heart of the city. Why cut it down?
NA	Gardnerville, NV	2016-11-30	The Sierra Nevada has lost over 100 million trees in the last few years. Why would we go out of our way to destroy more of them?
Fernande Fournier	Luxembourg, Luxembourg	2016-11-30	Wir haben die Pflicht der Natur zu respektieren und zu beschützen. Nehmen Sie Ihre Verantwortung, bitte. Helfen und handeln Sie menschlich und zügig. Verschiedene "Menschen" sind nicht über allem erhaben! Merci.
Esabeth Eassen	Alameda, CA	2016-11-30	The city needs this green open space.
Christopher Bennett	Ross, CA	2016-11-30	I grew up playing in the magic of those forests. I don't want a cement berna h there.
Fran Passacqua	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-11-30	I used to walk around there growing up in San Francisco.
Jennifer Baker	Rutland, VT	2016-11-30	This is my home place! I grew up at the corner of Utopia and Waltham; my family owned the house from 1950-1970. Is there a reason to kill beautiful things that are part of our heritage and memory? Please save Mt. Davidson Forest!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Auro mon ara	Mex co C ty, Mex co	2016-11-30	Stop
Van Bah	Santa C ara, CA	2016-11-30	I be eve that cutt ng forests s cutt ng human fe on th s p anet short.
Margaret Thornh	Ven ce, CA	2016-12-01	P ease keep the trees n th s beaut fu park area! It s dear to many res dents!
C aud a Land var	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	C earcutt ng th s area, and us ng chem ca s w mar the hab tat of hundreds of creatures and e m nate a rare w d space n our c ty.
Jen fer Aust n	Mounta n V ew, CA	2016-12-01	Trees absorb po utants.
Sarah Freder cks	Sebastopo , CA	2016-12-01	I grew up on Da ewood and th s forest s a va uab e asset to th s ne ghborhood.
M che Ba ea	Waban, MA	2016-12-01	Br ng san ty back to your park, stop a d sastrous p an.
Ben Cruz-Vernengo	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Because I ove San Franc sco and I don t want trees tonve cut down
Caro e Ke n	Oak and, CA	2016-12-01	I ove th s p ace. P ease don t ru n t!
Tob Gare ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I grew up wa k ng n th s forrest. I can see th s beaut fu forrest from the w ndows n my house. Save open space!
M a S otsve	Stevenson Ranch, CA	2016-12-01	My fam y ved n 2 d fferent homes on Da ewood Way for a most 30 years from m d 60 s to ear y 90 s, d rect y across the street from each other at the base of the forest. We (ne ghborhood k ds and my s bs) ooooved our beaut fu forest, and a the amaz ng memor es runn ng a ong the paths, p ck ng forget-me-nots, mak ng forts...A c t es shou d have a p ace to gett ng ost and escape ke n our Mt Dav dson jung e. You have to v s t the wa kways to understand what a gft t s! So beaut fu !
Anastas a G kshtern	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	T me to stop th s nsan ty!
Pete G kshtern	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	To save the trees. To stop herb c de use.
Anton Ka afat	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	T me to k NAP - to save the trees.
Eugene Bachmanov	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	"Natura " Areas Program s unnatura .
Deanna Y ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	We must preserve green space n San Franc sco for a the enjoy
He en W ant	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Green space s needed n the C ty
Kath een Dar ng	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I h ke th s h regu ar y. It s beaut fu . The br ds are amaz ng. Tak ng t a down w not on y d sp ace w d fe; t w destab ze the h , putt ng the homes surround ng t n danger. It s a so a HUGE waste of taxpayer funds. Leave t a one and p ease go f x the potho es n the roads nstead!!!
Kath een H. Byrne	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	P ease do not deforest Mt. Dav dson. It s a beaut fu part of San Franc sco s nature and shou d be protected. Kath een Byrne, Ha ght Ashbury
Ju e Chernoff	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I wa k around Mr Dav dson every morn ng w th my dog. It s the h gh ght of each day.
K rsten R ccard	Brook yn, NY	2016-12-01	Because we need to protect the w d fe and sens tve ecosystems that ex st n my un que hometown. More trees equa s more ca m humans, ess v o ence and fresh a r to combat the surp us of peop e dr v ng n SF!
Emma Sm th	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I m s gn ng because have spent count ess mag ca hours h k ng n th s forest. It won t fee the same when the trees are gone.
Ne Kozak	M waukee, WI	2016-12-01	Why wou d any sane person destroy an urban forest, the ungs of a c ty? Wh e the c ty stands, the forest shou d stand. And no one shou d ever use Round-up, wh ch stays n the env ronment and po sons groundwater.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Do ores Otto	Chr st ana, TN	2016-12-01	I grew up on Juan ta Way on SF, my parents st ve there and th s has a ways been a p ace of peace and seren ty, an oas n the m dd e of the c ty.Do not destroy th s area!
Chr st ne Peterson	G enda e, AZ	2016-12-01	I m s ng ng th s pet t on because I don t want to see the c ty I grew up n destroyed any more than t a ready has been!!
P per norr s	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Th s s r d cu ous! Not one s ng e person v ng n th s ne ghborhood nc ud ng myse f wants th s! What are the park and refs department do ng???? Shame on them!
Ju e Brown ng	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	The myr ad of reasons sted. The pr ort es seem very out of order.
Dr ssana Devananda	SF, CA	2016-12-01	There are so few green space eft n SF, p ease save th s one. It s part of my youth spent here n the C ty
Mary Kate Norr s	Greenwood V age, CO	2016-12-01	We just h ked Mt Dav dson on our recent tr p. What a gem to have r ght n the c ty! P ease fr ends s gn th s!!!
Bret Mcman ga	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ke trees. Des gnat ng a proper nat ve c mate s arb trary or subject to nterpretat on. Trees and w d fe are treasures our c ty shou d guard rather than term nate.
Jenn fer Enr quez	Redd ng, CA	2016-12-01	Th s s abso ute y d sgust ng that the c ty of SF wou d even th nk of comp ete y destroy ng a beaut fu forest and a the an ma s/b rds home! Save the forest!!! It s so amaz ng to have a tt e nature n the c ty. P ease don t destroy t, thank you.
Be nda Johns	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	My fr ends and ne ghbors and I wa k Mt. Dav dson regu ar y, n a seasons. Stop us ng herb c des on the mounta n and eave the trees a one. After 100 years, not sure a tree s st "non-nat ve". The mt. s hab tat to a w de range of b rds and an ma s, not east the raptors. Remove the trees and you k off our w d popu at on - not a very SF th ng to do. That s what makes NAP ud crous - po son and hab tat destruct on. Use our tax do ars to ma nta n what we have, not destroy t.
Nata a Krueger	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ove th s park because of a the trees. It wou d be devastat ng to see them cut down.
Sarah Papazog ak s	Wash ngton, DC	2016-12-01	Mt Dav dson s one of my favor te h k ng spots n the c ty.
Chr st na D Edoardo, Esq.	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Our forests are the ungs of our great C ty. #LetSanFranc scoBreathe
Chr s Bent y	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Why can t we eave th s p anet a tt e better p ace than how we found t once n a wh e. Th s p an makes no sense at a . Enough of the destruct on, et s p ease move forward not backward.
Ju e Andersen	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Th s s a w d fe sanctuary
Ky e Roat	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	We need a the green space there s eft untouched! P ease!!!
Er n Harr son	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	We need trees!
Dav d B sho	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I m appa ed, so s Mayor Sutro and the k ds that p anted that beaut fu forest. Why wou d anyone want to destroy t un ess they have some f nanc a nterest n t. A so, abso ute y no prest c des!! I grew up p ay ng n that forest..
j petersen	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Because I don t the trees chopped down.
M tch Kreaden	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ve n and frequent the area often, and th nk we have too few p aces to wa k n forests n SF. I have a Masters Degree n Env ronmenta Sc ence and can say that a 3 acre forest does not make a b g d fference on a arge sca e...but has a BIG d fference n the qua ty of fe of the res dents and makes forest accesab e to k ds to earn about nature (where n SF there are not that many forests).

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jess ca Lanham	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I want to save the trees
Matt Rosoff	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	The p an to cut down 1600 trees n one of our c ty s most beaut fu w d areas s absurd and short s ghted. P ease don t do th s!!!!
Denn s P nto	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mt. Dav dson has been neg ected for decades. It shou d have had proper forestry care on a cont nuous bas s. Tax payers a ready pa d for such serv ces but they have not been de vered. Now a p an to c ear cut based on unattended forest and des re to revert to some ong past env ronmenta scheme when res dent a homes d d not ex st s nappropr ate.
V ctor a Ara za	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I am s gn ng because I spent much of my youth h k ng up those h s des and go ng to the cross. best t mes of my fe.
Lara Monroe	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mount Dav dson s beaut fu exact y as s. There are so many rea needs n th s C ty; et s spend the money w se y.
Kate S mmons	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Save the forest, home to many an ma s
Morgan Jones	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ove Mt Dav dson (and so does my fam y!) and we shou d keep a of the hea thy trees that we can!
L nda Fe dman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	If you ve n SF and haven t wa ked around up on Mt. Dav dson, do....and then you w understand why th s pet t on s so mportant: Important enough for you to jo n me n s gn ng t.
Hersche Larr ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Every tree n San Franc sco s a treasure. Stop k ng them.
Gonza ez Br ana	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I m s gn ng because th s matters. Stop try ng to destroy nature!
Pame a Remensperger	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ove the green forest of Mt. Dav dson. I h ke the tra s regu ar y and take the ch dren of the preschoo I work at on adventures.
Margar da MacCorm ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	P ease do not cut the trees on Mt. Dav dson and PLEASE do not use tox c chem ca s ke Roundup. I ve n West Porta and frequent y h ke n Mt. Dav dson
T m Turner	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ve on Mount Dav dson and cannot mag ne oos ng th s marve ous forest. Th s forest has become the hab tat to many creatures nc ud ng, possums, raccoons, coyotes, red ta and red shou der hawks, ow s to name a few. Destroy the forest and you destroy the hab tat for these creatures. In add t on, trees are carbon s nks and he p to keep our a r cean and reduce g oba warm ng.
Mart n Raw ngs-Fe n	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	P ease do not c ear cut Mt. Dav dson t s a w d fe sanctuary for b rds, bumb ebees and sa amanders. Th s s a decades o d horr be dea n today s c mate, and w have negat ve consequences for the foreseeab e future of the area.
Abra Cast e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	My favor te p ace to wa k n a sf
Laura Van Zandt	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mt. Dav dson s a forest refuge for peop e and an ma s/b rds. It s d st nct ve appearance from many areas West of Tw n Peaks w be negat ve y affected by the proposed oss of trees
Mary G assanos	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I ove th s amaz ng mag ca p ace n the m dd e of our c ty. Leave t a one!
Jud th Har ess	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mt. Dav dson s a c ty treasure and shou d be ma nta ned, not destroyed.
Mon que Pf ager	San Rafae , CA	2016-12-01	Save the forests stop eros on. Save The w d fe
Les e Ho ngswoth	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mt Dav dson s one of my favour te p aces to h ke! P ease don t ru n t!
Em y C ark	Yuba C ty, CA	2016-12-01	Th s has been a huge part of my ch dhood grow ng up and cont nues to be a Spot to go when I v s t my fam y. Lots of w d fe, p ants and good memor es! P ease s gn th s pet t on

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Dee Se gman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	We desperate y need to keep our green urban forests as that--forests--to he p us breathe and keep the a r c eaner. Don t turn San Franc sco s forests nto grass and s and shrubs!
Dm tr Hochstatter	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	I don t agree w th the need to aggress ve y cut down trees n SF. I th nk the park dept. shou d take a more conservat ve stance on tree preservat on.
Jenn fer M ch e	Leander, TX	2016-12-01	I m an env ronmenta st, we keep destroy ng our p anet. I want to keep as much nature n tact for my one year o d granddaughter to enjoy one day. She ves n San Franc sco.
Tony Ho day	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Protect the forest. do not use herb c des, AND put n restrooms ke other parks have.
Joe W cht	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	a) nsect c des are awfu . do not use them. b) a ow the nature ts own space. stop medd ng.
Perr sh D Andrea	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	GET AHOLD of yourse ves, for cry n out oud. Embrace and VALUE our trees. What s WRONG w th you. You want t to ook ke t or g na y d d n the 1700 s? Rea y?? THEN TEAR DOWN ALL THE BUILDINGS, TOO, because THEY sure as he weren t there n the 1700 s, e ther. Th s s about greed for pu p, or, maybe, n the case of Mt. Dav dson, t cou d be about re g on as we . STOP THIS IDEA, NOW. VALUE the wooded areas we have! They are PRECIOUS and WONDERFUL.
Kye Ha ey	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-01	Mt Dav dson forest s a treasure. I d hate to see t go. What s the reason? I ve searched but don t see a c ear reason for deforestat on the h ? I use to wa k my 1 year o d up my back every day when we ved there t was mag ca (desp te go ng past the scary tox c spray ng s gns. What was that about?) Some c ar ty wou d be apprec ated.
Zac Wheatcroft	Peta uma, CA	2016-12-02	We th s s a horr be dea... Its not 1700 anymore, and there aren t a who e ot of other trees around, so et s just eave these n p ace... And to spray tox c sh t a over the p ace too? Who the he came up w th th s dea? Espec a y n th s age of c mate change, t s good to have as many trees around as poss be.
Ange a M er	Grand Rap ds, MI	2016-12-02	Th s s an oas s n the c ty. I was a nanny to a fam y n the M ra oma ne ghborhood and we h ked those tra s at east once a week. Tak ng p cn cs up to the top, acknow edg ng the Armen an genoc de, and be ng thankfu for such a ove y green space w th fantast c v ews. Th s s not the way to so ve the hous ng cr s s. I cannot even be eve t s on the tab e.
Lorcan Keat ng	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove the Mt. Dav dson forst
caro d mm ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	We need to preserve our natura open spaces.
RITA ros	san jose, CA	2016-12-02	I ove to breath oxygen
Veena S ngh	SF, CA	2016-12-02	If there s a safety reason for do ng th s, I wou d ke to know what that s. If not, then why???
Parker Math s	Hatt esburg, MS	2016-12-02	Save the trees.
Mark Werth	Port and, OR	2016-12-02	I ved n San Franc sco for 6 years and oved th s park.
Karen ew s	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	The forest s beaut fu and pest c des are cr m na
Bettym ermd M er	Da y C ty, CA	2016-12-02	Cutt ng down the trees on Mount Dav dson presents a hazard to the ne ghborhood because of denud ng of the mounta n.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Anand Dharawat	Be erose Terrace, NY	2016-12-02	<p>Trees are patient souls who serve us selflessly for hundreds of years at a time and don't really ask for anything in return. Depending on what you do in life, you are either given a human or an animal body or sometimes become a tree. Since trees serve silently, this can be either a punishment for someone who needs to reform or a chance for a great soul to greatly serve the Earth for centuries. We don't know how the Earth will suffer if we lose our trees and wildlife, and there's no reason to find out.</p> <p>When I start my day, I hug at least one tree and thank it and say "God bless the divine souls known as trees, thank you for all you do and all you intend to do. Thank you for providing us with shade and shelter, thank you for giving us oxygen, thank you for giving us fruit. Thank you for giving us wood, for paper and building materials, and so many other things. Thank you for giving me the proof of your life, thank you for being the site of so many sacred and special events, thank you for being divine, selfless souls. Thank you, dhanyavaad, abhar."</p> <p>This recitation barely covers all that trees do for us. As so, receiving proof of life means that trees show us that they are living beings. If you hug a tree, or specifically, put your open palm on a tree while speaking loving words, you will feel a reciprocal and sense the life in the tree. This is a loving thing that you do not want to kill, as they will exit Earth on their own terms.</p> <p>Even planting a tree for each one killed is not good enough. Please preserve all these trees today. Your kids and grandkids and beyond will thank you.</p> <p>--Anand Dharawat mailto:anandpdharawat@gmail.com re="nofollow">anandpdharawat@gmail.com 917-690-4330</p>
Ann Carr	Watsonville, CA	2016-12-02	I love trees
Jason Dozier	Woodland, CA	2016-12-02	We need to keep forest for our children to enjoy and love.
Andy Howse	San Bruno, CA	2016-12-02	I love trees
Craig Downer	Minden, NV	2016-12-02	Do not remove these beautiful trees that are habitat to so many species. These are as supporters of the air and land beauty and uprightness to all inhabitants of the San Francisco area. I visit this area and this would be a serious infringement on my quality of life!
Cynthia De Martini	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	This would be just one more blemish on our once-beautiful
Atasha Bozorgzad	Pleasanton, CA	2016-12-02	Mt. Davidson is gorgeous.
Dan Michele	Leander, TX	2016-12-02	I love trees
Lisa LeBanc	Rancho Cordova, CA	2016-12-02	<p>Each and every time an agency strives to destroy a natural resource area, the consequences cascade for decades to come.</p> <p>These eucalyptus stands pre-date the modern Bay Area; both the trees and the people living in these areas have adapted to co-exist and perhaps become dependent upon each other: the trees oxygenate, and very likely, the air which we enjoy the exhaustions of the humans in the environment.</p> <p>The release of sequestered carbons is also an excellent reason to leave these trees alone.</p> <p>Use that spare cash for something other than needlessly taking lives and the surrounding hills have come to admire and depend upon.</p>

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Dav d R chardson	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	San Franc scans need these treed areas to escape from the ons aught of our urban ves, not to ment on the fact that they prov de w d fe hab tats, as we as the cruc a funct on these trees perform of he p ng to c ean the a r we breathe.
Matt Fre he t	P easanton, CA	2016-12-02	Mount Dav dson s beaut fu and th s makes abso ute y no sense.
Ky e Decker	Horse Shoe, NC	2016-12-02	I can t be eve I have to s gn a pet t on n one of the most progress ve ct es n the wor d to save TREES. Keep San Franc sco green!
jasm ne cabanaw	peterborough, Canada	2016-12-02	I ove th s forest!!
Nan Go dberg	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s cr m na . I am so s ck of a you bureaucrats and po t c ans ru n ng the c ty we ve n. Stop screw ng around w th th ngs that don t need f x ng or chang ng. Every change does not a benef t make.
Shane Graff	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove h k ng n San Franc sco s green spaces.
Ros e Pongracz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ve on the s opes of Mt. Dav dson. Don t take away the trees!
Rosa a Webster	B g Sur, CA	2016-12-02	Because I am awesome and so s the forest!
Anthony Stevens	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I wa k th s park mu t p e t mes every year. It s a spec a urban escape that shou d be eft for many generat ons to enjoy!
Jam e Fox	Mart nez, CA	2016-12-02	Save the trees.
Ange a Rosoff	San Franc sco	2016-12-02	I am s gn ng because I ove fresh a r and natura death of a v ng p ants and an ma s. Why undo someth ng that s g v ng shade and homes to so many an ma s? Th s s a sense ess k ng of fe.
Andy Howse	San Bruno, CA	2016-12-02	I ove trees
Jayson Gerena	Hayward, CA	2016-12-02	Nature shou d be respected and I m concerned about our p anet s env ronmenta hea th.
Hutch Carpenter	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove the d fferent env ronments one encounters on h kes around Mt. Dav dson. Warm and w ndswept eastern s de, coo damp west s de. I can t understand the og c of damag ng th s amaz ng eco ogy.
Kev n Banderas	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-02	A peacefu p ace to wa k
beth d m cco	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	These trees prov de she ter from w nd, safety from ands de, trap mo sture to prevent fre zones and the forest to enjoy. Th s s a stup d cost y p an to ru n our ne ghborhood, make t unsafe and spray dangerous pest c des. P ease stop th s nsan ty and eave us a one.
ron saunders	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	We need to protect th s and. One of the on y p aces eft n the c ty. Tw n Peaks has been nvaded by buses, cars and th eves. Same w th Go den Gate Park. Let s save th s s te!
Jazm n E ek	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I wou d not ke the trees of mt Dav dson cut. P ease!!!
Ph p Co son	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Remov ng the urban forest s an nsane p an. Furthermore, Us ng herb c des and or nc ud ng Roundup s s mp y horr b e and shou d be consdered cr m na .
Mar a Ram rez	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I m s gn ng because the we need to preserve our park n SF n a hea thy and eco-fr end y way.
Judy Reyno ds	San Jose, CA	2016-12-02	Keep our trees, they prov de c ean a r and home for many b rds. We don t need c earcut and herb c de on grass and.
jann ce Caba ero	P ttsburg, CA	2016-12-02	Th s sn t r ght. P ease don t do th s and STOP us ng these terr b e pest c des
Ca t n Be t ks	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s a use ess project.
Chet Su van	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I grew up on that mounta n

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jacque ne Argote	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	The four tox c herb c des be ng used on Mt. Dav dson and other target areas are Roundup (g yphosate), Gar on 4 U tra (tr c opyr), M estone (am nopyra d), and Hab tat/Arsena /Chopper (mazapyr). Me as a San Franc sco res dent I am very concerned that SF Rec and Park s po ut ng recreat on areas w th cancer-caus ng tox ns n order to k trees that the pub c wants to stay stand ng.
Dan e L nt	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s my home. I grew up on Mt Dav dson and cou dn t mag ne t any other way.
Er n Ca ahan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s my ne ghborhood and I want to protect our natura env onment.
Chr st ne Yran	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Destroy ng Mt Dav dson s a d saster to our ne ghborhood and the c ty of SF.
L y Noce	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Mt Dav dson Forest s a treasure n our c ty San Franc sco, th s p ace s one of my favor te s tes for h k ng, I tru y enjoy my t me there.
Anya Pr est ey	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove th s park. It s a h dden oas s n San Franc sco. There are very few parks n the c ty, and none n th s area.
june job n	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s the fr st I have heard about th s. Such a ove y p ace shou d be protected. Were there pub c meet ngs about th s?
Ke y Wa sh	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	It s cr m na to use tox c pest c des anywhere, et a one somewhere used by oca res dents and an ma s - and cose to our homes. Runoff w nev tab y get to our yards.
E e Pat	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I care about nature n my c ty.
Wendy Ca ahan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ve on Da ewood Way near the forest area and t wou d be trag c to ose the trees that prov de a natura hab tat for so many an ma s and br ds. We wou d a so m ss the nature tra . Th s c ty has very few green be ts and we shou d be protect ng th s space vs. destroy ng t.
L z N cho s	New York, NY	2016-12-02	Why are hey do ng th s. Stop th s r ght now! Stop mow ng down forests and trees!!
Ange a J gmed	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I wou d ke to save th s forest Mt.Dav dson Forest , because I ove trees , w d nature and th s p ace one of the my favor te one s .
Er ch Braun	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I want to save the trees
Annette Cardwe	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Mt Dav dson forest s one of my fam y s favor te spots n SF.
Derr ck Hussey	New York, NY	2016-12-02	I m the Lorax, and I speak for the trees.
Brendan Mcdermott	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I recent y purchased a house that shares a property ne w th Mt. Dav dson. I purchased t because of the forest. Don t destroy our beaut fu park that s woven deep nto the fabr c of the ne ghborhood. The resu t w caps ze property va ues on the h and the c ty s tax revenue w suffer as a resu t. Th s s a huge env ronmenta , econom c and cura m stake on the part of San Franc sco s Department of Parks And Recreat on!
Stephan e Frank e	New Buffa o, MI	2016-12-02	Mount Dav dson s my favor te spot n the ent re Bay Area! P ease preserve th s beaut fu , peacefu oas s and eave t as s, the forest s what makes t so wonderfu ! P ease stop threaten ng our hea th by us ng tox c chem ca s to k p ants that shou d be eft to thr ve
Gabr e a W jegunawardena	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ve n the ne ghborhood and ve the Forrest!
Scott Turner	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s a terr be dea because the env ronment and ecosystem has changed and adapted to the current reg me. Cutt ng down the trees w just add a new pressure on the ex st ng p ants and part cu ar y an ma s current y v ng on the mounta n. In add t on to that, t s fundamenta y a terr be dea to use carc nogens, part cu ar y g yphosate wh ch s strong y nked to bee and butterf y dec ne.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Dor s Sp tz g	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I m s gn ng because nature SHOULD NOT BE DESTROYED but conserved!!
Mar Tamburo (Mar Mack)	M Va ey, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s a bad dea.
Kev n Fong	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I have ved n the Mt Dav dson area a most my who e fe and Mt Dav dson s a gem n San Franc sco . Cutt ng the trees w create eros on and a p ethora of other prob ems.
Kath een Fazekas	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Because I grew up n that area and went up there espec a y on Easter morn ngs.
Anna Spektor	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	D scover ng Mt. Dav dson park was ke a surpr se g ft - w th t s wet and fragrant forest paths. It s a treasure to cher sh, not to destroy!
S mon Cox	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	We need more trees, not ess.
Ines Ascenc o	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	It s mportant to save natura hab tats n San Franc sco for the an ma s, for the human be ngs and for the c mate!
ga a so	parad se, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s sacred ground n my fe. It s where I went to k ck methadone and hea n my youth. I re-awake to w d nature there, Mt. Dav dson s and m ne. The b ackberr es need to be eft unpo soned so peop e and other creatures can eat them and remember what generos ty s. Many t mes I ve stood n the wooded w dness there and mag ned the who e Bay Area naked, as t was: As you are now propos ng for th s h ghest peak n the C ty! Oh, I m sure ya wou d do someth ng "n ce" and maybe even more nat ve/eco. Th s unkempt beauty has ts own spec a p ace n SF. PLEASE et the tte euca yptus ra nforest pers st!
M ke Penn	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I spent a good dea of my ch dhood p ay ng on Mt Dav dson and want t saved for future generat ons.
M ke Anderson	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I am s gn ng because I ve on Mt. Dav dson and ove to be ab e to wa k through the peace and qu et of the forest. To destroy th s forest that has stood for years because t was ntroduced at some po nt n h story makes no sense. P ease do not cut down our forest!
L sa McHenry	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Do not cut our trees and po son our and!
L sa Kadyk	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Cutt ng down the trees on Mt. Dav dson? Us ng tox c pest c des? Th s s an nsane dea, for a the reasons sted on th s pet t on.
Kerry Sykes	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	We need the trees on Mt Dav dson! The ne ghborhood needs the nature and w d fe of Mount Dav dson to stay as t s!
Ange ca Campos	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ve n San Franc sco. I go to schoo nearby MT. Dav dson and t wou d be a shame to get rd of one of the beaut fu s ghts I can see from c ty co ege. MT Dav dson s a peacefu tte get away w th n the c ty where peop e can get nto nature and exerc se.
Oren Schaede	Pasadena, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s a gem n the c ty, a great park to wa k n and enjoy
Joan Cudd hy	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove h k ng Mt Dav dson
Karen Au	舊金山, CA	2016-12-02	I am s gn ng because I treasure the park and am worr ed about the ands de.
V cky Aronson	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I care
Tamra W son	Lex ngton, KY	2016-12-02	Former San Franc sco res dent, her- p ease preserve th s and and keep t forested, as a natura preserve.
Ir s Chere	Santa Rosa Ca forn a, Hong Kong	2016-12-02	I can t be eve th s s happen ng!!!! Shame on anyone who s promot ng th s p an!!! Keep roundup out of our ves and keep th s beaut fu forest a ve!!!!
Brenton S mpson	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Don t k the trees. We have beaut fu parks. Keep them that way.
Va entyna Butenko	Wa nut Creek, CA	2016-12-02	I see mport ancestors of parks for fam es and k ds

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Kate Brdgeman	Glasgow, United Kingdom	2016-12-02	I lived in the mountains, was married at Chana beach, and took photos in golden gate park. Leave the natural beauty of SF alone!!
Meane Swer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	Have you guys gone insane. Seriously, why would you destroy the little amount of nature this city has left??? Old growth cannot be replaced by new growth. I don't understand this mentality. If you want to destroy nature, do it in your own backyard.
Jessica Davies	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	I used to live a few blocks away
Dmitri Gaznikov	Тель-Авив, Israel	2016-12-02	I am a former resident of San Francisco and consider it my hometown. I'd like to do my part in preserving this forest.
Betsey Nea	Brasilia, Brazil	2016-12-02	Forests are where we go to reboot. Why on Earth would anyone consider doing away with such a gem? Lack of knowledge, we must forgive. Find another place to do your business people. Avoiding forest brings life to a community, thereby. A resting place in a busy world.
Iona Ragnadotter	Stockholm, Sweden	2016-12-02	Forests survive. We have to preserve them. A lot of them!
Eric Jonsson	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-02	I own the house I grew up in on Rockdale Drive. I strongly oppose denuding Mt Davidson.
Kat Kro	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	This is a community treasure!
Josinpoard	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	I like this area regularly, it's such an oasis of green serene beauty in the city. The environmental impact of clearing the trees seems huge. Please reconsider cutting the forest down.
Rich Costigan	Huntington Park, CA	2016-12-02	Climate warming.
Marie Franchin	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	We should be planting more trees, not cutting them down.
Carolyn Randa	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	I'm signing because environments change and the eucalyptus forest is now the "natural" environment. Using toxic chemicals to try to change it's harmful for the children, adults and pets that enjoy using the parks
Michael Regan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	I am sick and tired of SF doing stupid things with our resources. Get rid of a lot of these eco extremist they are eco terrorist.
Jacquelyn Pau	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	I grew up on Mt. Davidson and hiked there regularly. It was a beautiful meditative place. I can't believe some people want to take out 1,600 of the beautiful trees. Absolutely NO! NO! NO! I still love Golden Gate Park at the foot of Mt. Davidson and now I take walks in that park. I am happy every time I look up at Mt. Davidson and see the trees of one of our most beautiful urban forests. How can you push street trees on everyone and then turn around and destroy a forest that was here before I was born! (that would be 1945)
Michael Regan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-02	These Ecology terrorist need to be stopped. Tell the board to defund NAP that is the only thing that will stop this stupidity. Same thing with "rewilding" we don't need or want dangerous wild animals roaming our city streets.
Sharyn Hamer	Carmichael, CA	2016-12-02	This is a beautiful forest and provides a wonderful sanctuary for people and wildlife. Don't destroy it! As a former San Franciscan, born and raised there, I return often and love this area. Our environment is threatened by cutting trees down. We should be embracing ways to save it, not destroy it.
Carole Hess	Reno, NV	2016-12-02	Please do not destroy our beautiful Eucalyptus trees. They provide a wonderful humans and dogs to play, relax and commune with nature. My Davidson hosts many wonderful public events like mutant denomination Easter Sunrise services, weddings and many more. The trees create a rainforest environment which makes fire risk and is a habitat for many animals.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ju e ong ga egos	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Natura Areas Program s hated by most reasonable San Franc scans. It s noth ng but a taxpayer-funded garden ng project that uses ga ons of carc nogen c herb c de (Monsanto round-up) because the p ant ng scheme, such as t s, s s mp y not v ab e.
V ctor a Hamman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	It s nsane n th s age of g oba warm ng to cut down one of San Franc sco s ast carbon-sequester ng forests. I ove th s forest and wa k there regu ar y. Leave t a one!
M chae Ma one	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I want the Forrest trees to rema n on the h . They prov de a va uab e retreat for human and fauna popu at on. It s nature and we want t - c earcutt ng to a barren h s de s someth ng we do not want.
JU e Jones	CA, CA	2016-12-02	P ease stop spray ng pest c des and do not cut trees down
Patr c a Ardz ejewsk	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove the Mount Dav dson Park area and I see no reason to deforested and many reasons to keep t as t s.
Barbara Roberts	Oak and, CA	2016-12-02	Env ronmenta y unsound; carg nogen c; c t zens DO NOT WANT th s c ear ng done
Jon E strom	Va ejo, CA	2016-12-02	I m s gn ng because Mt. Dav dson forest s my favor te p ace n the c ty. I used to ve nearby and cher shed the trees and so tude. How a rocky, barren, c ear cut and herb c de soaked h s de can compare to the w d beauty there now s beyond me. San Franc sco shou d be ashamed of tse f...
Mary Lee	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove Mt Dav dson; t s a beaut fu c ty andmark, and most of the beauty s due to ts ushness and ta trees. As a res dent who ves down the b ock from Mt D and oves t, p ease don t remove ts trees!!!
Danyka Kosturak	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s not a good way to change th ngs. I voted to save the parks not destroy them. Th s s one of my favor te p aces n the c ty and t s ex stence s a thr . There must be a better so ut on.
Lyd a McN e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove the forest! An ntegra part of San Franc sco for hundreds of years.
Masha Campagne	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Because I ve a b ock away from Mt Dav dson and I ove the park!!
C nt W der	Sausa to, CA	2016-12-02	Save green space, sequester carbon, qua ty of urban fe!
R ta Maund	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s an mportant part of SF her tage and space for w d fe and res dents to enjoy!
E sa Wenze	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s c ty needs more trees. P ant trees n barren ne ghborhoods ke the Exce s or and Bayv ew before remov ng them e sewhere.
G enda Cook	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	SF s an urban env ronment. Not a nature preserve. The area as t s now s more usefu for peacefu recreat on than t wou d be w th ts h stor ca andscape. The forested env ronment s beaut fu . There are enough ba d h s n SF.
Spencer A exander	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I want to preserve th s beaut fu p ace n SF
CoCo Jewe e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove th s park and SF needs a the greenery t can keep ho d of!
Sher Med na	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I cannot stand the thought of yet one more p ece of my c ty be ng destroyed. Mt. Dav dson be ongs to the peop e, and to the many spec es of w d fe that make the r home there.
Dande o Edwardson	Berke ey, CA	2016-12-02	We need more nature and not ess! And Stop us ng Roundup ! t s po sonous too a an ma s, nc ud ng humans!
Morgan Matthews	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Mt. Dav dson s an amaz ng retreat from the bust e of the c ty. A of our beaut fu green spaces and parks are what make San Franc sco such a wonderfu c ty to ve n.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ke y Bass n	Oak and, CA	2016-12-02	I ove th s space and green space s what makes San Franc sco great. We need green space to preserve our menta hea th!
Ca ty Rogowsk	Wash ngton D.C., DC	2016-12-02	because I am The Lorax.
A ex Trembath	Oak and, CA	2016-12-02	There s no such th ng as "base ne" or "pr st ne" nature. The nature that ex sts on Mt. D today s the nature that w be affected by human ty s ntervent ons. There s no br ng ng back the past, so we shou d protect the present.
Weston McBr de	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove the forest! That s why I come here.
Courtney A ev	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ove runn ng n the beaut fu urban forest on Mt. Dav dson. It s a treasured p ace and shou d be kept!
Sh ng Wong	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s: "\$1 B on n Unfunded Park Ma ntenance: SF Rec and Park has over \$1 b on n unfunded deferred ma ntenance. The pub c wou d prefer that the C ty of San Franc sco nvest n cr t ca bas c park ma ntenance needs rather than spend ng m ons of do ars on cutt ng down be oved h stor c sanctuar es ke Mt. Dav dson."
Rebecca Bar	Somerv e, MA	2016-12-02	Th s park s beaut fu -- SAVE THE TREES!
Em y Mue er	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Don't a ow taxpayer money to be used to harm the env ronment.
Cather ne Banch er	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Mt. Dav dson forest must be saved for the benef t of SF c tzens and the env ronment, nc ud ng the an ma s that ca t home, b rds, bees, et a .
Patr a Brown	Santa Cruz, CA	2016-12-02	P ease keep th s oas s of green and th s wonderfu creator of oxygen. It s a treasure to San Franc scans.
Jonathan S monoff	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Mt. Dav dson Forest s a un que resource, a coud forest n a c ty, and shou d not be destroyed. I understand the urge to go back to how t once was, but the truth s that the forest s a better use of that p ace than the open scrub that was once there. Cutt ng t down wou d be a cr me.
Ra mundo T ng	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s my ne ghborhood!!!
M che e Wooten	Anchorage, AK	2016-12-02	I used to ve n San Franc sco and wou d often take wa ks n th s park. Beg nn ng from my home n Noe Va ey, I oved fgur ng out how to get nto the park from surround ng ne ghborhoods. Hav ng h top parks n SF enab ed me a sense of exp rat on, journey, and retreat dur ng the d ff cu tes of my Master s program n phys cs at SFSU.
Cam e Herrera	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I h ke and run here. Not on y that, keep ng a the trees we have s essent a for m t gat ng the c mate change that s a ready occurr ng.
Darrah Bach	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I ve near th s ove y park and wou d rea y hate to see t go for abso ute y no reason. Save the trees!!
Geoffrey Accurs	Longv ew, WA	2016-12-02	We need to start protect ng forests where ever they are! We have a ready ost over 90% of the redwoods and 50% of forests wor d w de. What s eff s under threat from many s des.
Ju a Re chard	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Because I grew up n the pres d o, because the green spaces n San Franc sco are the heart of the c ty.
Jan Stephens	W ts, CA	2016-12-02	S ts so mportant to save green areas, espec a y n urban areas!
Jean Sommerv e	Rockv e, MD	2016-12-02	Forests and the beauty of nature shou d be preserved. Humans need them! P ease preserve th s beaut fu p ace.
D anne Keen	South San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I grew up v ng near Mt. Dav dson, oved the trees then and st do.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Br dget Ke y	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	No one wants these trees cut down! We on y want the parks manag ng OUR trees proper y- wh ch they are not do ng! Instead of car ng for them, they have et them become unhea thy, and now nstead of br ng ng them back to hea th, they want to k them. We the peop e do not want th s, yet our emp oyees n the c ty don t want to sten to us! They are n for a fght!!!
Janet Seaforth	C overda e, CA	2016-12-02	My parents meet there 1946
Qu k Ca n	Aupa uk, Canada	2016-12-02	I want to support the peop e sav ng the forest.
Bonn e Wach	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I grew up near Mt. Dav dson and ove th s w d wooded urban forest. P ease save t for the generat ons to come. My. Dav dson and Mt. Sutro are the ast of the r k nd.
samantha ve arde	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	Th s s a beauty and needs to saved!!!! P us the statue there s for the Armen an genoc de
Er c Wendt	San D ego, CA	2016-12-02	I ove ta k ng wa ks n the Mount Dav dson forest!
Son a Todd	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	ts a cr me to Nature to k tress for the he of t, ts the home of f owers, b rds and other tte cr tters, p us w affect env ronmenta changes, and a the po son w affect humans as we , what an d of the creator of th s stup d ass dec s on!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Ange na Z eger	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-02	I m s gn ng th s because I ove see ng the trees on the way up I ove sten ng to the sound they make when the w nd bows around me, I ove the sme of them, the trees make mount Dav dson what t s today
Sandy Rodgers	Carm chae , CA	2016-12-03	Th s gem needs to be protected.
M Warren	Seatt e, WA	2016-12-03	As a nat ve San Franc scan, one who h ked parks and beach areas as a ch d , and grew up to be a steward of the and as a Gardener n Seatt e (nf uenced a of my young adu t fe by Go den Gate Park), I respectfu y request that you update th s p an from 10 years ago to ref ect best pract ces of today w th cons derat on to c mate change, b od vers ty, the r chness of sanctuary nature areas, h stor ca va ue as seen through h story, and a tree canopy that offers nca cu ab e benef ts on so many eve s. South San Franc sco, San Bruno suffered oss of h s des w th red tagged homes prompt ng mu t-m on do ar repa rs by the c tes, part cu ar y SSF whose h s de so b ocked Jun per Serra Bou evard, a Ca DOT h ghway (1994?) How can a,c ear cut not be detr menta n-c ty? Do you remember San Bruno mounta n be ng saved from deve opment because of a tte b ue butterfly? P ease, there must be a better p an to ach eve what s needed wh e spar ng as many trees as poss be. P ease take the t me to move forward w th a p an that fts a part es up. Thank you.
Dan e Anderson	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Mt. Dav dson s my favor te p ace n a of SF, and I ove runn ng through the forest.
Frances Ferry	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Hav ng a forest n the m dst of an urban area s refresh ng, up ft ng and beaut fu .
Jason Rose	Berke ey, CA	2016-12-03	I used to ve r ght by Mt Dav dson and found t nva uab e to have such a qu et and peacefu forest spot r ght there n the m dd e of the c ty.
Dav d Nugent	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s forest s an ntegra part of the San Franc sco env ronmenta andscape now. And an ntegra part of the commun ty. Your proposed act on s aga nst both the w shes of the commun ty and destruct ve to nature. Don t be stup d.
Isabe A ves de L ma	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	P ease s gn th s! One of my favor te p aces n SF
Dewey Sprenze	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	keep the trees!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jules Christeson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	While I understand the desire to return the park to how it once was, clearing a beautiful forest like this will be devastating for many reasons. I love this park and it would also be a pleasure to see it changed so drastically. The park currently serves an important part in SF's ecosystem, and destroying it is not something we should be doing right now.
Ron Proctor	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	In order to implement this plan by the SF Rec and Parks NAP it will require that pest control applications in our city parks increase. And to remove 1,600 healthy trees that will require the use of more pesticides. The non-native (Eucalyptus) trees on Mt Davidson that will be destroyed are justified by SFRPD as "Strategic Replacement" – a new criteria that Lisa Wayne dreamed up. It used to be "poor suitability" as a criteria for healthy tree removal but she soon realized that we are not fooled. It is an expensive experiment to enhance the biodiversity by killing trees and replacing them with grass and brush. Wayne's boss, the manager of SFRPD, Phyllis Gonsberg is on record as saying: "By prioritizing the removal of trees we can promote the health and sustainability of the forest." Not true, what you are doing is killing the ecosystems that have flourished for over a century now.
Hannah Davis	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I'm signing because this park offers nature and peace and a beautiful park. Mt. Davidson will become much less magnificent sans trees.
Ydya Morris	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love Mount Davidson and San Francisco
Tracy Lorenz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I care about our SF parks!
Mercedes Berthaud	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-03	Was part of my nature walks, before class at city, many years ago. When we were part of 24th and Hoffman Streets.
Stacy Chin	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need to repopulate trees by cutting these Eucalyptus down is the plan.
Goodwin Donald	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I hike Davidson often and this deforestation for sand gusting and far below San Francisco standards...
Matt Redmond	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love riding my bike in this forest; it'd be a huge shame to lose a wonderful place of refuge in the middle of the city due to logging concerns.
Peter Koch	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need the forest!
Noah Stone	New Orleans, LA	2016-12-03	Dude... trees
Waman Dea	Grass Valley, CA	2016-12-03	I love hiking up there!
John Remus	Santa Clara, CA	2016-12-03	I hike here and have taken photos many times, it's beautiful and should remain wooded
Rosalee Gabriele	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	trees are awesome and anyone who wants to cut them down can personally fight me
Emma Hogan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Wtf
Morris Sverand	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is my home and many Remember Mt. as it's leave it alone. No need there are far greater uses taxpayers money in San Francisco.
Andrew Chang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is one of my favorite places in the city.
Nick Vandehey	SAN FRANCISCO, CA	2016-12-03	I love that park. It's a little paradise in the city. Way more lovely than other non-forested hills.
Benjie Guy Yoche	Day City, CA	2016-12-03	I run here often and I love nature
Greg Mcquaid	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love being on these trees. Walk my dog on Mt Davidson daily. The entire landscape would be utterly changed. We gonna return the Sunset to sand dunes too?

Name	Location	Date	Comment
D ckson Lu	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Amaz ng natura c ty hab tats ke these shou d not be destroyed.
K ra Lee-Mundschau	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I LOVE SF
Corbett Campbe	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s my backyard, c ear cut t and we re gonna have more than a few words about t.
Jayden Pace-Ga agher	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Duh
Maeve Harr ngton	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I ve ved n the area my who e fe and ove Mt Dave. My fam y wa ks up to the top every Chr stmas Day. It s a beaut fu p ace and the trees add so much to that beauty. Shame on SF parks and rec for try ng to ru n one of the th ngs that make th s p ace so great.
Chr st an Baba	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s a beaut fu park, mportant to so many peop e of San Franc sco. Dont destroy t, and dont destroy trees. C mate change s the number one threat n the wor d, and trees are one way we can essen the carbon footpr nt.
Henr que Bagu ho	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I am s n ng th s pet t on to protect the fauna that ves there s nce the ex stence of these threes. A so th s sense ess act w cause major eros on on the h s that can put many homes n danger. Th s threes are the new norm and they shou d be eft a one. Maybe we shou d d sp ace the po t c ans that are organ z ng th s charade wh e we rep ace the r homes w th someth ng of our k ng. That shou d nc ude cutt ng the r wages to 0.
Fa sa P racha	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Because ove nature and my c ty. There s enough harm happen ng to mother earth. Let these trees ve p ease.
Sof ya Woodcock	Irv ne, CA	2016-12-03	The forests are my favor te.
Kenna Woods	Sonoma, CA	2016-12-03	We need Mother Earth, she doesn t need us.
Joy Oconnor	Brook yn, NY	2016-12-03	Save the forest n San Franc sco
John Fran cev ch	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Keep our qua ty of fe. Downtown s turn ng n to Manhattan. Keep our trees.
Robert Hart	Oak and, CA	2016-12-03	I used to h ke that h a the t me. The forest s beaut fu !
Enoch Ha e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Save our tree s.
Br anna Lyon	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I have many fond memor es of h k ng Mt.Dav dson n e elementary schoo .
Wendy L nderborg	Bays de, CA	2016-12-03	I ove th s forest-we need to keep t for everyone- t s so mportant
Ar e Hernandez	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Im a nat ve San Franc scan and I want to keep my c ty as I remember t
Ay n Sor a	SAN Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	care about the forests
Lorna Tuufu	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I ove my c ty green!!!!!!
V ck L McGu re, MA, MFT	Oak and, CA	2016-12-03	These are very good arguments. I can t mag ne the "benef ts" wou d outwe gh the ser ous prob ems th s wou d cause. Th ngs aren t as they were 20 or 10 years ago. C mate change has worsened-I thought we were supposed to p ant ots & ots of trees to he p med ate c mate change.
Ph Saf er	A buquerque, NM	2016-12-03	Leave Mt. Dav dson s trees a one or face expens ve awsu ts and protests. Trees have many benef ts to the env ronment and the pub c.
Kat Beau eu	Soque , CA	2016-12-03	Beaut fu area ~ p ease he p to keep t that way !
Sebra Leaves	San Fran csc o, CA	2016-12-03	Save the Mt. Dav dson Forest n ts current status. Spend your money tak ng care of the street trees the way the voters voted for you to do. We need tree ma ntenance, not tree s aughter.
Ho y McAdams	A ameda, CA	2016-12-03	Dont k the trees
Mary Reyno ds	Santa Cruz, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s a spec a p ace to San Franc scans and others.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
john tay or	sf, CA	2016-12-03	My sister has lived on Mt Davidson for 20+ years. This plan would affect her and anyone who enjoys the park negatively. I realize that Eucalyptus trees are not "native" but really, they have been here a long time, are not hurting anyone, help clean the air, and prevent erosion. Why cut so many down, why not replant, why use pesticides?? The pesticide use will certainly cause problems for asthmatics like my sister. What a shame this is.
Florence Korkames	San Antonio, TX	2016-12-03	This beautiful mountain top is one of the last places in San Francisco that allows an escape from the city, and preserves not only nature by the contemplative nature of this mountain-top. The Armenian monument is meant to be a place of peace and meditation, to reflect on a that has happened. Without the forest that peace will be lost. We must preserve it.
nka vaks	mountain view, CA	2016-12-03	We need trees to breath.
Todd Greenspan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I support restoration of native habitats in large open spaces but not in a community park in the heart of a residential neighborhood. In particular, the spraying of herbicides is a real threat to the 100s of children of playground and weekly bases in the Mt. Davidson park. If you want to restore the mountain, I suggest removing the large religious symbol first.
Bona Pak	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	There isn't any other place like this. Makes me feel out of this world in this outdoor busting city.
max ne chong	san francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need the trees for our wild life and birds. They are beautiful.
M chae Hom	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love the space and it should stay green.
Debra Forth	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I believe SF parks are one of our greatest assets in the city.
Douglas Cowan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	It is a mistake to cut these trees and leave this hillside barren. There is a concern about erosion. It will be a destruction of habitat. Park and Rec. Uses too much pesticides as well. Maybe we need to restructure Park & Rec.
Danny Wu	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love nature
Jenny Pardo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need a forest - green natural space for kids and adults to go
Jasmine Chen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love this forest
Rache Koas	San Antonio, TX	2016-12-03	I want future generations of kids to see how beautiful nature is, not have it erased where you can only see it through books and pictures on the internet.
George Keuftedjan	Bur game, CA	2016-12-03	We need the green trees
Kevin Contreras	Santa Barbara, CA	2016-12-03	I like trees
Jon Merker	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	stop tree murder!
Marika Stuurman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up in these trees
Sherie Ingram	Arngton, TX	2016-12-03	Destroying this forest would be a travesty.
Amy Obensk	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I need nature.
Abdu Monim	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need trees! Without trees carbon dioxide is going to be released into the atmosphere
Jenny Wang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love nature!
Alexandra Reoff	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need trees.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jonathan Lee	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is my favorite spot in the city. Through the past few years I have been going through many family issues along with some personal and mental problems. Mt. Davidson was my place to cope, where I could hike, get some fresh air, pray at the cross, and of course enjoy the view. I always tell my peers that we need MORE places like this in the city, not less.
Sa uzd na Banderas	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love this place.
Suzanne Sherman	Portland, OR	2016-12-03	Please...we need our trees and forests...for the wildlife, to help fight climate change, for our wellbeing...please leave us some bit of nature in a city already clear cut and over developed.
Victor Le	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I ran a lot there for cross country practice. Memories were made in trees
Susan Sha t	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Clear cutting the few green spaces with trees is both insane and rude to the residents of SF!
Emily Deremo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love Mount Davidson!
Sydney Zucherman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENTS
Andy Nguyen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	& t;3
Karen Ta	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I'm signing because I care.
Rodney Noble Jr	Meredith, NH	2016-12-03	Why would take out such an iconic and beautiful part out of the city? This is going to far!
Adan Durgeran	Santa Cruz, CA	2016-12-03	This is a beautiful mountain
L a Perrone	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up at the base of Mt. Davidson and have been hiking to the top since before I can remember. It means a lot to me that we save these trees. Please sign!
Keren Gutierrez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love my city
Bernvr Zhu	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I care about the environment
Mche e Perez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is my neighborhood. I grew up hiking my Davidson and stand. It wouldn't be the same after deforestation
Sandra Reyes	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is one of the few sanctuaries remaining in SF and home to an abundance of wildlife. This was my backyard for 12 years and the source of peace and tranquility for many. Please please save this for future generations!!
W Edson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	San Francisco must remain an icon of environmentalism in order to stay relevant.
V van Impera e	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This is an oasis in the city. It's gorgeous and peaceful.
Jeremy Enges	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Why?! Why would you do this?! Mt. Davidson is so special to so many people in so many ways, it's crazy that you want to take it down. Believe me, I'm very pro-development, I think it's good for the city, but instead of picking on beautiful public parks, why don't you develop the industrial corners or the outdated unused buildings that nobody likes? Do not tear down more green space. Mt. Davidson is an amazing and beautiful space. Save it.
Joey Jang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Why destroy nature?
Mchae M nucc	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Mchae z M nucc
A K	Kelseyville, CA	2016-12-03	We don't need more trees cut down. California is already in trouble with the loss of trees from our wildfires, Pine Trees infested with Bark Beetles, Oak Trees withering away at an astounding rate from Sudden Oak Death. California needs to address these 3 losses of trees before clear cutting more trees.
Aaron Rogers	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love going there for walks with my kids. Not so much anymore now that I'm learning about pesticide use by SF Rec and Park.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Walker Cahoon	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Because I take my dog to this park at least three times a week, and I go to this park five to six times a week regardless of weather-- it's beautiful. Why get rid of it.
Charles Woerner	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I want my kids to see natural beauty in the city.
Jane Kung	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Trees are a great addition to San Francisco!
Matt Hos	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I walk through this forest weekly with my family. These trees are important for offsetting the carbon emissions of the surrounding urban areas.
Jennifer McCarthy	Lafayette, CA	2016-12-03	Because it's the wrong thing to do. Leave nature, the trees and all the animals up there alone.
Casey Stenge	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	WE LOVE MOUNT DAVE. DON'T BE TREE KILLERS
Eli Recht-Appel	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I live there
Peter Jensen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Return everything to how it looked in the 1700s or cut the nonsense.
David Puketza	Oakland, CA	2016-12-03	Did many loops in and around Mt. Diabolo to the benefit of my mental and physical health. Great, unspoiled sanctuary that lets one unwind and recharge.
Ed Aureus	San Ramon, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up and went to school by Mt. Diabolo
Nichole C. Ely	San Carlos, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up on Mt. Diabolo and have fond memories of family hikes up to the cross. It's imperative that we keep some nature in our urban areas so kids can discover the beauty of ecological sciences. Please do not destroy the forest because you will be taking away the beauty and discovery of nature for families to enjoy.
Ruth Lovess	Fresno, CA	2016-12-03	We need these trees/this Park. It's necessary for health of the people and also for the environment. Please don't cut them out!
Barbra Ezer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love this place!
Catherine Cobey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	This has been my local park since I was a kid and is so serene and beautiful. We don't need to lose anymore nature in this city!!!
Nicole Cronin	Marysville, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up on Chaves Ave, my dad still lives there! My backyard was this majestic mountain. Daily walks to the cross with the dogs left you feeling whole again. Please don't let this happen. I still have faith in humanity.
Trevor Cronin	San Rafael, CA	2016-12-03	I used to play in this forest with my grandparents when I was a boy, I have a lot of memories close to my heart. It's a shame the only green San Francisco has, please don't destroy this forest, it's too important to the people of San Francisco.
Ruby Reke	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We need non-toxic nature parks for ourselves and our pets.
Barbara Johnson	Havre de Grace, MD	2016-12-03	I'm signing because I am against the senseless destruction of the forest, flora and fauna Mt. Diabolo forest supports.
Laura Yanow	94112, CA	2016-12-03	We need trees and open space in San Francisco. NO to interests trying to co-opt our forest! NO to those so disrespectful of our planet! NO to those trying to destroy our green spaces! Just NO.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
mar ane a macch ar n	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	When I was young (10-16), my fr ends and I wou d wa k n th s "Sherwood" forest for hours. Dragonf es, butterf es, b rds of a k nds,squr a s, zards,snakes were th ngs we c ty k ds got to exper ence here. We wou d wa k a ong the path and make up stor es w th each other....cannt mag ne my exper ences n th s prec ous forest were d fferent from scores of other k ds. Its one th ng to th n dead and dy ng trees for safety sake....But Logg ng.... t sn t even b g enough to make t commerc a y v ab e. And Pest c des? Who does th s n a forest? Next th ng they w want to og Stern Grove! If th s has someth ng to do w th gett ng the home ess out of the forest.....wh ch I hadnt heard there was a prob em....then house the home essand eave the forrest a one for the count ess generat ons of San Franc sco k ds to fo ow.
Luc en Sonder	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s a refuge from c ty fe, essent a to the we be ng of SF s res dents.
Rob n Fonta ne	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s absurd! We need theses treees! P ease save them!
Thaddeus Dz edz c	Hoffman Estates, IL	2016-12-03	Our urban areas need to preserve what natura areas we have n them!
M ke Lynch	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Mount Dav dson s an mportant part of San Franc sco s hea thy ecosystem.
Me ssa Ste n	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s s a treasured natura resource and shou d never be destroyed!
Suz Dehne	Los A tos, CA	2016-12-03	I m s gn ng for a the trees snce they have no vo ce. A so br ng ng back an area to what t once was? Rea y? Makes no sense n an urban env onment. It w never be the same.
Cynth a Wo sh	San Pab o, CA	2016-12-03	Parks are a p ace of beauty and peace. We need to preserve our parks not destroy them. The many parks n SF s what makes t such a beaut u cty.
M ha lordache	Bucharest, Roman a	2016-12-03	I am from Roman a, but env onment s a g oba ssue.
E ana Gurew tz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	It s my home! I grew up h k ng there every weekend w th my fam y. P ease protect t. It s beaut fu and mag ca .
Br an Freeman	Vacav e, CA	2016-12-03	Protect ng our parks and natura w d and s mportant to me.
v ctor a ehr ch	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Try ng to rd San Franc sco of mon nat ve p ants and trees s m sgu ded. At th s stage of the earth s tr bu at ons at the hands of humans, we need more trees, not ess, and the spec es s rre evant.
Andy He tz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	P ease keep our green spaces
B B oomf e d	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s dea s absurd. Why not c ear the trees n Go den Gate Park ?!
Sharon Beatty	Parad se, CA	2016-12-03	Peop e NEED open space!
Co ton Ferr s	Los Ange es, CA	2016-12-03	I ove that spot
W am Wa ker	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I th nk the deforestat on p an s be ng done n a m crocosm. If the hundreds of thousands of peop e who grew up v ng under these trees knew that they were be ng removed, they wou d be unhappy. Th s ssue shou d be heard at a fu Board of Superv sors meet ng where t cou d be fu y d scussed. I support measures that w combat c mate change. Add t ona y, the b ock I grew up on across from G en Park s cons derab y ess foggy than when I ved there as a ch d. Th s needs to be addressed.
John Ke eher	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-12-03	former res dent of the ne ghborhood
Armando Ru z	Sant ago de Querétaro, Mex co	2016-12-03	I ve been there and t s Jewe
Maya Gurew tz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Because t s a beaut fu p ace and as the c ty gets more and more popu ated w th bu d ngs we need to save the beaut fu nature
Ruth Keady	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	The park s very peasant the way t s. Peop e are us ng and enjoy ng t. Why change? Herb c des shou d not be used n any parks!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Parr s Lane	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Save the trees and protect the earth.. P ease just et t be..
Sao rse McCormack	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I ve grown up n th s area, ts a ove y tour st spot, I h ke t everday. Its apart of our commun ty
Tony Ga en	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Because fuck you that s why!
Joseph Sanchez	Ash and, OR	2016-12-03	I grew up n the c ty and p an on return ng when I f n sh schoo and I w sh for the c ty to be beaut fu and a great p ace to fe; support ng a great ecosystem for a fe
Thomas E ott	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I m s gn ng because our parks department needs a huge wake up ca that the r p an destroy ng th s San Franc sco jewe s horr f ca y stup d and a waste of taxpayers money.
W am Robathan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	We need the beauty and resp te a the more w th increas ng crowd ng.
Ne Ch n	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Save the fuck ng trees!!!
E eanor C nton Issa	Las Vegas, NV	2016-12-03	We must save th s prec ous part of our Earth!
John Leach	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-12-03	As a former San Franc sco res dent, and 4Th. Generat on San Franc scan th s s one of the on y rema ng Forest, and shou d be preserved.
Amber Lamprecht	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I ve on the s de of Mt. Dav dson and the trees and w d fe are my favor te th ngs about where I ve! P ease don t take away SF s natura spaces!!
Benjam n To edo	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	We need t
john ort z	Ba co, CA	2016-12-03	I grew up on Da ewood Way and p ayed n the forest. So many memor es and such a peacefu and beaut fu p ace to be.
Pau Weber	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Our fam y owned a house on Rockda e Dr ve for 55 years. I grew up w th count ess fr ends p ay ng on the mounta n n the 60 s-70 s. Th s w rreparab y harm the env ronment and beauty of the mounta n.
eah nann e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	It wou d be d sastrous to ose th s prec ous open space n our c ty!
m chae wyn a	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Trees shou d be a owed to make up the andscape of san franc sco
Yu L ng Wu	New York, NY	2016-12-03	Th s wou d be an abso ute d saster, p ease save the trees/env ronment/be aware of mother earth
vanessa fajardo	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	Th s needs to be stopped, San Franc sco needs ts green spaces!
Kate We ner	Wh te P a ns, NY	2016-12-03	I ove th s c ty and want to ensure that we have a hea thy, fe-g v ng c mate for years to come.
Keenan Joyce	Port and, OR	2016-12-03	I grew up n th s park. dont destroy the natura beauty of the c ty. Gentr f cat on forced me out of my home. don t ru n t. don t contam nate my c ty w th roundup and other carc nogens. th s s a horr be n t at ve. th s d sgusts me. preserve th s h story of my c ty, and make t a safe p ace for ts nhab tants. there are ess and ess resources ava ab e for ower c ass res dents. don t take our pub c forests.
A yson Yee	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I ve spent 18 years of my fe grow ng up next to th s forest. Its where I wou d take wa ks after schoo by myse f and where I used to spend t me w th my fr ends and fam y. I can t mag ne com ng home to see th s park that I ve grown up around destroyed.
Chad Kubo	South San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	I use to ve on Mt. Dav son on Teres ta b vd. That mounta n s ke a sanctuary n the m dd e of the c ty and home to w d fe. It makes no sense to destroy t!
Margaret Fre	E verta, CA	2016-12-03	To preserve green space w th n the c ty
ron Gurew tz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-03	There s no reason to destroy th s area. My fam y has ved on y a few b ocks away for 25 years. We h ke there week y. It s a SF treasure. And certa n y do not want to expose my ch dren to tox c herb c des. P ease save our forest

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Mark Lobre	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Why cut down trees simply because they aren't native?!
Sam Lax	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	The forrest is beautiful and I grew up with it.
Sarah Steinmetz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I'm signing this because why the fuck would sf want to destroy another con c park???
Anne Ravett	Sneville, GA	2016-12-03	I played in that forest growing up and loved every minute we spent there!!! Don't make SF a concrete jungle!!!
pau f korn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	this is bullshit! stop deforestation!!!
Alexandra Escobar	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	It's important to save and protect the beautiful nature that is part of the soul of this city. We cannot allow destruction to become part of the vocabulary that is synonymous to This city of love. We must always try to preserve the beauty of this city and not allow it to become distant fond memories of what once was.
Griffin Bragagnolo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I like park
Wayne Abn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Mt Davidson is a beautiful open space that is part of historic San Francisco which serves to save our water.
Alexa Abrams	Sherman Oaks, CA	2016-12-03	I have a good friend who grew up next to this forest, and they would be devastated to see it destroyed. The world needs more green space, not less!
Forrest Whittomb	Australia	2016-12-03	I am from the Bay Area and would like to see the protection of forested/open spaces. California prides itself on its nature and the meeting between the environment and a high technology. Protecting this space upholds these ideas
SUZANNE MCELWEE	SAN FRANCISCO, CA	2016-12-03	Despite the fact that not all the trees are native species together they are a unique forest space and habitat.
Mary M Smith	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I live on Mt. Davidson - we need the trees.
Georgina Cruz Martinez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	A beautiful place like this deserves to remain the same.
Sheila Johnston	Garden Grove, CA	2016-12-03	The trees need to be saved as much as possible. They supply much needed oxygen to the atmosphere, as well as a wind break.
Macom Daviss	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	These trees are habitat for many types of animals
Alex Goffo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I'm concerned about San Francisco's blatant disregard for ecological safe havens. Seeing out our sacred and for more money is not the San Francisco I remember or want to be a part of.
Ian Eitz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	As a horticulturist and native San Franciscan, I believe it would be a great loss to destroy such crucial elements of the ecosystem as well as the lives of the thousands of San Franciscans
Lori Chao	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love Mt Davidson and always hike there. The trail and view on the top of the mountain is amazing! Please don't destroy it!
Teresa (Cruz) CARNES	Ruidoso, NM	2016-12-03	I am signing this because this is my home this is where I grew up this is where all my memories are. My family still lives there and when I go back to visit I'd like to be able to take my hike up to the Cross as I've done a lot of my life. In the 1970s the radio stations broadcasted when the lights go down in the city every single kid on our block mom and dad and surrounding blocks went up to the forest, sat up there and watched the lights in the city as well as had a lot of our boom boxes on listening to the premiere of that song. There is no other place in San Francisco that holds the childhood memories of myself and a lot of the wonderful people I grew up with on that mountain please please save the Mount Davidson Forest! Thank you for reading
Jackie Thurman	san francisco, CA	2016-12-03	We can't give up our bits of wilderness with our city limits.
Edward Young	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I love to go up to Mount Davidson on my exercise time

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Mary Jane Ca	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	I walk here at least 3 times a week - and it would be a crying shame to see them clear cut this city refuge.
Susan Scheidt	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	My property is adjacent to Mt. Davidson and I strongly support maintaining its beautiful greenery and wildlife. Please do not remove the trees!!!!
Michael Moxey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	Environment > a
Inda Griffin	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-03	What the heck rec and park?! Aren't you supposed to be for the city and its recreation?
Katrina Sta cup	Detroit, MI	2016-12-04	We need to protect our Earth.
Truro Hawks	Chico, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up in San Francisco and plan to come back when I graduate. SF is a beautiful place in large part because of a lot of the wonderful nature places like Mt. Davidson, there is no need to tear this down
kenny coe	sf, CA	2016-12-04	I love birds and trees
Joshua Shrader	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please don't cut down our trees. I am a resident and also a gardener. You plan to deforest is deplorable and the use of roundup UNACCEPTABLE! I'm signing this in full conviction that the plan to cut down the forest is wrong and should be stopped.
Judy Womack	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We need to save the forest for climate changes, and the health of animals vs torts
Kathleen Crowley	Day City, CA	2016-12-04	The plan is idiotic. Why not turn Golden Gate Park back into sand dunes as we? Why are we at it, A non-O'hone residents of SF should leave the city and a building & infrastructure should be removed.
Jana Tft	Boca Raton, FL	2016-12-04	It may also cause erosion. Green space is necessary to the quality of life in SF.
Linda Sc aqua	Madera, CA	2016-12-04	Is us beautiful!
Hope Fower	Greenwich, NY	2016-12-04	I'm signing because Americans need to be proactive about protecting our environment, especially when our future president elect threatens to destroy it!
Kenda Owngs	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-04	Natural environments in the SF area should be preserved. I would go to this forest as a kid in the Girl Scouts and earned a lot of feedback there. I have been there to walk my family dogs. It is valuable to the community.
Bengu Atk	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	The wildlife in San Francisco is absolutely beautiful, and I want to keep it that way.
Sean McGrew	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Everything does not need to be "restored" to native habitat.
Wayne Yu	Day City, CA	2016-12-04	I go there all the time
Humberto Gonzalez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Leave Mt Davidson alone.
Con Vurek	Eugene, OR	2016-12-04	I grew up hiking this area. Please don't ruin it.
Christine Costello	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please keep this beautiful spot as it is. My grandfather took me on many walks there and I've been back many times. Grew up off of Monterey Blvd. We have so few natural areas and I'd hate to see this gem go.
Howard Scheiman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Save the forest
wayman rwn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I've always loved the Mt Davidson forest, a part of my childhood and my life today. It would be a shame to destroy something that gives so many people joy for so little reason. Please don't destroy the forest
Mara Casto	Redwood City, CA	2016-12-04	We need our forest for future generations.
Ju e Nazza	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This forest needs to stay right where it belongs!
Mike Murray	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love the forest on Mt Davidson and don't want to see it destroyed.
Paula Schmckrath	Hendersonville, TN	2016-12-04	I agree this would be a travesty for Mt. Davidson and the surrounding neighborhood.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Derrick Humphrey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Because a city who cares about climate change to unnecessarily cut down trees does not make sense as that's wrong. Is that for more real estate? Why should this happen?
Vincent Ma	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	For the health of the people, and the health of the planet.
Eizabeth Huey-Levine	Canton, GA	2016-12-04	I grew up in SF and feel so grateful to maintain the integrity of the few parks we still have available to city folks. The eucalyptus trees are key to providing cleaner air for us to breathe. This is Earth, keep it organic, not concrete.
Kesey Johne	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	R U KIDDING ME?!
Nick C. Ford	Fenton, CA	2016-12-04	Why would you do that ??? :(Insanity
Victor Brouk	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	The nature in this park is what makes San Francisco amazing.
Stephanie Hernandez	Ahambra, CA	2016-12-04	Because I grew up doing restoration work at Mountain Davidson when I went to Moroma.
Laura Summers	Dana Point, CA	2016-12-04	Obscene!!
Stephen Fettes	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	The forest must be preserved. Killing those trees and infesting that area with hazardous chemicals is bringing danger to the environment as well as the peoples lives. Don't do it.
Linda Tosch-Chambers	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please protect this beautiful piece of nature!
Alison French	Talent, OR	2016-12-04	Oh - this is a bad idea. San Francisco and the surrounding area need more greenery and more oxygen producing trees. I used to hike here and in many of the other parks visited when I lived in Berkeley. Please reconsider this - redo the outdated surveys.
Dane Hardy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I don't want to lose our green space!
Rafael Robles	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Trees are nice
Joyce Coffey	Day City, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up in San Francisco and the Mt. Davidson forest has always been a part of San Francisco.
Sara Stevenson	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-04	I am signing because not only am I a SF native but for all those chemicals and trees. We don't need to change we need to adapt and keep our city beautiful not more techy.
Samba Kangaga	New York, NY	2016-12-04	I'm signing because I'm a resident of San Francisco and grew up near my Davidson. I love this park and would hate to see it destroyed
Nora Coffey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	The City should retain all this green...for all the reasons stated in the petition and to keep our city beautiful.
Maria Barry	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up on Mt Davidson and spent many years hiking and playing there. Save Mt Davidson for future generations to come!
Kristealey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please stop using pesticides and harmful chemicals where families play and animals dwell. The trees and plants are home to animals and insects and good for our air quality.
Patricia Torres-Hendra	South San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love walking through the trees on Mount Davidson. I used to live in Plymouth and Monterey and have spent 60 years walking on the mountain.
Ale Woo	Palo Alto, CA	2016-12-04	The forest is a pleasant surprise and with SF and should be kept that way.
Pam Murphy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I used to go to school by there and have many many memories there
Linda Strong	Arroyo Grande, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up on the Mountain!! Rockdave! Born in 59! Don't destroy this beautiful place of happiness!
Ked Kerkham	Carfield, UT	2016-12-04	This is a habitat and rest/shelter for birds, insects. With city all around this is essential as much "wild" space is maintained as possible.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Brendan Hayward	Pittsburg, CA	2016-12-04	L berty
Kate Morgan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is a treasured resource! I shouldn't need to sign this but I will because I couldn't bear to see the forest destroyed.
Rina Weisman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's unconscionable that Mayor Moneybags Ed Lee can't keep his grubby paws off a true natural treasure! Shame on the City that no longer "knows how."
Jan Phillips	Bakersfield, CA	2016-12-04	I lived in the Bay area for many years. San Francisco is lovely. Trees are important. Please don't do this!
Els Brooks	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	The trees should stay.
Crysta S.	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up walking & playing among those trees. They must remain there for our children & grandchildren to have the same opportunity in the future.
Erick Perez	Day City, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up in the Marinoma neighborhood and Mt Davidson was my introduction to nature. I would like this area to be preserved for future generations to enjoy.
Ronen Crow	Oakland, CA	2016-12-04	This is wrong for so many reasons! We need our tiny remaining "wild" places more than ever. Please don't cut the trees, and stop the use of these extremely toxic chemicals. We need these places for healing, body and soul.
Kay Bowman	Santa Barbara, CA	2016-12-04	What are you thinking???? We need trees
Ben Olson	Windsor, CA	2016-12-04	It's important to preserve the natural environment and to be good stewards of the earth. Lose the idea of deforestation and the current use of pesticides - these are counterproductive.
Beth C. Barb	Freeland, WA	2016-12-04	I'm signing because this is a precious heritage --
Lisa Lucas	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We need to save the trees, landscape, and maintain a San Francisco legacy.
Tamara McCormick	Scott Air Force Base, IL	2016-12-04	My family lives on Mt. Davidson, where I grew up. Please don't destroy our beautiful forest! There is absolutely no good reason to do so. This will cause more harm than good!!
Darrane Webb	Dunedin, New Zealand	2016-12-04	Why wouldn't you want to sign this!? It's a beautiful park and one that is dear to a dear friend of mine. They think it's important to keep and this special to them, therefore it's special to me.
Patsy Jansen	San Jose, CA	2016-12-04	SF needs places like this!
Ova Weaver	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I saw my first owl in the city here as a kid! Don't compromise the wilderness city kids get to experience
Kyra Monterrosa	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's a part of our city
Tracy Rowland	Canyon Lake, TX	2016-12-04	Please keep Mt. Davidson as is and protect. This was one of my favorite places in SF as a kid. When I come home to visit I would like to be able to come here again. It's so beautiful.
stacy egh	san francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love the Forrest there. Why can't we just let the trees live out their natural lifespan? And then -sow y- get it back to its natural state?
W Rodriguez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up visiting Mt. Davidson and want to keep its natural beauty alive for more people to enjoy.
Geoffrey Wagner	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I hike those trails often and they are beautiful and an asset to the city.
John McGuire	Austin, TX	2016-12-04	I often visited Mt. Davidson during my High School and College days in San Francisco. I'd like everyone to have the opportunity to enjoy this unique spot of beauty as I experienced it.
Eizabeth Powers	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I hike there and it's beautiful.
Michael McCormick	Belevue, IL	2016-12-04	I'm signing because my family lives near Mt. Davidson. What you are planning is wrong, on all levels. Why cut down precious trees on this beautiful landmark?

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Zachary Ragan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I want to preserve the forest on Mt. Davidson.
Holly Retzinger	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is one of the most beautiful parks in SF. Please don't take it away!
Beverly Tharp	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's crazy to cut down trees.
Anna Chang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	save mt. davidson!!!
Laura Hutto	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Love this park and what it has to offer. Stop spraying Roundup!
LeeAnn Leeper	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	IM a Native Stop This now
Jessica Levant	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Mt Davidson Forest is one of San Francisco's jewels. An oasis. Please don't cut down those trees and spoil the natural setting.
Dusty Burton	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I'm signing because My City has become a construction Zone for condos. Our church would hold services on Mt Davidson and it should stay open space for family with kids and also dogs..
barbara berman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's the right thing to do
Eina Ansary	New York, NY	2016-12-04	Because Mount Davidson is a magical and powerful place that is both vital to me personally and to San Francisco's history and character.
Ben Stacy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This beautiful place was a vital part of my childhood. Don't tear it down.
Samuel Smoot	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I fucking love trees. Dope spot. Don't say my homes.
Marilyn Nashimoto	Tucson, AZ	2016-12-04	I grew up in SF and enjoying all the outdoor sanctuaries like Mt Davidson. Without it the city would not be the same.
Kelly Carlson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I am signing because Mt. Davidson Forest is beautiful and belongs to a San Francisco
Joe Hague	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Stop cutting down trees, just because they weren't here in the 1700. Mt Davidson is a place I. The city that I go to to find peace.
Margaret Murray	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This forest in my neighborhood is a haven for young things, including me.
Timothy Davis	Apo, AP	2016-12-04	Save the Forrest.
Alessandro Moruzz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Plant trees don't cut them.
Aimee Pavy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I hike over Mt Davidson every weekend. It's an oasis in the middle of the city. My hike affords me a place away from the anxieties of personal life.
Ada Lane	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I am a San Francisco native and I care about our beautiful parks!
Grace Chen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is my backyard. And no matter how you look at it, this is a stupid, wasteful idea.
Sean Min	Lawndale, CA	2016-12-04	I used to live in SF and Mt Davidson was a beautiful monument to my Bay Area experience
Juan Cuyjet	Day City, CA	2016-12-04	This is a beautiful part of San Francisco and should remain there.
Rebecca Marten	Milbrae, CA	2016-12-04	I want to help keep San Francisco the city I fell in love with.
Juanita Mastro	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's a beloved place to me where I have gone on walks with family since I was a toddler.
Ter Lenfest	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's a beautiful place to walk, run, and bike. It needs to be preserved.
Samantha Sheppard	Brooklyn, NY	2016-12-04	This is my favorite sanctuary spot in San Francisco. I, and many others, would be absolutely devastated to see it destroyed.
Ryan Morarty	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is my city and also my neighborhood. It's beautiful and very special up there and I don't want to see this destroyed.
Dary Sparks	Petaluma, CA	2016-12-04	It's an oasis in the City!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Kar Graham	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I see no compelling reason to destroy a part of San Francisco heritage.
Hans Oberschep	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It doesn't matter what Mt. Davidson looked like naturally. It's surrounded on four sides by concrete. It's part of San Francisco now, and it's much more beautiful as a forest than a rocky hill. We shouldn't tear up Golden Gate Park and replace it with sand dunes, and we shouldn't touch Mt. Davidson.
Chris Jenkins	Castro Valley, CA	2016-12-04	Preservation of San Francisco's remaining natural habitats of utmost importance.
Ga Gurewitz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I hike frequently on Mt. Diablos and always note the wildlife. Please do not destroy the habitat!
Carolyn Gibbs	South San, CA	2016-12-04	We must stop destroying all the greenery and wild areas - this gives places for so much wildlife to live we are killing our planet slowly. Please preserve what we can and take care of this small area.
Natalie Chavez	Gustine, CA	2016-12-04	I'm signing because the wildlife is beneficial to the community and so important to many people to sustain. It also seems like a ridiculous reason to chop down a ton of trees that benefit the community.
Laura Cahn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Green spaces in San Francisco need to be preserved. Spraying of pesticides in close proximity to people and wildlife does more harm than good.
Antonio Martinez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	What's mentally or emotionally wrong with you? Honestly, really, what's it?
nancy weber	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up on that mountain that's stupid why in the hell would they want to return it to how it was in the 1700s nobody's what they were and 1700 the mountain is as it is today. Let it be.
John Powers	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Oppose deforestation of Mt. Davidson
tanais	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please please PLEASE don't cut down all these gorgeous trees!
Jasmine DeLaMora	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I live here and a lot of animals reside on the hill. They would be destroyed by the home. We need to preserve what we have left of San Francisco and not give into gentrification.
Sarah Watson	Australia	2016-12-04	Even though I'm from Australia I care about what happens to forests everywhere. I'd love to be able to hike the trails when I visit one day.
Melissa Brudge	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love the serene, peaceful hikes on Mt. Davidson. It's one of the few places I can go to get away from everything without leaving the city. The trees and vegetation on Mt. Davidson are a big part of what makes it a quiet, special place.
Jude Gantz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	There are so many other legitimate expenses to incur which will be helpful to ensuring the ecology of the city. Spending time or resources to raze community greenery for no good reason is obscene. Leave Mt. Davidson alone!
stephanie ha	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I heart trees. I like to breathe.
Jonathan Wang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love this park and the facts speak for themselves. 1600 trees do not need to be slated for a few invasive and unstable (and insufficiently deemed so) trees. Please conduct a more thorough re-evaluation.
Amy Restone	Alexandria, VA	2016-12-04	Times change. The City needs this forest as it has evolved, not a holdover from the way it was before so many people lived here.
Arabella Dorth	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	As a long-time resident of San Francisco I am shocked and dismayed by this misguided and outdated deforestation plan. We need our urban forests now more than ever! Do not cut down the trees!
Dane Fenster	Pacific, CA	2016-12-04	Dear Park and Rec, haven't you heard? Roundups are carcinogenic and kill bees so please don't kill the trees.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
caro yn hurt	Jacksonville, FL	2016-12-04	I see no reason for the senseless killing of forests. We have a ready killed many forests in the guise of urban progression. Our nation would have no place to live because of it and our children will never know the peace that is received just by walking in the woods.
bess kesser	eureka, CA	2016-12-04	SF needs the trees! For oxygen, beauty, shelter for birds & other wildlife, for climate control & for the beauty of NATURE (to offset the people energy & concrete jungle). Plus, the herbicides are TOXIC as a get-out & NO ONE (in my opinion!) needs more Round-up & other poison unleashed into the air, water, & so on! Yuck! Keep the trees, please!
August Ragone	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We need to preserve San Francisco's natural beauty for the heritage of generations to come.
Ezabeth Gardner	Chicago, IL	2016-12-04	Deforestation is killing the environment and green spaces are shrinking at an alarming rate.
Robert Kaufmann	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Leave Mt. Davidson alone! It's doing very well as is. Logging will do harm.
Kimberly Feccano	Oakland, CA	2016-12-04	I'm from here! Don't cut our trees!
Sonya Katcher	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up going to this forest
Jane Hopper	Menlo Park, CA	2016-12-04	And I wish local space saving organizations would stop using it too.
Diana Uda	Antelope, CA	2016-12-04	Because I played in this forest as a child and believe children & families for generations to come should have natural green space within the concrete jungle to explore and build memories!
Betty Orya	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up there. It's a beautiful park and should remain untouched!
dawn s berstein	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I am signing because I want to save an important landmark and refuge in my neighborhood.
nnavacent	Sausalito, CA	2016-12-04	Stop going back in time, work with the beauty of here and now.
Tiffany Archbald	San Rafael, CA	2016-12-04	My grandparents live in Forest Hills and that area is beautiful to look at and visit so please let it be.
Ray Capra	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I used to live on Mt. Davidson and would walk up through the forest every morning before starting my day. It's a terrific, natural sanctuary that ought to be preserved.
Isabel Ebert	South San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	In a sea of urbanization, people need a piece of nature to enjoy. Destroying trees with harmful pesticides that impacts the web of life is not what Bay Area residents want! Keep this place a sanctuary as an urban forest!!
Mchael Ryan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Return to the 1700s? 1,000,000 people were not living in SF in the 1700s. The ecological reality is that 1 million people live in this region. This reality requires trees to remain safe from heavy use. Trees to help temper human detritus out of the air.
Dena Asanjan-Wams	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is the most ridiculous thing I've heard. Please save Mt Davidson Forest.
Patrick Canfield	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We can do better than this!
Eileen Cronin	Faon, NV	2016-12-04	I grew up on Rockdale Drive and climbed this mountain since I was a child
Paua Chott	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-12-04	I love the trees and the feeling they create in that neighborhood.
Lisa Moore	Oakland, CA	2016-12-04	I lived on the edge of Mt Davidson forest for many years. I've spent many hours there playing as a child and hiking as an adult. It's a wonderful resource in an overcrowded city.
Lizzy Harvey	Walla Walla, WA	2016-12-04	I frequently hike up Mt. Davidson from my house... it's a beautiful area and I have many, many memories of it, going back at least 15 years to when I was little. Please protect this green space!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Danne Terp	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I do not want to return SF to a desert
Karen Bouwer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I'm signing because trees and birds help me breathe in a world that I'm experiencing as more and more oppressive.
Kate Dick	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up hiking there, going every year with my elementary school classes. And I go now at the time. It's very special to me.
Shannon Bishop	Spring Hill, FL	2016-12-04	I'm a native Californian and this park needs to be protected.
Robert Dawson	Novato, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up in beautiful SF and I believe the trees are meant to stay.
Ashton Lockfield	Portland, OR	2016-12-04	I grew up in San Francisco and I love this park
Harry Davis	Oakland, CA	2016-12-04	We don't need to lose what little bit of open green space we have left.
Emily Tow	Cambridge, MA	2016-12-04	I grew up tromping around in this beautiful forest!
Kristina Smith	Palo Alto, CA	2016-12-04	I've been up this mountain, and seen this space ... it must be preserved! It's gorgeous! And a treasure!
Laura Regan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love Mt Davidson! Please save it!
Andree Burgess	Redding, CA	2016-12-04	I was born and raised in San Francisco. Mt Davidson is beautiful and would be terrible if they destroyed all those trees.
Magie Ceberos	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Trees are usually good for the environment
Knar Kahkejan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Not on our watch!
Nicole Holmes	Camargo, CA	2016-12-04	Too much beauty potential being lost
Anna Chodos	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love the hikes here, and I know we need as many trees as possible in SF
Nat Dart	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We need to protect this forest!
Bonnie McGregor	Menlo Park, CA	2016-12-04	My Davidson is beautiful as it is. Who comes up with these ridiculous projects?
Erin Thompson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Do not cut!
Kevin Bringham	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is totally shot
Caroline Ward	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Trees are the lungs of our city and we need to protect the wildlife habitat in Mt. Davidson.
Wam Murdock	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Forests need protection and thinning; not clear cutting...
John Butler	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up in the Marinoma area. I remember how my family would walk the trail almost every other day, reveling in its beauty and stillness. I remember biking up the path every morning and being astounded at how it was almost like an oasis and of green amidst the city. In the forest, I was cut off from the hustle of San Francisco and overawed by the beauty of nature and creation. If the forest were to be razed it would be a horrific tragedy.
Katherine Nims	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I like breathing.
Cyeon Lo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Even though these aren't native trees, they have created a habitat for native animals. Our city is filled with non-native things. Like houses! Keep these trees!
Susan Coyne	San Rafael, CA	2016-12-04	I LOVE walking in this gem of a park in SF. Please keep it!
Linda McGivray	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	We need to keep the green areas in the city.
Jude Rmer	Cincinnati, OH	2016-12-04	Leave this small, beautiful piece of nature alone!
Jessica Cheu	Marina, CA	2016-12-04	Mt Davidson is one of my favorite places in San Francisco and what makes San Francisco so special.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Scott Baker	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This is a ghastly project. These trees, despite being non-native are now part of San Francisco. They've gone native by protecting our wildlife and providing a refuge from the bustle of the city for hikers. Getting rid of non-native species is not a mandate. Some of the natives species, like Eucalyptus, are an expected and necessary part of what makes San Francisco, San Francisco.
Rena Simon-Igra	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This was my childhood stomping ground!
max tenhoff	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I've close to the mountain and kept the way that ways has looked
Suzanne Dods	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I know I know we are beset with petitions, but never give up and MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD. This is our chance..
Court Jones	Goleta, CA	2016-12-04	We need to reassess our values and priorities with regards to the environment. Nothing is more important or valuable than nature.
o v a contreras	san francisco, CA	2016-12-04	this is full of beautiful trees!
Juana Martn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Please save our wilderness sanctuaries!
Tammy Creo	Apharetta, GA	2016-12-04	We need to save our Earth.
Naome Weaver	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I am concerned with our environment, we need these trees, they rely on us for their protection. I am trying to do what I can to protect my fellow living organisms.
Teresa Chao	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I want to preserve the natural beauty of Mt. Davidson. I am against deforestation. San Francisco needs to retain the few natural areas that remain. Mt. Davidson is enjoyed by hikers, bicyclists, naturalists, etc. and the neighborhood is very proud of this beautiful space.
Caroline Maguire	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This park has been part of my life ever since I was young. I grew up hiking trails and it would be devastating to me to lose it.
Lana Sampson	Amherst, MA	2016-12-04	I grew up in this area, spent so much of my childhood exploring this nature, would be such a tragedy to remove such an important historical piece of San Francisco's culture
Nick Kassis	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Tress, man
Abiga Vargas	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-04	Because we must preserve our wildlife and nature!
Charles Higuera	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	It's fine as it has been for nearly a century -- steward it LESS drastically!!
Samuel Butler	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	This park and forest brought immeasurable joy to me and my family for decades. I played capture the flag with friends on it as a child, and when I got older I would run on the trails nearly every day. The ethical cost to the trees and animals inhabiting this wonderful sanctuary from the ever-growing development and hustle of The City would be catastrophic, a bet on a low scale, but this cannot be allowed. SF must keep its heart and soul issues like these. This is not who we are.
Sheila Finch	Long Beach, CA	2016-12-04	We need more trees, not less, and urban areas such as San Francisco need them even more. Please, don't do it!
Juana Vela	Rohnert Park, CA	2016-12-04	SF native born and raised. Save Mr Davidson!
Rosemarie Hrscher	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love wild places in the city and want to preserve them for me & future generations
Jonathan Chu	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Preserving trees is vitally important to our ecosystem
bridget segurson	san francisco, CA	2016-12-04	Destroying the natural beauty of this spot would be a travesty.
Cris Romero	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	To save Mt Davidson
Sandra Sehn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	As a SF native I know how important to the citizens Mt. Davidson and its forest is to SF's quality of life. Please Preserve it!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
T m Hayman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	Do NOT cut down our trees, hard to be eve th s s even be ng cons dered
Cath Beckstrand	San Jose, CA	2016-12-04	There s no og c n do ng th s whatsoever, t s detr menta for a s ew of reasons (out ned succ nct y here) and, frank y, our c mate & env ronment have changed so much s nce the survey for th s was done. We need these trees, and we need th s beaut fu hea thy forest.
Amanda Lang	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	We, the peop e! You s mp y cannot destroy nature wh e we ve here.
JEAN ALLAN	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	P ease do not cut down any of the tree on Mt. Dav dson.
Greg Bryan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	Because trees and parks are an mportant part of SF and the Park and Recreat ons nstead of try ng to protect and care for our va uab e pub c resources keep choos ng money over commun ty.
Ga nes Co eman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	I ve here, and th nk a forest n the c ty s necessary for a good Qua ty of L fe.
Megan Beach er	Men o Park, CA	2016-12-04	We need to save our w d spaces and the p aces peop e can get out n nature. Th s s a beaut fu forest w th an amaz ng p ant and an ma ecosystem. It needs to be saved and taken care of. Not KILLED AND POISONED! We do not need more houses or bu d ngs. We need open space!!!!!!
Dav d Rodezno	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	I be eve our future shou d be ba anced between a concrete jung e and a thr v ng forest
Kee y Enna	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	I wa k up Mt Dav dson regu ar y w th my two e ementary schoo boys. I ove fee ng mersed n a forest wh e n the heart of a c ty. Th s s a space wh ch makes me want to ve here and makes me proud to be a nat ve San Franc scan.
Maxwe Maruszewsk	Sh ng etown, CA	2016-12-04	I grew up h k ng th s h w th my grandma. Th s area s no ess mportant to us than go den gate park. These th ngs are what make sf a spec a p ace. Do not take them from us.
L sa Mastro	Long Beach, CA	2016-12-04	I ove th s p ace!!!!
Ryan Leung	Ch no, CA	2016-12-04	You don t change San Franc sco, you KEEP San Franc sco.... San Franc sco. Because we ove San Franc sco, when San Franc sco s San Franc sco.
pau tay or	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	hav ng ved here a my fe, the forest s part of me. on y a foo wou d chop t down.
Mon ca Lon gro	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	I ove Mt. Dav dson and I don t understand how cutt ng down so many trees benef ts San Franc sco. We need MORE trees, not fewer n th s c ty. Why wou d you want to cut down o d growth trees? A so, how does SF Park and Rec have the r ght to do th s when the c ty doesn t own the and tse f?
Sandy Su	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	I h ked Mt Dav dson park many t mes as a ch d and remember t fond y. P ease preserve th s park so others can cont nue to do the same.
Co n Wade	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	Th s a beaut fu park. It be a shame to see t go
Kather ne S ms	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	eave we enough a one
Martha M ner	Moss Beach, CA	2016-12-04	Chopp ng down trees s wrong on so many eve s. We need them for the oxygen they produce for us to breathe and a so to mend our broken sp r ts.
Norma Wa ace	R chmond, CA	2016-12-04	I m a 4th generat on San Franc scan. As k ds, we "c mbed Mt. Dav dson" for fun, morn ng, noon and n ght. Such good t mes. Th s was a rea forest! L ke Rob n Hood. Not a few trees ke Stow Lake or Go den Gate Park between streets, but a genu ne forest, a dark and scary at n ght, w th on y nature. I can t be eve th s nane dea wou d go forward. No harm s be ng done, and p enty of good by those trees. And a the poison be ng used atop th s h ? Unbe evab e. Stop a ready!!
Mo y Sa yer	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-04	We need more trees! Not ess!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
He ene Chatterjee	Dub n, CA	2016-12-04	Please protect this area. My fondest memories of my great grandmother, Irene Ashe, are of making that hike up Mt. Davidson who lived in the neighborhood at the base. An oasis in the city.
andrew kennedy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	like mount davidson
Dom n c Casazza	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I am born and raised in this City and this seems like it would just pave the way for development which is not at all an even trade off in my opinion. I agree with the points made in this petition and want to see the right thing done. Please leave Mt Davidson as is and not deforest it
A dan O Dr sco	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I love extremely close to Mount Davidson and it would horrible to see it go.
Shawna A apa	San Rafael, CA	2016-12-04	Keep these special and spectacular places, preserved.
B Se by	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-04	I've been hiking on Mount Davidson for years, love the trees – and especially the smell of eucalyptus. The city is already displacing people, but must they also displace the homes of countless thousands of birds and animals? The area is already ecologically balanced, and cutting it is a total waste of taxpayer dollars. It's a so-called ecological catastrophe and morally bankrupt.
shannon ashe	Eugene, OR	2016-12-04	I was a child there, and because of everything stated in this letter. Logging there is the bad idea of bad ideas. Just shortsighted and dumb.
Cynthia Sem	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I love on Mt. Davidson and it should be protected at all costs.
Aaron Den ey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Eucalyptus are naturalized citizens, leave them alone the parks in the how it is.
Suf S dhu	Irvine, CA	2016-12-05	Is there any bottom to your decisions on making? Does quality of life matter at all to you anymore?
Katherine Edwards	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I like Mt. Davidson and it's beautiful the way it is
Peter W kns	Santa Clara, CA	2016-12-05	I understand the desire to want to remove invasive species and return the area to its native composition, however, these non-natives have been in place hundreds of years now. Are they still truly non-native? The ecology has changed and the flora and fauna has adapted. I think this plan does more harm than good. Trees are a valuable resource and we need to be preserving them for the carbon, wildlife, and health benefits. Not destroying them.
Wend Wh tcomb	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I believe we should preserve the remaining wildlife and natural areas left in SF. It's what makes this a great city to live in!
Steve Lawrence	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I'm signing because I'm for trees, not for chasing a dream of return to days before Europeans arrived.
Charles A ensworth	Oakland, CA	2016-12-05	In solidarity and advocate for environmental justice.
L ye D ugach	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-05	This place is so special to me. Do not destroy this sacred and beautiful land.
E a ne Stev ck	Petaluma, CA	2016-12-05	I remember this forest from the time I was a child... Please do not destroy it!
Tan a We ngart	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This is one of the most favorite places in SF. What a distracting thing to do! And to add insult to injury - with our tax\$. Stop it!!
L nda Z mmerman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I support ALL the claims in this petition. I worked as a public health nurse (RN) for the city of S.F. for 21 years and based on my knowledge of protecting the physical, emotional and social well-being of a society I find the plan harmful to the residents of this city on those three levels.
N ge Nored	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	It's important
Lucas Mu en	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Trees
Mark Z er ng	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Things have changed since this policy was adopted. We need the carbon sink and the recreation these trees provide.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jayne R ey	L nco n, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-05	P ease preserve th s beaut fu wood for poster ty. So many woods and forests are be ng ost, ch dren w th nk that trees are sap ngs because they never see a mature tree. P ease do not et th s beaut fu p ace be destroyed.
Kather ne Tracy	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I have grown up w th th s park and hope that t w rema n as s!
Em ko Hamada	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I want 1600 trees rema ns n SF
Betsy Bonnynge	Tur ock, CA	2016-12-05	I be eve n trees n that area.
Chery e Ge ger	G bert, AZ	2016-12-05	Stop th s nsan ty! Protect our w derness and stop us ng po son! Thank you, my grandch dren w thank you.
Terra Mak sh ma	Fa rf e d, CA	2016-12-05	Fam y H story
Hannah Coston	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Th s forest s such an mportant part of the d vers ty of atmospheres n San Franc sco.
Kay a Jos e	Santa C ara, CA	2016-12-05	Because we cannot oose th s part of San Franc sco
ke e McManus	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Ke e McManus
Apr Pr tchard	Port and, OR	2016-12-05	my c ty....
Jeffrey Berger	Los Ange es, CA	2016-12-05	I Love Trees, and Parks!
james m cke son	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Hav ng been go ng to Mt. Dav dson for forty years. Over the past 15 the park serv ce has stead y destroyed ha f of t and rep anted(that surv ves) noth ng. What a joke!
Mary M. R ordan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Because of the env ronmenta reasons, the forest shou d be tended to, not more tra s shou;d be created, the forest a ows for the water storage when t ra ns and contr butes to hea th er a r. ETC> I m sure the powers that be know a of th s and must take t nto heavy/deep cons derat on rather than go ng a ong w th the ch c deas of the day. W th the added popu at on be ng added to San Franc sco w th the mass ve new bu d ngs, we need every bt of forestat on we can get to preserve the a r and hea th qua ty of our very m ted space. We s mp y cannot afford to ose the Mt. Dav dson frest.
Nazareth Overman	Pac f ca, CA	2016-12-05	Born and ra sed n "The C ty" Mounta n Dav dson has been a b g part of my fe and a so my ch dren ves
Grant Pa mer	Los Ange es, CA	2016-12-05	What the fuck s wrong w th you peop e?? Destroy ng a beaut fu pub c forest? THAT S what you th nk your job s as a c v c superv sor?? No, your job s to make the p ace where peop e ve MORE beaut fu , not destroy a prec ous resource of natura beauty for your const tuents to enjoy. Jesus Chr st.
Lou e Lurat	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I ove Mt. Dav dson and don t want t to be destroyed,
Andrew M er	San D ego, CA	2016-12-05	I oved th s p ace when I was a k d. San Franc sco doesn t need anymore of ts open spaces to be deve oped on anymore. LEAVE IT ALONE
Debra McLaugh n	Ben c a, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up n that area. We do not need another cement c ty, w th just one park n town. P ease save the forest!
Haunan Pao	Auck and, New Zea and, New Zea and	2016-12-05	Tree. they take a wh e to be magn f cent and deserve our respect.
Robert Gepford	G en E en, CA	2016-12-05	I was born and ra sed n the Bay Area. And do not want to see the parks turned nto po son p ts.
Gaston Gu bert	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Every p ant was an " nvas ve" at some po nt, euca yptus, cypress, and many others have become a part of our cu tura her tage snce the r ntroduct ons hundreds of years ago, and that hab tat on mt. Dav dson has c ear y become natura zed ong ago. Re ntroduct on of nat ve p ants w not make t a hea th er or more beaut fu ecosystem.
Jody Fr edman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	San Franc sco needs more trees, not ess

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Maya Zuckerman	sf, CA	2016-12-05	I love this forest and it's important we leave green lungs in our city!
James Cameron	Orlando, FL	2016-12-05	I'm a former resident who spent lots of time on Mt. Davidson. The loss of these forested areas would be a tragedy on so many levels.
Katherine Grant	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I love hiking on this mountain
Tanya Wassman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I go there to walk after the time and bring my daughter.
Shanna Carson	Castro Valley, CA	2016-12-05	I was born and raised in SF, lived right below Mt. Davidson...why in the world would you want to return it to what it looked like in the 1700s? We need trees for our air, our mental health, beauty. What about the wildlife? We need green spaces in cities - too much cement already!!!
Joshua Kidd	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Because this park has been around since I was a teenager and I used to have a great sense of unity between nature and the city here. It's a calming beautiful place to go and have some time to yourself when not having to leave the city, yet still be able to escape the cold concrete grasp!
es e kaye	san francisco, CA	2016-12-05	We need greenery in SF. These trees provide oxygen and clean the air, they are home to birds and squirrels. Don't make it barren. Stop with the pest control. Please save the trees. Thank you.
Lucy Lyons	Half Moon Bay, CA	2016-12-05	As a former SF resident, I'm signing because I believe cutting down the trees on Mt. Davidson is a horrible idea. Why return it to what it looked like in the 1700s?? Why stop there? Why not "restore" Golden Gate Park to the sand dunes it was before? This is crazy. Please stop this plan before it's too late.
Judy Toupn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Way too many trees are being cut down in this city. We need these trees not only to help fight global warming, but they are the habitat for so many creatures. It also provides thousands of people refuge, recreation & much pleasure. While the trees may not be native, neither are we. Returning it to a more natural landscape is a bit absurd at this point in time & the use of toxic chemicals is just poor management. Please do not proceed to cut down this forest.
Bonnie Johnson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	What an egregious use of "San Francisco" taxpayer dollars -- pretty sure this goes against most local residents.
Isla Lewis	Genoa, IL	2016-12-05	I walk the Mt. Davidson Forest with my daughter quite frequently. Please do not destroy a place of such beauty, history, recreation and home to any number of wild creatures.
Dave Hoare	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I like Mt Davidson the way it is
Emma Yanez	San Rafael, CA	2016-12-05	I stand with the trees.
Erka Be	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I enjoy hiking in the trees on Mt. Davidson.
judy oberte	Redwood City, CA	2016-12-05	I must.
Abbe Day-Merchant	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I want to keep the trees. No need to take SF back to dunes and rocks.
Liz Hirsch	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Mt. Davidson Forest is an oasis in this urban center. We should be protecting trees, not destroying them
Arana Cneros	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I love mt Davidson.
Bobby Snger	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I live at the bottom of this beautiful ecosystem. Leave it alone
Leo Gendelev	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Leave Mt. Davidson alone. It's a beautiful place. There's no good reason to ruin it.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Arwen Zembora n	Austin, TX	2016-12-05	As a former, and future, Bay Area resident I am hoping the trees will not be cut. Please reconsider.
Lynda Sampson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Because my home is on Mt Davidson and I support this urban forest.
Nancy Young	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-05	This is a beautiful, very green and lush pocket of green in an increasingly ugly city. Please leave it alone.
Gloria Justen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Use of the toxic Roundup pesticide is totally unacceptable. And we need trees! Trying to eradicate eucalyptus at this point is futile and pointless. The forest has become habitat for many animals and a comforting oasis of green for people.
Nancy Evans	Safayette, CA	2016-12-05	Horrible plan!
Margene Aron	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Please do not cut down all those trees on Mt. Davidson. The trees, the forests, add necessary health and wellbeing to the residents of the SF Bay Area. The trees give and hold life for so many animals, birds, insects. Trees and nature are so necessary for the wellbeing of so many. Please don't cut down the trees. Please save this beloved Forest.
Jesus Verduzco	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I care about my city! Don't destroy this beautiful attraction and spruce up place.
Ben Harper	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I can't fathom why SF would do this.
Forence Monzasch	Day City, CA	2016-12-05	This is utterly stupid. What is the reason and what is the plan? Who owns this and??
Nancy Anderson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This is a beautiful place in our city
Max Rana	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Please don't clearcut any trees in San Francisco, especially upon Mt. Davidson. Please restore the facilities at McLaren Park and make mountain bike trails throughout the city's greenspaces!! And please eradicate the poison oak. Thank you.
Hannah Mer	Oakland, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up on Mt. Davidson and that forest was my escape from the city during my teenage years. It made life seem so much easier when I could just walk a few blocks and be in the middle of a forest
Ryan Pasquene	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Sounds like a plot for development and I like trees
Hristo Ivanov	Woodland Hills, CA	2016-12-05	Weed need trees.
Jeffrey Rodriguez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	We need and it's not the right thing to do for cutting down a beautiful forest that shows the wonders of this city. Too many things have changed in this city and it's not pretty. By cutting down 1,600 trees will just make it worse in any type of way
Anta Sgurdson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This quest to return SF woods to some "natural state" is nuts! They dug up a the cephalopod out at Ocean Beach and now the city has to pay for shifting the sand around!
Nate Amde	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I love Mt. Davidson and its forest. It is an underappreciated San Francisco landmark, but a landmark nonetheless. It should be preserved to the best of our ability.
Jenn Murnighan	Marysville, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up in San Francisco on hills younger grew up to hike Mount Davidson for us especially on Easter my family would go up and celebrate Catholic mass very fond memory please keep San Francisco green from my children and grandchildren to remember I'm third-generation native San Franciscan please keep it
Ian S.	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I've been going there since I was a wee baby and still walk my puppies up there as much as I can. Don't ruin the nature that gives my home city the onyx charm it has left.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
asadu ah modara	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I am sgn ng th s pet t on because the regress ve p an of the San Franc sco ark and Rec. Comm ss on has changed my concern to anger.
Pame a Wa atka	Los Gatos, CA	2016-12-05	P ease don t et the nat v st agenda destroy our trees. The dea that non-nat ves are nfer or s just an dea, unsupported by sc ence. A tree s a tree.
Ryan Borges	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up n the C ty and ove wander ng nto the park. It offers resp te from the crush of urban fe and prov des and escape and chance of adventure for future generat ons.
A den Doug ass	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	We need outdoor space, we need oxygen!
Les e Ke y	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up w th t. I am com ng home to t soon after a tenure n NC. I gre up w th t! 3rd generat on nat ve. P ease eave someth ng of my c ty!
Mark (Marcus) Ewert	SF, CA	2016-12-05	We need a the trees we can get on th s p anet!!! I m ncensed that th s s even an ssue!
Donna Dav s	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	P ease protect Mt Dav dson. Save the trees.
da ya he er	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up adventur ng on mt. Dav dson. It s one of the many treasures on San Franc sco.
Wendy Herzenberg	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I ve used mt Dav dson for h k ng for the ast 20 years and I hate to th nk of an ma s os ng the r hab tats and those beaut fu trees os ng the r ves. I respect that the c ty wants to return the c ty to ts natura hab tat but not f carnage has to be nvo ved
Art st Amy Kar e Res dence	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Hea th and we be ng of our ne ghborhood and water supp y. Do not use pest c des on Mt Dav dson, they are tox c to humans and w d fe.
Rache Sojda	Bur ngame, CA	2016-12-05	Mt. Dav dson s so beaut fu the way t s...to c ear a those trees away wou d make t an eye-sore. Not to ment on the tox c chem ca s!! We need ess tox c p aces and more trees!!
Kather ne Gao	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Th s s my hometown and I want to preserve Mt. Dav dson
Ca eb Conner	Haverford, PA	2016-12-05	There s never a good reason to cut down a forest!
N co na M an -Wa ker	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I am sgn ng because th s s a beaut fu park that has prov ded me w th so many ch dhood memor es and w prov de wonderfu memor es for many more peop e.
Joy Wh t ock	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I ove h k ng n th s mag ca forest n the m dd e of our c ty. P ease preserve!!
k ra pace	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	rec&parks has done more to destroy our natura andscape than to he p t. p ease stop them before t s too ate. the r p ans for mount dav dson are part cu ar y d abo ca. ve yet to see one of the r projects *not* end n b ght and eros on.
Lu s Arba za	Seas de, CA	2016-12-05	We need to keep a the w derness that we can
k ra pace	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	p enty of fe has s nce grown up around these euca yptus stands; other forms of fe have s nce come to enjoy them. rec&parks s one of th s c ty s most destruct ve forces. the r use of roundup a one (nc ud ng, w thout v s b e not f cat on, n dog parks) s pos tve y shamefu. ve seen th s department ru n a ot of parks n th s c ty; ve yet to see them mprove someth ng. p ease stop them.
A cea Osborne	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I ove San Franc sco and ts green space!
V rg n a Odonne	Stockton, MO	2016-12-05	I am from the Bay Area, Ca forn a... t s beaut fu and shou dn t be abused.
W mer Tam	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Why wou d you do th s?
bernadette be	fa rf e d, CA	2016-12-05	I grew uo n SF. Mt. Dav dson s tru y a SF andmark.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Mathew Spohn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This plan is from an outdated way of thinking about natural resource management. My family and I hike in this forest every week and we don't want to see it destroyed.
Michael Martinez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	As a long-time SF resident, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars on an ignorant plan to eventually reclaim the land for development.
Darwin Be	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This green space needs to be saved
Juan Chavarraga	Van Nuys, CA	2016-12-05	It's important to conserve as much forests as we can to help combat CO2 emissions in our atmosphere
Justin Moran-Abe	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	This is my front yard. You'd be foolish to destroy this beautiful place
Kris Strube	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Why not the original habitat, many animals call these areas home.
Suzy Lord	Montreal, Canada	2016-12-05	I live nearby! I love this park, and often go there with my family for a rejuvenating walk...I am shocked to read this plan of cutting most of the trees...WHY?
Jeff Easand	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	My son and I hike Mt. Davidson frequently and enjoy the trails, trees, and viewpoints. Please keep the area as it is today (and with no toxic pesticides).
Samuel Cuadra	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Trees
Eric Huertas	Pasadena, CA	2016-12-05	We need this forest.
Molly Cahen	Brooklyn, NY	2016-12-05	This piece of nature in the middle of the city is important to me and my family. Please protect this forest.
Katrina Sanders	San Carlos, CA	2016-12-05	We need every tree we have
Steven Bender	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	These projects are automatically suspect to me because of the involvement of companies which manufacture highly toxic herbicides. I don't think the true motive for clear-cutting is the stated one.
Kristina Henriquez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Because air, water, Mother Earth and all of us need to live. We all deserve to live peacefully.
James Clark	Toronto, Canada	2016-12-05	Tree give life.
Michael Baw	Auburn, CA	2016-12-05	The environment is more important than aesthetics, and trees are more aesthetically pleasing than anything.
Max Mendez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I was not and raised in San Francisco. There has been so much change in the recent years to this city. Why lose such a beautiful place. Can we keep SF original in at least our parks and open spaces. This is completely unnecessary and I'm afraid that once logged it will be proposed as the next high to build more new and unneeded condos
Jill Rosenthal	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	The negative impact of this plan far outweighs any perceived positives - I'm unclear on any positive outcome. Return the hill to the 1700s? Should we return Golden Gate Park to sand dunes? Food for the financial District?
Jamie Martinez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	Mount Davidson is one of the most gorgeous and serene escapes from the city. Taking it away would be an absolute tragedy.
BILL RODRIGUEZ	Rochester, WA	2016-12-05	I was born and raised in SF the Genpark/Sunnyside area and would hike up to the cross on Mt. Davidson all of this beautiful please do not let them destroy our natural areas.
Moe Davis	Day City, CA	2016-12-05	This forest is my favorite place in San Francisco.
Benjamin Julian	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-05	I walk in this forest about once a week. It's beautiful the way it is.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jlm B ngs	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Dear Park and Rec, P ease do not destroy one of San Franc sco s natura sanctuar es, the Mt. Dav dson Forest. The forest he ps fght c mate change, prov des a refuge for w d fe, prevents eros on and food ng and much more. It s a so a major recreat on area for thousands of c ty dwe ers. P ease reject the deforestat on p an.No San Franc scan wants a ba d h . Thank you. Best, J m B ngs
Lee Parme ee	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I grew up wa k ng the tra s, and fee that the forest shou d be protected.
Ster ng Bard	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Nature s beauty and other w d fe ve there
Rob Vercoe	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Mt. Dav dson s better w th trees. Remov ng them wou d take them away and we shou d protect trees ke th s n our area.
Kev n Baumann	Germany	2016-12-05	Save the green p aces
Karen Ferguson	Men o Park, CA	2016-12-05	Th s project s a waste of taxpayer funds.
Son a S erra Wo f	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	It s beaut fu and deserves to stay that way
Debra Amador	Peta uma, CA	2016-12-05	Trees and open space are needed to keep San Franc sco thr v ng.
N cho as Moberg	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Mt Dav dson s beaut fu ! Keep t beaut fu .
Pau a Fukuyama	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	We need green space. P ease stop us ng dangerous neurotox ns.
Thomas Chen	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	We need to save the forest or e se we are done for...
a exander o son	Oak and Ca forn a, CA	2016-12-05	Th s s my home, my c ty, and I know how mportant these spaces are to the hea th of th s urban area and ts res dents.
He d Cra g	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Once t s gone, there s no gett ng t back and I, for one, want to ve n a beaut fu c ty... wh ch means at east oases of green!
ho e chern s	Ha f Moon Bay, CA	2016-12-05	Th s s rrespons b e, dangerous and reck ess!!! P ease do the r ght th ng and don t do th s!
A sa V nokurova	Seatt e, WA	2016-12-05	We need a the trees we can get! A so, Mt. Dav dson s an urban retreat v ta to the menta hea th of many San Franc scans. These 1600 trees have an mmeasurab e, exponent a y pos t ve effect on San Franc sco as a who e.
Co n We	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	We need more trees, not fewer!
Matthew wr ght	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	No! Just no!
Nancy Wo f	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Leave our urban forest a one!! No more tox c pest c des!!
Lu s P	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	Keep the forest
Br dgett Luther	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-05	I m s gn ng because we need more trees, not ess. P ease rev ew your p an SF Parks Recreat on and Parks
Teresa Wentworth	San Jose, CA	2016-12-05	I was rs sed n San Franc sco n the 50 s and 60 s up near Mt. Dav dson. As ch d we used to wa k up to the cross through the woods. It s part of a San Franc sco andscape, and shou d be preserved.
Pau a Burkhart	Sonoma, CA	2016-12-05	Th s s just r d cou us! Stop runn ng the env ronment. Trees aren t the on y v ng th ngs on Mt. Dav dson; there are many other forms of w d fe.
Chr stopher Ramos	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	cutt ng down trees s not the way to go
Shannon Bergman	San Car os, CA	2016-12-06	We need to preserve our forests, not destroy them. S gn f cant env ronmenta mpacts shou d not be taken ght y.
Irma Moraw etz	Ha f Moon Bay, CA	2016-12-06	Because t s the r ght th ng do, spend money more w se y then cutt ng down our magest c Trees.
Kev n Rucker	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	SF s my home and Mt. Dav dson wou d be barren and w ndy w th the trees.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Loyd Affholder	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	It's a micro fog ecosystem, why?
Michael Moore	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Outrageous idea that we destroy the environment and we subject Mt. Davidson residents to potential a very massive fooding.
Terra Marchant	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	please save the trees!
Carla Otstott	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Quit cutting down trees! We need them and want them.
Samuel Zorn	St Paul, MN	2016-12-06	Mt. Davidson Forest is a treasure that must be protected.
Kieran McGowan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	is right
Tom Duffy	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I am signing this petition because I live on the slopes of Mt. Davidson and maintaining its current integrity is vital to the neighborhood and to our frequent use of its trails and peaceful woods. The plans by the Rec & Park are simply an abomination of this special park. Please stop them for ruining yet another urban forest.
Lisa Bruner	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	San Francisco's green spaces are a beautiful resource for the many city dwellers who don't have yards or patios. These trees are an important part of keeping the area green and homes for animals.
Bronwyn Gundogdu	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I am signing because I'm so outraged over the decision to remove the trees from Mt Davidson. San Francisco is unique in being such a high density city but with beautiful oases of urban forests. These urban forests provide a rich resource aesthetically and environmentally. This seems to be a project being implemented by a small number of people with city government who are following their own very limited view of how SF should look, without regard to what the majority of San Franciscans want.
Mackenzie Owen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Clear cutting the Mt. Davidson forest is a profoundly stupid idea.
Craig Hanson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I grew up with Mt Davidson as my backyard. I should as..
Victoria Schwartz	Oakland, CA	2016-12-06	Save open space in SF!
Kathryn Kaimar	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I do not believe in clear cutting without replacement. This act would be more harmful than helpful to San Francisco.
gabriel davies	san francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Because I love this forest, and go hike there often. Stop destroying nature!
Terris Gue	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Over the past 36 years I have hiked these trails. I've watched the trees grow. Please Keep the forest. We have twin peaks for open space.
Tiffany Burkhardt	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	It's a gorgeous trail as is. Please do not disrupt.
Stewart Goossens	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	woods aren't good...they're GRRREAT!
Cecilia Tran-Muchowski	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I am a resident and we need to save beautiful Mt. Davidson Forest
Kim Rickman	South San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I am a fifth generation San Franciscan. I walked up this hill with my Great grandparents, grandparents, and parents. I walk now with my children.
Thomas Kany	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Please do not continue to remove precious green space that truly helps make this city the magical, wonderful place that is!
Naom Jatovsky	Dan Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	There is NO reason to do this. None, Zippo. Leave it alone.
Ter Rothschild	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Sign petition. It's the right thing to do!
amanda aceves	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Mount Davidson is an essential park for the surrounding community. In a community with little to no trees. The residents there, often walk to mount Davidson park, to enjoy the beautiful lush area. I often go there as a resident of this community. Losing these trees would be absolutely devastating to me and my neighbors.
Adam Young	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	San Francisco preservation.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
J m Strano	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	SF Parks and Recs have lost the corrective minds. Leave the trees alone. If anything, import some koala bears from Australia and help save them as well. Hands off the forest!
Chrysta Kafka	Palo Alto, CA	2016-12-06	The plan to toxic chemicals to remove or even reduce a healthy urban forest is both reckless and shameful.
Shannon Eaton	Dubua, CA	2016-12-06	SF needs to preserve the beautiful trees.
Timothy Armour	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	In twenty years our future children will ask "what were they thinking, cutting down all those trees" What looks good right this moment is not the right thing to do. For future generations...stop this NAP madness.
Aaron Loney	Brauer, MN	2016-12-06	This sounds like a very short sighted plan and ANY PLAN THAT INVOLVES Roundup (glyphosate), Garon 4 Ultra (tricypyr), Mestone (amnopryd), and Habitat/Arsenal/Chopper NEEDS HALTED immediately!
Mandy Barovick	Reno, NV	2016-12-06	I grew up in the Bay!!! Let the Forest live!!!
Melissa McMan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Outrageous!
Nina Beck	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	The greenery is beautiful and healthy for the environment and soul!
Jaen Martens	Forestville, CA	2016-12-06	I love trees. I love San Francisco and this seems a ridiculous, cruel and unnecessary thing to do.
Kochandees	bodega, CA	2016-12-06	Trees clean the air
Tommy Hemick	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I'm signing this because we need places like this in the city to get away from the urban jungle. This place brings peace of mind, allows family time, and improves the environment. Don't destroy it!
Murray Cahen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Because my wife and daughter love to walk there
Sara Madigan	Mankato, MN	2016-12-06	This is a beautiful park that must be preserved for the health of SF
marahortz	sancarlos, CA	2016-12-06	I LOVE THE TREES!
Michael Zachary Davis	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I spent a lot of time up here in high school. As someone who's traveled the world, I can tell you the one thing I missed about San Francisco was being able to go to parks within the city where I could completely disconnect from the business of the city.
Dane Pedersen	Martinez, CA	2016-12-06	The forest is a beautiful sanctuary for wildlife and people
Jane Schafgans	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	Leave the trees alone and stop spraying poison.
Shannon McKay	Spokane, WA	2016-12-06	I have enjoyed these parks many times over the years. I LOVE the outdoors and these spaces provide so much more than outdoor recreation. They are truly healthy for our planet. Please reconsider the logging and pesticide usage. Thank you.
Kristap Batn	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I want to preserve nature in San Francisco
miramcantor	sansanfrancisco, CA	2016-12-06	Can we really afford to cut down trees in an urban environment? We need our sanctuary more than ever with the current condition. Please save the trees!
Anne Smons	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	This is an infuriating plan to waste taxpayer money on a "politically correct" but environmentally unsound project. The forest is a benefit to SF, not a threat!
Mayy Yaser	San Bruno, CA	2016-12-06	Please leave this beautiful park alone! It's peaceful and serene
Josephine Yang	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	We love Mt. Davidson forest. It's a murder to log this forest.
G.B. Mer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	We need the trees to maintain the health of the people and land of San Francisco. I agree with what's said in the attached letter. Save Mt. Davidson Forest.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ju e Ange	Gard ner, NY	2016-12-06	what happens to peop e when they get nto pos tions n c ty coun c s? It s the same the wor d over. They become power mad d ots mak ng absurd dec s ons w th money that comes to them far too eas y w th no accountab ty. Do not cut down these trees. Trees are sacred and where they grow br ng fe. In an age where we never stop hear ng about c mate change and carbon footpr nt t s even more nonsens ca to cut down trees wh ch are a carbon s nk. As far as us ng a the var ous tox c sprays - career sts w th degrees who are ack ng n common sense, a sad and very common state of affa rs. Are these peop e ncapab e of th nk ng? Do they not have ch dren?
Just n Fung	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Seems unnecessary and a comp ete waste of c ty money. Mt Dav dson s a rare and revered oas s of nature here n San Franc sco. Lets preserve t for future generat ons to come!
ara burke	San D ego, CA	2016-12-06	We shou dn t be k ng trees w th harmfu pest c des, there are other ways to perform hort cu ture p ann ng
L sa Ta ey	St. Lou s, MO	2016-12-06	I m mov ng there.
Pau Crowe	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	I ove th s peacefu oas s..
Marce a Breton	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	I ove the trees and tra s of th s spec a h .
Jesse R cket	Tampa, FL	2016-12-06	I once ved near and v s ted th s park.
Jess ca Fassas	Da y C ty, CA	2016-12-06	I h ke there and t s so beaut fu
Lena Fekr n an	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-06	I m s gn ng th s because enough s enough. We are k ng our earth and to even th nk that there s a vote to dec de to destroy the forest s f abbergast ng.
Zeena Bat wa a	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	we wa k here and ove t !
Char otte Brockman	Da y C ty, CA	2016-12-06	Th s s c ear y a nat v st p ot. To return a hab tat to t s cond t ons 300 years ago gnores the good of the hab tat as t current y ex sts. There are an ma s that re y on th s hab tat for surv va now. San Franc sco s known wor d-w de for ts natura beauty and k ndness to the p anet. Why k that now?
Rory Desmond	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	We need th s natura resource for hea th and recreat on. It s an essent a part of c ty fe.
Sky Kra	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Th s park and these trees are v ta and va uab e v ng grow ng be ngs.
Va d Or to	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Love h k ng there -- the sme s and s ghts are fantast c! L ke you re n a fa ry and!
Margaret Zo d	Crandon, WI	2016-12-06	I m s gn ng because the remova of these trees wou d be detr menta to San Franc sco; a beaut fu c ty that I enjoy v s t ng.
Robert Patterson	Crooked R ver Ranch, OR	2016-12-06	I m a nat ve SFcan. I return frequent y to get my C ty "f x." What can these peop e poss b y be th nk ng? Return to 1700? Sure, next step w be to propose more hous ng for the wea thy.....
Gay e Partmann	Rohnert Park, CA	2016-12-06	nat ve San Franc scan -
M chae Whe p ey	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	I ove tak ng a wa k n that forest, and wou d hate to see t go!
Suzette Hytche	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-06	Are you k dd ng!???? Round-up!!! Monsanto has po soned us ong enough and now the c ty I was once so proud of, s tak ng part n us ng chem ca s that not on y k weeds, but peop e. NO, NO, and NO!
Jan Wa ton	A ameda, CA	2016-12-06	Leave that forest a one! We need more trees, not fewer.
Raz e Gonzaz	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	NO!
M chae Parker	M am Beach, FL	2016-12-06	It s rd cu ous they even are com ng th s c ose. not acceptab e
Deborah Atk ns	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	W d fe needs a vo ce!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
sa y abrams	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Use the money to take care of the c ty trees as prop e asked. We need trees. Let these trees ve.
Nancy Boder ck	Benton C ty, WA	2016-12-06	Why wou d anyone want to destroy th s beaut fu p ace, home to many d fferent brds and w d fe?? Save th s park... t s beaut fu !
Terese laqu nta	Rac ne, WI	2016-12-06	Parks and Rec need to stop hav ng a narrow v ew of what "works" and open the r m nds to the other poss b t es. The so ut ons they fee are necessary are not so ut ons at a . Why does the department need to prevent a tree from grow ng. There are euca yptus here. The way to "so ve" th s s not by cutt ng them a down.
Ezmereda Gorey	Sacramento, CA	2016-12-06	Th s s nsane, get t together Parks and Rec SF. Aren t you aware by now that trees are the ungs of the Earth? Wake up!
Trevor McDowe	Novato, CA	2016-12-06	I lke to breathe cean ar
Mo ra Hanes	Larkspur, CA	2016-12-06	Those trees store carbon and prov de us w th oxygen. It s sense ess to cut them down. Peop e v ng n San Franc sco need more opportun tes to wa k n forests, not fewer.
Jeff Harr	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Mount Dav dson s my favor te ocat on of a the parks n the c ty.
SUZANNE VICTORIA	O ymp a, WA	2016-12-06	I WAS BORN IN SAN FRANCISCO!!!
joseph dow er	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	We need w d areas n the c ty
Jayn Chase	Bedford, NY	2016-12-06	It s mperat ve that you ook at the sc ence and not just Monsanto s corporate junk sc ence about Roundup. The chem ca s we put n our water stay n our water and come back to us. Why wou d you ever manage Parks w th chem ca s?! That s the worst dea lve ever heard! P ease do not cut the trees on Mt Dav dson and p ease stop us ng chem ca s n a parks!
Chr st na Hem ock	Pac f ca, CA	2016-12-06	I dont even understand why th s wou d happen?? t shou d be protected pub c and state and!!!
Br an Ingram	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Dude, wtf are you th nk? Thats why.
Ju e Butterf e d	San Jose, CA	2016-12-06	We n need a the natura p aces we current y have n SF. DO not take another away from t s c t zens and v s tors.
Jud th S ssener	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	P ease protect and ma nta n the Mt. Dav dson Forest!
Joshua Garza	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	I m aga nst the p ans to ce ar cut trees n severa parks n San Franc sco.
Rob S don	M Va ey, CA	2016-12-06	I used to ve on Mt Dav dson.. p ease don t
Chery Larson	B g Lake, MN	2016-12-06	As a phys c an ass stant I am d rect y opposed to the use of herb c des and am concerned and the d rect hea th mp cat ons nc ud ng the carc nogens and neurotox ns.
He d Ch ao	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	We must save the trees, because that w he p save us.
Laura Fou ke	New York, NY	2016-12-06	We need to protect the Earth.
Caro Cor ng	Mau d n, SC	2016-12-06	I used to ve n Ca forn a and support the sav ng of th s beaut fu recreat ona area. Ca forn a has tte enough left now. Let s save th s park/recreat ona area.
L sa Payne	South San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	The c ty needs to eave some th ngs a one ke nature. What about mud s des from the removed trees????? Anyone address ng that?
yvonne Daub n	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Save the forest on Mt Dav dson
Nata a Hermos a	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Forests!!!
E zabeth K mb e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Because we need to save and nurture our parks, not str p them!
Kath een Panar s	Memph s, TN	2016-12-06	Save the trees they g ve so much to us.
Steve Savage	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-06	Los ng the tress s trag c. Us ng roundup s unconsc onab e.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Aysa Wright	Portland, OR	2016-12-06	What a waste to destroy these!
Roland TREGO	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	The forest is wonderful now. We can spend our money in more useful ways.
Peaches Stitts	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-06	I am born and raised in San Francisco and as a native I want to keep some of San Francisco's natural beauty and to keep wildlife thriving.
Scott Speces	Seattle, WA	2016-12-07	I'm opposed to the logging. It makes no sense. Leave the forest the way it is.
George Goodspeed	Minden, NV	2016-12-07	Please consider the environment here, this is a must preserve effort!!
Soane Cook	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	I am going to sign this petition because I want to save the forest.
Ryan McCuen	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	The Sausalito Sea was a so-called "accident" and came into being in 1905, since then it has become a habitat to many species that have come to depend on the sea. California was a so-called "reversible" changes by agriculture and the raising of cattle to the point where certain plants now depend on the livestock. My point is that while it's great to live in the past, you cannot bring back the dead, at least not in this way. Now more than ever it's important to try to make sure that a species can survive and thrive on this planet, and without evidence that deforesting Mount Davidson is going to bring back the Xerces Blue Butterfly, the California Gnatcatcher, or the quail population for instance. Then there is no reason to do this.
Debbie Hemlock	Pacific, CA	2016-12-07	We need to protect our environment and climate. Cutting these forests will endanger both. Don't cut down these forests. They are one of the last areas people and animals can breathe and experience serenity. Leave these for our future generations.
Pam Keeler	Rye, NY	2016-12-07	Trees are important for our future
Lindsay Cuibertson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	It's beautiful and shouldn't be touched. Enough with destroying the earth!
Tim Adamch	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	It's one of a kind!
Kristine Lee	Calabasas, CA	2016-12-07	As a former resident of San Francisco, Mt. Davidson Forest is a necessary sanctuary in the city. Not only is the space a vital green space that is frequented by locals, visitors, and wildlife. Please preserve this gem for generations to come.
ginger pepper	san francisco, CA	2016-12-07	Park and Rec needs to be controlled. Mr Ginsberg is destroying our public parks. He'd privatize a park if he could. Eucalyptus trees are our history and science states we benefit from them and they've 300 years or longer.
Aan Vondrak	Carson City, NV	2016-12-07	I love trees
CLARE HERMAN	Pleasant Hill, CA	2016-12-07	I lived in San Francisco for many years and all my friends and relatives are appalled that this could actually happen to our forest!! It does not make any sense to destroy such a beautiful place!
Stephanie Rivera	Patterson, CA	2016-12-07	.
Alex Creese	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	SF City gov is full of dots
Katherine Rans	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	I love the trails of Mt Davidson, it's a hidden oasis of green in the city!
Liz Stebay	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	Save these beautiful trees! There are so many better things SF Rec & Park should be doing with the right money!
Rebecca Clark	West Hills, CA	2016-12-07	Let's protect the most intact and pristine habitats for our wildlife and flora.
Pau Lord	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	As a SF resident, a forest, even non-native species (in most cases) are more valuable in the urban environment than an absence of forest. Without restriction on recreational use and a phased reforestation plan in place and fully funded, then leave well enough alone.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Brian Marabeo	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	Please don't strip SF's highest peak and the green vista I have from my front porch and window. The city's embarrassing devotion of trees. Homeowners remove them to add parking spaces or let them die of neglect. And Mayor Lee's office does nothing to help the situation, especially now that they're aiming to chop down Prop E. And now what? Leave a little natural beauty please. Spare the Mt Davidson trees.
Ezabeth Olson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	We need trees to help us make clean air! The trees are beautiful and barren hills are not. Please do not engage in this meaningless, unhelpful, and wasteful destruction of trees helping to clean our city air.
Scott Dawson	Las Vegas, NV	2016-12-07	Because we need our forest!!!
Roderic Mast	Herndon, VA	2016-12-07	The world needs more trees and nature.
Amy Vassar	Pacific, CA	2016-12-07	This is outrageous. Both logging and peccadillo use are unheard of nowadays please resist this plan.
Robert Kroner	North Hampton, NH	2016-12-07	I used to live at 7th / Kirkham and long admired this stand of trees. The plan for removing them is a poor one.
Judith Stein	Oakland, CA	2016-12-07	we need our natural spots more than ever.
ES	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-07	Trees are an integral part of our planet and environment. We need them!
Erin Derkey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	I'm signing this petition because Mt Davidson is a beautiful city sanctuary for hiking and taking in the views of the city
Peter Pryputniewicz	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	I lived on that hill nearby for many years and appreciate both the physical and intangible value to the surrounding area that forest provides. Destroying this forest is unnecessarily destructive and a waste of resources.
Krysa Kobryner	Patagonia, AZ	2016-12-07	What? why? We love trees!
patrick whitechagnon	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	omg, sf, love you but you are bringing me down
leonard jay	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	The native plant obsessives won't be satisfied until they turn all the open areas into harsh, windswept dunes. They would turn Golden Gate Park to sand if they could. We need trees. Perhaps the sand-and-dust people should move to Phoenix. ~Leonard Jay
Christine Kessing	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	This plan might have made some sense 20 years ago, but now it's nothing short of destructive to a real sanctuary for animals and insect life. Please do not let the deforestation go forward.
Curtis Bradford	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	Save our trees. We don't want to go back to the Sandy, craggy way s.f. looked in 1700s. Leave our landscapes alone...
Jessica House	La Fayette, GA	2016-12-07	We need to protect our world if we need it and it needs us
Cath Campbe	Gainesville, FL	2016-12-07	Please save this forest!! We have to stop the destruction we're causing, killing and removing trees take homes from hundreds of other species that use them!
leen kim	Burkeville, CA	2016-12-07	this jewel should be preserved, not clear cut!
Robynsey	Honolulu, HI	2016-12-07	We have to save nature!!! No more slash and burn business as usual.
Ashma Sarin	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	this is my favorite place in the city.
Jacqueline Proctor	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	The forest is an historic, vernacular, and cultural landscape that should be protected. Preserving Sutter's forest was the reason neighboring campers campaigned to make it a City park in the 1920s.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
J Thomas	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	"If you don't treat a few endangered species with herbicides they will come back. Glyphosate is a probable carcinogen and has been blamed for causing autism, among other health problems. Let's poison our kids. Monsanto doesn't have enough money. Let's kill the birds and wildlife too. Just because most of the world's extinction has happened in the last 30 years it doesn't mean we shouldn't kill more living things. We destroy better than any species on earth. Will SF show Trump how to do it?
Christine Cho	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	Mt. Davidson Forest is my favorite nature walk near my home. Please save the trees!
Sharon Simonson	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-07	The trees are scarce in these parts.
Jeff Londer	Burroughs, CA	2016-12-08	This heartbreaking plan to cut down 1,600 trees on Mt. Davidson and apply pesticides is a hazardous use of taxpayer money and would have significant negative impacts on public safety, public health, and the environment. The diversity of wildlife living on Mt. Davidson is awe-inspiring. Over 40 species of birds have been spotted recently. Mt. Davidson is one of the top birding locations in all of San Francisco. SF Rec and Park's matrix of wildlife sightings lists 3 types of bumblebees that make their home on Mt. Davidson. The California sanderling is another inhabitant of the forest. The public does not want San Francisco to use taxpayer dollars to destroy the home of so many birds and wildlife.
Brooke Rodriguez	Houston, TX	2016-12-08	We need to protect our last remaining wild spaces!
Patricia Ztkus	Fareless Hills, PA	2016-12-08	We need the trees!
Ayssa Husan	Ottawa, Canada	2016-12-08	I'm signing because the preservation of trees is important. Forests are nature's beauty and they are important on so many cultural, social, economic and political aspects then people realize.
Kenneth Stanford	Sherwood, AR	2016-12-08	I'm signing this to save the beautiful forest, the trees, and wildlife deserve to stay where they are.
Victoria Poukos	Aurora, Canada	2016-12-08	I want to help save this magical forest.
Sandra Carretero García	Spain	2016-12-08	Firmo porque quiero salvar este lugar, no se merece que se talle, los árboles son parte de la vida, de la naturaleza, el medio ambiente... por favor, juntos podemos cambiar el mundo y hacer un lugar mejor. Concencemos por el medio ambiente, es parte de nosotros.
Kimberly Ley	Fairview, TN	2016-12-08	I'm signing because a nature needs to be protected. Think about the world we are leaving for our children and our grandchildren. I would love for my sons children to have nature in their lives and for these natural beautiful places not be used for greed and money.
Jessica Jensen	Minneapolis, MN	2016-12-08	Save this beautiful forest. We need these trees!
Kathiane Avear	Vitoria, Brazil	2016-12-08	Árvores são vitais ... Sem elas, não estaríamos aqui hoje .. Que Deus os abençoe.
Coleman Twigg	Lethbridge, Canada	2016-12-08	Trees are beautiful. We need them to breathe. And animals live there.
Brian DeBaise	Meriden, CT	2016-12-08	I am passionate about saving what is meant to be shed here on this beautiful planet.
Hannah Booth	Hartsville, TN	2016-12-08	Save 1600 trees. Signing is easy. There is NO REASON for the logging of these trees. As for the wildlife and birds that will be affected. Just check the link. It's quick and painless. Help save some lives

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Anett Zotorzyck	Skokie, IL	2016-12-08	Forests are valuable sources of biodiversity needed to sustain life and wellness on this planet. Please act wisely and with the future in mind and save Mt. Davidson Forest in San Francisco. We must preserve and conserve the wilderness that remains on Earth and maintain strong environmentally friendly policies because of the countless benefits that would bring to the state, country, and world. San Francisco and California are known for the redwood areas and it would be a shame to destroy that. Thank you for your time. I have faith you will make the right decision.
Laura Deane	Hauppauge, NY	2016-12-08	I used to live in SFO, we need the trees.
Sarah Farre	Bismarck, AR	2016-12-08	I'm signing because we need our trees to live!
Natasha Fataa k	Australia	2016-12-08	I'm signing to save nature and the trees and I love NKKKK
Jao Yn Lee	Petaing Jaya, Malaysia	2016-12-08	Trees should be preserved for our next generation
Matthew Donon	Castleton, VT	2016-12-08	Preserving this earth's essential to the survival of life.
Amanda Cabrera	Lake Jackson, TX	2016-12-08	It's absolutely important to preserve our planet: Every tree that we can save counts.
Jyan Jandreau	Black Hawk, SD	2016-12-08	Because this is the right thing to do.
Sydney Bevers	Shawwater, TX	2016-12-08	We cannot afford to lose anymore trees. This forest cannot go down
Doreen Koronos	North Babylon, NY	2016-12-08	It's important to save our forests!!
Marah Kastrava	Eugene, OR	2016-12-08	It's ridiculous that this is even something that needs "signed"..... It's very clear, like straight up you in the face clear, as to why we need to save this forest.
Madeine Scnsk	Lake Ann, MI	2016-12-08	justice mother Earth we belong to her
Rebeca Pzarro	Spain	2016-12-08	Amo los árboles, a naturaleza y los animales
Sandra Roeder	Man, IL	2016-12-08	I believe in our forests..the trees not only provide us with clean air, but provide thousands of species a home. I believe in NKKKK Somerhaeder.. She and I are fighting to keep this planet free from things they can harm it.
Norma Bustos	Gibsonton, FL	2016-12-08	I want my son to grow up in a better place.
Ashley G.	NY, NY	2016-12-08	We need more trees on the planet. Period.
Cathy Daviss	Gen Gardner, NJ	2016-12-08	I care!!
Celine Tucker	Saint John, IN	2016-12-08	Ecosystems at stake!!
Verónica Pera ta Batista	San Carlos, Costa Rica	2016-12-08	Es que vayan a destruir un bosque tan precioso y vayan a quitar el hogar a muchos animales, signifique que a los seres humanos ya no les interesa o que se pase a planeta por cosas tan estúpidas como construir edificios, a humanidad va empeorando poco a poco si no nos detenemos seremos nosotros que nos quedaremos sin hogar.
smarotsou akak	Thessaloniki, Greece	2016-12-08	Clearcutting 1,600 trees on Mt. Davidson would increase the security risks from climate change by removing an old-growth, active forest carbon sink. The majority of the trees in the interior Mt. Davidson forest are healthy and do not require thinning or removal. The diversity of wildlife living on Mt. Davidson is awe-inspiring. Over 40 species of birds have been spotted recently. The proposed deforestation project would cause significant unavoidable negative impacts including loss of biodiversity, loss of riparian resources, cultural resources, and recreation.
Ignacia Calderon	Santafo, Chile	2016-12-08	Because I believe that every forest should be saved. And all the environment and natural surroundings should be protected because they were created for beauty and to save us from all the bad things around us.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Karen Vergara	Quito, Ecuador	2016-12-08	Porque me siento responsable con la vida natural que pertenece a planeta y que con nuestra existencia está dañándose.
Catherine Barad	King of Prussia, PA	2016-12-08	We need to preserve our natural resources!!
Bee Maue	Australia	2016-12-08	Deforestation sucks!
Deysy Garcia	Lawrenceville, GA	2016-12-08	I believe in this cause
Romana Ender	Howe, MI	2016-12-08	Forests are important! I love to spend my free time out in the woods!
Victoria Aguirre	Lamont, CA	2016-12-08	We must stand with nature not against it.
Maria Garcia	Escondido, CA	2016-12-08	Save the trees!
Hemerson Hamaur Mona Montenegro	Managua, Nicaragua	2016-12-08	Estén, no está mal dañar los bosques.
Alex Gao	Bythe, CA	2016-12-08	☐☐
Meane Anderson	Massonville, CA	2016-12-08	□ □ □ □
Victoria Rico	Henderson, NV	2016-12-08	I love the earth!!!
Gabriela Oto	Quito, Ecuador	2016-12-08	Que los recursos naturales de planeta puedan conservarse, porque ellos aportan vida a los humanos.
Mary Perera	Harrison, NJ	2016-12-08	save them!
Heather No	Auburn, ME	2016-12-08	It's the right thing to do.
Ann Nelson	Boonington, MN	2016-12-08	Please don't ruin this beautiful forest. The wildlife and people deserve to have them preserved.
Jessica Sargent	San Diego, CA	2016-12-08	We need this beautiful place!
Gary Thomson	New Smyrna Beach, FL	2016-12-08	Everything deserves a chance at survival
Cheyenne Freeman	Occidentia, CA	2016-12-08	We need trees for the earth to thrive and stay healthy
Mercy Gomez	Quito, Ecuador	2016-12-08	Los bosques y reservas son el hogar de muchas especies y sobre todo vidas
Michele Vtanov	Panama, IL	2016-12-08	Save our earth
Chloe M Ford	Australia	2016-12-08	Without trees what world do we have? Saving trees saves lives.
Patricia Springer	Oxford, ME	2016-12-08	I have family in California, and this is a beautiful place.
Joana Mendez	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-08	I'm signing this petition because beautiful nature doesn't need to get destroyed at a speciality function important because they give us fresh air and amazing sites to see
Keisey Masteran	Sewckey, PA	2016-12-08	Trees. Don't be a dick to Nature.
Lauren McMahon	Royal Oak, MI	2016-12-08	I love this planet and I can't stand to see humans ruin more of it.
Rima Ezen	Montreal, Canada	2016-12-08	We need to make a change & simply because trees are very important to the natural cycle & they are vanishing too!! Preserve the earth preserve it
Imogen M Ford	Australia	2016-12-08	Because I want to help make a change
Yoany Amaya	Baltimore, MD	2016-12-08	want to save the forest (nature) for our future (kids)
Anna O'Vero	Washington, NJ	2016-12-08	The earth is all we have when everything else is gone.
Alex Reyes	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-08	I'm signing because I want to preserve the Bay Area's natural beauty!
Karla Figueroa	Tegucigalpa, Honduras	2016-12-08	It's not just because the trees are pretty, it's because we need them more than we think even when they are more than hundred miles away, and since air, oxygen and oxygen, they do more for us than we do for them.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
A ce Tufenkchyan	Austra a	2016-12-08	It s our duty to protect our beaut fu p anet! Let s constr bute to that w th sma but determ ned steps each day! M ne today s to stand for Mt. Dav dson Forest n San Franc sco!!!
Shaye M ford	Austra a	2016-12-08	Sav ng the env ronment w save my ch dren s ves.
Laura Abe	Austra a	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng th s pet t on because once what was a wor d fu of hundred of forests now are decreas ng rap d y due to deforestat on wh ch s now a major ssue n our env ronment today and t does not just cause c mate change but hundreds of over ssues wh ch must must be so ved for our future generat ons.
Ange a W ams	Ka angur, Austra a	2016-12-08	We need nature
Tamara Thaher	Ph ade ph a, PA	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because I be eve nature, an ma s and trees are someth ng so beaut fu and so fu of fe that runn ng t cou d ru n th s earth. We tera y cou dn t breathe w thout the rema n ng trees we are eft w th so not on y are they k ng them but they are cutt ng of the r a r supp y.
Natha ye V cente	Mar borough, MA	2016-12-08	be eve that when peop e come together to make someth ng happen, t happen.
N sha Bre sford	Cogan Stat on, PA	2016-12-08	Save the Forrest!
Jan ne Orev o	Bacoor, Ph pp nes	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because I be eve that no one s sav ng the env ronment but us.
Tracy Hoyt	Ho ster, CA	2016-12-08	Th s shou dn t even be cons dered. It sn t necessary to pave every s ng e green patch.
Eman Fat ma	R ffa, Bahra n	2016-12-08	I ove Nature. Th s forest deserves to be rescued.
Katr na Stan ey	Baden, PA	2016-12-08	PROTECT OUR FORESTS
Chr st ne Dav d	Le cester, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng th s because w th g ob ng warm ng mpact ng on everyth ng from weather, the O zone, me t ng of the Art c, the dec ne of the Cora Reefs n the oceans. We need a the forestry we can get. The more trees, the more O2, we cannot surv ve w thout a r.
Renee D as	Hughson, CA	2016-12-08	I want to save the forest
Tara Fagan	Freder cksburg, VA	2016-12-08	I care about th s wor d.
Kr ste Sm th	Irv ne, CA	2016-12-08	We can t breath money! We need these trees!
Ha ey A en	Fram ngham, MA	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because every tree, forest need to be protected. "On y when the ast tree has been cut down, the ast f sh been caught, and when the ast stream po soned, w we rea ze we cannot eat money".
Mar ssa Porteous	Auck and, New Zea and	2016-12-08	We need to save the forest
Kara Garc a	Oak Lawn, IL	2016-12-08	Save our earth!!!! Qu t r pp ng t apart and tear ng t down
M nd Bruder	Marana, AZ	2016-12-08	The forests serve as our natura a r cond t on ng, they are v ta to our eco system. Every tree counts.
Am sha Lester	West Jordan, UT	2016-12-08	It s t me to save what s prec ous! Stop deforestat on!
L ndsey Watson	Dover, NH	2016-12-08	I wou d ove to come v s t some day! And we certa n y need more trees not ess - on y one of severa reasons why, c ear y and s mp y out ned here! Thank you Nad ne and thank you N kk for shar ng!
Mark G br ck	North Las Vegas, NV	2016-12-08	I ove th s area. P ease eave t a one !
Amanda W son	Bur ngton, VT	2016-12-08	Th s s what matters. Save the trees!!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
John Quigley	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-08	I strongly oppose the plans by SF Recreation and Park and SF Planning to destroy the Mt. Davidson Forest!!! This forest provides multiple benefits to the community. The plan by SF Recreation and Park and SF Planning to destroy the 1600 trees of the Mount Davidson forest is shortsighted, wrongheaded and will cause great harm to the public and community. The methods of using toxic chemicals like Round Up to achieve the goals threatens public health. The plan to kill this forest MUST be rejected in order to serve the public good.
Dane Yopez	San Diego, CA	2016-12-08	I'm sick of trees being cut down. They're alive and give us the oxygen we need.
Dylan Baeke	Boulder, CO	2016-12-08	I believe in forest conservation
Frankie Servido	Houston, MA	2016-12-08	JAY LIVES HERE AND LIKES TREES AND THEY HAVENT HURT ANYONE
Ayssa Arcon	Fresno, CA	2016-12-08	I'm signing because I would like to see that forest for many years in the future
Lydia McBride	Virginia Beach, VA	2016-12-08	I love nature.
chrissa	Cannock, United Kingdom	2016-12-08	Nature is not for the human race to control and bindy do with whatever they desire.
mark asbury	Burien, CA	2016-12-08	As a former resident of this neighborhood I cherish this quiet place, and any urban forest is a public treasure. In this case of the choices between poisoning the forest and having an invasive species, I take the invasive species.
vanessa casados	McAllen, TX	2016-12-08	I'm doing this because I love nature and signing this petition is way worth the cause.
Cauda Degado	Chicago, IL	2016-12-08	I believe that without nature we are doomed.
Tamara De	Australia	2016-12-08	We need our rainforests!
Stephanie Youmans	Acworth, GA	2016-12-08	STOP CUTTING SACRED TREES
Andrea Hernandez	Santa Ana, CA	2016-12-08	This earth is important and forests are beautiful. All those trees help us live. We protect the things we love.
Marso Martínez	Mexico	2016-12-08	Por la conservación de los ecosistemas, ya que son parte natural de este planeta y tienen el derecho de existir, somos nosotros los intrusos en este mundo. Son necesarios son fuente de oxígeno y es hogar de otras especies.
Heen Harrod	Huntington Beach, CA	2016-12-08	I care.
Breanna Hett	Gendale, AZ	2016-12-08	I'm signing because slowly the world is realizing how incredibly valuable these forests are. Not only for our physical health, but emotionally, spiritually, whatever you want to call it, there is absolute and NO denying that the forests and the wild creatures they hold, make us human. Instills in us a oneness with the earth and the people and things around us. There's TONS of evidence that supports this. And if you really don't care about any of that "hippie" stuff, then think of it this way, no trees, no oxygen, no oxygen, no you. #doGOODbeGOOD
Adrianna Saazar	Santa Ana, NY	2016-12-08	We need to be mindful of this world, and not be so quick to take down the green things!
Chester Czike	Pataskala, OH	2016-12-08	This is important and we need people to stand up more for these causes.
Dana Masyova	Bratislava, Slovakia	2016-12-08	I love nature.
catherine pages	Carlsbad, CA	2016-12-08	We need to stand up and protect the environment and its precious trees.
Dayawanti Punj	India	2016-12-08	I'm an environmentalist and against deforestation
michele P	Petaluma, CA	2016-12-08	I want to save the trees and environment
chrismcmerman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-08	My family works in that forest to get away from the city.
tf Thorda	Mandan, ND	2016-12-08	We need to stop destroying nature and appreciate it.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Natacha Goërtz	Johannesburg, South Africa	2016-12-08	Global warming is a serious problem that needs to be fought vigorously!
Roxanne Heuer	Cape Town, South Africa	2016-12-08	We need to preserve nature. I want my children to grow up and experience what I experienced.
Marco Lucey	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-08	Because I don't like beautiful things destroyed. This is a horrible idea!!!
Emily Fitzgerald	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	Save the trees and wildlife
gabriele Tuschhoff	Germany	2016-12-08	Weich die Natur und Ihre Tiere. Und die Zerstörung aufgehalten werden muss.
Michele Yanez Newcomb	Lubbock, TX	2016-12-08	We must protect our Earth and its precious irreplaceable resources from being destroyed / decreased / overtaken. We must protect the resources that are naturally produced to keep away the chemical or synthetic takeover!
Anna Avanzo	Tracy, CA	2016-12-08	We need the trees. Animals need their homes.
Samantha Campbell	Southbank, Australia	2016-12-08	I live in NZ yet I mourn for the destruction of ANY natural reserve, forest & its inhabitants no matter the location on the globe. I do not understand the thought process of individuals who believe it is ok to unnecessarily destroy ecosystems, whatever the reason might be. Let nature be nature in the places that it has left, I mean honestly. Live and let live and leave well enough alone. The world sees everything.
Tatiana Aguirre	Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	I'm signing because these trees don't deserve to be cut down ☐
Manon Roovers	Netherlands	2016-12-08	I believe that we should stop harming nature, this earth has bled enough. It's time to think about sustainable futures so not only we, but also are future generations will be able to live a happy, healthy life on this earth. I believe not chopping down beautiful forests is a good way to start.
Tereza Čížková	Brno, Czech Republic	2016-12-08	I want to save the trees!!!!
Emilia Smardz	Bydgoszcz, Poland	2016-12-08	Trees are important. We need them to live.
Jacqueline Garcia	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-08	We should protect the little green we have in this country. They are so beautiful and help us and its beautiful to see people enjoy it.
Mayur Jadhav	Abu-Dhabi, Kuwait	2016-12-08	I'm signing this petition because no matter where I live each forest in this world needs to be protected and saved... with so much of deforestation its responsibility of each and every human on this planet to save as many trees as possible because ultimately our Mother Earth will be protected and saved and we should be doing anything possible to do this. Its shameful that we have to this on the first place, people have become so greedy that they are destroying what gives them life. I wish this forest is saved.
Karen Chavez	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	I love nature
Heena Jones	York, United Kingdom	2016-12-08	We have to nurture nature!
Vanessa Lopez	Dallas, TX	2016-12-08	I like breathing oxygen.
Giovanna Anguoso-sazar	Houston, TX	2016-12-08	Because I care about the planet but and I would love nothing. More to stop deforestation.
Martina Janáková	Prague, Czech Republic	2016-12-08	I'm signing because we need trees, we need clean air, this is one step of many steps to save our planet.
Belle Romero	Elk Grove, CA	2016-12-08	America is one of the places where we have the amazing ability to build and create new things but this is also a reason why our lovely and serene nature is being torn apart and many ecosystems destroyed as well as a possible endangered animal. We need to save our precious and or we will eventually have nothing.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
C aud a Ort z	A buquerque, NM	2016-12-08	Beaut fu forest, wou d hate to see t destroyed or any other forest n the wor d, we need to respect nature, respect our home, our mother earth!
Jenny Zaragoza	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because we need to start cons der ng sav ng a these forest because not on y are they essent a to us by g v ng us breathab e a r but a so to an ma s the forest prov des them a home...#sav ngahome!
anna graz a s	Scorrano, Ita y	2016-12-08	anna graz a s
Lu s Ayon	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	I care about th s ssue.
Pърjoteanu andreea	Ga at , Roman a	2016-12-08	We ve because of here!!
veron ca b unt	M nrow, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	Because s ow y th s p anet s be ng destroyed
Mar yn Scho ze	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	P ease stop the cutt ng of trees on Mt. Dav dson and other parks n the c ty. Just because they are not nat ve doesn t mean they are va ue ess. We need mature trees to he p w th c mate change.
A ex a D az	West Jordan, UT	2016-12-08	I LOVE MOTHER EARTH
N k ta Otto	MOOINOO , South Afr ca	2016-12-08	Trees are tru ey mportant. And how does everyone expect to breath f there are no onger trees to he p for oxygen!?!??
Gabr e a To ent no	Los Ange es, CA	2016-12-08	We need to keep the trees!
Sonja Sa eva	Espoo, F n and	2016-12-08	I ove trees :D & t;33
em y meehan	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	Gett ng r d of these trees s a waste of t me and money! The trees n the parks are so mportant to the peop e of th s c ty and the d verse w d fe. The trees f ter our po uted a r and reduce temperature. They g ve refuge to an ma s and he p those of us v ng n the c ty unwd and fee c ose to nature. I don t know what I wou d do f I cou dn t h ke through My Dav dsons trees or G en Park s canyon. We need these p aces as refuge for our c ty-weary sou s!
Jayne Ormrod	Manchester, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I be eve that we are destroy ng our own p anet and the forest and and we destroy the more creatures we w pe out by tak ng the homes p us we need to tree to substan our own p ant
Herm one Bk	Athens, Greece	2016-12-08	Forests are mportant to fe. Forests are our fe! Save the Forest of San Franc sco!
Iné Rademeyer	Sann eshof, South Afr ca	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because t s the r ght th ng to do.
Stone Ke y	Lakes de, MT	2016-12-08	I want to save the trees
Devon o der	Ma dstone, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	Save the trees!!
Samanta Rose Exner	Londr na, Braz	2016-12-08	Ma s natureza... Menos desmatamento! Prec samos preservar nosso ar!
Georg na Barnett	Wo verhampton, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because we have got to STOP tear ng down nature, not just for the sake of our p anet, but for a of the an ma homes we are destroy ng!!
mary schAAF	Ga veston, TX	2016-12-08	It s funny how qu ck y eco og ca ent tement becomes env ronmenta RAPE. Have some respect for the OTHER spec es on th s p anet.
L y Farrant	London, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I care about the conservat on of forests and w d fe.
Andje a l c	Pozarevac, Serb a	2016-12-08	I love nature, i love animals, and I wish all people could feel the same Share the love ☺
Car a Carbone	Spa n	2016-12-08	We need nature
K mber ey James	L ckey End, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because I ove forests and ove w d an ma s and brds, and rea y ove what you and lan are do ng. Its amaz ng. P us ove you both from tw ght and the vamp re d ar es.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
A na Scar ett	Sth m, Sweden	2016-12-08	Because I care about our planet. Gotta start somewhere. Im here thanx to N kk Reed.
samantha de gado	Spain	2016-12-08	Be the change ☐☐
Marta Alfonso Sánchez	Spain	2016-12-08	Free forest
Brenda Torres	Brooks, CA	2016-12-08	I'm signing this petition because I care for wildlife and I would hate for birds and other animals to lose what they see as HOME☐☐
Sara Alonso	Spain	2016-12-08	Tenemos que saber e bosque
ketho angam sekhoze	India	2016-12-08	I grew up in a small state of India called Nagaland and which is filled with nature's greatest beauty and as the years go by trees are being cut down to build so many economic purposes. Though it had brought us so many development yet it has started to destroy so many forest and rivers which saddens me. I have not been to any part of America but seeing the efforts to save even a single tree gives me hope. I pray that such efforts will soon take place to save the forest and beautiful landscape of my land.. I want to join this petition because I want to help the earth retain its beauty and life.
Jordan Alonso	Farmont, WV	2016-12-08	Saving our planet is beyond important.
Anadra Sanchez	Guayaquil, Ecuador	2016-12-08	No me gusta saber que un bosque pierda esp r tu...
Madison Taylor	Auburndale, FL	2016-12-08	I support this cause and love N kk Reed!
Carré Summers	Sheboygan, OH	2016-12-08	I'm a tree hugger!!
Anna McDonald	Redcar, United Kingdom	2016-12-08	I love trees
Jess Warby	Australia	2016-12-08	I'm signing this petition because so many forests are being demolished and destroyed for reasons that for many, MANY individuals consider natural resources in which these places are destroying precious land and to find can be found in Eco-friendly, environmentally preserving ways other than tearing down specific species habitats and such essential objects that allow life on this earth for one's own selfish gains! In the past 50 years animals across the globe due to poaching, unnecessary killing and extermination of habitats have dropped by over 50% because some people don't understand the term "moderation" or "preservation". Our environments are already deteriorating enough from global warming (due to humans) without people assisting even more in the process for something so useless! Honestly people need to think long and hard about these sort of situations or removing something that cannot be revived (or can be with a lot, ALOT of time).
Barbora Buksova	Bedford, United Kingdom	2016-12-08	Forests are our chests! We can't just get rid of them
Zuzana Kurečková	Ostrava, Czech Republic	2016-12-08	nature is important and beautiful. We need her and she was not us. It must be protected.
Sandra Bandeira	São Bernardo do Campo, Brazil	2016-12-08	Todas as florestas importam não interessa web que parte do mundo e as estão!!! Ass nem!!!
Abby M tche	Australia	2016-12-08	I am passionate about the trees.
Shauna McCauley	Torrington, CT	2016-12-08	We must make attempts to halt climate change-however big or small. We must also protect our ever decreasing wildlife population and remember that trees= life.
Hadya Bhatt	North York, Canada	2016-12-08	I'm signing because people are destroying the earth and we need to save it
Flore-Anne Verge	London, United Kingdom	2016-12-08	Today more than ever it's of the utmost importance to preserve our forests.
Ax n Gunes	Stockholm, Sweden	2016-12-08	Because we have to save our nature
Rumaanah Manga	Johannesburg, South Africa	2016-12-08	I love land

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Katarína Dašková	Pr ev dza, S ovak a	2016-12-08	Our nature s so mportant for us. I do not understand how peop e can be so se fsh and stup d to destroy th s wea th. I hope that there s st some peop e who care about nature.
Mad son Ca po	Temecu a, CA	2016-12-08	Save the trees! Trees g ve us oxygen and that s fe!
Er n Maurer	Fu erton, CA	2016-12-08	In a wor d w th so much hate and destruct on, tte p eces of pure, abso ute beauty ke th s forest need to be protected at a costs.
Tayná Carva ho	Brasí a, Braz	2016-12-08	É mu to mportante que sa bamos cu dar do me o amb ente corretamente. Ass no porque quero ser parte de um ato tão bon to de sa var essa f oresta.
nancy cech	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	Mt Dav dson s a treasured retreat. We need more escapes of a the deve opment or we be v ng n a concrete box and f ght ng w th each other for a g mpse of green.
Megan G bson	At anta, GA	2016-12-08	Because I care about trees!!!
Inya He sen	Antwerp, Be g um	2016-12-08	I care a ot about g oba warm ng and c mate change and I a so th nk that cutt ng down trees s not a so ut on to anyth ng.
Laur e Le anda s	A buquerque, NM	2016-12-08	I agree we must save green spaces for the preservat on of connect on to our spr t w th n nature.
Anna Sæv k Nærø	Å esund, Norway	2016-12-08	Because we need to take care of the Earth.
Jeannette Woodbury	SF, CA	2016-12-08	I wa k there every day.
Căc a Strasen	Germany	2016-12-08	Ich unterschre be we w r d e Bäume dr ngend brauchen können!
Jenn fer Jones	Port and, OR	2016-12-08	We need parks and natura spaces to keep us hea thy and happy!
Anna Meded	Prague, Czech Repub c	2016-12-08	send you ove and good energy!everyth ng comes back so I w sh you a the best
Ju e Garc a Ca derón	Guayaqu , Ecuador	2016-12-08	Contr bu r para sa var e bosque!
Se na P ernagorda Bektas	Germany	2016-12-08	Ich unterstütze, we ch mmer dafür b n d e Natur zu erha ten bzw. was davon heute noch übr g st.
Makenz e Zen sek	Sa nt Pau , MN	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because preserv ng earth s the r ght th ng to do, t s our duty.
nah kar bengoa	Rumson, NJ	2016-12-08	Porque s n os an ma es y os bosques no somos nada, no tenemos nada... Y aun s endo pos be a v da s n e os, no querría v v r en un mundo así.
Ch oé Lange	France	2016-12-08	I signed because I love the nature (and Nikki Reed too ! □) and because I'm French and in France we don't fight for the forest So congrats □
Emma Rouse	Wheathampstead, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	Someth ng needs to be done to keep th s p anet beaut fu
Amanda Johnston	Sm thf e d, UT	2016-12-08	I th nk protect ng our forests s very mportant
Ka yn Spahn	Sun Pra r e, WI	2016-12-08	A of our forests matter and are mportant for our env ronment!
Magda ena C ocan	C uj-Napoca, Roman a	2016-12-08	Earth needs to be saved, we need to be saved...
Nad rah Sh ttu	London, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	As humans who nhab t the Earth, We need to susta n th s p anet for as ong as poss be for the next generat on and then the generat ons after that
Ce na Scott	Tacoma, WA	2016-12-08	Sav ng our earth s not on y mportant for us today but more mportant y f r our future.
Char otte Bryant	Ashurst, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	I strong y oppose the dea to destroy such beauty that conta ns over 1,600 trees that hab tat over 40 spec es of b rd and obv ous y much more w d fe. We have and st are oos ng too much nature n our wor d; ets not oose anymore than we have to. P ease.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
A e Ho combe	Tu sa, OK	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because I care about the w d fe that w be affected by th s. I m s gn ng because I don t be eve n tox ns and pest c des f ng our a r. I m s gn ng because we are ucky to ca th s beaut fu Earth our home, and I don t understand why peop e are try ng to destroy t. I m s gn ng because the person who started th s pet t on deserves to have the r vo ce heard. They may just be one person, but what they be eve n deserves to have a chance to be heard.
Cam a ha n	FALUN, Sweden	2016-12-08	The trees are our ungs and they need protect on
Ana P ke	Monroe, GA	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because t s t me to move forward n the effort of creat ng new ways of susta n ng human fe w thout destroy ng our p anet.
Amber Gur ey	Hebron, IN	2016-12-08	Because I want to keep the trees
R na Rathod	Ind a	2016-12-08	I love this earth It has given us soo many things nd wht we r doing with this just for our selfish human nature I am completely against it I have been taught in my school from my childhood tht trees are our best frnd nd i believe in it It should be protected by us So glad to find people like u on this earth Hoping for the best Long live all the forest-,
W nton Dav es	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	I can t be eve you are try ng to deforest that beaut fu peak.
Jasm n Anderson	Germany	2016-12-08	We ch denn Wa d ebe und ch hn schützen w . Er st das zuhause von t eren und der Menschhe t
Nata a Gonzá ez	San Is dro, Hered a, Costa Rica	2016-12-08	Cada arbo es mportante. Grac a a todas as personas que hacen esto pos be!
Imran Peksen	Germany	2016-12-08	I s gn th s pet t on because I want to safe the nature
DeEtta Cobra	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	Th s s just s y to cut down a forest of trees n pursu t of nat ve p ants. Do we want t to ook ke Tw n Peaks w th grass and and scrub nstead? No way! The m es of h k ng tra s, the w d fe, the beaut fu forest s a wonderfu resp te n the center of a dense c ty. The forest s an asset, not a h nderance.
A yssa Char es	South Jordan, UT	2016-12-08	We need to save th s beaut fu earth.
Are y Ru z	D nuba, CA	2016-12-08	I want future generat ons to be exper ence more than fake p ast c trees
Hannah Myers	Ogden, UT	2016-12-08	We need trees to breath and ve and to cont nue fe on th s earth!!!
Ju a Butterf y H	A bany, CA	2016-12-08	We need MORE trees, not ess! To waste taxpayer money on destroy ng an eco og ca space that prov des hab tat for so much w d fe as we as beauty and resp te from the c ty for peop e s unacceptable and goes aga nst eco og ca and soc a va ues.
Joce yn Vann	San Jose, CA	2016-12-08	I m s gn ng because I v s t San Franc sco often. I wou d hate to see the trees, wh ch we a desperate y need n our ecosystem, destroyed. Larger c t es have very few trees eft as t s; t wou d be unwise to take away what s eft.
Theresa Keyes	Montara, CA	2016-12-08	C ear cutt ng? Roundup? In a forest of over 1000 adu t trees, w th over 40 spec es of b rds and w th endangered sa amanders? In the face of goba warm ng? Does not add up
Oona Woodbury	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	Th s park s a part of my fe and ch dhoo d and does so much good for the c ty
stephan e ga nson	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	I want to preserve Mt. Dav dson for SF urban dwe ers to use and apprec ate.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Adeem Kher	Bet Jann, Israe	2016-12-08	Because its too damn cruel to see these beautiful forests cut down , there is no explanation in the world or no reason convincing enough to cut down and sabotage this work of art , moreover this is a place where hundreds maybe thousands of animals live and consider home , buy taking that away from them it could lead to their death I enjoy nature and so should everyone else its peaceful , refreshing , and the best thing that was created , theyre already ruining everything else with pullution why dont they try to make up for it ! Thank you for bringing this subject to light , I respect everyone who does and fight for it , good luck ☐
n ck mck ss ck	M am , FL	2016-12-08	The wor d needs to protect and pr ort ze these sacred spaces!
Denn s Woo	Seatt e, WA	2016-12-08	As a nat ve San Franc scan, I want those trees to be there when I v st.
Ce na Va enzue a	Norwa k, CA	2016-12-08	I ove the beauty that nature br ngs p us cutt ng down trees s harmfu s nce as humans we need them more then we know... the r roots grew there for a reason
Susan Young	Austra a	2016-12-08	Because w thout the trees, we destroy our oxygen and atmosphere W th a the po ut on. And take away a the natura beauty of nature. If we don t stop now! We never w and we w have k ourse ves out of stup d ty and GREED!
Lynn Van Dyke	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	Keep San Franc sco green!
E y Stamm	Tucson, AZ	2016-12-08	Trees are mportant to the human race.
Peter Coyote	M Va ey, CA	2016-12-08	P ease! The natura wor d s part of the reason why San Franc sco rema ns such a beaut fu c ty. What poss b e reason can there be n th s era of g oba warm ng, to cut down 1600 trees? To bu d more unaffordab e hous ng? I th nk not. Stop the cut p ease.
John Sa ter	Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	I fee very strong y that cutt ng these trees s a short-s ghted management dec s on wh ch shou d not go ahead.
rona peet	ph a, PA	2016-12-08	Trees must be saved!!!
Caro e S ru n ck	M Va ey, CA	2016-12-08	We need trees to enjoy and breathe the fresh a r they he p cean and because surround ng ourse ves w th nature s very mportant for our heath and we - be ng.
Rhonda Hart-Dav s	Barnard Cast e, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	Its a stup d dea. Fu stop.
Barbara Kut n s	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-08	I don t ke what s happen ng to our forest on Mt. Dav dson. Don t cut down a these trees. We have enough dead trees from the p ne beet e, d fferent spec es, but same effect.
Let c a Santos	London, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	How can peop e so be tak ng about destroy ng hab tats when t s so ev dent how devastat ng t s for our p anet and the an ma s on t??
Mo y Mart n	Be vedere T buron, CA	2016-12-08	P ease don t cut down these trees -- they are a v ta part of a hea thy c ty and hea thfu v ng!
Jenn fer Armenta	West Sacramento, CA	2016-12-08	SAVE NATURE!!!!
Francesca Rusc tto	Ita y	2016-12-08	Penso che s a per una buona causa
E se Sm th	P ymouth, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-08	As f were not runn ng out of trees fast enough...save the few ounces of prec ous beauty we have eft x
Caro yn Seran	Bow ng Green, KY	2016-12-08	We must NOT cut down our prec ous forest.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
jenn fer guerrero	Argentina	2016-12-08	para que se ganen los bosques y naturaleza en todo el mundo eso que nos da oxigeno y vida. Tambien tiene vida que nosotros
Stephen Roberts	Austin, TX	2016-12-08	conservation helps prop up the first domino of civilization. If nature fails, we fail ...
Ne Rubenking	Davis, CA	2016-12-08	Lived in SF for years, not far from Mt D. The idea of cutting down those trees makes me physically ill.
obo he p	sf, CA	2016-12-08	please do not cut trees!
O ver Ch n	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	Cutting down these forests is a waste of money and will adversely affect the environment on Mt. Davidson. Please stop this bad idea.
Samantha Tutud	Covington, NM	2016-12-09	I'm signing because we as humans need to protect Mother Earth's Beauty! Please stop DESTROYING Our Beautiful Planet Earth. HUMANS Enjoy Mother Nature, not parking lots
Deanna Townsend	Tempe, AZ	2016-12-09	It's the right thing to do
Jane Logan	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	The loss of trees is terrible and pesticides are nexusable.
Wendy Hart	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	I believe a open space for people to enjoy nature and wildlife is a precious commodity especially in a city that can feel stressful at times. Nature renews the spirit and is beneficial to both mental and physical health. We need this space to be protected.
Meody Haer	San Francisco, CA, CA	2016-12-09	What's a holiday dinner in San Francisco without a quiet walk in the Mt. Davidson woods afterward? One tree creates a roof for four people. How can you possibly offset this loss?
Jod Ann Apsasson	Edmonton, Canada	2016-12-09	I love nature and believe we need to save the trees to help save humanity.
esu mart n	san Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	...I speak for the trees
Whitney Hayes	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	Save the beauty!
kay aung	santa cruz, CA	2016-12-09	Mt. Davidson, as it is, is a beautiful part of San Francisco, that should not be cut down!
Jessica Brower	New Port Richey, FL	2016-12-09	"A nation that destroys its soils destroys itself. Forests are the lungs of our land, purifying the air and giving fresh strength to our people." - Franklin D. Roosevelt
Justine McCanna	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-09	It's a forest oasis home to trees and animals.
DAVID VALKENAAR	Santa Clara, CA	2016-12-09	Our woods need to be preserved for the enjoyment of generations to come and the survival of the natural world.
Katlynn Mauk	Statesville, NC	2016-12-09	I think nature is important, and we need trees and plants to protect us.
Logan Tracy	Tubac City, AZ	2016-12-09	Nature's beauty
Jessica Šégrová	Louny, Ústecký kraj, Česká republika, Czech Republic	2016-12-09	I care about the planet.
Jeffrey Herzenberg	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	Protect our local treasure for our and future generations to enjoy its life.
Amy O'Hara	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	Walking among trees on Mt D is a remarkable thing to be able to do in the middle of this city. It would be a real loss to replace them with low-lying scrubby plants, however authentic to some point in the past that might be.
Amy Taub	Buffalo Grove, IL	2016-12-09	Nature is more beautiful and amazing than anything we could build there and we can't get it back.
Huasoane	Los Angeles, CA	2016-12-09	this is so wrong. please make this horrific plan stop. we need every last tree to flourish on our planet.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Dan e Castro	Portland, ME	2016-12-09	I'm signing because I believe that green spaces in urban areas greatly improve the overall quality of life for ALL citizens.
Cynthia Dutra-Brice	Fremont, CA	2016-12-09	Respect Mother Earth and protect our environment for the future.
Rick Baraff	Napa, CA	2016-12-09	Mt. Davidson's beautiful and amazing part of SF. To destroy it to put up crappy housing is shameful at best -- that's obviously the end goal. Cutting back trees to make it look like 1700?? Who in the world comes up with ridiculous ideas like that? Oh, right... corporate buildings who sacrifice overh top property...
Jenn Fanning	Arngton, WA	2016-12-09	I'm signing because no one else will, because it's my life mission to make sure we've got forests, clean water, culture and WORLD HEALTH for everyone's grandkids grandkids!!! Don't tear apart another forest!!!!
Dan e Rodriguez	Oakland, CA	2016-12-09	They need to chop down that cross before they chop down these trees.
MAGGIE AUBEL	RIO RANCHO, NM	2016-12-09	Protect the earth!!
Raeche Brown	Jacksonville, FL	2016-12-09	I am completely baffled as why one would want to destroy such a beautiful place. Not to mention the negative impact on the natural world and environment that would follow. Please don't cut the trees down!
Nathan Thompson	Aubany, CA	2016-12-09	There's already a lack of fairly wide "green space" in the city proper. I understand the concern about non-native trees, but the use of toxic pesticides and the lack of a plan to replace the trees with more native trees is troubling.
Sue Hogan	Palo Alto, CA	2016-12-09	This is a no-brainer. I never want to see a healthy tree cut down for any reason. Please allow the owner or trees to remove the refuse naturally as they are healthy and can survive for at least another two centuries.
Brett Stein	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	Brett Stein
Esabeth Nkova	France	2016-12-09	Mama Nature is our home. This forest is our home, the air that we breathe
Doug Mobley	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	The forest is part of Sutter's legacy and must be preserved.
Maggie Brown	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	As a taxpayer, a voter, and a resident of San Francisco, I think it's outrageous to mass cut trees in parks, which are our city's peaceful havens, wildlife homes, and "lungs". Use that money to make needed improvements to our parks and to help the trees that already provide so many services. Not to destroy what we love here.
Quinn Fertly	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	I am a native and love this park the way it is
Barbara Bevan	Sacramento, CA	2016-12-09	My mother was born and raised in San Francisco. Many of my friends live there. I lived in the Bay Area for much of my life.
Dan e Deitch	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-09	The cost to the environment is too great for the sake of authenticity of flora. The forest is worth preserving as it is.
Jordyn Downes	Las Vegas, NV	2016-12-10	Trees are so important to life
Mary Echo	San Bruno, CA	2016-12-10	I grew up in SF and Mt. Davidson was a favorite spot to find solace in nature in the city
Natalie Anson	South Gate, CA	2016-12-10	We have to protect our beautiful and for our children!
Chandra Egan	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-10	I hike with my kids in Mount Davidson. Please preserve the trees and refrain from using pesticides as much as possible.
Marcelo Tabarrin	Italy	2016-12-10	Only someone who can't see the beauty of a tree is capable of designing a desk knocking down of 1,600 trees
L M Deweese	Indianapolis, IN	2016-12-10	We need to save this natural, recreational beauty and stop using chemicals. San Fran, you are a trend setter usually for the positive and we are appealing to you

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ga e Dor on	Taos, NM	2016-12-10	because Trees are our rec proca breaths >□□& t;
Kr st na Brennan	M Va ey, CA	2016-12-10	P ease cons der a phased approach w th new nat ve trees p anted to rep ace the canopy gradua y. P ease do not destroy the homes of so many creatures!
Darren Staszak	Mount C emens, MI	2016-12-10	Of the 229 peop e who have seen th s pet t on/p edge to protect our p anet 201 have s gned. P ease jo n us! https://www.change.org/p/pres dent-e ect-trump-stop-c mate-change-deny ng-foss -fue - ndustry-a y-scott-pru tt-from- ead ng-the-e-p-a
R. A. Duffy	Seatt e, WA	2016-12-10	P ease save th s forest. Our trees are under great stress and we need to save not s aughtered them.
mara reyno ds	Stevenson, WA	2016-12-10	We need more parks.
Jean Zukav	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-10	I ve n San Franc sco, and know there aren t too many trees eft. We abso ute y must protect ANY w d areas eft here.
Isabe a N co a des	Santa Rosa, CA	2016-12-10	Th s forest I shou d mportant!!!
Carr e Zo	Ash and, OR	2016-12-10	Forests are the most v ta aspect of the ecosystem. P eas use common sense.
A bert Down ng	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-10	Th s s a beaut fu refuge from c ty fe
chrys a baugh	Redwood C ty, CA	2016-12-10	The C ty needs t s green spaces ~
Va er a Lazarte Fores	Potosí, Bo v a, P ur nat ona State of	2016-12-10	Por que es muy mportante mantener os espac os verdes, grac as a as personas que tratan de mantener ntacto ese bosque.
Phong Luong	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-10	I ove tra runn ng under the canopy of trees!
Deborah Martyn	Eastsound, WA	2016-12-10	Nature s our Sou , p ease preserve th s park
Chr st na Afanas eff	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-10	Spent many many days wa k ng th s when I ved n the area. A prec ous gem n SF.
Heather B yeu	Bou der, CO	2016-12-10	We need a the trees we can get to make oxygen for our breath ng and to regu ate our c mate on a p anet where human be ngs can thr ve.
m chae tank	Oak and, CA	2016-12-10	I have ved on and off n San Franc sco for 8 years and there s no reason to cut down these trees en mass! We need to keep them n the ground for future generat ons!
martha pereyra	m am beach, FL	2016-12-11	Hermoso proyecto,Uruguay nesec ta esto, os an ma tos estan desproteg dos.
Jan ce VrMeer	Sedona, AZ	2016-12-11	Why oh why wou d you tear down a thr v ng forest??? Hav ng grown up n the Bay Area, I have a spec a fondness for ts natura beauty and am a ways saddened when I return "home" and see the "renovat ons"... P ease, preserve the Mt. Dav dson forest! The benef ts that a commu ty rece ve from a we estab shed forest, s mposs be to rep cate.
Co een Pundyk	Topanga, CA	2016-12-11	I grew up n the ne ghborhood and my son ves n West Porta present y. Mt. Dav dson s a pos t ve for everyone n the c ty and shou d not be c ear cut.
Dawn Gr ff n	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-11	I grew up there and t was my sanctuary
Janeen Cox	Ho ston, MA	2016-12-11	I v s ted here when vacat on ng n Ca forn a. It s beaut fu ! You can t ose tl!
Jan na Turch n	Sebastopo , CA	2016-12-11	We need more w d fe than ever before, not ess. Humans need nature to rema n sane. It s our true home.
M ra O ah	Gat neu, Canada	2016-12-11	j a me es arbres!
M che e Beach	Char eston, AC	2016-12-11	We need to save our forests

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Frances Jacobs	Indianapolis, IN	2016-12-11	we need the trees we need the Green Space we need a the world that goes with the trees and green space. the person who put this pet on together has facts figures and very knowledgeable information ten thousand percent behind her and I hope everyone else besides this and gets with the program too
Jen Solumon	Petaluma, CA	2016-12-11	I love Mt Davidson and the trees and nature there!! I don't understand this plan!!
ggna Lawrence	Bayside, CA	2016-12-11	City people NEED Trees! We ALL need TREES! Preserve the Forest! Please!~&t;3~
Mora Kavanaugh	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-11	I grew up hiking and playing on Mt. Davidson - going to Easter Mass there. Would hate for generations to come not to enjoy the forest!
Tim Oseckas	Grovedale, VIC, Australia	2016-12-11	We must protect whatever remaining areas of nature exist for the beings that live there and for the future of the planet
Vickie Leon	Lakewood, CO	2016-12-11	Dangerous to our planet.
Amy Lockwood	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-11	This is a magical place.
Jennie Coleman	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-11	The city needs this forest!
Sharon Haneman	Hotsville, NY	2016-12-11	Must be in the way of some rich dots view :(
Veronica McCure	Davis, CA	2016-12-11	Please preserve this beautiful forest.
aura stevenson	san francisco, CA	2016-12-11	Keep our trees- and access be sanctuary spaces for city residents. Climate change has made trees impossible by availability and positive mental health effects of spending time in forested spaces are well documented. Thanks for standing to the people of San Francisco.
Susan Aken	Saint Paul, MN	2016-12-11	This plan is outrageous. The environmental outcome is detrimental. Save our green spaces.
Louise Hastie	Healdsburg, CA	2016-12-11	I was born in San Francisco and grew up there. I was able to enjoy the beautiful and amazing places that made The City unique. The people who live there now deserve to have access to this forest.
Kara Beo	Daly City, CA	2016-12-11	I am signing because this is a beautiful park with trees and it is a waste to cut these trees down. Unnecessary and they should stay!
Michele Dederch	California, CA	2016-12-11	WE need our forests
Harper Beo LaRoux	Richardson, TX	2016-12-11	Playing on Mt. Davidson is one of the sweetest and most magical moments I have of growing up in San Francisco. I strive to visit every time I return.
robert dreyer	san francisco, CA	2016-12-11	We need trees in San Francisco.
Adrian A.	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-11	Save our beautiful forest park!!
Barbara Gunter	Gaithersburg, TN	2016-12-11	I believe in parks and green spaces for people to be able to have a place outside the urban jungle to breathe clean air and enjoy life.
Denise Monaghan	Pasadena, CA	2016-12-11	We have to save green spaces
Charlene Spedden	Cape Canaveral, FL	2016-12-11	We need to protect what forest, trees plants and wildlife sustains.
Anna Heath	Oakland, CA	2016-12-11	I grew up on Arroyo Way in Moraga Park, and am shocked to learn of these plans to remove the forest that I grew up knowing and exploring. I implore the SF Recreation, Park, and Planning departments to protect this and for the generations to come.
Kat McHugh	Half Moon Bay, CA	2016-12-11	Please don't clear cut the trees in Sharp Park or SF! This world space is vital to the wellbeing of our world friends and our own.
Davd Lehnng	Beaufort, PA	2016-12-11	I was born and grew up in San Francisco, and my sisters live on Mt. Davidson. We have taken walks there many times when I was there on a visit.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Lu s Fe pe de J. Rujana barra	Mex co	2016-12-11	Por a conservac on de ecos stema, mantener un equ br o y opt ma ca dad de v da, y que e recurso s ga d spon be para futuras generac ones, etc etc, en resumen por e b enestar de todos nosotros.
G se e Mart nez	Reed ey, CA	2016-12-11	Th s s my favor te p ace n a of SF!!!
Ann MacLeod	V ctor a, Canada	2016-12-12	What a short s ghted p an. The benef ts of th s forested area c ear y out we gh any ga ns n destroy ng t.
E zabeth Ke y	Pa m Desert, CA	2016-12-12	We need trees and green areas or we a d e.
Ana L nder	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	I enjoy wa k ng on Mt Dav dson Forest and strong y object to the cutt ng of 1,600 hea thy trees.
Den se Morgan	Wheat R dge, CO	2016-12-12	I am s gn ng because I be eve n these trees!
Chr st ana Barrows	n n ch k, AK	2016-12-12	P ease, don t cut the trees on Mt. Dav s on!!! I Was born n Santa Cruz, grew up n the Bay Ar a & have seen c ty s a over the wor d. In the c ty, peop e (& an ma s) NEED Nature! A sanctuary where they can get away for a moment & regroup. You w be do ng a MASSIVE d sserv ce to the res dents(espec a y the ch dren who crave the woods) & v s tors of SF f you destroy th s, one of the ast sma b ts of nature, n an a ready over paved c ty. Parks ke th s are what make San Franc sco what t s... A c ty that stands out, tru y a jewe among the mundane. P ease eave Mt. Dav dson w d!!
Darshana Greenf e d	Men o Park, CA	2016-12-12	These trees make our c mate hea th er and us happ er - p ease protect these trees!
Char ene Mason	Tujunga, CA	2016-12-12	These p aces matter. Stop def ng Mother Earth.
Les e Ha berg	Va enc a, CA	2016-12-12	I ke woods
No and No and	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	P ease do not ru n th s!! Th s s one of the treasures of SF! Keep th s for future generat ons!! P ease share th s and s gn t to save a San Franc sco Treasure!
N co e O Connor	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	P ease save our prec ous urban woods n San Franc sco! We need these for our hea th and san ty. I do not support the p an to convert forests to brush. P ease, SF Rec and Park Dept. do not do th s. P ease preserve our forests, not hurt them. Thank you for sten ng.
Anna B ack	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	Th s s such a beaut fu p ece of nature w th n our urban area!
M m Sudbury	D xon, CA	2016-12-12	We need to save our parks and the beauty they prov de.
August HILL	Bruxe es, Be g um	2016-12-12	I m s gn ng because I m part Ca forn an and I ove that p ace. A ot of fo ks around me do to. A so, there s the obv ous need for our future env onment
D gnora Gonza ez	H a eah, FL	2016-12-12	Deforestat on has to stop. We must stop cutt ng down and destroy ng v ta parts of our ecosystems to produce mass ve tox c waste. It s utter y appa ng.
A exander Webber	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	We shou d protect our natura hab tats - espec a y n c t es.
Mason Dunn	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-12	I be eve n the preservat on of th s and a parks n San Franc sco!
Candace Caspers	Rancho Cordova, CA	2016-12-13	I have had enough of the destruct on of nature at the hands of humans. Stop destroy ng beauty.
L a M hoan	San Jose, CA	2016-12-13	I grew up on Mt. Dav dson. Go ng back to "nat ve" ways s be ng done by peop e who do not have an nvestment n the ne ghborhood and who do not understand the evo ut on of a c ty or an ecosystem.
Nancy M yamoto	Redway, CA	2016-12-13	How can any sane human want to spray Round Up near a p ay ground??? The UN has sa d that Round Up s a carc nogen!!! One week after that was announced Sw tzer and banned t. S nce MONSANTO seems to be runn ng our government these days I m sure a debts are push ng Round Up. BE INFORMED Round Up s hazardous to everyone but espec a y CHILDREN !!!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Loreen Jones	Stevenson Ranch, CA	2016-12-13	Save our trees....a ways!
Joanne Brancheau	Toledo, OH	2016-12-13	My son and son-in-law live across from that beautiful park. That's just cr m na as we as insane. Leave nature alone. That who else does down.
Dav d Ferre	Dardanelle, AR	2016-12-13	This is a beautiful area right across the street from my brother and brother-in-law's house. There's no reason whatsoever to spoil this natural beauty.
Dan e e Joy	Colorado Springs, CO	2016-12-13	Our forests, our parks, our animals, our planet needs to be protected. We need to make a change. I want to be apart of the solution, not the problem.
Matthew Kramer	Loomis, CA	2016-12-13	I love visiting here and the trees and wildlife deserve to keep their homes.
Frank Moore	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-13	I love Mt. Davidson. Hasn't anyone thought to sue CCSF to prevent this from going forward based on damage to property by erosion? Anyone out there organizing such an effort?
Jenny Mosseray	Bruxelles, Belgium	2016-12-13	Just a nature.
Nancy Stton	Mountain View, CA	2016-12-13	I grew up on the slopes in Maroma park. The forest was a wonderful resource for us, a real gem in the middle of all the concrete. I'm saddened to see the possibility that it could be destroyed.
Ron Proctor	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	I have concerns about the focus on "restoration" of native plants in "Natural Areas", which has in the past caused destruction of natural - but non-native - vegetation including thousands of trees, increasing use of pesticides including some that are banned elsewhere, and access restrictions for recreation.
Ron Proctor	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	I have concerns about the focus on "restoration" of native plants in "Natural Areas", which has in the past caused destruction of natural - but non-native - vegetation including thousands of trees, increasing use of pesticides including some that are banned elsewhere, and access restrictions for recreation.
Rob n Sherrer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	San Francisco Forest Alliance!
Amy Van der Wyk	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	The Mt. Davidson forest is filled with healthy, mature trees and is home to beautiful birds of prey. At my home garden, near Mt Davidson, I have planted many Californian natives, but I wholeheartedly disagree with the notion that a vibrant ecosystem such as the Mt Davidson forest should be replaced, thinned or in any way harmed. These are mature, thriving, towering trees. We've entered an era of looming climate change and drought. Keep our urban forests!
Iana Gaper n	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	I love Mount Davidson and want to keep it as is.
Betty E s	Vaiejo, CA	2016-12-14	A rare treasure surrounded by cement, tall buildings, a large busy city, freeways, etc.
Richard Drechsler	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	Save San Francisco's tall trees and the animals who rest on and beneath them.
Amy Jo F n	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-14	I like those trees and I like that familiar landscape and I utterly disagree with the proposition of the use of Roundup.
Amy Jo F n	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-14	I like those trees. I like that familiar San Francisco landscape. I utterly disagree with the proposition of RoundUp.
Bonita Seaman	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	I'm signing this petition because I believe that the beauty of Mount Davidson and its trees is paramount to the beauty of the City of San Francisco. This mountain is one of the reasons that I chose to live in this area. It is a beautiful area that brings peace and tranquility, a wonderful hiking area and a peaceful refuge for people as well as the wildlife.
Nathan e Mer	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-14	I believe that a nature is sacred. Delete the housing, not the plants.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
eleanor facon	Stockton, CA	2016-12-14	We need the trees for healthy living.
d an m er	Va ejo, CA	2016-12-14	care
Ange a We man	Mad son, WI	2016-12-14	This is astonishing! Removal of 1600 trees. Poses extreme environmental hazard and long term destabilization.
L d ane A ves	João Pessoa, Braz	2016-12-14	Eu apo o tudo que for para sa var o nosso mundo.
Jess ca Cod spot	oak and, CA	2016-12-14	Parks are integral to the community shared by humans and animals alike.
jean ba brera	san franc sco, CA	2016-12-14	Protect nature. What do we do when birds bring a seed from a non-native tree?
Frances Brady	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-14	I'm signing because I love Mt Davidson in its current forested glory. I hike up it everyday with my dog and would be devastated if senseless people tore the trees out especially if it came from my taxpayer dollars.
Ken Nang e	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-14	The city should leave this area alone!
Susan He e n	Oak and, CA	2016-12-15	Please do not cut 1600 more trees slated for logging. It is a human refuge as well. Susan He e n
Anthony Catchatooran	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-15	Mt Davidson is important.
Roche e Towers	Oak and, CA	2016-12-15	No!
Bern ce Doner	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-15	I do not want the tragic loss of trees on Mt Davidson to happen!!!
T ffany Truj o	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-15	Who the heck cuts down trees anymore?? Heard of global warming? I understand eucalyptus is not native and that there is concern with that, but there simply MUST be a restoration plan to INCREASE the number of trees in SF, and honestly across the state and country. As so, toxic herbicides and insecticides should NEVER be used. I find this shocking in such a so-called progressive city. The planning dept would do well to take refresher courses in Environmental Science and Biodynamic Gardening. To say I am disappointed with this plan is a gross understatement.
Sarah Kottmeier	San Carlos, CA	2016-12-15	This just can't happen
Suzanne Howar-Carter	A ameda, CA	2016-12-16	we need trees to absorb carbon!!
Heather Janssen	a ameda, CA	2016-12-16	We need to protect what's left of this naturally beautiful area
Ana t Markos an	Cupertino, CA	2016-12-16	To cut 1600 trees to make it as it used to be in 1700? This is crazy, needs to be stopped!
Lee Mazman an	Day City, CA	2016-12-16	Let's erase ourselves from San Francisco, just leave what was born, grew, here. No more irrigation than cutting down immigrant vegetation. Morons.
N na Potepan	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-16	It's so important to have nature in a city
Benjamin Agu ar	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-16	As a native San Franciscan who has lived in the neighborhood for over 20 years, Mt Davidson has served as a wonderful retreat for my family and I. I attended Maroma Elementary, just a few blocks away, and still remember hiking up to the cross and helping plant strawberry trees in the area. Please save this amazing space.
reyes sydney	Bur game, CA	2016-12-16	love sf
payton carro	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-16	Because I grew up running around this beautiful place and so should any young person raised in the city... We need to preserve green space as much as possible.
Raymond Goyette	Dracut, MA	2016-12-16	These trees should be saved for many good reasons.
Ma com Catchatooran	South San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-17	The most beautiful view in San Francisco. The venerable Mount Davidson Cross

Name	Location	Date	Comment
M chae Ga egos	San Anton o, TX	2016-12-17	I used to wa k through that area
Marcus Kess er	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-17	Trees are fe
Garo M rg an	Fremont, CA	2016-12-18	Hav ng been born and ra sed n S.F., and a over of Mt. Dav dson, as we as a proud Armen an, th s s a beaut fu ocat on - as s. Why mess w th t? No good reason.
Gregor Gab e	M creek, UT	2016-12-18	Trees Supp y the A r We Breath!!!
Caro yn Shuman	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-18	Th s s an mportant and beaut fu hab tat and resource to the c ty.
Janet Parker	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-19	I th nk t s unconsc onab e to cut down these trees!!!!
L z Cors ck	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-19	Save a of the trees and p ants n Mt Dav dson.
Dana G enn	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-20	I be eve n the Urban forests. Adu ts and ch dren a ke need trees n th s urban env ronment! If the c ty forests went back to nat ve we wou dn t have Go den Gate Park e ther! The ne ghborhood needs th s forest, beaut fu just as t s.
Br an Mack	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-20	The Mt. Dav dson Forest s a beaut fu part of my fe and that of many others and t wou d be a shame to destroy t.
Barbara Eb	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-20	We need trees and un nhab ted and n SF
Kat e Franc s	Peaks Is and, ME	2016-12-21	I ove h k ng on Mt. Dav dson. Its beaut fu . P ease preserve t!
ANNEMARIE CAVELL	Sunder and, Un ted K ngdom	2016-12-21	L tt e horrors
Kar a Sha enberger	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-21	I am a second generat on San Franc scan. I grew up p ay on Mt. Dav dson, go ng to the Easter prayers, enjoy ng the beaut fu green space n the urban gray. We must protect our parks and green spaces.
E zabeth Yoon	Fa rfax, VA	2016-12-21	Euca yptus trees create a hea thy env ronment.
Sherr McEwen	Sacramento, CA	2016-12-23	We need to keep these parks espec a y when the r so c ose to b g c ty s we need the nature and natura th ngs that ve n
K mber y Woods	Las Vegas, NV	2016-12-23	These forests just as so many others need to be preserved. These trees prov de oxygen for our ungs. I speak for the Trees!!! Our ch dren and grandch dren w need Oxegyn too!!
Dar ene Lacy	Ind an We s, CA	2016-12-24	I ove the trees!! We NEED them!
jeroen roer	S ttard, Nether ands	2016-12-24	ove the Forest and Mother Earth
D anne L ndewa	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-24	I care deep y about hav ng natura spaces n urban areas.
Byron W ams	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-24	We need to save the green spaces we have.
Ab ga Schott-Rosenf ed	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-24	I ve near Mt Dav dson and t s been one of the most spec a p aces n the c ty to me a my fe. The arguments aga nst cutt ng down the forest are sound; I see no reason to destroy one of SF s most prec ous and beaut fu s tes.
She a Sma	E Sobrante, CA	2016-12-25	I am a res dent of the Mt. Dav dson area (Sherwood Forest) and I oppose the destruct on of Mt. Dav dson as we as the use of pest c des.
Jayson Morr s	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-25	grew up n th s h and th s s bu \$h1t
Sven Soder und	San Franc sco, CA	2016-12-25	we need trees
Steve Smyth	Sk ve, CA	2016-12-25	Come to your senses San Franc sco C ty Counc . F nd rea st c budget cuts other than a va uab e p ece of nature that actua y he ps not on y the menta we be ng of your res dents and many v s tors, but a so contr butes to c ean ng the very a r you breathe, contr but ng to a San Franc scan s phys ca we be ng. T me to cut the fat, voters of SF, and make some changes at the top. These peop e are out of contro , and on y YOU can stop them.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
K m Cooper	San Mateo, CA	2016-12-25	This s crazy. Times move on from three hundred years ago. We need more trees, not fewer.
Robert Dorough	Vacav e, CA	2016-12-25	Leave those trees alone!! This s not Ok ahoma the and of no trees!
Kathy Derby	Sonoma, CA	2016-12-25	This area s needed for the safety of the folks n SF. We need a quiet pace to walk from time to time. KEEP IT !
Jeff Doras	Petaluma, CA	2016-12-25	Born and raised n SF. Don't mess with Mt Davidson. Sf needs to keep its open spaces.
John Champion	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-25	This s one of the more patently absurd ideas I've ever heard, even for SF. Do something useful please.
Emilio Martinez	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-25	I grew up hiking that mountain. The trees and the view are what make it a majestic park.
Cooby King	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-25	Love the current integrity of this park.
Barbara Gee	Oakland, CA	2016-12-26	I'm signing because I grew up on Mount Davidson and value its forest.
Lara Farnham	Berkeley, CA	2016-12-26	Putting pesticides into our water table in order to return a forest to how it was 300 s ridiculous.
Dana Scott	SF, CA	2016-12-26	It's time to stop the war on trees n San Francisco, for whatever the ostensible reasons - or lack thereof!
Jan Beuyn	Sebastopol, CA	2016-12-26	My parents lived 60+ years at the foot of Mt Davidson, on Teresita Blvd. I grew up there. Please do not follow through with this misguided plan which is expensive, detrimental and unnecessary. San Francisco needs its outdoor environments. -JB
Amea Cutten	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-26	I grew up on Mt. Davidson
Edith Weaver	Costa Mesa, CA	2016-12-26	We need to preserve our ecosystems and diversity of plant and animal life. Please, please do not destroy the beauty that contributes to the mental wellness of San Francisco residents.
Robn Anderson	Oroville, CA	2016-12-26	My mother loved this area, she was a native San Franciscan as was her mother. Save the forest. Save the memories.
tergente	oroville, CA	2016-12-26	I'm generation San Francisco. Leave Mount Davidson alone PLEASE! I have a hard time believing the city would be better off without it! Stop the toxic hazardous pesticides!!!! It's a damned FOREST!!!! DE-FOREST this beauty? For? oh yah..profit!!!!
Mayra Videa	Princeton, FL	2016-12-26	I grew up with Mt Davidson as my backyard.. please do not destroy this beautiful place.
Christine Videa	Miami, FL	2016-12-26	This was my backyard as a kid. I would be devastated not to be able to visit my hometown and hike to the top. It's make life a miracle because in my 36 years of life the view never changes
Gary Majourau	Pacific, CA	2016-12-26	I'm signing this petition because it further damages our precious environment by contributing to global warming and leaving poisonous insecticides in the wake of a this deforestation n the San Francisco/Sharps Park area.
Zenz Cook	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-27	I grew up on Mt. Davidson! It's a jewel in the center of our City.
John Ahearne	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-27	It's one of the best and least known treasures n SF
Garry Pacquiao	Fairfield, CA	2016-12-27	We need to preserve the Natural Resources... It's vital to our safety when it comes to Natural Disaster. A healthy environment can also protect us from sickness.
Ova Necastro	Newark, DE	2016-12-27	We need to save the environment. The world is shrinking.
GRETA DUCHMANN	San Francisco, CA	2016-12-27	Please save this beautiful place!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Christine Hiss	Day City, CA	2016-12-29	As a native San Franciscan, I want to keep something of old San Francisco intact. It's bad enough our cross-section of our days due to an insensitive city government and a few disgruntled residents. What happened to major tyru es?
Ga Spang er	B ssf e d, MI	2016-12-29	We need to keep the fe and preserve our h stor ca forest.
ju anne cerget	Graham, WA	2016-12-30	It must be saved!
stacey pett tt	K ngsburg, CA	2016-12-31	It wou d be bad for the env ronment to cut down the trees and use pest c des to prevent the r return. The pub c doesn t want these trees removed. It wou d be costly, bad for the a r, dangerous to eave the ogs on the mounta n, and a danger to the and/ homes be ow due to nstab ty from deforestation (mud s des). It s r d cu ous to even cons der your remova of perfect y good trees.
RubyAnne Kobaba	Edmonton, Canada	2016-12-31	If you don t stop k ng my Trees, U w suffocate us a ! U cou d make hemp a cash crop 4 paper requirements.
G nny Mess er	Fa ng Waters, WV	2016-12-31	We need forests on our p anet. Trees do so much to he p our Env ronment. W thout them we wou d be goners
Mary Jones	Akron, OH	2017-01-01	we need to preserve our trees, they are one of our great natura resources, that are not eas y repaced. we need the r shade, th r oxygen, the hum d ty they add to the a r- and the she ter they g ve to w d fe. p ease do not do th s!
Mche e Jacques-Menegaz	San Franc sco, CA	2017-01-02	Parks and green space are a necess ty. We desperate y need th s natura oas s, and a others, n the m dst of our urban env ronment; t s one of the th ngs that s so wonderfu about San Franc sco. P ease do not destroy t for the sake of return ng the area to ts or g na cond ton; after a , t w never be the same, and so many brds and an ma s, and humans, have adapted a ong w th t. Thank you.
Mark Drafah	Oska oosa, IA	2017-01-05	wow, I can t be eve th s, th s s gone to far, how d d some dept. get power to term nate trees ke that, I be eve th s, what year s th s, don t we rea y need trees bad, I mean rea y bad, and we have the peop e who protects t want ng to k t, everyone needs to read th s, I won t e to you, t s very very ong, but very nterest ng, then p ease s gn but p ease read t a the way thru
Mar anna Coodge	San Franc sco, CA	2017-01-06	Th s doesn t make sense why they want to cut down so many heathy trees. I wonder what the rea reason beh nd th s s. A that Round-up po son s ncred by d sturb ng.
Just n Leathers	San Franc sco, CA	2017-01-06	I m s gn ng because I be eve we need to save the park I enjoy wa k ng through. We don t have many parks ke mt Dav dson eft n SF
Matthew Jabez Nazario	Paranaque, Ph pp nes	2017-01-07	If Trump gets to become pres dent, Mt. Dav dson s ready to gets ts sh e d for ts protect on! Amer ca w be s ck aga n f Amer ca s nat ona parks are gone! D*mn you, Trump!
Deborah Goncaves	Fremont, CA	2017-01-10	I be eve we need to save our forests, they make a huge mpact n our ves.
Rhonda Graves	Fort Worth, TX	2017-01-17	On the Internet, the who e wor d s watch ng. No one can h de anymore.
Renee Fabbocch	Muenchen, CO	2017-01-18	I ove Nature https://www.facebook.com/713354805354554/v deos/996043150419050/
Ra sa Gaustyan	San Franc sco, CA	2017-01-19	Mt Dav dson s very spec a to me.
Kaar a Ocampo	San Franc sco, CA	2017-01-19	don t want the park to d sappear.
Mar am Ayrapetyan	Los Ange es, CA	2017-01-22	I care about our env ronment.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Thomas Burke	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-23	Mount Davidson is the most important natural landmark in the City.
Cynthia Scott	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-25	Please keep our forest, my kids and dog and I love it. It is one of the nature preserves that keeps me sane. Cynthia
M Sykes	Ventura, CA	2017-01-25	WTF are you people doing?! WAKE UP and we come to the 6th extinction! Planning to help life on Earth or just help ensure our destruction?!
Rheanna Laroche	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-25	This is a valuable natural habitat!
Chris Correae	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-27	I live near Mt Sutro and like the way it looks now. I believe cutting so many trees down would be a ridiculous act of mismanagement.
Sandra Bue	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-27	I am signing because the area since the way it is. As if you cut down a those trees what about mudslides after that
ynette feese	sf, CA	2017-01-28	I know how about we leave the trees alone to give us a reason to breathe & NOT give cancer to people and animals..just a thought
Erka Burke	San Francisco, CA	2017-01-29	We Must have open space, unadulterated by development. We must save trees.
Christopher Grey	Choudrant, LA	2017-02-03	Save the area! Me and my at once girlfriend walked through this park and observed the trees one summer. She has since passed away and I hope to walk through this space again.
Jean Key	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-04	The destruction of our trees had to stop!
Ken Ken	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-05	a waste of OUR money--and why destroy the scenic landscape they provide and we as helping with carbon dioxide!
Joseline Tam	Day City, CA	2017-02-09	I have fond childhood memories of hiking in Mt. Davidson with my classmates. Save Mt. Davidson!
Margo Seeley	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-10	I walk on Mount Davidson all the time and greatly enjoy the greenery and escape from the urban chaos. If not Davidson is logged we lose all the trees and all the undergrowth. It is too big of a loss of green - please do not log it!
Mary Hayne	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	We've already lost 10 million trees in CA to the drought. They are a precious resource!
mary merryman	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	I live here
Merrill Rando	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	Rec and Park cut Don't appreciate the destruction of century old trees in the Presidio.
Gregory Veran-Cavet	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	This is a poster child of overzealous non-pragmatic nonsense policy. The goal of urban parks are not to be botanical historical gardens, it is to provide a natural space for people in the city to escape the turmoil of concrete and cars, by accessing to green forests and nature with the families and friends. No one cares if that type of tree or bush wasn't there 300 years ago.
Cindy Shene	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	Keep the trees!!!!!!
Sarah Eckhardt	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	I love trees!
Jan Johnson	San Francisco, CA	2017-02-21	This space is important to the health of the city.
S R	Ft Lauderdale, NY	2017-02-21	There is no substitute for old trees and canopy to soothe the soul and nurture Mother Earth.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 8:58:22 PM

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

suchiu lo

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 4:08:39 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. As a homeowner with property adjacent to Mt. Davidson, I am greatly concerned about removal of trees and the resulting erosion. Consider other areas where wholesale forest reduction has resulted in landslides. Our years of drought have made us complacent - but recent heavy rains should give all of us a wake-up call. Trees stabilize the soil, leave them alone. Here are 10 issues I am also concerned about:

- 1. Public access restrictions:** Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
- 2. Increase in greenhouse gases:** You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
- 3. Increase in herbicides:** The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
- 4. CEQA process violations:** The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
- 5. Trail closures:** The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
- 6. No required tree replacement in Project area:** The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
- 7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:** The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
- 8. Bicyclists singled out:** The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
- 9. Impact of** The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR

fencing ignored: demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias: Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of “alternate facts”, such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Carol Borden-Gomez
Homeowner at 221 Juanita Way, SF 94127

From: [jean lemarquand](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Plan to drain wetlands
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 6:49:34 PM

Dear Board Members:

Subject:

Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. Although not a Californian, I do wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems anywhere in North America.. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. Again, I request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

We, as humans, all lose whenever we allow crucial eco-systems to be compromised for short term monetary gain or for selfish group interests. Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Jean Le Marquand
Laval, Quebec
Canada

From: [Gabriel Donohoe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Deny Appeal and Approve the Natural Areas Plan!
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2017 6:12:22 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, a Sharp Park golfer, and a supporter of the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which among other things includes the Department's Laguna Salada Restoration Plan, to improve habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole golf course.

The Natural Areas Plan was approved December 15 by the Planning and Rec & Park Commissions, following a 20-year process of study, public input, and environmental review. But now the same anti-golf groups that have for years been trying unsuccessfully to close the golf course, have appealed the Commissions' decisions to your Board. Please vote to deny that appeal.

Sharp Park is a beautiful, historic public course, built by one of history's greatest golf architects, Alister MacKenzie. Each year since 1932 it has provided reasonably-priced enjoyment, healthy outdoor exercise and a community gathering-place for tens of thousands of diverse men, women, senior, and junior golfers. It is also convenient—just a 15-minute freeway drive from the City's southern neighborhoods. Please do not allow the anti-golf groups to obstruct the City's plans to improve habitat while maintaining the golf course. Their delaying tactics have been going on for years, and their arguments have been repeatedly rejected -- by the Rec & Park and Planning Departments, as well as the Corps of Engineers, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the California Coastal Commission, and state and federal trial and appellate courts in San Francisco and San Mateo County.

It is time to move forward. Please vote to deny the appeal, and to approve the Natural Areas Plan. Support your Recreation and Park Department's carefully-developed and balanced plan to recover frog and snake habitat in the Sharp Park wetlands, while saving the beautiful, popular, and historic 18-hole golf course.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Gabriel Donohoe
166 San Felipe Ave
San Francisco, CA
94127

From: [M. Citron](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Destroying frog habitat.
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 1:46:52 PM

To all members: Please, please, please do not allow this home for California's amphibian, the Red Legged Frog to become a (gasp!) another golf course. Please review your vote and make the right choice.

All the people want the frogs. Big business wants the golf course.

Mal Citron 906 Via Verde Del Rey Oaks, CA 93940 manaci@sbcglobal.net

From: [Phil Smoot](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: mippolitosf@hotmail.com; richard@spublicgolf.org
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 11:45:53 PM

From:
Phil Smoot
330 Arlington Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
415-584-9465

February 7, 2017

To:

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Thanks,
Phil

From: [Quentin, Peggy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect The California Red-Legged Frog
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:49:49 AM
Importance: High

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Thank you for your attention.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:34:25 AM

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

I rarely get involved in issues such as this one but feel it is critical for me to do so now. There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. I have spent more time in Glenn Canyon Park than most and have seen different management and usage policies come and go. I have seen the feral cats leave and the coyotes move in. I have seen the owls grow scarcer and much of the bee population collapse. I have seen fences and trails added and removed. Nothing comes close to the utter and totally irrevocable changes proposed by the EIR and those that manipulate its implementation in order to impose their vision of what the park should look like. I still don't understand how such a small group of people can get so much authority to implement a plan that is murky in its true intentions and completely without the type of oversight that will allow us to recover from any mistakes or abuse of authority that this ill-conceived plan allows for. Why does their need to be a sweeping vision to return everything to a time when there were no human inhabitants? Why do we need any BIG PLAN at all? Isn't it enough to maintain and improve our beautiful parklands without having to give them a 100% facelift? What was so wrong? Were there a lot of complaints that there were too many trails or trees? Did anyone say that we need to use dangerous pesticides because we need to make changes to the landscape quickly? Is the entire trail systems collapsing that they need to be redone and many closed? Yes, we need to manage our parks responsibly. But I don't think that responsible management includes major and irrevocable changes to landscape--sure sounds like a vanity project of a very select few. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

- 1. Public access restrictions:** Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
- 2. Increase in greenhouse gases:** You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
- 3. Increase in herbicides:** The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
- 4. CEQA process violations:** The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
- 5. Trail closures:** The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public

recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area: The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA: The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out: The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored: The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias: Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Peter Ostrow 9 Craggs Court, SF 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:26:28 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Paul Rotter
190 Belgrade Ave. SF 94117
Paul@belgravehouse.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:19:27 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Wendy Stock, Ph.D.
1306 Bay View Pl.
Berkeley CA 94708

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:06:45 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Leslie Moxley. Walking in the park should be safe!! Poison sprays are used at ground level the same height as small children and dogs. Danger unsafe unhealthy!!!!

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:55:35 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Melissa A. Borden
2219 26th Avenue
San Francisco 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:55:02 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Lourdes S. Borden
2219 26th Avenue
San Francisco 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:54:18 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Robert A. Borden
2219 26th Avenue
San Francisco 94116

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:53:35 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Kit Lofroos
101A Post, Petaluma CA
(a user of SF Parks & Open Space!)

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:05:58 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Christine Kerr
3960 Waterhouse Road
Oakland, CA 94602

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:52:50 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Andrew Lawrence

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:42:24 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Carleton Hoffman
723 Peralta Ave.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:42:24 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Carleton Hoffman
723 Peralta Ave.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 8:44:50 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong. Not only that, the massive cutting of trees planned for Sharp Park will destabilize current bird populations as well as other wildlife who depend upon the trees for habitat. The cutting of trees will be so massive, it is also going to result in soil movement, as well as much greater water runoff--even now with our rainfall this year, you can anticipate mudslides, as well as runoff that will flood the lower areas near the rifle range. This could lead to runoff of the area's soil contamination into neighborhoods and proximate to people and their pets, not to mention wildlife.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use. Not only will there be an increase in herbicide use, the remnant stumps and brush become areas where mosquitoes can breed, exposing the public to heightened risk for West Nile Virus, Zika and other mosquito borne illnesses.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Dr. Suzanne M Valente
Pacifica, CA

I write because Sharp park is in Pacifica and this program will therefore affect me.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 12:04:56 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Michael Stock
744 Guerrero Street Apt 10
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:57:32 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Lu Carpenter
San Francisco 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:49:42 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Kyle Decker
550 Buchanan St Apt 6
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:42:04 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Michael O'Rourke
Citizen Taxpayer
District 4

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:29:01 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

This is important!

Sandi Covell

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:18:34 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Donna K. Turner
1154 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:04:34 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Robert R Bonnet bobbonnet@gmail.com

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:03:43 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: M. Kathleen Hallinan Bonnet

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:58:16 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Susan Wheeler
230 Moncada Way
San Francisco 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:48:40 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 170044 FW:
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 4:36:15 PM

From: Dermot Stratton [mailto:dermot.stratton@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:57 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: richard@sfpublicgolf.org; mippolitosf@hotmail.com
Subject:

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Being able to continue the legacy of making an Alister MacKenzie designed golf course at an affordable price for SF residents is a great privilege, which would be a shame to lose. There has been a lot of efforts to balance preservation of the habitat while maintaining golf course access and continued appeals are not a productive use of our tax paying dollars.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

Best regards,

Dermot Stratton
612 Arlington St
San Francisco, CA 94131



YOUTH COMMISSION
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor Edwin M. Lee
Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

CC: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Hydra Mendoza, Mayor's Families & Children's Advisor
Francis Tsang, Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff for Appointments
Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, Recreation & Park Department
Maria Su, Director, Department of Children, Youth, and their Families

FROM: 2016-2017 Youth Commission

DATE: Wednesday, February 22, 2017

RE: One Youth Commission action at the February 21, 2017 meeting: Support YC Motion 1617-AL-03 [Motion Urging the Board of Supervisors to Remove Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report]

At its **Tuesday, February 21, 2017 meeting**, the Youth Commission voted to support the following motions:

To support YC Motion 1617-AL-03 - [Motion Urging the Board of Supervisors to Remove Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report]

This matter refers to Board of Supervisors File No. 17044. A record of their response is attached to this document.

Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to this issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

FILE NO.

MOTION NO. 1617-AL-03

1 [Motion Urging the Board of Supervisors to Remove Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment Project
2 from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact Report]
3

4 The San Francisco Youth Commission urges the removal of the Sharp Park Golf Course
5 redevelopment project from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan Environmental Impact
6 Report (EIR). The Sharp Park Golf Course is a liability for San Francisco taxpayers and the General
7 Fund and deserves closer scrutiny by the public and the Board of Supervisors. The San Francisco
8 Recreation and Park Department (RPD) previously indicated the need for a separate review.
9

10
11 In 2009, in response to public scoping comments on the EIR, the RPD stated:

12 “Because redesigning or eliminating the Sharp Park Golf Course is a separate proposal being
13 studied by SFRPD, it will not be included or evaluated as part of the proposed SNRAMP
14 project analyzed in the EIR. Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they
15 would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.”
16

17 We are concerned about the inclusion of a Pacifica-based Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment
18 project within the San Francisco “natural areas plan.” The golf course has lost more than \$1.75 million
19 in the last 11 years, drawing scarce resources away that could instead be invested within San
20 Francisco in neighborhood parks and recreation programs.
21

22 However, the draft EIR includes a golf course redevelopment project. This redevelopment is estimated
23 to cost the City \$11 million, and is expected to lead to future sea wall upgrades, potentially costing
24 millions more.
25

1 Scientists from institutions such as the University of California and San Francisco State University
2 have criticized the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment project, stating that it harms endangered
3 species and damages the wetlands. The golf course was built upon wetlands, and the RPD pumps
4 freshwater from the natural areas into the ocean, wasting more than 100 million gallons of fresh water
5 each year.

6
7 The Sharp Park Golf Course, which is located outside San Francisco, indicates the need to realign our
8 scarce funds towards those facilities, programs, and services relied upon by young people and
9 residents of our neighborhoods. We urge the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to ensure the golf
10 course redevelopment is subject to further review by removing the Sharp Park Golf Course
11 Redevelopment from the EIR.

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

Madeleine Matz, Chair, 2016-17 Youth Commission

From: brucew@dogpacsf.org on behalf of [Bruce Wolfe](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Dee Seligman](#)
Subject: Appeal of Certification of EIR for Recreation and Parks' SNRAMP by Planning Commission
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2017 1:22:36 AM
Attachments: [SFFA-DogPACSF-appeal-support.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors and Clerk --

Please accept and add this letter of support to the record for the upcoming hearing of the **Appeal of Certification of EIR for Recreation and Parks' SNRAMP by Planning Commission.**

Thank you for your attention on this matter.

Yours,
DogPAC of SF



Appeal of Certification of EIR for Recreation and Parks' SNRAMP by Planning Commission

The EIR does not do what it is supposed to do, reveal the significant negative environmental impacts of the Plan. Please send it back to Planning to make it right, so when we adopt the Plan, everyone knows what we are committing to and mitigation measures are put in place to minimize the negative impacts.

Over the past 15 years the Natural Areas Program has operated without accountability. They have spent millions and millions of dollars furtively implementing the SNRAMP in the guise of their "Urban Trails" and "Trail Improvement" projects. Trails have been closed, fences erected, trees cut down and native plants installed. Have they accomplished anything positive? Are the changes the Plan proposes for our parks sustainable, or do they require constant human intervention and a never ending flow of money and herbicides? Does the EIR help us answer these questions?

We are, specifically, concerned about the ignorance of the federal advisory of harm in removing so many registered dog-play areas without replacement or relocation after we spent so many years in developing and tax dollars to support and provide for over 150,000 dogs and their parents. This is unconscionable and dismissive, especially, with the looming closures at GGNRA.

-The EIR hides the fact that the NAP Management Plan will close 95% of natural areas to public access. Since NAP controls one-third of all Rec-and-Park-managed land, that's a significant access closure that is not adequately addressed in the EIR.

-The EIR did not adequately address impacts of the closure of 15% of the total legal off-leash space in SF city parks. It did not consider impacts as the population of people and dogs increases over the years.

-The EIR did not adequately address impacts if NAP insists on closing up to 80% of the total, legal off-leash space in SF city parks that are located either within or immediately adjacent to natural areas. This worst-case scenario should have been studied, but wasn't.

-The EIR said NAP's off-leash closures, when combined with proposed closures in the GGNRA, would have a significant impact, but the EIR did not identify any mitigations to address the impact. An obvious mitigation -- for every acre lost, new off-leash areas

would be created. But it won't work if large off-leash areas at Bernal Heights and McLaren Park are reduced, and the lost off-leash acreage is replaced with multiple, small off-leash areas in other parks. People want the experience of hiking with their dog, which they have in the current off-leash areas at Bernal and McLaren, and they can't get that in the much smaller Dog Play Areas in most other parks. The visitor experience must be the same in any replacements.

I) The EIR did not adequately address the impact on public safety in the parks if people with dogs are forced out of large areas of our parks. Paws in the park are eyes in the park. A well-used park is a safe park.

We do not want our parks closed and turned into nature preserves where all we can do is walk through them on a few trails. This is what the SNRAMP intends. It restricts public access to on-trail only. Before we surrender 25% of our parkland to this Plan there should be a real discussion. The EIR sweeps this issue under the carpet.

The SNRAMP is completely dependent on the use of Tier 1, most hazardous, herbicides to kill unwanted trees and plants. The EIR claims implementation of the SNRAMP will not require herbicide use. Think about it. In fact, new evidence revealed just last week shows there may have been some abnormalities with regards to relationships between the private sector and government agencies.

http://www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/2988645/suppressed_epa_toxicologist_it_is_essentially_certain_that_glyphosate_causes_cancer.html

We want our city to “walk the walk” on climate change. If we are going to cut down 18,500 trees, there better be a good reason. This is going to release a lot of methane and carbon dioxide and destroy future carbon sequestration. Somehow the EIR claims the Plan will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Let's have an honest discussion please.

City surveys have demonstrated the public wants more hiking trails. The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. As if that was not bad enough, in parks where the NAP has already implemented its “Trail Improvement Projects,” over 50% of the trails have been closed. According to the EIR, this is not a significant impact on public recreation. It is.

We do not want RPD spending our money to build fences, close trails, spray herbicides and cut down healthy trees. From January through October 2016, the Natural Areas Program made 85% of SFRPD's herbicide applications.

RPD's new Equity Metrics count money spent on those things as a benefit to disadvantaged park neighbors. The park areas closed under the SNRAMP continue to be counted as a benefit to the Equity populations. This turns the Equity Metrics into a tool for environmental racism.

If the EIR had presented an honest picture of the significant environmental impacts of the SNRAMP, mitigation measures would have been required to minimize the harm caused by the program. We need those now. The actions of the Natural Areas Program must be measured to insure compliance with the Plan and with the mitigation measures.

-The Plan calls for cutting down an average of 14 trees per month in San Francisco. The NAP should be required to maintain a log of what they cut down. That would be easy. If the NAP cuts more, we have a right to know.

-The EIR claims the NAP will replant a native tree for every tree they cut down. This is woefully inadequate. Whatever the final commitment, trees planted must be logged and their survival tracked.

-Trail additions and trail closures must be tracked via the trail maps contained in the SNRAMP. We do not want our trails to secretly disappear.

-Is the program accomplishing anything? Are any of the "restored" areas actually able to survive on their own? A sustainable plan should actually be able to reduce maintenance to promote ecology. If perpetual human intervention is required, the program should be scaled back to reduce the environmental damage and spend the money on something that produces a benefit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Bruce Wolfe', enclosed within a hand-drawn oval.

Bruce Wolfe, M.S.W, President

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2017 10:29:17 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

I will be affected by and am especially concerned about changes planned to Mt Davidson and Glen Canyon, but I believe changes planned from this report are not in the best interests of the whole city.

Signed:

Rod Hemphill
70 El Sereno Ct
District 7

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2017 8:09:58 AM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 10:37:10 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Michael Malone
233 Santa Paula Ave
San Francisco CA94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:52:23 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Eloise M. Bates
104 Tiffany Avenue
San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 7:09:13 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area. Returning San Francisco to a treeless plain of windswept dunes will dramatically decrease the pleasure of walking and biking in the City.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such

10. Evidence of bias:

as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Jeffrey Piade (District 2 resident)
3550 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Dee Seligman](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: additions for supervisor packets for EIR hearing on Natural Areas
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 5:23:53 PM
Attachments: [West of Twin Peaks Council letter 10-24-16.docx](#)
[Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Assoc. NAP EIR Certification 2.20.17.docx](#)
[Center for Environmental Health Letter BOS Feb 2017 \(1\).pdf](#)
[Stand Earth Letter BOS Natural Resource Areas Plan Feb 2017.pdf](#)

Dear John and Brent,

The following four organizations have sent letters of endorsement of our Appeal that should be included in the packet being created tomorrow and Friday for the supervisors.

Thank you for your all your assistance!

Cordially,

Dee Seligman
San Francisco Forest Alliance
H: 415-668-6308

Resolution Calling for the Removal of Forested Areas from NAP and Implementation of the Maintenance Alternative for the Program

WHEREAS, The Natural Areas Program (NAP) of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department intends to remove existing habitat on one-quarter of the City's parkland and replace it with native plants (arbitrarily defined as those here before European colonization); and

WHEREAS, The proposed Management Plan for NAP has been undergoing an Environmental Impact Review, which is likely to come before the Planning Commission for certification sometime in December 2016 or after the first of the next year; and

WHEREAS, The Recreation and Park Commission intends to hold a session to officially accept the NAP Management Plan on the same day that the Planning Commission certifies the NAP EIR; and

WHEREAS, After hearing presentations by Recreation and Park Department staff supporting NAP and the San Francisco Forest Alliance opposing it at its May 21, 2012 meeting, the West of Twin Peaks Central Council (WTPCC) voted to submit a letter opposing NAP to the Planning Commission on June 4, 2012 as part of public comment on the NAP Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, That letter expressed WTPCC's concerns about NAP's plans to cut down 18,500 trees in parks controlled by the SF Recreation and Park Department, including removing 1,600 trees on Mt. Davidson, as well as our concerns about NAP's repeated applications of toxic herbicides to keep non-native plants from growing back, as well as our concerns about the loss of access to large areas of our neighborhood parks and the closure of 9.2 miles of trails; and

WHEREAS, That letter also called on the Recreation and Park Commission to rethink its support of NAP; and

WHEREAS, Appendix F of the NAP Management Plan, which gives details of the NAP Management Plan's urban forestry plans, refers to existing trees in parks like Mt. Davidson as "invasive," adding: "The long-term goal of urban forest management in MA-1 and MA-2 areas [which comprise most of NAP's areas] is to slowly convert those areas to native scrub, and grassland habitats or oak woodlands" (p. F-1); and

WHEREAS, The Miraloma Park Improvement Club, a member organization, sent a letter to Mayor Edwin Lee on January 27, 2014, opposing any expansion of NAP on Mt. Davidson, and in particular, calling for management of the forested areas of Mt. Davidson be removed from NAP's control and returned to the control and maintenance of the Recreation and Park Department's Forestry Division; and

WHEREAS, The MPIC letter also opposed implementation of the NAP General Management Plan as written and supported the implementation of the Maintenance Alternative identified in the NAP EIR, an alternative that allows NAP to continue to manage native habitat that has already been created, but does not support any additional destruction of existing habitat for replacement with native plants; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley Professor of Urban Forestry Joe McBride, sent a letter to Recreation and Park General Manager Phil Ginsburg on June 29, 2013, stating that, “I conclude that the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan for the removal and thinning of different portions of the eucalyptus plantation on Mt. Davidson is not justified”; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That, the West of Twin Peaks Central Council urges the Mayor, the General Manager of the SF Recreation and Park Department, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Recreation and Park Commission to remove all forested areas such as at those in Sharp Park, and, in particular, the forested areas of Mt. Davidson, from NAP control and give management control of forested areas to the Recreation and Park Department’s Forestry Division’s trained arborists for routine maintenance, and prohibit the removal of any trees in NAP-managed areas except for reasons of hazard abatement or construction of buildings (but not habitat restoration); and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the West of Twin Peaks Central Council urges the Mayor, the General Manager of the SF Recreation and Park Department, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Recreation and Park Commission to restrict NAP to implementing only the Maintenance Alternative identified in the EIR; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the West of Twin Peaks Central Council urges the Mayor, the General Manager of the SF Recreation and Park Department, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Recreation and Park Commission to prohibit all Tier 1 and Tier 2 [the most toxic] herbicide use by NAP to ensure public safety in all park areas.



Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 27608
San Francisco, CA 94127

February 20, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors,

The Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association (GGHNA) represents over 400 households in the Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood of San Francisco (bounded by 19th Avenue, Santiago St, 9th Ave, and Kirkham St.). Our neighborhood is composed of primarily single-family homes (mostly homeowners, not renters) densely packed together. We have four parks in our neighborhood, all with natural areas in them – Grandview and Golden Gate Heights Parks, Hawk Hill, and the Rock Outcrop. In every park in our neighborhood except Golden Gate Heights Park, the Natural Areas Program (NAP) controls 100% of the park. All of the natural areas in the parks in our neighborhood are located on steep slopes. It's not just our neighborhood that will see major impacts from NAP. Fully one-third of all RPD land, including Sharp Park, falls under the Natural Areas Program's control.

In 2011, GGHNA submitted a comment on the Draft EIR for NAP that outlined our primary concerns with the Program: 1) impacts from drifting sand due to the parks' slopes and the removal of non-native plants that hold the sand in place; 2) impacts from NAP tree management, especially tree removals and "limbing" proposed at Grandview Park; 3) impacts from introducing sensitive species into natural areas, especially impacts on adjacent private property; and 4) impacts from poor maintenance of NAP areas. None of our concerns were adequately addressed in the NAP EIR.

For example, the response to our maintenance concern – that NAP staff do maintenance in parks every day – completely missed our point that the Program schedules less than one maintenance day per month in half of the natural areas. This lack of repeated, continual maintenance results in dead plants, ugly brush piles, and an aesthetic eyesore rather than an inviting neighborhood park. Saying that NAP staff work on maintenance somewhere each day is not an adequate response to the concern we expressed in our comment.

In our comment, GGHNA also asked that "scattered, open sand" be removed as a criterion for the natural areas in our neighborhood. In 2006, a home on 14th Avenue was red-tagged after a major landslide smashed into it. The house was immediately adjacent to the Rock Outcrop where non-native iceplant had recently been removed. At a neighborhood association meeting several years ago, homeowners who live adjacent to Grandview Park complained about damage to their backyards from sand that had drifted in from the park after iceplant was removed. NAP staff responded that they had no "legal" responsibility for damage that occurred outside the park. This is why we asked that "scattered, open sand" be removed from our neighborhood parks. Our concerns about "scattered, open sand" were not addressed in the EIR.

GGHNA is also concerned about the inadequate and incorrect analyses of greenhouse gas emissions from the removal of 18,500 trees and thousands more saplings, and from an inadequate analysis of the increased use of herbicides needed to keep all those removed trees and saplings from re-sprouting.

GGHNA therefore supports the San Francisco Forest Alliance's appeal of the certification of the NAP EIR. GGHNA asks that you send the EIR back to the Planning Department to address the concerns raised by our association and by the Forest Alliance. These issues are too important and the scale of land controlled by NAP too large for any controversy about the NAP EIR to be accepted. Please de-certify the NAP EIR and send it back to Planning so that all these issues can be adequately, accurately, and impartially addressed.

Sincerely,

Carla Kozak
Secretary, Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association



Center for Environmental Health

National Office:
2201 Broadway, Suite 302
Oakland, CA 94612

East Coast Office:
42 Broadway, Suite 1314
New York, NY 10004

T: 510.655.3900
F: 510.655.9100

T: 212.689.6999

ceh@ceh.org www.ceh.org

February 9, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The Center for Environmental Health (CEH) protects children and families from dangerous chemicals in the air, food, and water by working with communities, consumers, workers, government, and the private sector to demand and support practices that are safe for public health and the environment. CEH is concerned that cutting down over 18,000 trees without adequate replacement per the Natural Resource Areas Plan will hurt human and environmental health by worsening air pollution.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan states that the deforestation "would result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts as a result of exceeding the BAAQMD thresholds for NO_x pollutant emissions." (EIR pages 438-440). It concludes that "cumulative impacts associated with criteria air pollutants would be significant and unavoidable."

CEH urges the SF Board of Supervisors to please send the EIR back to the SF Planning Department for further air quality mitigation measures.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Green
Chief Executive Officer
Center for Environmental Health



February 14, 2017

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

Stand.earth, formerly ForestEthics, is a leading environmental organization based in San Francisco.

We are concerned that the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan will create climate change because it fells over 18,000 large trees without adequate replacement.

The Environmental Impact Report for the plan contains math errors, incorrect assumptions, and outdated science. For example, the Greenhouse Gas calculations confuse rates with stocks, assume that 90% of the existing trees are not absorbing carbon, and presume that all new trees will survive. The tree replacement rate for the entire plan is only 0.19. Correcting these problems in accordance with best available science shows that the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan creates significant Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the San Francisco Bay Area that must be mitigated.

Please refer the EIR back to the Planning Department so that it can provide an accurate picture of Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the California Environmental Quality Act and include further mitigation for the environmental harm to climate and public health. Please ensure that the City of San Francisco continues to be a global leader in the fight for climate resilience.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Hammond", with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Ross Hammond
US Campaigns Director
Stand.earth

Footnotes & Sources:

Tree Growth Never Slows

Idea debunked that young trees have the edge on their older siblings in carbon accumulation, U.S. Geological Survey, Nature Journal, January 2014

<http://www.nature.com/news/tree-growth-never-slows-1.14536>

Carbon Capture: Tree Size Matters

Yale Environment Review, July 2015

<http://environment.yale.edu/yer/article/carbon-capture-tree-size-matters#gsc.tab=0>

Increasing Wood Production Through Old Age in Tall Trees, Eucalyptus and Redwood, Stephen Sillett, Forest Ecology and Management Journal, February 2010

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900872X>

Mayor Ed Lee signs Mayors' National Climate Action Agenda Letter

November 2016

<http://www.climate-mayors.org/our-letter-to-the-presidentelect-november-2016/>

Compensating for the Loss of a Healthy Tree: How Many Trees Do You Owe Me?

Dr. David Nowak, U.S. Forest Service, November 2016

<http://www.slideshare.net/arbordayfoundation/compensating-for-the-loss-of-a-healthy-tree-how-many-trees-do-you-owe-me>

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 4:17:38 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Charles Belbin
293 Joost Ave
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 4:03:37 PM

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

The EIR for the SNRAMP is a "whitewash" From wikipedia: To whitewash is a metaphor meaning "to gloss over or cover up vices, crimes or scandals or to exonerate by means of a perfunctory investigation or through biased presentation of data"

Fact 1:

You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2:

You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3:

You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4:

You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5:

Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion:

Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed:

Michelle Nagle

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 3:13:09 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Diana Anderson
Dr Scott Anderson
1335 Masonic Ave. sf 94117

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 2:40:50 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Gerardo Tapia Vera
655 Saint George Drive
Salinas, CA 93905

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 2:19:07 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:	There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:
1. Public access restrictions:	Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.
2. Increase in greenhouse gases:	You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.
3. Increase in herbicides:	The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.
4. CEQA process violations:	The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.
5. Trail closures:	The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.
6. No required tree replacement in Project area:	The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.
7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:	The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.
8. Bicyclists singled out:	The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.
9. Impact of fencing ignored:	The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.
10. Evidence of bias:	Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

I am particularly concerned about the use of dangerous herbicides in public areas. We all deserve to be protected from these, especially pets and children.

Signed:

Valerie Tisdell, member SF Bicycle Coalition, Friends of the Urban Forest, Sierra Club

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:05:20 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions :

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases :

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides :

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures :

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area :

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA :

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out :

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored :

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias :

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Suzanne Bryan
48 Lurline Street
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:06:01 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors: There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions : Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases : You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides : The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations: The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures : The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area : The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA : The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out : The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored : The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias : Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Richard Mazzarisi
1839 15th St. Apt. 464
San Francisco CA 94103

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:15:13 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Jason Potts

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:18:22 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

I lived in the Bay Area for 30 years and am getting ready to return after coming back to care for elderly parents. These kinds of issues concern me, especially since they would never have been even consider during the years I lived there. Please, for the love of all that is holy and special about SF and the Bay Area, do not implement this! Thank you.

Signed:

~Kathy Robles
58C Wavecrest Avenue
Winfield Park NJ 07036
Formerly a resident in Marin, San Mateo and Contra Costa counties as well as working in San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rescind Certification of EIR for SNRAMP: it is a "whitewash"
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:41:58 PM

**Attention SF
Board of
Supervisors:**

In these politically unstable times, when federal funding of sanctuary cities is threatened, is it really the wisest choice of finances to cut down perfectly HEALTHY trees to cater to a FEW people who want to see San Francisco restored to pre-colonial contact sand dunes??? This is completely unreasonable and highly IRRESPONSIBLE on your part if you let this happen on your watch! Why not focus time and resources to remove DEAD pine trees in the parks and natural areas, as there are plenty due to drought and bark beetle infestation. Removing dead trees that actually pose a threat to park visitors makes sense! Removing healthy trees at great expense and then having to use ridiculous amounts of toxic herbicide after the fact does NOT. Be financially prudent and ecologically safe, Supervisors!!!

Fact 1: You cannot cut down 18,500 trees and "replace" them with grass and shrubs without a huge release of greenhouse gas and a loss of future carbon sequestration.

Fact 2: You cannot close 28% of our City's parkland to public access and claim there is no impact on our recreation.

Fact 3: You cannot say implementing a plan that is totally dependent on herbicides will not increase herbicide spraying in our parks.

Fact 4: You cannot ban bicycles from 1/3 of our park areas and say there is no impact on bicyclists.

Fact 5: Yet this is what the EIR claims.

Conclusion: Reject the certification of the EIR and send it back to Planning for an honest evaluation of the impacts of the SNRAMP. While that is happening, halt RPD's premature implementation of the Plan.

Signed: Shannon Stevenson
Mt. Davidson, San Francisco

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 3:48:29 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

I am particularly concerned about plans to ruin trees and use pesticides in the Mt. Davidson area. It is ridiculous. Spending money to risk residents' safety and quality of life is insane. We live here because the forest exists. It provides safety from landslides and fire, and wind. Pesticide use is already affecting the people who live in the neighborhood. Please stop.

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:00:35 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: John Weinstein

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:19:25 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Please seriously review these 10 points,
Roger Underhill
520 Shields St., SF 94132 in District 11

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:26:30 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and greplacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

James Thurston
689 Mangels Ave
SF 94127

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:40:23 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Eileen Massey
Oakland, CA

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 4:46:13 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Mike Regan
66 entrada ct

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 6:21:29 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Barbara Addeo'
1650 jackson Street #705
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 8:38:58 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: david goodyear

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 8:40:25 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed: Stephanie Mueller

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:22:16 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

David N. Richardson
1169 Bosworth Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94131

From: burst@emailmeform.com on behalf of [EmailMeForm](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EIR DOES NOT identify the impacts of SNRAMP implementation, mitigation needed
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 9:52:32 PM

Attention SF Board of Supervisors:

There are procedural violations of CEQA and SF Admin code involved in bringing the EIR from DEIR to FEIR. There is a question whether the EIR properly identifies the impacts of SNRAMP implementation. Here are 10 issues I am concerned about:

1. Public access restrictions:

Public access will be confined to on-trail only, or less than 5% of the access we currently enjoy. The EIR does not identify this impact.

2. Increase in greenhouse gases:

You do not have to be a scientist to realize that cutting down 18,448 trees and replacing them with grass and shrubs will have the opposite effect. The EIR calculations are wrong.

3. Increase in herbicides:

The SNRAMP is dependent on the use of herbicides to kill the roots of felled trees and unwanted plants. The EIR claims the Plan will not require additional herbicide use.

4. CEQA process violations:

The process utilized by Planning violated CEQA, thereby preventing proper vetting of the EIR.

5. Trail closures:

The SNRAMP plans closure of 26% of our trails. Actually, the NAP has closed more than 50% of the trails in parks where they have executed "trail improvement" projects. This is a significant impact on public recreation the EIR fails to address.

6. No required tree replacement in Project area:

The EIR analysis of impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, aesthetics, wind and hydrology hinge on a false premise, that every tree removed in the Project area would be replaced with a new tree somewhere in the Project area.

7. Project implementation before EIR violates CEQA:

The EIR claims the SNRAMP is not being implemented ahead of the EIR certification. Yet, we have already had our trails closed and fences strewn across our parks.

8. Bicyclists singled out:

The EIR claims, "The SNRAMP does not single out bicyclists as a concern and does not include actions directed specifically at bicycle use." Signage installed by RPD in 2015 proves this to be false.

9. Impact of fencing ignored:

The NAP's implementation of the SNRAMP in advance of the EIR demonstrates that their use of fences will be much more extensive than what is disclosed in the SNRAMP.

10. Evidence of bias:

Bias in the EIR is demonstrated by the inclusion of "alternate facts", such as the explanation for the bench removal at Mt. Davidson and the Glen Canyon Miraloma trail closure.

Signed:

Victor Bartolotta
1924 15th Ave 94116

From: [PEF Pacifica](#)
To: [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for a Full and Separate EIR for Sharp Park, Pacifica's Environmental Family
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 11:37:30 AM
Attachments: [Pacifcas Environmental Family Support for Full and Separate EIR for Sharp Park 2 2017.docx.pdf](#)

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Clerk of the Board,

Below and attached please find a request from Pacifica's Environmental Family in support of a full and separate EIR for Sharp Park versus moving forward with the project as part of the overall Natural Area Management Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Re: Please conduct a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review, of Sharp Park.

Dear San Francisco County Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your ongoing research and study in support of environmental stewardship. **We are writing to urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.**

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into the City's Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. When the scope of the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR was defined, Recreation and Park Department promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review."

Despite this promise, the golf course redevelopment project was inserted into the EIR and was not subject to mandatory public hearings or early, formal oversight by regulatory agencies. We feel strongly that this additional review is necessary to ensure protections for the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake and California Red-legged frog.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the best informed environmental decisions possible.

On February 28, please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR and ultimately authorize a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

Sincerely,

Cindy Abbott
President, Pacifica's Environmental Family
For the Board of Directors



Honorable London Breed
Honorable Malia Cohen
Honorable Mike Farrell
Honorable Sandra Fewer
Honorable Jane Kim
Honorable Aaron Peskin
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai
Honorable Jeff Sheeny
Honorable Norman Yee
San Francisco County Board of Supervisors

February 21, 2017

Re: Please conduct a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review, of Sharp Park.

Dear San Francisco County Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your ongoing research and study in support of environmental stewardship. **We are writing to urge you to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR.**

We are concerned that a multi-million dollar redevelopment plan for Sharp Park Golf Course has been inserted into the City's Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. When the scope of the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR was defined, Recreation and Park Department promised: "Should changes to the Sharp Park Golf Course be proposed, they would undergo a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review."

Despite this promise, the golf course redevelopment project was inserted into the EIR and was not subject to mandatory public hearings or early, formal oversight by regulatory agencies. We feel strongly that this additional review is necessary to ensure protections for the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake and California Red-legged frog.

Please preserve the public trust in City government and ensure that San Francisco is making the best informed environmental decisions possible.

On February 28, please vote to remove the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the Natural Resource Areas Management Plan's EIR and ultimately authorize a separate regulatory review, including CEQA environmental review.

Sincerely,

Cindy Abbott
President, Pacifica's Environmental Family
For the Board of Directors

Cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: [mw](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Public Golf Alliance](#); [Mike Wallach](#)
Subject: Some District 3 history on the Sharp Park question
Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 10:07:38 AM

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

Please accept my belated congratulations on your election as our City Supervisor in District 3. My name is Mike Wallach, I am a 30+ year San Francisco resident, 20+ years in District 3 on Russian Hill, a Director on the Board of the 999 Summit Owners Association, an enthusiastic but bad golfer and a patron of San Francisco's historic landmark municipal public golf treasures at Lincoln, Harding, and Sharp Park.

I am writing in support of the certified EIR prepared for the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan developed by our San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. As you know, there is an appeal pending on this EIR, that will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on February 28th. I urge you to reject the appeal, support the plan and not waste the enormous time, effort, and taxpayer funding our hard-working and environmentally committed SF RECPARK employees have invested in this plan over the last 20 years.

I have been following the Sharp Park story closely over the last 10 years, including [commentary on my blog](#), some of which has been cited by more conventional media (Example: [Nevius at the Chron](#)).

I am sure you and your staff will be looking at the issues surrounding Sharp Park carefully, and I won't belabor here the environmental and recreational issues that have already been litigated and studied ad nauseum over the years. You'll be bombarded by conflicting and inaccurate information from those who would destroy the course. They will be flogging technicalities and legal sophistry to obfuscate their objectives, but they have only one end goal. They intend to force the City to turn over to the Feds 400 acres of coastal parkland that belongs to the people of San Francisco - by any means necessary. I ask you - Do you want to risk our park being managed and controlled by Donald Trump's National Park Service?

I'll leave you with one important additional point.

This vote basically boils down to one question for you and your fellow Supervisors: ***Who do you trust?*** Do you trust our City RECPARK union employees, managers, directors and commissioners - committed environmentalists one and all - who have invested decades in time, effort and funding into forging a plan which will make our City proud? Or do you trust the representations of a small group of eco-litigators like the Wild Equity Institute and Center for Biological Diversity who have repeatedly sued the City and cost SF taxpayers millions defending against their failed lawsuits?

I am confident you will choose wisely.

Thank you for considering my views.

Regards,

Mike Wallach
999 Green St. #1501
San Francisco, Ca. 94133
415-271-4072

Addendum: Included below please find my previous correspondence with your predecessor David Chiu on this issue. Subsequent to this last exchange [Supervisor Chiu voted with the majority of the board 7-4](#) to support SF RECPARK common sense efforts to enhance the habitat while preserving the historic legacy and affordable recreational opportunities at Sharp Park.

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: In support of the environmentalists in our RECPARK Department and their efforts to improve the endangered frog habitat at Sharp Park

Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2014 23:08:58 -0700

From: mw

To: David Chiu <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>
CC: info@sfpublishgolf.com

Supervisor Chiu,

As President of the Board of Supervisors you have cultivated a reputation for seeking collaborative solutions, putting reasonable compromise ahead of ideology, and forging practical real world solutions for the City. In your campaign for the State Assembly, it will be even more important that you are perceived by your potential constituents as a practical problem solver rather than a doctrinaire ideologue. On March 25 you will have another opportunity to demonstrate that capacity. On the Board's calendar is an appeal by Wild Equity Institute against unanimous decisions of the RECPARK and SF Planning Commissions to approve a *Mitigated Negative Declaration* and proceed with the long delayed *Sharp Park Safety, Infrastructure, and Habitat Improvement Project*.

But I am ahead of myself. My name is Mike Wallach. I am a 30 year resident of San Francisco, live in District 3 on Russian Hill, an enthusiastic but bad golfer, and a frequent patron of the San Francisco municipal golf courses. I have corresponded with you before about Sharp Park (see below). I was very disappointed with [your December 6, 2011 vote for the John Avalos ordinance on Sharp Park](#). It was clearly intended to start the City down a path that would destroy the Sharp Park golf course and give the federal government control of 400 acres of coastal park land that belongs to the people of San Francisco. On March 25 you will have an opportunity to rectify the public perception created by that vote.

There is much I can say about this issue, but will limit myself here to one simple point. The controversy about Sharp Park is usually framed as "environmentalists" vs. "golfers". It is an easy narrative to understand, but is simply not true.

The controversy surrounding Sharp Park is more accurately understood in terms of being about "environmentalists" vs. "environmentalists". On the one hand we have practical problem solving environmentalists and conservationists like the dedicated and hard working employees of San Francisco Rec & Park who have the best interest of the Sharp Park wildlife at heart. They want nothing more than to move ahead with improving the managed habitat on which these creatures depend. But they have been blocked by ideologically motivated environmental litigation specialists like the Wild Equity Institute for whom the frog and snake are simply a means to an end. Their end goal, their only goal, is to destroy the legacy Alister MacKenzie course and force the people of San Francisco, by any means necessary, to give up control of a beautiful 400 acre coastal park that belongs to the people of San Francisco.

We've had golf course operations at Sharp Park for 80 years. The golf course created the fresh water habitat at Laguna Salada for the California Red Legged Frog to thrive. It is a managed habitat, and it is our responsibility to continue to manage it and improve it. The most important aspect of the plan in question on March 25 is that it will take necessary steps to improve the habitat for both the endangered frog and snake. This is what we've learned during this controversy, this is what the scientists who know the most about the frog and snake at Sharp Park have told the Board of Supervisors over the past several years. For example - this is from a [presentation by Karen Swaim to the San Francisco Government Audit and Oversight Committee in December 2009](#). Karen Swaim is a field biologist who has worked for over 20 years with the frog and snake habitat at Sharp and Mori Point. She is still regarded as a local expert by all state, local, and federal agencies with an interest in survival of the species. Here is what she said:

"Golf is not what is responsible for the decline of the San Francisco garter snake... the frogs are prolific west of highway one, they are not in any trouble at all west of highway one... You need to protect the sea wall. You need to have a fresh water managed habitat currently for this species to recover it, and that is all there is to it."

Her opinion was confirmed in Federal Court last year when WEI tried to secure a preliminary injunction to stop golf operations at Sharp Park. After hearing the arguments, this is what [Judge Susan Ilston found in her ruling denying the WEI plaintiffs](#) a preliminary injunction and ultimately dismissing their lawsuit:

"Experts for both sides agree that the overall Frog population has increased over the last 20 years.. Neither side disputes that the number of egg masses found last winter in Sharp Park was the highest ever recorded... Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden of showing irreparable harm to

the California Red Legged Frog or the San Francisco Garter Snake absent the issuance of a preliminary injunction on defendants' activities at Sharp Park. Accordingly, the motion for a preliminary injunction is DENIED."

Do not be distracted by the baseless claims of the Wild Equity Institute lawyers. Let's move forward and start a process which will improve the managed habitat for the frog and snake at Sharp Park, and incidentally also for the golfers. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Wallach
999 Green St.
San Francisco, Ca. 94133

M: 415-271-4072

On 11/10/2009 3:44 PM, David Chiu wrote:

Mike,

This is not an issue I have devoted a lot of study time to; I was awaiting the recent report and the upcoming debate. Happy to talk about my perspective as it evolves. I'm interested in examining different options to protect our environment and ensure recreational interests.

David

To: David Chiu <David.Chiu@sfgov.org> Subject: Re: Sharp Park Golf

You are welcome David, but... I'd kind of like to get an inkling of what your position is on this issue.

- Mike Wallach

David Chiu wrote:
Thanks for sharing your perspective, Mike.

David Chiu

To: <david.chiu@sfgov.org>
11/10/2009 10:45 AM

Subject: Sharp Park Golf

[To:david.chiu@sfgov.org](mailto:david.chiu@sfgov.org)[Email:mw@dividedwestandunitedwefall.com](mailto:mw@dividedwestandunitedwefall.com)[PREFIX:Mr.](#)

FIRST_NAME:Mike
LAST_NAME:Wallach
ADDRESS1:999 Green Street #1501
ADDRESS2:San Francisco, Ca.
ZIP:94133
PHONE:415-775-8419
[EMAIL_VERIFY:mw@dividedwestandunitedwefall.com](mailto:mw@dividedwestandunitedwefall.com)

COMMENTS:David, As my representative on the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask your support for continuing Sharp Park as a golf course, as

outlined by the recently released report from the Dept of Parks and Recreation. This course is used by many retirees in your district as well as young people of all cultures across the bay area. It is a unique landmark course that with a little love could be an enormous draw for San Francisco. Please join with your fellow supervisor Sean Elsbernd, Pacifica Mayor Julie Lancelle, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, State Assembly Whip Fiona Ma, Assemblyman Jerry Hill, San Mateo County Supervisors Carole Groom and Adrienne Tissier, and San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera in support of Sharp Park Golf. Unfortunately Ross Mirakimi has put The City in a position of being intimidated by a well funded group of out of state eco-extremists who brag about intimidating municipalities with lawsuits (The Center for Biological Diversity). They have no interest in finding common ground between the recreational interests of your constituents and the wildlife. Only destroying the course will satisfy them, which makes a lawsuit inevitable. We have a lot of problems in The City, but a shortage of top drawer legal talent is not among them. We need to stand up to these bullies and do what is right for the residents of San Francisco and Pacifica. - Mike Wallach

From: [Kelsey Josund](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 2:41:33 PM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Kelsey Josund

--

www.pinkpolkadotsguild.com

From: [kothelmut](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Farrell, Mark \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, London \(BOS\)](#); [Johnston, Conor \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Sheehy, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect wetlands and reject any SNRAMP that includes golf course redevelopment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2017 1:59:38 AM

Dnia 17 lutego 2017 01:00 kothelmut <m3magda@buziaczek.pl> napisal(a):

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to reject the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP), unless and until the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment is removed from the plan. The vast majority of California's wetlands have been drained, degraded and destroyed. Sharp Park is home to federally protected, endangered California Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana draytonii*), California's official state amphibian. The Board of Supervisors should work to protect, rather than to kill, harm and harass these frogs, which is what happens when the City pumps the Sharp Park Wetlands out to sea, causing the frogs' egg masses to be stranded on dry land. I wholeheartedly oppose any usage of taxpayer funds that results in the destruction of rare wetland ecosystems or the degradation of important wildlife habitat. Using taxpayer dollars to drain wetlands for non-essential purposes is thoroughly unethical. As such, I again request that you not approve any version of a Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan that condones or funds such activities. Please see www.savethefrogs.com/sharp-park for more info, and remember that there are over 1,000 other golf courses in California.

Yours Sincerely,
Anna Szaszorowska
Poland

From: [MM](#)
To: [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: REJECT Significant Natural Resource Areas Plan or SEVER Sharp Park Golf Course Redevelopment
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 12:18:01 PM

Esteemed Supervisors:

The purpose of this communication is to advise you to reject the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan as it is proposed. This Plan relies upon oversight by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. The Department's management, at present, has a track record of wasteful overspending of taxpayer money, interlocks with privatization interests, and proven disinterest in responsible stewardship of our environmental resources.

Profit over planet is poor decision-making. I would encourage you to, at the very least, recommend severing the Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment from the SNRAMP. The Sharp Park Golf Course redevelopment plan will have a significant and irreversible impact on an environmentally sensitive area in and around the Coastal Zone. Both the California Red-Legged Frog and the City's namesake San Francisco Garter Snake, both listed under the Endangered Species Act, will be further threatened, extirpated, or suffer extinction. No public servant should have species extinction on their record.

In similar Coastal Zone projects, SFRPD has shown disregard for contractual obligations stipulated by FEIR. There is no reason to assume that the Sharp Park Golf project would be any different.

Further, residents of an adjacent apartment complex have suffered displacement as their homes have been renovated and, as rents have subsequently nearly doubled due to those renovations, they have been forced out by increased housing costs. Remaining tenants live with the the threat that they might be next.

In addition, the Carlyle Group has invested in coastal property also adjacent to the golf course. They stand to benefit substantially from the City's investments in Sharp Park. It is now an open secret that SFRPD's donors, who have become the proprietors of our parks, are well-invested in real-estate.

That an elite few should rule over the interests of many—many of whom are your constituents, is bad governance.

It would be still worse governance, if monetization of property in the public trust were to outweigh the naturally occurring complex interrelationships between living things which yield diversity, beauty, aesthetic appreciation, and grace.

Reject the SNRAMP. As a compromise, take golf course redevelopment out of it.

Sincerely,
Mike Murphy
Director, San Francisco Watershed Protection Alliance
Resident, Outer Sunset District

From: [Williams, Jim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: rharrisjr1@gmail.com
Subject: Save SHARP PARK!
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2017 9:51:10 AM

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94104
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Support Natural Areas Program and Golf at Sharp Park
Urge Supervisors to deny appeal of Natural Areas Final EIR
Case No. 2005.0912E
Hearing: Feb. 28, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Planning Commission's approval of the Final EIR for the Rec & Park Department's Natural Areas Plan, which includes habitat recovery for frogs and snakes, while maintaining the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Please deny the appeals from the Commission's decision.

I am an avid golfer but more importantly an avid environmentalist. We have a tremendous community asset in Sharp Park Golf Course, and I want to assure that it will continue to have this as a resource and recreation area for generations to come.

I urge your commissions to approve the Final EIR for Rec & Park's Natural Areas Program, which includes the department's balanced plan to save the beautiful and historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course, while recovering frog and snake habitat in the wetlands.

Sharp Park Golf Course, "the poor man's Pebble Beach," is one of San Francisco's great public recreation spaces and architectural treasures. It is designated a Historical Resource Property under CEQA, a City of Pacifica Historical Site, and one of the 50 "Best Municipal Courses" in America by Golfweek Magazine. It is friendly, beautiful, and reasonably-priced, and was built in 1932 by history's greatest golf architect, Alister MacKenzie. It is a true melting pot: the golfers are a diverse collection of men, women, seniors, juniors and students, including all categories of age, gender, race, and social class.

Anti-golf activists have tried for years to close the golf course and to obstruct and delay Rec & Park's Sharp Park Plan. Their current call to "sever" Sharp Park from the Natural Areas Final EIR is their latest tactic. A virtually identical effort to "sever" Sharp Park from the EIR failed at the Board of Supervisors in December, 2012. To sever Sharp Park at this point – after years of work, countless public hearings, and millions of dollars of staff time, consultants, and

public expenditure (including the \$10 Million Pacifica Recycled Water Project, completed in 2012, which provides recycled irrigation water to the golf course), would be an extravagant, ridiculous waste of public time, money, and effort.

On at least a dozen occasions over the past several years, numerous public agencies and courts have rejected attempts to delay and hinder Rec & Park's Sharp Park Plan. Among them the San Francisco Rec & Park Commission, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), Planning Commission, Public Utilities Commission, Mayor's Office, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Commission, San Francisco Superior Court, San Mateo County Superior Court, US District Court for the Northern District of California, and the Ninth Circuit US Court of Appeals. In their decisions, all of these local, state, and federal agencies and courts have rejected similar arguments by the same golf opponents who now ask you to "sever" Sharp Park from the Natural Areas Final EIR.

Please reject the arguments to sever Sharp Park. Please approve the Natural Areas Final EIR, and approve the Natural Areas Plan.

Thank you for your service to the community and for considering my request.

Jim Williams
345 California St. Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94104

This message is intended only for the person(s) to which it is addressed and may contain privileged, confidential and/or insider information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action concerning the contents of this message and any attachment(s) by anyone other than the named recipient(s) is strictly prohibited.

Carroll, John (BOS)

From: Docs, SF (LIB)
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 12:29 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: RE: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017

Categories: 170044

Hi John,

I have posted the notice.

Thank you,

Michael

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 11:34 AM
To: Docs, SF (LIB) <sfdocs@sfpl.org>
Cc: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017

Please kindly post the below-linked hearing notice for public viewing.

Thanks so much.

John Carroll
Legislative Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445 - Direct | (415)554-5163 - Fax
john.carroll@sfgov.org | bos.legislation@sfgov.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)

Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 11:16 AM

To: bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggas@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com;

bo@slotelaw.com; richard@sfpublishgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC) <stacy.bradley@sfgov.org>

Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT) <jon.givner@sfgov.org>; Stacy, Kate (CAT) <kate.stacy@sfgov.org>; Byrne, Marlina (CAT)

<marlena.byrne@sfgov.org>; Rahaim, John (CPC) <john.rahaim@sfgov.org>; Sanchez, Scott (CPC)

<scott.sanchez@sfgov.org>; Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>;

Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC) <anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org>; Hue, Melinda (CPC) <melinda.hue@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas

(CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>;

Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS)

<alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Lew, Lisa (BOS) <lisa.lew@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>;

Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>

Subject: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017

Good morning,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, to hear an appeal regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Please find the following link to the hearing notice for the matter:

[Hearing Notice - Dated February 14, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Thank you,

John Carroll

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415)554-4445 - Direct | (415)554-5163 - Fax

john.carroll@sfgov.org | bos.legislation@sfgov.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Dee Seligman; sfforestnews@gmail.com; bplater@wildequity.org; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Categories: 170044

Good afternoon,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled a hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.** Please find linked below the letters of appeal filed regarding the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project, as well as direct links to the Planning Department's determinations of timeliness and standing for the appeal, and an informational letter from the Clerk of the Board.

[Appeal Letter - January 5, 2017](#)

[Planning Department Memo - January 10, 2017](#)

[Appeal Letter - January 17, 2017](#)

[Planning Department Memo - January 20, 2017](#)

[Clerk of the Board Letter - January 25, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Thank you,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

January 25, 2017

Ms. Dee Seligman
Ms. Rupa Bose
Mr. Tom Borden
San Francisco Forest Alliance
P.O. Box 460668
San Francisco, CA 94146

Mr. Brent Plater
Wild Equity Institute
474 Valencia Street, Suite 295
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan

Dear Ms. Seligman, Ms. Bose, Mr. Borden, and Mr. Plater:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of memoranda dated January 10, 2017, and January 20, 2017, from the Planning Department regarding their determinations on the timeliness and standing of your filings of appeal of the California Environmental Quality Act certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

The Planning Department has determined that both appeals were filed in a timely manner and have standing with the exception of Save the Frogs!, whom did not submit comments on the Draft EIR. See the attached memorandum from the Planning Department for more information.

The appeal filing period closed on Monday, January 17, 2016. Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 31.16, a hearing date has been scheduled for **Tuesday, February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, at the Board of Supervisors meeting to be held in City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Legislative Chamber, Room 250, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Continues on next page

Please provide to the Clerk's Office by noon:


- 20 days prior to the hearing:** names and addresses of interested parties to be notified of the hearing, in spreadsheet format; and
- 11 days prior to the hearing:** any documentation which you may want available to the Board members prior to the hearing.

For the above, the Clerk's office requests one electronic file (sent to bos.legislation@sfgov.org) and two copies of the documentation for distribution.

NOTE: If electronic versions of the documentation are not available, please submit 18 hard copies of the materials to the Clerk's Office for distribution. If you are unable to make the deadlines prescribed above, it is your responsibility to ensure that all parties receive copies of the materials.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks John Carroll at (415) 554-4445, Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

Very truly yours,


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

- c: Stacy Bradley, Project Sponsor, Recreation and Parks Department
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
John Rahaim, Planning Director
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
Melinda Hue, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Carroll, John (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 11:16 AM
To: bplater@wildequity.org; desai@npca.org; ggas@goldengateaudubon.org; office@sequoia-audubon.org; kerry@savethefrogs.com; deesel91@gmail.com; SFForestNews@gmail.com; tom@intrinsicdevices.com; bo@slotelaw.com; richard@sfpublishgolf.org; Julia4th@yahoo.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Categories: 170044

Good morning,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, to hear an appeal regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Please find the following link to the hearing notice for the matter:

[Hearing Notice - Dated February 14, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Thank you,

John Carroll

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415)554-4445 - Direct | (415)554-5163 - Fax

john.carroll@sfgov.org | bos.legislation@sfgov.org

 Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following appeal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: Tuesday, February 28, 2017

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: **File No. 170044.** Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan identified in Planning Case No. 2005.0912E, issued by the Planning Commission through Motion No. 19825 dated December 15, 2016. (Appellants: Dee Seligman, Rupa Bose, and Tom Borden, on behalf of the San Francisco Forest Alliance, and Brent Plater of Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society) (Filed January 5, and January 17, 2017)

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board and agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, February 24, 2017.


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

January 26, 2017

File Nos. 170044-170047
Planning Case No. 2005-0912E

Received from the Board of Supervisors Clerk's Office two checks, each in the amount of Five Hundred Seventy Eight Dollars (\$578), representing the filing fees paid by Dee Seligman of the San Francisco Forest Alliance, and Brent Plater of the Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society, for the appeal of the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Plan.

Planning Department

By:

Tomy Young
Print Name

[Signature] 4/27/17
Signature and Date

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 4:23 PM
To: Dee Seligman; sfforestnews@gmail.com; Bradley, Stacy (REC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Project - Appeal Hearing on February 28, 2017
Categories: 170044

Good afternoon,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled a hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.** Please find linked below a letter of appeal filed regarding the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan, as well as direct links to the Planning Department's determination of timeliness for the appeal, and an informational letter from the Clerk of the Board.

[Appeal Letter - January 5, 2017](#)

[Planning Department Memo - January 10, 2017](#)

[Clerk of the Board Letter - January 19, 2017](#)

Please note that a second appeal was filed on January 17, 2017, regarding the same project by Brent Plater of the Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, Save the Frogs!, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society. Our office is currently awaiting the Planning Department's determination on filer's standing to appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170044](#)

Thank you,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

 Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

January 19, 2017

Ms. Dee Seligman
Ms. Rupa Bose
Mr. Tom Borden
c/o San Francisco Forest Alliance
P.O. Box 460668
San Francisco, CA 94146

Subject: Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan

Dear Ms. Seligman, Ms. Bose, and Mr. Borden:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of a memorandum dated January 10, 2017, from the Planning Department regarding their determination on the timeliness of your filing of appeal of the California Environmental Quality Act certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

The Planning Department has determined that the appeal was filed in a timely manner.

The appeal filing period closed on Monday, January 17, 2017. Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 31.16, a hearing date has been scheduled for **Tuesday, February 28, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, at the Board of Supervisors meeting to be held in City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Legislative Chamber, Room 250, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Continues on next page

Please provide to the Clerk's Office by noon:

- 20 days prior to the hearing:** names and addresses of interested parties to be notified of the hearing, in spreadsheet format; and
- 11 days prior to the hearing:** any documentation which you may want available to the Board members prior to the hearing.

For the above, the Clerk's office requests one electronic file (sent to bos.legislation@sfgov.org) and two copies of the documentation for distribution.

NOTE: If electronic versions of the documentation are not available, please submit 18 hard copies of the materials to the Clerk's Office for distribution. If you are unable to make the deadlines prescribed above, it is your responsibility to ensure that all parties receive copies of the materials.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks John Carroll at (415) 554-4445, Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

Very truly yours,



for Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

- c: Stacy Bradley, Project Sponsor, Recreation and Parks Department
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
John Rahaim, Planning Director
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
Melinda Hue, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:23 PM
To: Rahaim, John (CPC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); Byrne, Marlena (CAT); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Hue, Melinda (CPC); Bradley, Stacy (REC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Plan - Determination of Standing Request
Attachments: Appeal Ltr 011717.pdf; COB Ltr 011717.pdf
Categories: 170044

Good afternoon, Director Rahaim:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of a second appeal of the CEQA Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resources Area Plan. The appeal was filed by Brent Plater of the Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, Save the Frogs!, Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society on January 17, 2017.

Please find the attached letter of appeal and a letter requesting a determination of standing from the Clerk of the Board.

Kindly review for determination of standing.

Regards,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

 Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

January 17, 2017

To: John Rahaim
Planning Director

From: Angela Calvillo *PM for Acc*
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Subject: Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Plan

A second appeal of the CEQA Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Significant Natural Resources Area Plan was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board on January 17, 2017, by Brent Plater of the Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, Save the Frogs!, and the Golden Gate Audubon Society.

A memorandum dated January 10, 2017, from the Planning Department determined the appeal filing period for this matter closes on January 17, 2017. Pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 31.16(c), I am forwarding this appeal, with attached documents, to the Planning Department to determine the appellant's standing. The Planning Department's determination should be made within three (3) working days of receipt of this request.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks John Carroll at (415) 554-4445, Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

c: Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Acting Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Melinda Hue, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary, Planning Department
Stacy Bradley, Staff Contact, Recreation and Parks Department

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

January 5, 2017

To: John Rahaim
Planning Director

From: *ACC* Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Subject: Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report - Significant Natural Resource Areas Plan

An appeal of the CEQA Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Significant Natural Resources Area Plan was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board on January 5, 2017, by Dee Seligman, Rupa Bose, and Tom Borden on behalf of the San Francisco Forest Alliance.

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 31.16, I am forwarding this appeal, with attached documents, to the Planning Department to determine if the appeal has been filed in a timely manner. The Planning Department's determination should be made within three (3) working days of receipt of this request.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks John Carroll at (415) 554-4445, Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

c: Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Sarah Jones, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Melinda Hue, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary, Planning Department
Stacy Bradley, Staff Contact, Recreation and Parks Department



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: January 10, 2017
 TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
 FROM: Lisa Gibson, Acting Environmental Review Officer *LG*
 RE: Appeal Timeliness Determination – Natural Resources
 Management Plan, Planning Department Case No. 2005.0912E

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

Reception:
 415.558.6378

Fax:
 415.558.6409

Planning
 Information:
 415.558.6377

An appeal of the Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (formerly the Significant Natural Resources Area Management Plan), Planning Department Case No. 2005.0912E, was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors on January 5, 2017 by the San Francisco Forest Alliance (Appellant). As explained below, the Planning Department finds the appeal to be timely filed.

Date of FEIR Certification	30 Days after FEIR Certification	Appeal Deadline (Must Be Day Clerk of Board's Office Is Open)	Date of Appeal Filing	Timely?
December 15, 2016	Saturday, January 14, 2017	Tuesday, January 17, 2017	January 5, 2017	Yes

Timeline: On August 31, 2011, the Planning Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP) with a public review and comment period from August 11, 2011 through October 31, 2011. On October 6, 2011, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR. On April 27, 2012, the Planning Department opened a second public review and comment period which ran from April 27, 2012 through June 11, 2012. The Responses to Comments document was issued on November 16, 2016. On December 15, 2016, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed hearing to consider certification of the Natural Resources Management Plan Final EIR (NRMP FEIR). The Planning Commission certified the NRMP FEIR on December 15, 2016.

Appeal Deadline: Section 31.16(a) and (c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code states that any person or entity that has submitted comments to the Planning Commission or the Environmental Review Officer on a DEIR, either in writing during the public review period, or orally or in writing at a public hearing on the EIR, may appeal the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR up to 30 days after the certification of FEIR. The 30th day after the certification of the FEIR is Saturday, January 14, 2017. The next date when the Office of the Clerk of the Board is open is Tuesday, January 17, 2017 (Appeal Deadline).

Memo

Appeal Filing and Timeliness: The Appellant had submitted written comments on the DEIR and therefore the Appellant has standing to appeal the certification of the FEIR.¹ The Appellant filed the appeal of the FEIR on January 5, 2017, prior to the Appeal Deadline and therefore the appeal is considered timely.

¹ The San Francisco Forest Alliance had submitted written comments on the DEIR, albeit under the name of a different President.

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion, or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Reactivate File No. []
- 10. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Hearing - Appeal of Final Environmental Impact Report Certification - Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan

The text is listed below or attached:

Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan identified in Planning Case No. 2005.0912E, issued by the Planning Commission through Motion No. 19825 dated December 15, 2016. (Appellants: Dee Seligman, Rupa Bose, and Tom Borden, on behalf of the San Francisco Forest Alliance, and Brent Plater of Wild Equity Institute, on behalf of the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter, the National Parks Conservation Association, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Sequoia Audubon Society) (Filed January 5, and January 17, 2017)

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: Alisa J. Jernard

For Clerk's Use Only:

1700M