**SAMPLE LETTERS**

**Member of a golf club –**

Assembly Member/Senator ### (\_\_\_\_\_\_):

As a resident of your district and a member of the ### (\_\_\_\_\_\_) Golf Club I am deeply concerned about AB 672 (Garcia; D-Bell Gardens).

This bill ***singles out golf and only golf among California’s parks/open space activities for blanket exemptions to the Public Park Preservation Act of 1971 (Public Resources Code Section 5400-5409) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).*** The State of California should not be favoring or disfavoring specific recreational activities nor picking winners and losers among them. Applying a CEQA exemption to golf as the one and only defined “underutilized” recreational land use would amount to a legislative stigmatization of golf as a State-disfavored recreational use. Should this measure pass, every golf facility in California will have a proverbial target on its back for additional development by way of repurposing.

The logic underlying AB 672 – that golf is an officially disfavored use of land – would set a dangerous precedent. This logic could easily be extended to other recreational uses such as soccer/football fields, baseball/softball diamonds, tracks, picnic areas, amusement parks, and land conservancies. The slope here is as slippery as it is dangerous. The Public Park Preservation Act of 1971 must remain intact, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be applied equally for potential development projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

### (name)

### (address)

### (email address) (*optional*)

### (phone number) (*optional*)

**Individual golfer –**

Assembly Member/Senator ### (\_\_\_\_):

I am deeply concerned about AB 672 (Garcia; D-Bell Gardens) for its potentially damaging impact on community golf courses in California.

AB 672 proposes to facilitate the development of California’s municipal golf courses as “affordable” housing tracts by:

* Removing them from the protections of the Public Park Preservation Act.
* Providing an exemption to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
* Mandating a one-size-fits-all zoning element.
* Singling golf as the only open space/recreational activity for which these exemptions and facilitations apply, literally targeting them for development to the exclusion of all other open space/recreational activities.

The bill would set a dangerous precedent. This logic could easily be extended to other recreational uses such as soccer/football fields, baseball/softball diamonds, tracks, picnic areas, amusement parks, and land conservancies. The Public Park Preservation Act of 1971 must remain intact, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be applied equally for potential development projects.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

### (name)

### (address)

### (email address) (*optional*)

### (phone number) (*optional*)

**Golf Club Board of Directors -**

Assembly Member/Senator ### (\_\_\_\_):

The ### (\_\_\_\_\_\_) Golf Club Board of Directors, which speaks on behalf of over #\_\_\_ community members who call the ### (\_\_\_\_\_\_) golf facility home, stands in opposition to AB 672 (Garcia; D-Bell Gardens).

This bill ***singles out golf and only golf among California’s parks/open space activities for blanket exemptions to the Public Park Preservation Act of 1971 (Public Resources Code Section 5400-5409) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).*** The State of California should not be favoring or disfavoring specific recreational activities nor picking winners and losers among them. Applying a CEQA exemption to golf as the one and only defined “underutilized” recreational land use would amount to a legislative stigmatization of golf as a State-disfavored recreational use. Should this measure pass, every golf facility in California will have a proverbial target on its back for additional development by way of repurposing.

The logic underlying AB 672 – that golf is an officially disfavored use of land – would set a dangerous precedent. This logic could easily be extended to other recreational uses such as soccer/football fields, baseball/softball diamonds, tracks, picnic areas, amusement parks, and land conservancies. The slope here is as slippery as it is dangerous. The Public Park Preservation Act of 1971 must remain intact, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be applied equally for potential development projects.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

### (name), (\_\_\_\_\_) Golf Club Board President

### (address)

### (email address) (*optional*)

### (phone number) (*optional*)