

# Say NO to Golf at Fort Sheridan



## ONE MINUTE BACKGROUND

### The Deed

The deed restriction requiring a golf course “in perpetuity” was not imposed by the Army. The golf course requirement was added by local communities.

The Secretary of the Army simply ratified the language. The Army followed the rule that “it is the job of the local community ... to plan for the reuse of the surplus property.”

The Army has only two requirements for the land:

- Care of the cemetery
- Protection of open spaces

### The Committee

Lake County Forest Preserve District Board has created a Master Plan Advisory Committee. They will evaluate the concept plan. Send your comments to [fort@lcfpd.org](mailto:fort@lcfpd.org)

### The Golf Gold Rush

Golf was a significant municipal revenue source in the ‘90’s and is structured to be financially self-sustaining. Today, golf rounds are down and golf courses are becoming financial burdens and closing.

## Golf – Losing Money

The proposed Fort Sheridan golf course will become a tax burden on Lake County residents and will diminish public access to unique Lake Michigan bluff habitat.

In the last 15+ years the golf revenue landscape has deteriorated dramatically:

- Two of the present three Lake County Forest Preserve operated golf facilities lose money. The annual Forest Preserve 2010 – 2011 budget forecasts a loss of **\$469,480** for all golf course operations.
- The **City of Highland Park** reported a **\$604,000** loss in 2009 on its Highland Park Country Club and a five year loss over **\$1.2 million**
- The **Park District of Highland Park** has lost **\$1 million** in the last 5 years and is budgeting a loss of **\$184,000** for 2010.
- **Lake Bluff** projected its 2009 golf course loss of **\$335,000**

## Where is the “No Golf” Option?

The only option Lake County Forest Preserve District is evaluating is a 9-hole golf course. The District’s golf consultant has indicated a 9-hole course will:

- Not be able to support its debt service (financing the development)
- Cannibalize rounds of golf from financially troubled neighboring municipal courses putting these courses in an even worse financial position

---

## Questions You Might Ask Lake County:

- Why is the board ignoring the option to maintain the land as open space instead of building a golf course that will likely result in a financial burden?
- How confident is Lake County that any of the three 9-hole golf course options will not be an additional financial burden resulting in a taxpayer subsidy?
- Since 2 of the 3 golf courses Lake County is presently operating are losing money, why are they building another course?
- Since Lake County's own consultant has indicated that 5% to 10 % of the rounds of golf on any one of the three options proposed for Fort Sheridan will be stolen from nearby municipal courses that are all losing money, why build another course that will negatively affect local taxpayers in those towns?
- Does Lake County plan to use our referendum money to build a golf course?
- What public funds will be used to build any of the options?