



Editor [Camden Swita](#): Heard some news you want us to check out? Let me know: camden@patch.com

SF Mayor Considers Veto After Supes Narrowly Approve Sharp Park Proposal

Mayoral spokeswoman said Lee is "very concerned".

• December 7, 2011



new

Embed | Share

Credit [Camden Swita](#)

Photos (1)

Photos



Credit [Camden Swita](#)

Add your photos

A proposal that could lead to the closure of [Sharp Park Golf Course](#) got [initial approval Tuesday](#) from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, but a spokeswoman for Mayor Ed Lee said the mayor is considering vetoing the legislation.

The board voted 6-5 in favor of the ordinance, which calls on the city's Recreation and Park Department to offer a long-term management agreement to the National Park Service that would likely involve the closure of the course.

The majority of the 417-acre Sharp Park, which is owned by the city of San Francisco, has served as an 18-hole public golf course since it opened in 1932.

But partnering with the National Park Service to include the land as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area would likely result in the closure of the course since federal officials have indicated they are not interested in managing a golf course.

Mayoral spokeswoman Christine Falvey said Lee is "very concerned" about the proposal and is considering vetoing the legislation after talking with other city and federal officials, including Congresswoman Jackie Speier, who is also against the plan.

However, Falvey said Lee "will reserve final judgment" until after the proposal receives final approval from the board next week since more changes could potentially be made to the legislation before then.

The board would need eight votes to overturn a mayoral veto.

Supervisor John Avalos, the author of the ordinance, said at today's board meeting that the course has accumulated a deficit of about \$1.2 million over the past five years and has also brought the city a federal lawsuit over the alleged harm caused by the course to two imperiled species in the area.

Avalos said amendments added to the proposal today would simply allow the city to enter discussions with the park service.

"It allows the option, not a mandate for a partnership," he said.

But Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, an outspoken opponent of the legislation, said it is clear that "everybody that supports this legislation.. their intent is to close the golf course."

Environmental groups supporting the proposal have filed a lawsuit against San Francisco seeking to stop pumping and mowing activities at the course, saying they adversely affect the San Francisco garter snake, an endangered species, and the California red-legged frog, a threatened species.

Elsbernd noted after today's vote that U.S. District Judge Susan Illston last week ruled against the groups, who had sought an injunction to stop the pumping and mowing activities prior to a trial set for July 2012.

Illston's ruling cited data showing that the frog population has actually increased in the area in the past 20 years and that there has only been one confirmed snake death there in recent years.

Elsbernd said he also opposed the proposal because of the historical significance of the course, which was designed by Alister MacKenzie, who has also designed several world-famous courses, including Augusta National Golf Club in Georgia.

"It's a wonderful recreational facility for thousands of San Franciscans," he said.

Elsbernd said his opposition wasn't because of a love for golf, either.

"I haven't played for years," he said. "I don't have the patience."

--*Bay City News*

For more news about Pacifica and surrounding areas, including the San Mateo County Coastside, [follow us on Twitter](#) and "[like](#)" us on Facebook.

Related Topics: [Mayor Ed Lee](#), [San Francisco Board of Supervisors](#), [Sharp Park Golf Course](#), [Sharp Park Golf Course Shut Down](#), and [golden gate national recreation area](#)

Email me updates about this story.

Website:

Thanks. We'll email you the next time we update this story.

[Email](#)

[Print](#)

- [Follow comments](#)
- [Submit tip](#)
- [Add photos & video](#)
- [6 Comments](#)



[mw](#)

10:10 am on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

These are the six supervisor who voted to give away control of 417 acres of beautiful, valuable coastal park land that was a gift to the people of San Francisco, belongs to the people of San Francisco, is our common San Francisco heritage for almost 100 years, and should be a legacy for us to leave to future generations of San Franciscans.

John Avalos District 11 John.Avalos@sfgov.org
David Campos District 9 David.Campos@sfgov.org
David Chiu District 3 David.Chiu@sfgov.org
Jane Kim District 6 Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
Eric Mar District 1 Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org
Ross Mirkarimi District 5 Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org

By their vote they show an extraordinary lack of judgement, have put politics and ideology ahead of the interests of the city they were elected to serve, have betrayed the people of San Francisco, and shown they are not qualified to serve in any public capacity in the San Francisco government.

[Log in to reply](#)



Flag as inappropriate

Bhatman

11:03 am on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

Boo hoo, they didn't vote my way so the they don't deserve to serve the electorate. What an elitist attitude that speaks volumes. Mike.



Flag as inappropriate

Butch Larroche

11:37 am on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

Have you not felt this way after your elected representitives let you down via a vote Bhatman? I would think you have if you were honest with yourself.



Flag as inappropriate

[mw](#)

1:12 pm on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

Bhat,

As I've said before, it is axiomatic we get the government we deserve. We elect them, we have no one to blame but ourselves. It is time to unelect those who put politics and ideology ahead of the interest of our city and a great place to start is with these six.

It was a 6-5 lame duck vote. Only one vote is needed to change the outcome. Mirkarimi will be off the board in the new year. That is a very good thing. He can do less damage as Sheriff than what he can do on the Board. Eric Mar is up for reelection and vulnerable. His vote puts him wildly out of step with his district and at odds with his constituency. It won't take much of a concerted effort and he'll be off the board this time next year. He was weak to start with, and by showing he has more loyalty to Avalos than his own constituents, he's made it easy for someone who actually cares about the city and district to replace him.. The fact that the progs were willing to throw his reelection prospects under the bus to get this passed speaks volumes about the desperation on their part and frankly - Eric Mar's stupidity. The guy is a few clubs short of a full bag.

The people of San Francisco also just voted overwhelmingly for Ed Lee over John Avalos. In no small part he was elected with the specific expectation that he will keep a lid on the Supes when they go off the rails like they did here. This is a perfect opportunity for Ed Lee to do exactly what we elected him to do and veto this nonsense.

Flag as inappropriate

[Steve Sinai](#)

12:20 pm on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

I guarantee that when Ed Lee vetoes this legislation, Bhatman/Hallman will be ranting and raving about it.

[Log in to reply](#)



Flag as inappropriate

[mw](#)

11:17 pm on Wednesday, December 7, 2011

Just a little comedy relief for all you Pacificans, so you can point and laugh at what we call governance in the City by the Bay - One of Eric Mar's greatest hits - about a year before he threw his own constituents under the bus to vote for Avalos ordinance to give away our parks:

<http://www.thedailyshow.com/watch/mon-january-3-2011/san-francisco-s-happy-meal-ban>

[Log in to reply](#)