

1 [Opposing California State Assembly Bill 943 (Santiago) - Land Use Regulations: Local  
Initiatives: Voter Approval]

2  
3 **Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill 943, authored by Assembly**  
4 **Member Miguel Santiago, which would impose a supermajority voting requirement of**  
5 **55% on all ballot measures in cities and counties with populations of 750,000 or more**  
6 **that are qualified for the ballot by citizen petition and are designated by the county**  
7 **counsel or city attorney in those cities and counties to inhibit unchecked development.**

8  
9 WHEREAS, Article II, Section 1 of the California Constitution recognizes that “all  
10 political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for their protection, security,  
11 and benefit, and they have the right to alter or reform it when the public good may require”;  
12 and

13 WHEREAS, The people of the City and County of San Francisco voted in 1898 to  
14 amend the City Charter to make San Francisco the first city in the nation to recognize the right  
15 of citizens in municipal jurisdictions to be able to qualify an initiative ordinance measure for  
16 the ballot by gathering sufficient petition signatures from fellow citizens; and

17 WHEREAS, Initiative ordinances qualified for the ballot by citizen petition gathering  
18 have long been an important part of the local democratic process in San Francisco; and

19 WHEREAS, Assembly Member Santiago has authored Assembly Bill 943 which would  
20 impose a supermajority voting requirement of 55% on all ballot measures in cities and  
21 counties with populations of 750,000 or more that are qualified for the ballot by citizen petition  
22 signature gathering and are designated by the county counsel or city attorney in those cities  
23 and counties to “reduce density or stop development or construction of any parcels located  
24 less than one mile from a major train stop”; and

25

1           WHEREAS, Had the 55% supermajority requirement been in effect in San Francisco in  
2 previous years, critical ballot measures that closed loopholes in rent control and strengthened  
3 tenant protections, established reasonable limits on downtown office development and  
4 required the creation of a Waterfront Land Use Plan, would all have failed to become law,  
5 counter to the will of the voters; now, therefore, be it

6           RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco  
7 oppose Assembly Bill 943; and, be it

8           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San  
9 Francisco urges the members of the State Legislative Delegation to oppose Assembly Bill  
10 943; and, be it

11           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San  
12 Francisco directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit copies of this resolution to the City  
13 Lobbyist and the respective offices of the State Legislative Delegation upon its passage.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25