

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

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Tails
Resolution

File Number: 170845

Date Passed: July 25, 2017


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

July 25, 2017 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy and Tang
Excused: 1 - Yee

File No. 170845


I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 7/25/2017 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned
Mayor

8/4/2017
Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

8/4/17
Date