

Obtained under the Public Records Act, the following message from Noland (Library Board member and former member of the City Council) to Goldberg (Director of the City Budget Office) objects to using the levy as an excuse to raid its general funds to benefit other departments, not restoring the lost general fund allocation even when the economy and City revenues increase. Noland also objects to portraying the levy to the voters as \$17 million/year for the Library rather than as a general fund/levy swap that would benefit the Library only \$12 million/yea, with \$5 million of its current general fund allocation going elsewhere. Noland eventually fell into line with the other Library Board members in agreeing to the transfer of general funds away from the Library without a commitment to restore the funds when City revenues improve; and not explaining to the voters the levy's net effect of redirecting elsewhere \$5/million year in the Library's general fund allocation. (Turner is City Librarian. McCaffrey, Liu, Dixon, and Fujiwara are the other Library Board members. McCoy is an aide to the Mayor.) The message is edited to remove a sentence referring to one person's health issue.

-----Original Message-----

From: jane noland [<mailto:janenoland@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 11:00 AM

To: Goldberg, Beth; Turner, Marcellus; Marie McCaffrey; ERIC LIU; Dixon, Dan; Theresa Fujiwara

Subject: Re: Library Levy

Dear Beth,

Thank you for your response. It appears that we are on the same page.

Appreciatively,

Jane

----- Original Message -----

From: Goldberg, Beth

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 08:32 AM

To: jane noland <janenoland@comcast.net>

Cc: Turner, Marcellus; Marie McCaffrey <marie@historylink.org>; Dixon,

Dan<Dan.Dixon@swedish.org>; Theresa Fujiwara <theresafujiwara@comcast.net>; ERIC LIU <epliu@me.com>; McCoy, Julie

Subject: RE: Library Levy

Hi Jane--

Thanks for your email. As you know, the technical committee's work is resulting in a recommendation that as City revenues grow, so too would contributions to the library on a proportionate basis. Beyond that, decisions about funding for the library -- like that of other City services-- is one of trade offs and priorities. Therefore, it is difficult to make guarantees beyond that. The City of Seattle has traditionally been very supportive of the library. While I am not in a position to guarantee what future decision makers will decide, I don't see any reason why funding for the library would not receive the same level of consideration as it has in the past.

Thanks again for your email. We are looking forward to our discussion at noon today.

Best Regards,
Beth

-----Original Message-----

From: jane noland [<mailto:janenoland@comcast.net>]

Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2012 3:23 PM

To: Goldberg, Beth

Cc: Turner, Marcellus; Marie McCaffrey; Dixon, Dan; Theresa Fujiwara; ERIC LIU

Subject: Library Levy

Thank you for inviting me to email.

My concern about the direction we are taking on General Fund levels for the library over the length of the levy is that, as stated in the "Financial Modeling Goals" and as shown in the "Levy Financing Models For Scenarios", there is no opportunity for the library to benefit should revenues improve in later years.

I understand your concern about the need for the library portion of the general fund to share reduction if revenues go down. My concern is that there is no opportunity for an increase in the library's general funding if and when revenues improve.

I propose that a financial modeling goal be included that: "Recognizes that the city's General Fund support for the library may increase over the life of the levy if and when revenues increase."

Otherwise, as the modeling numbers indicate in the case of the \$5,000,000 support for base, this is a permanent 1/3 to general fund, 2/3 to library levy. I think the voters would be very unhappy to support the levy on this basis.

I am only speaking for myself here but I think the levy would have a much better chance of success, if the library portion of the general fund floats along with the city's revenues and we can be clear with the public about that. Otherwise, we should be clear that this is a library/general fund measure.

Thank you for considering this. See you tomorrow.

Jane Noland