

Bieganski, Leanna

From: Marshman, Barbara [BMarshman@mercurynews.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 2:09 PM
To: Vossbrink, David
Subject: RE: Library Ballot Initiative Preliminary Analysis

Yes, we'll pile on for sure. Jerks. These people ought to know better.

Barbara Marshman

Editor, Editorial Pages

San Jose Mercury News

Phone 408 920-5542

bmarshman@mercurynews.com

From: Vossbrink, David [mailto:david.vossbrink@sanjoseca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 11:15 AM
To: Marshman, Barbara
Subject: FW: Library Ballot Initiative Preliminary Analysis

More on ballot box budgeting coming to town.

DV

Preliminary staff analysis: <http://www.piersystem.com/external/content/document/1914/1374739/1/04-24-12%20CMO.PDF>

Because the proposed ballot initiative includes no new revenues, the increase in Library Funding would have to be offset by reductions in other General Fund service areas. The reductions necessary to offset the increase in the amount budgeted for Library services would have to be evaluated. If the ballot initiative qualifies for the November 2012 ballot and is approved by the voters, a General Fund rebalancing plan would be required to be brought forward for City Council consideration for the remainder of the 2012-2013 fiscal year in order to increase the Library Department Budget by approximately \$19.4 million and make offsetting decreases to other City programs and services of approximately \$19.4 million. This would impact the two-year approach to balancing the budget currently underway that is designed to provide budget stability to City operations.

Magical thinking: http://www.mercurynews.com/ci_20457968/former-san-jose-elected-officials-backing-library-funding

Fiscalini doesn't agree.

"I'm not sure at this stage we could say supporting the libraries to the degree we should is going to have an inimical effect on other items in the budget," he said.

"I think it's a stretch to say you're not going to be able to hire somebody or have to lay off somebody because of this. I don't think that's the case," he said. "It's a matter of budget priorities."

Rational thinking: http://www.mercurynews.com/opinion/ci_20184115/mercury-news-editorial

But asking for a set-aside of existing money at the expense of other programs in bad times is a cheap trick. It allows voters to make a statement without making a choice.

We might feel differently about a fair set-aside for libraries if, after city costs stabilize and revenue revives, a mayor and council ignore neighborhood demands and persist in shortchanging this critical service. But the cuts of the past few years were not out of disdain for public wishes. These were painful, desperate budgets, holding things together in hopes of a return to the kind of economy Hammer, Fiscalini and Johnson had to deal with. They thought there were some tough years at the time, but they hadn't seen anything yet.

From: San Jose News and Information [mailto:sanjoseinfo@sanjoseca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 9:28 AM
To: Vossbrink, David
Subject: Library Ballot Initiative Preliminary Analysis

You are receiving this email because you are on the City of San Jose's mailing list for news and information. If you would like to unsubscribe from this list, please [click here to unsubscribe](#).

Library Ballot Initiative Preliminary Analysis