

CITY OF SEATTLE
RESOLUTION 31422

A RESOLUTION related to the Budget Control Act of 2011 and Sequestration.

WHEREAS, Since Congress failed to pass a bill reducing the deficit by \$1.2 trillion dollars the Budget Control Act of 2011 mandates the automatic sequestration through across-the-board cuts from mandatory and discretionary spending in the years 2013 – 2021, beginning with \$110 billion of automatic cuts commencing on January 2nd, 2013; and

WHEREAS, Because on any given night in Washington State, more than 22,000 people are homeless and more than 132,000 extremely low-income families spend more than half their income for rent and have trouble affording basic necessities, the sequestration of federally-funded programs that serve these residents in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal communities is in opposition to the goal of providing safe, healthy, affordable homes and the necessary supportive services, and the development and recovery of thriving communities; and

WHEREAS, Sequestration will also impact funding for critical public safety, homeland security, environmental, education, public health, and transportation programs that directly affect the quality of life for all residents of Seattle; and

WHEREAS, the sequestration of federally-funded programs shift costs onto states and municipalities, which, unlike the federal government, cannot adequately cope with them through deficit spending; federal borrowing costs are at an all-time low; and questionable austerity policies have pushed Europe into a double-dip recession; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE MAYOR CONCURRING, THAT:

Section 1. The sequestration cuts mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 will cause severe harm to some of the most vulnerable residents in Washington State and are in direct contravention of our mission and our beliefs.

Section 2. We strongly oppose the sequestration of federal funding for housing, community development, public safety, homeland security, environmental, education, public health, and transportation programs as mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 and urge Congress to halt the non-defense, discretionary cuts in order to protect key programs that prevent and end homelessness, truly serve the most vulnerable in our communities and preserve the quality of life of all residents.

1 Section 3. We call upon Congress and the President to instead adopt a balanced
2 approach that:

- 3 a. Allows the tax cut for the wealthiest 2% of our citizens to expire at the end of 2012
4 and includes additional revenue by restructuring our tax system in order to fund
5 crucial services and investments; and
6 b. Upholds the federal commitments to affordable housing, community development,
7 ending homelessness, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, transportation,
8 education, homeland security and public safety; and
9 c. Prioritizes the revitalization of the economy and a return to broadly-shared prosperity
10 with the creation of millions of new jobs.

11 Adopted by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2012, and
12 signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this _____ day
13 of _____, 2012.

14 _____
15 President _____ of the City Council

16 THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

17 _____
18 Michael McGinn, Mayor

19 Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2012.

20 _____
21 Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

22 (Seal)

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Legislative	Lisa Herbold/4-5331	N/A

Legislation Title:

A RESOLUTION Related to the Budget Control Act of 2011 and Sequestration

Summary of the Legislation:

The Resolution opposes the sequestration of federal funding and urges Congress and the President to adopt a budget with a balanced approach of more revenue and preserving the social safety net.

Background:

The Budget Control Act of 2011 mandates the automatic across-the-board cuts from mandatory and discretionary spending, or "sequestration," in the years 2013 – 2021, beginning with \$110 billion of automatic cuts commencing on January 2nd, 2013

Please check one of the following:

This legislation does not have any financial implications.
(Please skip to "Other Implications" section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

This legislation has financial implications.
(If the legislation has direct fiscal impacts (e.g., appropriations, revenue, positions), fill out the relevant sections below. If the financial implications are indirect or longer-term, describe them in narrative in the "Other Implications" Section. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each title and question.)

Other Implications:

- a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**
No
- b) **What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**
None
- c) **Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**
No

d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?

N/A

e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?

No

f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?

No

g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?

No

h) Other Issues:

N/A