



# TALENT CITY COUNCIL

## STUDY SESSION AGENDA

June 17, 2026 - 6:00 PM  
Talent Community Center, Dining Room  
104 E. Main Street, Talent, Oregon



---

*All Council meetings are digitally recorded and will be available on the City website at [www.cityoftalent.org](http://www.cityoftalent.org). The meeting location is accessible to residents with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to the City Recorder at 541-535-1566, ext. 6.*

---

1. Call to Order / Roll Call
2. Discuss General Fund Revenues and SRO Decision.....02
3. Adjournment



# City Council Agenda Report

## *General Fund Revenues & SRO Decision*

---

**Meeting Date:** June 17, 2026      **Staff Contact:** Alex Campbell

**Staff Recommendation:** Discussion      **Estimated Time:** 40 mins.

---

### **ISSUE BEFORE THE COUNCIL**

How to approach the School Resource Officer position for the coming school year.

### **BACKGROUND - SRO**

The budget for Fiscal Year 2026-27 that was passed on June 3 included the School Resource Officer (SRO) position. Although there was intense discussion about the feasibility of continuing to fund the position (prompted in part by staff's proposal to eliminate the position to generate cost savings), staff recommended including the position in the budget to provide flexibility and time to fully consider alternatives.

The City of Talent Police Department has included a School Resource Officer since 2019 when a part-time officer was placed at the Talent Middle School. An SRO provides multiple services to a school, its students, staff, and faculty: providing physical security against internal and external threats; assisting the school with serious behavioral issues; and handling investigations of crimes or threats against students inside or outside of school. The Talent SRO also assists before and after school by directing traffic. As was relayed by multiple members of the public at the May 20 Budget Committee hearing, an important benefit of having an SRO is their ability to build relationships with students who may not have other opportunities to have a positive experience with a law enforcement officer.

During the school year, the SRO is available as a back-up to the police department, which is utilized occasionally to respond to urgent calls, as needed. In addition, outside of the school year, the SRO fills patrol shifts, which improves operational flexibility and generates some savings in over-time cost.

The District considered the part-time program to be successful and requested that the City dedicate an officer full-time (during the school year) to the position and has provided funding up to \$75,000 per year to defray the cost to the City of the SRO. The \$75,000 was intended to cover the full cost of the SRO's time at the school, but it has not fully covered direct costs in recent years. (This is due to several factors, including overtime and inflation in personnel costs.)

In the spring of 2025, the District Superintendent informed the City that sustaining that level of support was becoming very difficult for the district. During the 2025-26 budget cycle, the District was able to maintain that level of support. However, in spring this year, the District proposed an Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) under which the City would continue to provide a full-time SRO, but the District proposed to pay for half of their compensation during the school year, up to \$40,000. City staff have explained why \$40,000 does not actually fully cover one-half of the SRO cost during the school year. The District has responded by offering the attached proposal that is much more likely to fully-fund one-half of the SRO's time spent in/at school.

Council directed staff to request that the District fully fund one-half of the total annual cost of having an SRO on staff. (Even at that level, the City would be paying for a portion of the time during the school

year.) The District is not able to offer that level of funding.

The difference between what the City has requested (and what the District had previously contributed) and what the District has offered is approximately \$20-\$30,000. (The uncertainty is due in part to exactly which officer would serve in the position.)

To review, and using slightly rounded numbers:

- The all-in cost of the year-round position is roughly \$150,000.
- The SRO spends about 2/3 of the year at the school (at a cost of \$100,000).
- The District’s previous contribution of \$75,000—although intended to cover the full cost of the SRO position during the school year did not fully cover that cost.
- The District’s latest offer of \$50,000 is intended to and would cover one-half of the cost of the SRO position during the school year.
- The City’s request that the District cover one-half of the annual cost of the position would have been very similar to the previous amount of \$75,000, but under that scenario the City would still be covering paying about ¼ of the cost of the SRO position during the school year.<sup>1</sup>

**BACKGROUND – PUBLIC SAFETY REVENUES AND GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES**

Unfortunately, the share of the SRO cost that the District can provide is not the only question the City must grapple with. The question of continuing to fund the SRO position must be considered in the larger context of the overall fiscal condition of the City, particularly the General Fund (GF). To move to a cost structure that will allow the City to stop spending down fund balance requires revenue increases and/or cost reductions that together total a minimum of \$450,000 per year. The adopted budget took one significant step in that direction by eliminating one position in the Administration group, which on net will save the City approximately \$150,000 per budget year.

Two levers that are within the City’s control—and staff has recommended considering—to achieve the needed budget improvements are reducing the cost of the SRO and increasing Public Safety Surcharge revenues. Those two decisions impact each other.

Staff believe that there are at least three scenarios to consider, outlined in the table below.

Scenario	Savings vs adopted budget	Annual revenue increase to “balance” GF	Additional considerations
(1) Retain year-round position.	None.	\$300K	
(2) Fund the SRO for the school year only	<> \$50K less in expenditure (during non-school months) <> \$5-10K in additional over-time (OT) cost  <i>Net savings: ~\$45K</i>	\$255K	A. Not certain that City can find a qualified candidate willing to work 9 months. B. City loses benefit of position during summer.
(3) Eliminate the SRO position	<> \$50K less in revenue <> \$155K less in expenditures <> \$5-10K in additional OT cost  <i>Net savings: ~100K</i>	\$200K	A. Lose SRO. B. Lose back-up officer during school year. C. City loses benefit of position during vacations.

<sup>1</sup> A full accounting of the cost of the SRO position to City would include other direct costs that come with the position, such as equipment, training, etc. A rough estimate of those costs is \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year.

Regardless of which decision the City makes about the SRO, staff believe a significant increase to the Public Safety Surcharge (PSS) is necessary to improve the financial condition of the City. Under the above SRO scenarios, the additional revenue options include the following:

To generate \$300K (scenario 1):

- Add \$4.84 to the monthly residential PSS (New monthly PSS: \$10.50)  
+ \$200K in residential PSS revenue
- Shift non-residential PSS to trip-based charge  
+ \$100K in non-residential PSS revenue

To generate \$255K (scenario 2):

- Add \$3.84 to the monthly residential PSS (New monthly PSS: \$9.50)  
+ \$160K in residential PSS revenue
- Shift commercial PSS to trip-based charge  
+ \$95K in non-residential PSS revenue

To generate \$200K (scenario 3):

- Add \$3 to the monthly residential PSS (New monthly PSS: \$8.66)  
+ \$120K in residential PSS revenue
- Shift commercial PSS to trip-based charge  
+ \$80K in non-residential PSS revenue

(The revenue figures above assume a full year of revenue, which is accurate for future fiscal years, but does overstate the actual revenue to be generated in the next fiscal year due because the new fee rates are unlikely to be in place until the second quarter of the coming fiscal year.)

#### **ALTERNATIVES FOR DISCUSSION-SRO**

Both the City's Chief of Police and the School District need to make some decisions to prepare for the next school year. The City could:

- Commit to the SRO position for the coming year (scenario 1).
- Offer scenario 2—contingent on identifying a qualified officer who would accept such a position.
- Inform the District of the City's intent to not continue with the SRO program.

In all three of these alternatives, failing to take the suggested action to increase revenues (or equivalent revenue or cost-cutting measure) will result in greater spend down of General Fund fund balance.

#### **ALTERNATIVES FOR DISCUSSION-REVENUES**

Council, of course, may consider phasing in any PSS increase over multiple years. The most important goal is to bring revenues in line with expenditures, even if that does take place over more than one budget.

Of course, phasing delays (some of) the revenue increases, which will erode fund balances. One approach to a phase-in that would minimize the impact on the City's fiscal condition would be simultaneously implement a temporary reduction in the Transportation Utility Fee. In the short- and medium-term, the City needs to increase investment in pavement maintenance—and the recently adopted budget does exactly that. However, due to the reality that the City has not been aggressively pursuing street maintenance in recent years, the Street Fund has one of the strongest fund balances among all City funds: a budgeted ending fund balance for the coming year of \$1.26 million vs. operating expenditures of \$1.03 million. The Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) is currently \$3.93 per household, generating approximately \$156,000 in revenue. A temporary reduction of the TUF equivalent to one-half

of any increase in the PSS could be used to spread the net increase in total City surcharges across two or even three years.

### **PUBLIC SAFETY SURCHARGE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

As stated above, under any scenario, staff believe that we need to move forward with changes to the public safety surcharge as soon as feasible.

Staff will prepare a notice of the possible rate increases as an enclosure in the July utility bill—including examples of the commercial fee increases. The notice would identify an Open House & Special Meeting of Council to accept public testimony in July. If Council were prepared to introduce an ordinance increasing the surcharge at the first meeting in August and adopt it via a second reading on August 19, the ordinance would go into effect in September, and the increase could be included in the October utility bill.

These public education sessions likely need to include a greater emphasis on how widespread these type of budgetary challenges are in Oregon. For example:

- City of Phoenix has recently increased their equivalent of the Public Safety Surcharge, which was \$3 per month in 2025 to \$6 per month in January of 2026—with another increase to \$10 per month scheduled for January 2027. Phoenix also recently increased their parks fee from \$2 per month to \$6 per month, with planned increases to \$7 per month in 2027 and to \$8 per month in 2028. (That's a total of \$15 per month increases spread over two to three years.)
- City of Portland has adopted multiple revenue increases over the last few months, including:
  - An arts tax increase from \$3/month/person to \$4 per person.
  - A new \$12/month/household transportation utility fee.
  - These will go into effect around the same time as a new parks levy that will increase property taxes by about \$300 per year with a modest home (taxable assessed value of under \$225,000).
  - That totals to an equivalent of almost \$40/month.
- County Administrator Danny Jordan recently discussed similar dynamics that are challenging County funding for public safety and forcing the [closure of part of the County jail](#) on the [Bill Meyer show](#).

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Memo from Phoenix Talent Schools Superintendent Brent Barry



# PHOENIX-TALENT SCHOOLS

EXCELLENCE *for* EVERYONE

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Talent City Council Members and Phoenix-Talent School Board Members

**From:** Brent Barry, Superintendent

**Date:** June 9, 2026

**Subject:** Proposed Funding Structure for a School Resource Officer (SRO)

## Purpose

This memo outlines a proposed cost-sharing understanding between the City of Talent and the Phoenix-Talent School District for a School Resource Officer (SRO) during the 2026-27 school year.

## Proposed SRO Assignment

- The SRO would serve students and staff during the school year at Talent Elementary and Talent Middle School.
- Assignment would be based on:
  - **171 school days per year**
  - **8 hours per day**
- Estimated fully loaded cost (salary and benefits):
  - **\$75 per hour**
  - **\$102,600 annually**

## Cost-Sharing Proposal

- The City and School District would share the annual SRO cost equally.
- Annual contribution:
  - **City of Talent: \$51,300**
  - **Phoenix-Talent School District: \$51,300**

## Full-Time Officer Costs

- If the City chooses to maintain the officer as a full-time employee beyond the school assignment:
  - The District's contribution would remain **\$51,300**.
  - The City would be responsible for any additional costs unless otherwise agreed upon by both parties.

## After-School Events and Additional Hours

- For school events requiring SRO attendance:
  - City staff and district staff will outline agreed upon after-school events prior to the school year in order to adjust the time the SRO is present on campus. This is to reduce over-time hours for the SRO and still allow for coverage at important events.
  - In addition, If the District provides at least **two weeks' notice**, the Police Chief may adjust the officer's regular schedule to cover the event without additional cost.
  - If the district requests additional support and attendance and it does not fall within a time to adjust the schedule to eliminate over-time, the district would be responsible for the full cost of those extra hours unless another arrangement is approved by the District and the Chief of Police.

## Summary

This proposal:

- Establishes a clear 50/50 funding partnership.
- Defines responsibility for costs beyond the school-day assignment.
- Clarifies how overtime and after-school event coverage will be handled.
- Provides a transparent framework for supporting student and school safety through a School Resource Officer program.