

**Budget Committee
FY 2025-26 Budget
Comments Received
May 5, 2025**

The Portland Community College Foundation Board of Trustees writes:

May 3, 2025

Kim Morgan
PCC Foundation Board of Trustees
kmorgan1995@gmail.com

Dear Members of the Beaverton Budget Committee,

On behalf of the Portland Community College Foundation Board of Trustees, I am writing to express strong support for PCC's Future Connect Scholarship Program and to respectfully urge the Budget Committee to increase the City's investment in the program from \$35,000 to \$65,000 in the upcoming budget year.

I want to thank the City of Beaverton for its long-standing commitment to equity, youth opportunity, and inclusive community development, which is demonstrated in your 12-year partnership and support of Future Connect. The \$1.2 million you have invested in this program since 2013 has made a transformative difference for over 620 Beaverton students, many of whom are the first in their families to attend college. This support has helped create a pathway to college and career success for those who need it most. Future Connect is more than a scholarship, it is a proven model for student success that cultivates a sense of belonging, promotes educational equity, and builds long-term community resilience. In total, with support from cities like yours and philanthropic partners, Future Connect has served 4,368 students across the metro region.

An independent evaluation by Education Northwest affirms the program's impact:

- 11% increase in three-year college completion or transfer rates
- 0.6-point GPA improvement in the first year
- 12 additional credits earned in year one—an extra term of academic progress
- 91% first-to-second term retention rate

These are not just statistics, they are indicators of lives on track to a better future with a living wage and ability to contribute to their community. Importantly, 96% of the most recent cohort identified as low-income and 87% identified as students of color, underscoring the program's role in advancing Beaverton's racial equity and inclusion goals.

This spring, more than 133 Beaverton high school students have applied to Future Connect for the 2025-26 academic year. Your increased investment would help ensure these students receive the advising, scholarships, and summer bridge programming they need to make a successful transition to college.

We recognize the difficult budget decisions before you and deeply appreciate your continued support. Investing in Future Connect is a strategic use of City funds. It not only improves educational outcomes for individual students but also strengthens the social and economic fabric of Beaverton. Graduates go on to become local educators, healthcare workers, entrepreneurs, and civic leaders who give back to the community.

Thank you for your leadership and for championing programs that reflect Beaverton's values and priorities. We respectfully urge you to consider increasing the City's investment in Future Connect to \$65,000 this year.

With Gratitude,

Kim Morgan
President
PCC Foundation Board of Trustees

And Mayor Beaty Responds:

Dear Members of the Board,

Thank you for reaching out regarding Beaverton's FY 2025–26 budget and the city's past support of Future Connect.

As we enter our third consecutive year of navigating a structurally constrained budget, Council remains focused on maintaining stability and delivering essential city services. While Beaverton has long taken pride in investing in regional programs that support equity and opportunity—like Future Connect—our ability to fund a broad range of external initiatives has become increasingly limited.

Over the next two weeks, we will be evaluating all funding requests in the context of our adopted goals, core responsibilities, and long-term sustainability. These are difficult choices, and not a reflection of the value we place on our partnerships, but of the financial realities we must address head-on.

We appreciate the important work PCC and the Future Connect program continue to do for students across our region, and we thank you for your ongoing collaboration and service to our shared communities.

I look forward to continuing our conversations and finding ways to support shared priorities in the future—both fiscally and through the strong partnerships that define our region's success.

In partnership-
Mayor Lacey Beaty

Lacey Beaty (she/her/hers)

Mayor

City of Beaverton | PO Box 4755 | Beaverton OR 97076

503-726-8117 (cell) | 503-526-2345 (desk)

A Beaverton Community member writes:

I am writing to you with regards to the upcoming budget and most specifically the library.

Number one, I would like to ask if an addendum was ever sent in with regards to the Library budget? I ask this for reasons that may, on the surface, seem trivial, but the reality is that it is just another bit of obfuscation from the truth to benefit those who are in charge. XXX learned today that her position will be moved from Tech Services to Access in the library to essentially replace the person being laid off. We've also learned that they intend to call back that person into a new position they are creating using two part time positions. I will spare you my entire thoughts on this as I do not agree with how this is handled, but given the state of the contract language I am also not really capable of properly arguing against it as it stands now. I do, however, feel like that position should have been offered to the highest ranking LA2 and down the line until someone wanted it and then the recall is to the existing position, but again, contract language being what it is, here we are.

I digress, my main issue here is that nowhere in the budget does it show the moving of a position from Tech Services to Access. They go out of their way to explain the empty position due to retirement that is being removed and that work will be "redistributed" but not of an actual staffing change. It just makes me question what else they might be hiding, a series of thoughts I would rather not have about those in charge of services given directly to the people of the city. Again, this feels minor, but this change is supposedly to do with upcoming changes at the county level. The problem here is that, unless the levy is approved, those changes are not likely to occur. Also they claim to be cutting the funding for materials by \$100,000 and on the surface it shows this, but in the ACT AMT column on page 109 of the budget in the line marked "310 LIBRARY MATERIAL" the year to date shows only \$260,857 having been spent. If I am lead to believe that as of the publication of this document they had only spent around 60% of this year's allocated budget then they will certainly either: a) come in under the budget amount they announced for last year and the Tech Services department cannot function with one less person in that scenario or b) they rush to spend the rest of those funds allocated, in which case XXX will definitely be needed for the suddenly influx of material that will come in at the beginning of the fiscal year otherwise those materials are unlikely to get out to the public in a timely fashion.

As the city is allegedly taking an approach of community outreach being important, it seems to me having library materials out in a timely fashion should be a pretty key component for the library, you know...the place with the books that people come looking for. It's bad enough they made the terrible decision to withdraw so many of the books from the current collection that it looks like the library is "going out of business", but to also not have new books coming out in time will certainly lead to even less visitors to the library.

I would also like to propose another scenario that would benefit the budget and, if we are already making changes for the upcoming centralization effort at the county we might as well start at the simplest of changes, that we remove from the roster those members of staff that are already retired and receiving their pers payments while they sit in, now, redundant management positions. I've heard that there are possibly more people within the city doing this, but in this instance I am referring to XXX. There is enough management existing at the library to cover the positions that still remain in Tech Services and as those positions are sunsetting I see no reason why a position is remaining that is held by someone that is already retired. I understand that there are some rules that allow PERS retired individuals to work is a thing, but I also understand that double dipping into the coffers at a time of budget issues and being the head of a department that will cease to exist per the plans of the library director and WCCLS at large leads to a large amount of distrust amongst the workers and management. If you won't even remove a redundant management position from the

roles while you continue making cuts to materials and personnel it becomes increasingly difficult for someone like me, on the outside looking in, to trust the judgment of the leadership of Beaverton. Just some food for thought there as it is something that makes no sense to me right now.

I am also not a fan of the continued “kick the can” approach to leadership that this city manager has preferred. Last time around they claimed to have “closed the gap” on a \$7.7 million dollar deficit, and yet this year we sit with a, larger, \$10 million deficit. I have a hard time believing that, if they had “closed the gap” last year the deficit would be even larger this year. They make the argument that personnel costs are the problem, yet agreed to the contract negotiated during which time they already knew they were sitting on a deficit carried over from before. They refuse to acknowledge their role in this issue and continue to “kick the can” and you all let them. It’s time they stop using contingency funds to pretend they have done something with the general fund while forcing the other funds to actually cover the gaps on their end. The proposal this year echoes the last, we see contingency funds being used to cover the large hole that will lead to an even larger deficit next year. If this continues, at some point that will no longer be possible and the city will go bankrupt. I beg you to push for more tax revenue through other means like other cities have done and stop pushing the problem further down the road as that only makes it bigger and worse.

While I have a deep distrust of the city management, (I watched them skirt around questions in the last budget cycle and obfuscate the reality that was them hiding the issue behind the contingency fund) I believe in your power as councilmembers that is needed now more than ever to force a righting of the ship for the good of the people. It’s not enough to trust the city manager is doing everything possible while continuing to run larger and larger deficits.

Thank you for your time and I wish you luck in navigating these coming waters,
In the spirit of the earth,

And the Library Responds:

As the person stated, we adhere to the SEIU contract as we adjust staffing levels. What was just released was the proposed FY25/26 budget which details the library department funding and is available to all. Oregon Budget Law prevents us from being more specific before it is released. Additional staff outreach will be conducted soon. The Library Director met with all library staff in March and discussed openly and transparently how she is working on a transition plan for the centralization of collections. Specifically she noted the following:

- What will be the impact on staff who work in collections. Will their job change significantly?
Yes, position duties will change significantly for those who select and deselect materials.
- Will we still have Tech Services staff?
We will no longer have a Tech Services Department.
- Will any staff be laid off?
With current budget realities it is likely that staff at the library will be impacted, including layoffs.

The Library anticipates spending the majority of the amount for collections this year. Many invoices weren’t processed at the time the budget book was published. Staffing workload around this typical industry practice has been taken into account by Library leadership. Regardless of what we spend this FY, we’re cutting \$100k from materials in preparation for the centralization of collections. Regarding the comment about WCCLS centralization of collections and the levy approval—if the levy does not pass, many aspects of the Library will

need to be adjusted beyond the centralization of collections. It is still worth reducing collections proactively because if the levy does not pass, the Library will need to be looking at significant reductions in expenditures.

We use a method called CREW for managing materials. In the past there had been a lot of deferred maintenance on the collection. Now that the collection is being thoughtfully curated, we actually are seeing improvements in some turnover rates. Circulation of physical collections have been steadily decreasing over the years and COVID has pushed people toward digital materials. There is a misconception that the more books you have, the more circulation you will have.

Workbacks after retirement are common and in this instance, the continued employment of XXX saves the City money as it is less expensive. Overall the library faces significant budget challenges in the future and it will require large scale revenue or expenditure adjustments to make a difference.

If contingency funds are not used to cover the budget shortfall, then there would need to be additional staff reductions. Oregon's tax system, costs beyond our control and numerous other factors that are covered in the Budget Committee meeting result in continued financial challenges. We are pursuing other tax revenue through the WCCLS funding and governance project.
