

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
12:00 P.M.

* * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This is NOT the official record of the proceedings.

* * *

[Live captioner standing by]

>> Welcome to the February 25, 2026, work session.

For work sessions like this one where there is no opportunity for public comment, you can access the meeting by watching the live stream available on our website.

Or by calling into one of the numbers listed for this meeting on the web page.

Thank you for joining us.

I now call the 2026 work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

I'll turn to the City Manager to introduce our first topic.

>> Thank you, Council President.

The first topic is Renter Protections Review.

And the subject of today's work session is the report Council requested for the implementation and impacts of renter protections Phases 1 and 2, including a qualitative and quantitative analysis on renters market.

With that, I'll hand it over to Amy Cameron for a presentation.

>> Good afternoon, Mayor and Councilors.

I'm Amy Cameron.

Just getting my slides loaded here.

And I'm the Rental Housing Analyst with Community Development.

It's good to be back with you today for this rental protections Phase 1 and 2 work session.

In today's presentation, we'll start by grounding this conversation in the city's housing stability approach and how renter protections fits into the broader strategy.

Then we'll review key findings from the impact analysis and share some options for minor code fixes and potential next steps.

Renter protections, the topic of today's work session is one of three approaches.

The City of Eugene has implemented numerous policies and plans that emphasize housing as an urgent community need and that align with the strategic plan goal to stabilize the cost of housing.

Through the urban growth strategies process, the city is working on a long-term strategy to increase housing production from 900 to 1600 units annually with an emphasis on affordability and choice.

The city's efforts continue to keep people housed by preserving existing rental and ownership housing for low income residents.

Stabilizing the cost of housing is a long-term goal that will take time, while our community works together to address long-term housing challenges in Eugene, renter protections serve as strategies to address immediate and tangible needs.

Now we'll move on to look at the impact of Phase 1 and 2 renter protections on the housing market, renters, and landlords.

The impact analysis report in attachment "A" of your packet has two main sections.

First is the policy analysis conducted by EcoNorthwest using qualitative data.

Given the control group, the project team used a peer city comparison.

The study looked at three areas of rental housing market, eviction filings, rental housing supply, and consolidations of rentals.

EcoNorthwest does not have causal links between changes in the rental market.

Eco is at today's session to address questions about this part of the report as needed.

The second section of the report is the implementation analysis conducted by staff.

It highlights accomplishments and challenges of Phase 1 and 2 and provides opportunities to the rental housing program.

In the next four slides we'll look at findings from eco's analysis.

When Council was considering Phase 2, the topic of rental housing and supply costs came up frequently.

Here some key findings in the report.

EcoNorthwest compared Eugene's affordability to the peer cities and found relative to

incomes, Eugene's rental housing is more expensive than its peers and Eugene has a high rate of housing mismatch, meaning many residents are in housing that doesn't align with their affordability needs.

They also compared construction rates to peer cities to see if there was any indication of renter protections having impact on construction.

No clear trend emerged, in fact, Eugene's recent rental housing construction rates exceed those in the two years prior to the rental protections.

EcoNorthwest found there were some slight changes in shares of small-scale housing stock used as rentals.

Town and houses, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes helped steady between 2016 and 2023.

While the share of single-detached units used as rentals declined by 3% from 24% to 21%.

This decline started well before renter protections were adopted.

The single-detached units likely became homeownership units were redeveloped into rental housing or converted to another use such as short-term rentals.

The number of overall rental units registered with the city has steadily increased since

2019.

And numerous macro economic and land use factors effect construction rents, affordability, and sales or conversion of homeownership and rental housing, and as a result, EcoNorthwest was unable to establish a definitive causal relationship between renter protections policies and the supply and cost of housing.

There was a lot of interest in whether the renter protections would impact rates of evictions.

EcoNorthwest compared Eugene's eviction filing rates with 2026 and 2024 with peer cities and found similar trends.

Like most of the peer cities, eviction filings in Eugene have exceeded pre pandemic levels surging after pandemic era protections for renters ended.

Most Eugene filings are for nonpayment of rent, wage stagnation, and limited financial resources for renters.

Eviction filing rates and termination of tenancy are influenced by many factors including court procedures and settling outside of court.

As a result, EcoNorthwest was not able to establish a direct link between renter protections and eviction filing rates in Eugene.

Support provided by the rental housing program is vital for helping renters navigated resources, get eviction-related guidance, and understand their rights and responsibilities.

Among the top 5 reasons renters call this city supported hotline are for rent assistance, termination notices, and eviction and resource navigation.

EcoNorthwest compiled relocation science payment information reported by landlords to the city between August 23, 2023, when Phase 2 went into effect and October 31, 2025.

There were 84 payments.

Landlord-based reasons for terminations list in the lower right corner of the slide were the reason for most payments.

Followed by no cause terminations and declining to renew a fixed term lease of less than one year.

No payments were reported for rent increase at or above the state maximum which was 10% during this period.

While 84 households is a small percentage of nearly 40,000 rental households, we heard that it can mean the difference between securing new housing and experiencing homelessness for some renters.

And now we'll turn to Phase 1 and 2 implementation and highlight programmatic accomplishments.

In addition to successful implementation of the Phase 1 and 2 policies, staff have strengthened support for tenants and landlords through expanded services, education, and outreach.

Throughout the implementation process, staff communicated widely about code changes and available resources, contacting over 35,000 renters, 2,500 landlords, and over 3,000 interested parties.

Solutions and support services include the creation of the rental housing analyst position, enhanced collaboration with community-based organizations, fair housing training and support for renters, landlords, housing providers, and advocates.

Criminal records set aside clinics to help Eugene residents with conviction histories remove barriers to housing.

Trauma-informed hotline.

And a website provides an accessible centralized hub for rental housing information, a suite of new program materials, expanded Spanish content and resource center.

Based on community input, city provided solutions and support have had a positive impact on housing access and stability for some of the most vulnerable renters.

And now we'll turn to what we heard from community members through the survey and testimonials included in the report in attachment "A."

The city conducted a statistically valid survey of renters in fall, 2023, and landlords in 2024.

Based on renter responses in 2023, the \$10 screening fee cap provides tangible relief, especially those -- especially for those impacted by systemic barriers.

The survey found that people with conviction histories or rent subsidies or five times more likely to submitted applications for housing than someone without those circumstances.

Prior to the cap, 10 applications could cost upwards of \$500.

With the cap, that amount is limited to \$100.

What staff heard in the survey and throughout implementation was generally what Council heard.

Many landlords are concerned about how the regulations would impact their business, citing relocation as the most impactful regulation, followed by state regulations limiting termination of tenancy without cause and the state's extended notice period for nonpayment of rent.

As stated in the testimonials in the report in attachment "A," community organizations that serve interests impacted by systemic barriers, support the need for local rental protections to provide stability in a tight market, especially as federal and state rent assistance dwindles.

Moving on to some areas for potential minor code fixes.

Staff identified five areas of the Rental Housing Code that could be amended to clarify and align the code with prior Council direction.

Attachment "B" in your packet provides information for each item on the topic area.

Pump the revision, current code language, and the proposed revision.

If Council is interested in moving forward on one or more of the proposed minor code updates, a motion included in the AIS would direct city manager to prepare a draft ordinance and to schedule a public hearing.

Looking ahead, Phase 3 of the current roadmap, attachment "C" in your packet, includes Items 1 through 3 on this slide.

Items 1 and 2 were identified as supports for the lowest income renters, mitigating systemic barriers to access to rental housing in a competitive market.

Item 3 was a hot topic in 2021 during the federal moratorium.

Staff will come back with initial feasibility information on Phase 3 items later this year, including information on impact, funding, and a potential policy pact for items included in Phase 3, and Council will have an option to give further direction at that point.

We've heard Council's interest in discussing ten that.

Opportunity to purchase.

TOPA gives them the first right to purchase for those with financial means, or the tenant association could transfer the purchase rights to a selected party.

TOPA policies include timelines for providing notice of intent to sell, forming tenant associations and real estate transactions.

If Council is interested in discussing tenant opportunity to purchase, you can make a motion today or at a later date to direct the city manager to bring back information on TOPA.

And with that, I'll hand it over to you, Councilors, for discussion.

>> Leech: Thank you for that presentation.

I will open up the floor now for Council discussion.

Okay, Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: I guess somebody had to go first.

Thank you, staff, for this presentation.

And also thank you for taking time to meet.

I know you met with many of us individually, and I always find that very helpful when I'm able to take advantage of that with staff.

So thank you.

I'm wondering when you're having interactions with the community, I don't -- I mean, I could have missed this in the packet, but do you have a way of tracking and reporting out, like, interactions and outcomes when you're speaking with folks in the community?

Or is that part of the data that it's really hard for you to collect right now?

I know we were talking about that.

Could you talk about that a little bit?

>> Yes, Councilor Yeh, thanks for the question.

We do actually have a log where we keep track of all of the inquiries that come in.

And that is in -- there's some graphs in your packet about those inquiries, how many of them are landlord calls, how many of them are tenant calls.

We document what the topic is and what the staff action is.

So we have that information.

And we're doing that for all of -- anything that's related to the Rental Housing Code gets logged.

So renter protections go into that log as well.

>> Yeh: I would imagine sometimes you don't always know what the outcome is.

Is that probably correct?

>> Correct.

>> Yeh: Okay.

My other item I want to talk to you -- I know during our meeting we were talking about the third item on our Phase 3 list of topics that you're coming back.

And you were talking about how the things have kind of changed since we did those Phase 3 selections of the things on Phase 3.

I'm wondering if you could share some of what you shared with me about whether that is a high priority now or not.

Or maybe I was misunderstanding our conversation.

>> So the -- the third item in Phase 3 is a moratorium on no cause evictions.

That was a hot topic when those items were being discussed during the federal moratorium.

The state law limits no cause terminations to the first year of tenancy.

And city relocation assistance requires landlords to pay relocation assistance if they do a no cause termination.

We do know that the reported payments for relocation assistance were mostly landlord-based reasons and not no cause terminations.

It was nine -- it was about 10% of those relocation assistance payments were for no cause evictions.

>> Yeh: I guess what my question is, is do you think it is worth staff's time to spend extra resources in this area or are there other things that might be better for you to spend your time on?

Considering what has happened at the state and the data that you presented with us today.

>> I think that we would know more by doing the initial feasibility analysis.

And we could bring that information to you for your consideration.

>> Yeh: That's fair, okay.

Thanks.

I appreciate that.

You guys are the experts, I appreciate you sharing your opinion on this.

Since I'm first, I think I emailed and text you all I have a motion around TOPA, but I will wait and let people have their opportunity to talk.

I'll get in, Council President, at the end maybe.

Thanks.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Yeh.

Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Council President and thank you for the presentation, Amy.

I appreciate that.

Do we have any data on how many single occupancy detached rentals, you know, the old single-family homes that went off the rental -- long-term rental roles and were converted to either short-term rentals or sold?

Because I heard from a number of individuals that they did that with their rentals.

I'm just curious what the effect was after Phases 1 and 2.

>> Yeah, I'll let eco jump in here, because that was part of the analysis that eco did.

This -- the city's tracking doesn't know what happens to a rental once it comes off of our rolls.

And we don't have a great way of identifying the type of rental unit that is registered and leaving our registration.

>> Groves: So we don't know whether it's a detached single occupancy or if it's a multiunit occupancy?

>> We -- we have a good understanding based on the number of units that are registered with a property.

>> Groves: Okay.

>> We could get that information.

The eco analysis did show that there was a slight decrease in the share of single-detached that are used as rentals in Eugene over the period that was looked at from -- it was an eight-year period.

From -- eco, if you want to jump in and comment on that.

>> Sure.

Hi, everyone.

For the record, my name is Justin Sherrill.

Thank you for having me.

On this particular topic we've received questions also outside of this particular project,

and Amy is correct, what we do see when looking at the data is overall a reduction in the percent of single-family detach stock that is used as rental in Eugene.

We also see this in Oregon and in other metros across the U.S.

This is a national trend.

It's an Oregon trend.

It's a Eugene trend.

If I were to opine any further, the data would actually show that Eugene's reduction from about 24% of single-family detached stock as rental in I believe it was 2016 has been reduced to about 21%.

That reduction is slightly slower than what we see at the state level.

Which has gone from about 20% to 15%.

And Portland is even steeper than that.

So these are really just reflecting broader national trends, I would say.

It was a great time to sell your home between 2020 and 2024, perhaps, for a lot of different reasons.

And being able to disentangle as Amy said what became of that rental afterwards is very difficult, if not insurmountable data issue, I would say.

>> Groves: Thank you, I think that's helpful that we watch this over time too.

Because it's the trends I'm most interested in.

My next question is we were talking about -- Amy, you were talking about the number of rental units actually increasing but we've also had some very large multiunit rentals constructed during that period of time.

I'm curious, do we have any data that reflects changes from, you know, by the time you put a shovel in the ground, you're not going to stop your project.

So I guess what I'm trying to understand is what percentage of that growth was measured after construction began versus new construction of multiunit rentals after the protections went in?

You understand what I'm trying to get at there?

I'm not sure I worded it the best.

>> Yes, Councilor Groves.

I think if I understand your question you're asking when we looked at the permit, construction permit trends that are included in your report, how far back were those already started when renter protections began, is that --

>> Groves: Yes, what was underway at the time you measured versus -- because once something starts you're not going to get halfway through the project and discontinue it.

>> I think I'll kick that to eco team since they did that analysis.

>> Sure.

That's a great question.

The permit data that we're using to compare Eugene to its peer cities comes from HUD state of the city's data systems.

This is essentially associated with the census building permit survey that's conducted nationally.

As a result, what we don't have information on is duration of permitting of the permitting process to know exactly that that gap of time.

We only can see permit issuances by year.

So really I think what your question is is maybe getting at is that really narrow sliver of

permit activity perhaps in the last one to two years is being more of an indicator of the effect of these programs on the housing market.

>> Groves: Yes.

>> And I will say, you know, we did see a pretty large jump in permit activity in Eugene in the years immediately following 2020.

So 2021, I believe it was, and 2023 -- sorry, excuse me, '21, '22, and '24 as being significantly above kind of Eugene's usual annual permit rate.

Some of that could be delayed projects or longer-term projects that maybe got disrupted by COVID era disruptions to the permitting process that we see generally everywhere.

And so I would say this is probably still a question that we need to monitor as data comes in.

Unfortunately, the data from HUD is fairly slow going.

I did take a look at it, though, earlier today for 2025.

They have preliminary permit activity.

So they don't have the full year worth of permits for Eugene yet.

But if you were to annualize it, it would roughly look on track with what was occurring in Eugene in 2020 and 2023.

For rentals that would be maybe around 500-ish units total permitted.

>> Groves: I appreciate that.

I hope that we do keep monitoring that.

Again, I'm concerned about whether we're trending up or down.

I do think it's something when we make policy changes, it's important that we follow that so we know what we're doing, what effect it's having on a number of fronts.

Not just this, but at a time when we're desperately wanting to produce more places for people to live, I think we need to know what the effects are of the decisions we're making.

Thank you very much.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Groves.

Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Thanks.

Thanks for the presentation, very clear, good report too and thanks to eco for the work that you've done on this.

My takeaway from all this is that the program works as intended.

And it had a pretty big impact on evictions and assistance and protections and also habitability.

And so the renter protection program actually is a really good thing for renters, a majority of renters in the city.

And also the other takeaway that I took away was that the impacts from the program are pretty minimal and the fears that people were talking about when we were talking about this two years ago weren't realized on a large scale.

And as Justin said, other cities are seeing the same kind of transitions away from single family as rentals.

So that's a national and Oregon trend, so it's not attributable to the program, it's something that's occurring outside of this program.

One of the impacts, though, that was really important was the \$10 cap on fees.

One of the -- one of the -- one of the slides said that on average some folks had 10

rental applications at 50 bucks a rental application, that's 500 bucks.

But at \$10 it's only 100 bucks.

Your low income rental person, the difference between 500 bucks and 100 bucks is huge, especially on a cash flow basis.

I think that was an overall success as well.

On Slide 6, I had a question about that.

That's the evictions filing.

And there were several graphs like this one.

And comparing us to Corvallis and Tacoma, we were always at the top of this graph in terms of -- on evictions and other things like that.

And we just have more evictions.

I wonder if anybody knew why.

>> Yeah, Councilor Zelenka, that's a good question.

I can answer that.

So the graph on Slide 6, which is also in your packet on page -- I believe it's Page 23, and I can put it back up on the screen.

The eviction -- this is eviction filings only.

So this is the publicly available data that's through the court system.

And there are many factors that influence when landlords file evictions in court, including court procedures, settling outside of court and local regulations that might impact when and how a landlord can file an eviction.

I believe it's cheaper in Oregon to file an eviction in court than it is in Washington, for example.

Eviction filings have been -- the national eviction research center said Princeton's eviction lab says that filings can be used as a way to collect rent.

So it just really depends on the type of landlord, the court procedures, and also the cost of housing and the median incomes in a region or in a specific city.

>> Zelenka: Yeah, so Oregon and other places like Washington, Spokane, Tacoma.

That's interesting.

I'm all in favor of the minor fixes we should move forward with those.

Moving on to Phase 3 in the feasibility analysis makes sense to me.

Interested to hear Councilor Yeh's motion on TOPA, that makes sense to me too.

Anecdotally on rentals, especially in my part of the town, the student high rise apartments, those -- people keep saying how many can they build?

Well, what they're doing actually when we saw a map of where students live, they're scattered all over the city.

And what that supply is actually meeting is demand for proximity to the campus.

That's why they're being built.

They do have an anecdotal benefit of I noticed a lot of rentals around increased how good they were because they were competing against these new shiny things, so that actually was an ancillary benefit.

>> Leech: Councilor, I can open it up for second round here in a moment.

>> Zelenka: Thanks.

>> Leech: Thank you.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Chair.

Amy, remind me, we passed Phase 2, I believe it was in August.

Was it '24 or was it '23?

It was '24, wasn't it?

>> '23.

>> Clark: Okay.

And the eviction measurements that you mentioned in that slide, did I see that correctly that it was measured from 16 to 23?

From 2016 to 2023?

>> Correct, mm-hmm.

>> Clark: So we didn't actually measure after we passed the Phase 2 protections, is that correct?

>> The graph that I showed on Slide 6 measured from 2016 to 2024.

>> Clark: I thought it said '23 on the slide.

I apologize.

>> Yes.

>> Clark: Uh.

Okay.

I don't want to waste everybody's time drilling down on the data and its collection method.

But I will say that working with realtors every day, there's a realtor who is a friend of mine.

He'll remain unnamed so he isn't brought into this argument.

But I will say Councilor Keating works with his wife and may know who I mean.

Who told me the story of the 16 families he had to help evict based on us passing Phase 2.

And for really no other reason but that the -- the owner of all 16 of those rentals decided that they could no longer afford the cost of the regulations that we were putting on them.

So I suspect that if we have a public hearing, he'll probably come and tell us about that, at least I hope so.

So I'm -- I'm -- I'm willing to look at us doing tweaks and additions and fixes to what we've already done, I suppose.

I'm not certain of the utility of Phase 3 at this moment.

But I will say with regard to the potential for a motion on TOPA, I'm entirely in favor at this moment based on what I know of the idea of people being able to purchase their -- their -- wherever they rent, whether it's the whole building in association with others or, you know, transferring those rights.

I will say in fairness that I want to learn more than I know right now.

So that I can make the best possible decision.

But from what I know at the moment, I would say it sounds like a pretty good idea because I'm in favor of anything we can do to help more people own the place they live.

So thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Clark.

Councilor Keating for first round.

>> Keating: Thank you, Council President.

I'll be brief.

I want to express my deep appreciation for the presentation and for the conversation.

I -- I look forward to the TOPA conversation as well, so I'm anxious and eager to hear what Councilor Yeh is floating.

I have a question for legal counsel.

As the only current renter on Council who would like to someday purchase the home they live, would I have to declare potential conflict of interest before casting a vote on TOPA?

>> To bring back information about TOPA, no.

Because it doesn't have an actual benefit or detriment to you.

Probably -- I wouldn't even think would rise -- just again, if the request as I understand the motion would be simply to just bring back information, I don't have a conflict of

interest concern.

Depending on the terms of the TOPA and all that, potentially as we lead into it you may be conflicted out.

>> Keating: Okay.

Thank you.

In the interest of time, I'll yield the rest of my time and look forward to Councilor Yeh's motion.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Keating.

I am going to insert myself here and then give Councilor Yeh a second round.

And just want to express my gratitude as well for this presentation and for kind of a thorough review of Phases 1 and 2.

I think it's really clear that the rental market is very complex and there's a lot of different market factors that come into play when we are looking at this data and parsing it out sometimes can be difficult.

And what I've heard as well from some of my colleagues is a desire for more data and more knowledge of how we can understand through time these trends or what's

happening kind of after the fact.

And I heard Justin say that it might be insurmountable to actually track some of these things that we are interested in.

But do you know of any tracking tools or anything that -- you know, strategies that we could implement that would give us a better framing of this information as well as to better distinguish between kind of the bigger picture trends and our own policy?

>> Great question.

You know, these are -- this is a pretty novel process, so we're all kind of exploring it together.

I will say that maintaining the rental registry is really going to be just the most essential thing you can do.

This is -- anywhere we go that we encounter rental registry in any market we go in is an invaluable tool.

I will also say from this specific experience, I think that the question around mom and pop landlords, the small, single-family, detached landlords, it's always a really difficult question to answer with the data without essentially violating people's privacy.

We rely on assessor data typically for insight into this particular question.

And maintaining historical records of assessor data, ownership information about properties relative to the site information is typically how we establish some sort of rental use of the property.

That can only ever answer the question so much, specifically with regards to larger apartment complexes, establishing any sort of trend about multiunit owners in large kind of investment vehicles.

These types of landlords typically kind of they will establish an LLC for the ownership of each individual property.

So attempting to tie those together somehow is usually kind of -- you'll just run around in circles.

But maintaining it is better than not maintaining it.

So having access to a running historical assessor record will be something that we would recommend going forward as well as that rental registry in particular.

>> Leech: Thank you so much.

I see Madelyn has raised hand as well.

>> Yeah, my name's Madelyn Miller, I work at EcoNorthwest and I was project manager

on this with Justin.

The only thing I would add is if you're considering additional policies that would require analysis -- well, that you would want to evaluate the analysis after the policy's been in effect, one of the barriers we ran into was that we didn't have data before the policies went into effect that we're tracking out comes that the policies we're trying to change.

So if you did have a policy in mind, you could consider requiring data before the -- like one or two years before the actual policy goes into effect or takes effect.

That would give us run room to really do what's called a difference in difference analysis and look at the trend line on some sort of outcome.

See when the policy was implemented and then be able to study it afterwards.

So that's the only thing I would add.

>> Leech: Thank you so much.

Well, I am supportive of moving forward with the minor code fixes to the public hearing and definitely supportive of learning more about TOPA.

I think maybe Amy, could you remind us of the timeline for Phase 3 or projected timeline?

And then I guess whether it makes the most sense to include TOPA in Phase 3 or if it actually makes more sense to move it forward on its own.

>> Yeah, Councilor Leech, thanks for asking.

Staff have planned to come back with initial feasibility information on Phase 3 items later this year.

So that would include that information on impact funding and potential policy path.

I think I'll kick it to Will to answer the second half of your question, if it makes sense to put it in Phase 3 or separately.

>> Hello, Council, I'm the community development director.

I think what we would do if you -- if you'd direct the city manager to bring back more information on TOPA, we would look at it kind of with it but probably not put it into the roadmap that we've got.

And involve it as part of Phase 3.

It is going to be mostly the same staff, so we're going to -- that's Amy who you're looking at.

She's our lead on all of these things.

And so we will, you know, if the direction is to bring that back, we will put that into the work that she has -- can do and then evaluate the capacity.

But we would just ultimately bring back all of the information that you requested.

More information on Phase 3 and more information on TOPA.

>> Leech: Excellent.

Thank you so much, Will.

I would be supportive of moving forward with TOPA if we can do it more quickly than incorporating it into Phase 3, I'm very much supportive of that.

So I appreciate all of the work that you all do for us.

And I'm looking forward to the next steps.

I see Councilor Kashinsky has raised hand for first round and then we will go into second round.

>> Kashinsky: Sorry, this could probably also go regarding motions, but just for point of clarity when we say incorporate into Phase 3 or not, and prioritizing like with staff's time and how staff are able to do that time, same would be separate that would be

something that would come back around the same time or would we be saying we finish Phase 3 and then move on to TOPA?

Like what would be the order in there?

>> I think the -- probably our starting point, absent some specific Council direction, we would start the two of them together and plan on bringing them back around the same time.

If there's something specific about the work, the nature of the work that changes that, we would follow the -- kind of the most efficient path.

And if Council was specific about one -- about kind of the prioritization and the timing, then that's, of course, Council's prerogative to add that in the motion.

>> Kashinsky: Okay.

Yeah, I don't want to, like, get too into the weeds, but just then it would obviously be all of Council.

But like my desire with this would not be to see, okay, we spend a year or two years finishing up Phase 3 and then we start working on TOPA.

So it sounds like that's not really what it would look like.

So thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor.

I see city manager hand raised.

>> Thank you, Council President.

This may be a little redundant, but I just kind of wanted to add on to what Will said.

If there is a desire by Council to order that work because it is the same staff doing it, it would be helpful for us to know.

>> Leech: Great.

Thank you.

I will start our second round.

Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: You can let other people ask questions and I'll do the motion at the end.

That might be better, if that's okay with you.

>> Leech: Sure.

Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Council President.

I support separating TOPA from the Phase 3 rental protections.

And actually I think it's one of our highest priorities.

I think it's an important thing to move forward on.

So I'll put that forth.

Second, I was going to ask some questions along the same lines as Council President did regarding some of the data.

But this is not my area of expertise so I would like to float out to Amy and our friends from EcoNorthwest, are there any questions you wish we had asked or things you want us to know about this process?

I always like to turn to the people who have the experience working in the -- in the area and listen to them.

I think it's -- and we -- we can make decisions, of course, and we have to make

decisions.

But I -- I think sometimes we try to exercise expertise that we don't have.

So I would appreciate anything you have that you think we should have asked.

>> Councilor Groves, that's a great question.

I'm not sure that I'm completely prepared, but I think one of the things around -- I think around the evictions trends that you were looking at, I think one of the things that's important to know also that didn't get included in that report is what are the outcomes of those eviction court cases.

And how some of the state regulation impacts the outcomes and how tenant representation versus landlord representation impacts those outcomes.

It's important to know that only 25% of those filings results in a judgment of eviction, although a court filing against you does impact your future stability.

But the rest are really dismissed out of court.

I -- I'd like to think more on other questions that you could have asked and perhaps get back to you on that.

>> Groves: That would be great, and I hope you would share that with all of us.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Groves: Thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Groves.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Chair.

I have asked our city attorney about this before in a very passive and cursory sort of way, but as long as we're bringing up TOPA, I would be interested in learning more, because I don't have all the complete answers about whether this is a good idea or not.

But interested in the idea, although there's national discussion about it, on a local basis, if we -- if it was a worthwhile question to pursue, whether we ban corporate ownership of single-family homes in Eugene.

And whether or not that's a good idea.

And what we're legally able to do and not do.

But as a part of a conversation about folks being able to buy their rentals or not or rentals are being converted, I would like to add that wrinkle to the mix of the

conversation somehow.

So if city's attorney could give me more clear information as we move forward, that would be awesome.

Thank you.

>> And also I'll just add, it's -- we can provide that in more formal sense.

But there is some state legislation around this as well that's being tracked that would actually be informative on that exact issue.

I would like to get that information from Ethan to help inform this discussion.

Because I did see something come up with the state on this topic.

>> Leech: Great.

Thank you.

Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Thank you, Council President.

So I'm just going to go ahead and make my motion.

Well, actually I guess I should ask city manager first, so my sense of my colleagues is that they are also interested in this being -- not coming well after the renter protections for Phase 3.

That was kind of my concern when I was going to throw it in is because I don't want it coming later.

Earlier is fine.

Is that something I can build into the motion or do you feel like you have everything you need and we can just say bring us back and you will -- you have enough for the timeline?

>> I think it feels like we have general support in this conversation about bringing it forward, which could mean prioritizing it above some Phase 3 work, our team would have to work on that.

Then I think that's fine if the motion passes to move forward with TOPA.

>> Yeh: Okay, excellent.

>> And one option for that, Councilor Yeh, to not actually have the motion included in the Phase 3.

>> Yeh: I was going to take that out because it seemed like other -- my colleagues did not agree with that part, and I can take some feedback.

So I crafted it up and I was just going to leave no specific time.

>> Or you could say prioritize before Phase 3 work, actually, if you wanted to make that even more --

>> Yeh: You think I should say that.

I'm going to write it down so I don't mess up.

Okay.

So I'm going to go ahead and do it, we'll see if I do this right, counselor.

Move to direct the city manager to include information and a possible implementation plan for a TOPA tenant opportunity to purchase policy, prioritized over renter protections Phase 3.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> Leech: Did we get who the second was?

And is there any further discussion from Council?

I see Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Council President.

The motion says prioritized over, could that be interpreted as in that this priority supersedes the Phase 3 or is it -- is it understanding -- is city staff understanding that as I interpret it, it's before Phase 3?

>> Before.

>> Keating: Okay.

That doesn't need to be clarified by the motion maker, that's just understood?

>> It doesn't replace.

If the word replace had been in there, I think that would have caused confusion.

The work will happen first.

Since there's one individual doing it, it can't all happen at the same time.

>> Keating: Great.

Thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you.

I will now take the vote for this motion.

All in favor.

[Raising hands].

I see seven hands.

And that means the motion passes with a vote 7-0.

Thank you so much for that motion, Councilor Yeh.

And now I will turn to the Council Vice President to put another motion forward.

>> Yeh: I move to direct the city manager to schedule a public hearing on ordinance implementing the minor code fixes in attachment "B."

>> Zelenka: Second.

>> Leech: Any further discussion?

Seeing none, I will now take a vote for this motion.

Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Council President.

I'm going to vote yes to move this on to a public hearing.

I'm still kind of undecided on this piece, and I'll wait to see what we hear back from the public in further discussion.

Thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: What he said.

>> Leech: Great, thank you.

I will now take a vote for this motion.

All in favor.

[Raising hands].

I see seven hands, that means the motion passes with a vote of 7-0.

And that concludes our first agenda item.

And I will now turn to the city manager to introduce our second topic.

>> Thank you, Council President.

So our second work session is on right of way utility licensing ordinance and utility permitting.

It's an informational work session.

It's being provided in response to a work session poll from Councilors Yeh and Lee from August of 2025 about establishing a right of way utility licensing ordinance to expedite utility permitting.

Jack Blackham will be here from public works to present and he'll go over the tools that we have now and how it might look different if we did have a right of way ordinance.

So I'll pass off to Jack.

>> Thank you, Matt.

I will share my screen now.

Can everybody see that okay?

Okay.

Thanks.

Thank you again, city manager.

Good afternoon, Council, my name is Jack Blackham.

I'm the intern development services manager of public works engineering, and I'll be speaking to you today about right of way utility licensing ordinances.

In this presentation, I will provide a high-level overview of the multiple tools we use to manage the short and long-term use of our right of way by utilities.

I will discuss what franchise agreements and licensing ordinances are.

Review basic fee compensation structures from Eugene and other Oregon cities who have adopted licensing ordinances.

Then have time for discussion and to field any questions.

So the city has -- currently has two governance structures for our utility's long-term use of the public's right of way.

The city has had a right of way licensing ordinance specifically for telecommunication United States, except cable since 1997.

I will talk more about that specific ordinance later in the presentation.

And the nearly all non-telecommunication utilities in the city operate underneath another government structure called a franchise agreement.

As the diagram shows, a large portion of the infrastructure being discussed is located subsurface.

It's the city's job to manage the very limited space within the right of way for all users with many different considerations in place.

This is a super complex system, much of which is not seen at the ground level.

The city's utility permitting program within the public works maintenance division provides the ability for utility providers short-term use and/or access of the public right of way.

The city's permitting program and processes establish standards for construction methods, traffic control, surface restoration and inspection while helping minimize disruptions to the public and preserving the long-term condition of the public right of way in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Eugene code and the city's 2022 utility construction and use of the right of way manual.

Individual utility permits are required for the relocation of existing utility facilities, extensions, expansions, or upgrades.

As well as work that involves traffic lane or sidewalk closures or those with impact to street trees.

The average time is ten days, includes review of engineering plans, traffic control and TPAR plans.

It is for installation of service connections, repairs, and general maintenance activities.

These permits do not require city plan review or approval, provided the city receives the notice prior to the work.

This provides an expedited utility option to utility providers for a franchise agreement or a telecommunication licensing ordinance.

Franchising agreements.

These operate as a contract between the city and utility provider.

This could loosely be analogous to a lease being signed for an apartment unit, a lease contains specific terms and conditions, perhaps negotiations for use of a parking spot or use of amenities for the length of the lease.

Franchise agreements are for a specified length of time and are individually negotiated by the city with each provider.

These negotiations can and do take a great deal of staff time.

The agreement contains the terms and conditions for utility to provide their service through our right of way.

Specific contract terms such as service obligations and compensation can differ across each agreement and provider.

Similar to the apartment lease analogy, the franchise agreement has little to no room for change once executed until it either expires or there is mutual agreement between the parties.

All of the city's franchise agreements do contain the requirement for utility providers to obtain permits through the city's utility permitting program for their short-term use of and work within the right of way.

Entering a franchise agreement does provide those utility providers with the ability to utilize the blanket permit -- utility permit option for expedited routine work.

An alternative local regulatory framework for utility providers long-term use of the right of way is a potential right of way licensing ordinance for non-telecommunication utilities.

This governance structure provides utility providers to apply for and obtain a license from the jurisdiction while the franchise agreement may be closer to a leased unit in an apartment, the licensing ordinance could be more akin to the building codes.

Any entity building a structure is required to comply with the building codes in had place at the time of their project.

However, building codes do change.

State regulations may evolve.

And the city and contractor alike must adapt to those changes.

In this sense, a future non-telecommunication licensing ordinance could dictate the Council-adopted terms under which utility providers could use the city right of way for long-term placement and operation of their utility facilities.

Licensing ordinances establish uniform and consistent rules, responsibilities, and fee

structures for all utilities obtaining a license.

The city currently has a licensing ordinance specific to telecommunication utility providers, except cable.

So in 1997, the city's telecommunication licensing ordinance and the telecommunication program were adopted to enforce policies related to the long-term use of the city's right of way, compensation, and the treatment of competing telecommunication providers.

The decision to adopt the ordinance was rooted in both state and federal law which grants the city authority to control the use of public rights of way and license operators of telecommunication systems the ability to utilize the rights of way.

The compensation serves to reimburse the city for use of streets, public enterprises, increased complexity on public works projects due to the presence of telecommunications facilities, and public inconvenience from street occupation by construction crews and equipment.

The ordinance seeking long-term use of the right of way apply for and obtain a license.

This aids the city in permitting, compliance, and regulatory enforcement.

Looking at them together, a new right of way licensing ordinance likely could establish a more consistent regulatory framework and fee structure for non-telecommunication utilities operating in the right of way rather than using individual franchise agreements.

There may also be circumstances in which the city may wish to have different terms and conditions for different providers and/or utility services.

In which case a franchise agreement could provide more flexibility.

Other Oregon cities have included stipulations in their licensing ordinances to allow themselves the opportunity to still enter new franchise agreements if it is in the public interest to do so.

A licensing ordinance could create uniform rules and expectations across non-telecommunications providers and reduce the staff time required to negotiate and manage multiple individual franchise agreements.

Additionally, as federal or state regulations change, the city could amend the ordinance adopting the needed regulations rather than negotiating new franchise agreements and waiting until current agreements expire to implement the new regulations.

Both governance structures only impact staff time for consideration of utilities long-term use of the right of way.

It wouldn't necessarily affect short-term use or permitting requirements and timelines.

Under a non-telecommunications licensing ordinance, providers would still need to obtain permits for the short-term use of the right of way from the city's utility permitting

program.

A new right of way licensing ordinance could be implemented with no immediate impact to non-telecommunication utility providers that have current franchise agreements until their existing franchise agreement expires.

At present, only two non-telecommunication utility providers are operating without franchise agreements.

And then considering fees and revenue.

In the City of Eugene, the telecommunication licensing ordinance includes a 2% fee for provider registration and a 7% license fee.

Both of these are based on gross revenue generated by the utility in the city.

Currently the 2% revenue supports an equipment replacement fund while the 7% revenue is allocated to the general fund.

Looking at a sampling of other Oregon cities with licensing ordinances, we can see the fees collected are in the 3.5 to 10% range, again, this is based on the gross revenue generated by utility facilities that serve customers within those respective city limits.

It does appear that the most common way to collect fees is on an annual basis while the city does collect our fees quarterly from the telecommunication providers.

These -- the four Oregon cities I'm showing here did initially adopt the fees by Council resolution, which were separate from but connected to their respective right of way licensing ordinances.

Subsequent updates to those fees may also vary based on ordinance delegation.

A final item of note that is not listed here and I didn't discuss during the presentation are pass-through facilities.

These facilities don't serve customers, nor do they generate gross revenue within the city, but they still do use our right of way for their facilities.

These facilities are charged based on the total linear length of infrastructure with some cities electing to charge minimum annual fees for tiers of lineal length.

In summary, a potential non-telecommunication right of way licensing ordinance could provide benefits to the City of Eugene's right of way governance through a reduction in staff burden on negotiations and management of multiple franchise agreements.

More consistent regulation, oversight and compensation to the city.

And allow for the city to have more flexible response to changing federal and state regulatory policies.

However, right of way licensing ordinance that eliminates franchise agreements for all utility providers could also reduce the city's flexibility to utility provider needs based on what their customers and services may require.

Staff would need to conduct further research and analysis in the matters such as the various utility services, providers and operators within the city, and regulatory and compensation terms to determine who a right of way licensing ordinance could and to what degree improve the city's governance of the public right of way for long-term use by utilities.

Additional research and analysis would require a significant investment of staff time to determine the decision points and associated recommendations for City Council to consider with a right of way licensing ordinance before actually drafting an ordinance.

This includes but would not be limited to the benefits and costs of different fee structures, whether the right of way licensing ordinance applies to specific utility services, providers, and/or operators, and how the right of way licensing ordinance could influence different implementation and enforcement processes.

And that concludes the presentation.

I will note the other staff we have available to help answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you so much for that presentation.

I will now open up for Council discussion.

And I see Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Chair.

Jack, thanks for the presentation.

Nice job.

First question, would -- would a typical system, if put in place, have staff-level approval of a license or would that require Council approval for a license being granted?

>> Thank you for that question.

I think that would depend on the ordinance and what's in the ordinance.

But I believe that licenses in most Oregon cities are to the staff level.

For the application and obtaining the license.

>> Clark: Thank you.

If such an ordinance were to be proposed that it was a Council decision, could a license be revoked or declined for arbitrary reasons?

>> That's another good question, Councilor.

I think again that would be specific to the ordinance once drafted.

We can bring that information back to you if directed to do so.

>> I'll interject here.

>> Thanks, Katherine.

>> Never arbitrary.

The ordinance can either do one of two things.

It could actually set forth what the basis for approval or denial, you could put that in the ordinance itself or you could delegate that authority to be done through administrative process.

Either way, there would be provisions upon which something could be -- would be denied or approved or, you know, modified or any of those things.

So it wouldn't just be a black hole.

And that's very consistent with our other licensing and administrative processes that we have around that.

>> Clark: Would -- obviously there would be overriding requirements from things like PUC and their statewide mandates on such a thing.

Could you talk a little bit more, Katherine or Jack, about the requirements and the interaction with PUC's regulation and how a licensing fee would interact?

>> This is entirely regulation of our right of way.

Which we have an absolute home rule authority to do.

So there would be none.

This is our -- this is our authority, the statute makes clear it's our authority.

We can regulate use of our right of way, and that's what we would be doing through this.

>> Clark: And now I'm going to ask a question that sounds evil but I don't mean it that way, I'm just asking the question.

Could someone, if they had such an intent, not that I suggest anybody does, but could someone use a right of way authority to deny a utility provider from operating within the

city?

In other words, if somebody wanted to cancel people's ability to get natural gas, could they do it this way?

>> Well, the notion of issuing something has some conditions associated with it.

I mean, that is the whole purpose is to create a structure in which our right of way can be used.

So whatever -- whatever that looks like.

But you know, we have -- we have the provision of natural gas right now, so I'm not -- I'm not entirely clear.

But a licensing would have mechanisms associated with it, a grant or denial, or there wouldn't actually be a purpose for a licensing requirement.

So by its nature it could be granted or denied.

>> Clark: Thank you very much.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Clark.

Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Yes.

Excuse me.

Just a couple of quick questions.

Thank you for the presentation and the work that you've done on this so far.

Can you give me an example of what one of these pass-through utilities would be?

>> Yeah, thanks for that question, Councilor.

That would be a utility that -- something like kinder Morgan or Williams where they don't have service connections to specific customers within the city, but they're large-scale facilities that utilize our rights of way for the location of those facilities.

So whereby, another utility may generate fees because they have specific service connection to locations.

Pass-through facilities do not.

>> Kashinsky: Do we have anything now where pass-through facilities are -- like how are they paying their fees if -- do we have franchise agreements with them?

Are they -- or are they just kind of using the right of way?

>> Yeah, there are franchise agreements and they pay for the lineal length.

And I see the public works director has her hand up.

Go ahead, Lacey.

>> Thank you for the question.

We have a couple of examples.

We have a railroad that has just a couple crossings in our right of way.

They pay by lineal foot.

We also have a franchise agreement with NCI communications, they don't provide service within Eugene, but they need to use our right of way in order to extend their cabling through.

So they pay by lineal foot as well.

>> Kashinsky: Okay.

And that's all through franchise agreements, it sounds like.

>> Correct.

>> Kashinsky: When -- when did our last franchise agreement with northwest central end?

Can you remind me?

I tried to -- I may have missed it in the packet, but...

>> I didn't include that.

Can I -- I think I'll defer to the city attorney's office.

Do you have information on when that franchise agreement ended?

>> In 2021 was the last time that it was extended.

I don't have that specific information.

>> Kashinsky: Okay.

It's been about five years, it sounds like, give or take.

Okay.

>> I don't think it's been that long.

You did extend it back in 2021 one last time.

But you know, I'll just say generally I know we've got -- I'm sensing some of the questions are fairly specific to northwest natural gas, and that's not what we prepared for with this -- with this work session because the work session was about a permitting for right of way.

So if we're going to -- if we're going to want to get into some of those specific questions, we certainly can get those to you.

We're not going to be prepared do that today because that's not what -- what the work session poll was about and what we're all prepared to talk with you about today.

>> Kashinsky: Yeah, I mostly just because they seemed to be the sort of one that we don't have a franchise agreement with, and so that was where that question was come from.

When talking about the blanket permits, I think I heard, and correct me if I'm wrong, that a franchise -- a right of way ordinance would not necessarily include the ability to could blanket permits.

Could it or is that one of those things where it's like, oh, depends on how we write it?

>> Thanks for that question.

Yeah, sorry if I wasn't clear on that.

Having a franchise -- a utility having a franchise agreement or being licensed provides the ability to utilize the blanket permit.

>> Kashinsky: Okay.

>> Either one of those governance structures.

Again, our licensing ordinance right now is only for telecommunication providers.

But having that governance structure and having a license does provide the ability to utilize that.

>> Kashinsky: Okay, sorry, I must have misheard.

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Kashinsky: Those are my questions.

Thank you so much again for the presentation.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Kashinsky.

I also want to -- I have a few questions and then I do have a motion that essentially just brings back more information.

So I guess my thoughts, and I requested this work session so I do want to state clearly that it wasn't my intention to create some, like, secret way to deny natural gas, okay.

I have been seeing other cities in our AIS, thank you for that chart of other cities, it seemed like we have this opportunity to streamline some of our systems, make it easier and make our city more efficient in some of these permitting areas.

And have some mechanisms for controlling even like the funding that comes in through that and some of the things that we would like to see.

So kind of with that, can -- Katherine, it sounded like we are able to include things like labor standards or climate resilience standards in that right of way space if we went forward with a licensing ordinance.

>> Potentially.

I mean, it really -- I mean, it all matters, the specifics of all of that.

I mean, it's certainly -- it would -- if we were talking issuing a license, I'll just use the phrase clear and objective.

I mean, it has to be, you know, objective, achievable.

So I mean when we start talking about more kind of abstract things, I think we -- it really is going to matter what specifically as a condition of pool you're speaking to.

>> Leech: I always think about liability.

I have a lot of constituents that write in about different pieces when we're doing stormwater and X, Y, Z.

What enforcement tools would be included if there was a failure to meet standards or if there was damage to city assets?

>> Thanks for that question.

Is that regarding -- I do want to make this distinction that when we talk about the permitting, just to be very clear, we're talking about the short-term use and access.

On a licensing ordinance and franchise agreement, that's for the long-term placement, right.

So was your question more with the permitting, if something is damaged in the course

of short-term work, then we would have enforcement procedures through our permitting program.

If there was -- depending on the situation at hand, and depending on the licensing ordinance for non-telecommunication facilities if we do go that route, there may also be enforcement policies in place with that ordinance to that individual license holder at the time.

>> Leech: Great.

Thank you for that.

>> Councilor.

>> Leech: Yeah.

>> May I just add a little bit.

I'm one of the assistant city attorneys.

Just to answer your question, if our franchise agreements, we have indemnification provisions as well as insurance requirements.

We also have that in our telecom licensing requirements as well.

So regardless of which mechanism, we would build in those same types of requirements for having insurance and agreeing to provide indemnification to the city for those types of damages that you're asking about.

>> Leech: Great.

I appreciate that answer.

And so if there's no other comments or questions at this point, I will make my motion.

And then there can be more discussion after that.

So I move to direct the city manager to return for an additional work session providing analysis of utility services, providers, and operators within the city and of regulatory and compensatory considerations to assist the City Council in determining whether to move forward with a new right of way ordinance.

>> Kashinsky: Second.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Kashinsky.

Is there any other discussion on that?

Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Yeah, I just had a timeline question, because it is my understanding, Jack, what you were explaining, there's actually a number of things that need digging into before we'd be in a position to even write -- to even start to write this.

So I'm wondering what your timeline would be to bring this back.

Realistic timeline.

>> Yeah, thanks for that comment and question, Councilor.

We would -- a lot of things happening right now.

Probably four months at least.

There's a lot of considerations and definitely to bring, like I mentioned, the decision points and recommendations to you to provide us with the clarity and direction.

So probably four months I think is what we planned out.

>> I think just to follow up on that, Councilor Yeh, putting four months out, it is more likely to come back after the break than before.

>> Yeah, thank you, city manager, that's a good clarification.

>> Yeh: Great.

I appreciate the -- I know one of the goals in this is to help staff be able to use their time better.

So the longer this stretches, the more time you're spending on things that you could be spending on something else.

But I want to make sure -- obviously we need all the information we need.

So thank you so much.

>> Leech: Thank you.

If there's no other discussion, I will take a vote for this motion.

All in favor.

[Raising hands].

That's 7.

So this motion passes with a vote of 7-0.

And Councilor Clark, did you have comments?

>> Clark: I had an item, I'm sorry, I wanted to add a note to the previous discussion, if this is appropriate to do it this second.

>> Leech: Sure.

>> Clark: Thank you.

I just wanted to ask a favor of the city attorney to add one piece of information for at least if nothing else, for my further clarification and make amendments to what comes back to us with the -- with the potential motion -- or I mean for the public hearing.

With the potential fixes on the previous subject.

In my ward and I suspect in several other wards, there are places where the rental code doesn't protect people that it should.

In my opinion.

And I'd like to add to that.

Those places are places where people own their home, but they rent the dirt underneath it.

In manufactured home parks is the colloquial way to say it.

There's one specifically in my ward where the -- it has recently been purchased, the new owner wants to raise the lease payments for the dirt substantially.

There is state law that covers of already what they can and can't do.

But there's no enforcement mechanism in the state law.

And rather than wait for them, my question is going to be, can Council please advise me how to make an appropriate amendment that would cover protecting people who rent the space for their home from unreasonable increases in the cost.

Thank you.

>> Leech: Thank you, Councilor Clark.

That concludes our agenda for today and I now close the February 25, 2026, City Council work session.

We are adjourned.