

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
MARCH 9, 2026
5:30 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.

* * *

>> Mayor Knudson: Welcome to the March 9, 2026 work session. For work sessions like there there's no opportunity for public comments. In case of medical emergency an AED is located on the counter behind staff to the left on the west side of the room. In case of emergency evacuation, emergency access through the double doors located at the back of the room and patio doors can be used as needed. Thank you again for joining us this evening. I now call the March 9, 2026 work session of the Eugene City Council to order. I will turn it over to our city manager, to introduce our first topic. A work session on home energy policy score discussion.

>> This is part 2, this will focus on the policy piece of the discussion. You have the opportunity for action if that's what you would like to do tonight. We have Danielle and Ian from our sustainability program with us. And I will hand it off to them.

>> Good evening, City Council. I am Danielle and I'm a climate policy analyst in the sustainability program. Joining me is Ian Penn, sustainability manager. This is the second of two work sessions focusing on proposed home disclosure work policy. At the first session staff provided overview of the home energy score tool and policy. And summarized community engagement and research findings. I will quickly run through that again and then share key considerations for potential adoption including cost estimates and possible approaches for funding the program. Regular Friday framework and implementation plan should Council decide to proceed. Council may decide to take action to direct the city manager to draft an ordinance.

I talked about the challenges and opportunities regarding energy use in Eugene's housing stock. Council has established a decarbonization goal to reduce the impact of

carbon in homes as well as energy efficiency. Previous engagement has shown this many people are unaware of how to improve their home's energy efficiency. Help staff identify top priorities on the slide. Expanding the use of home energy scores temperatures achieve these priorities. Previous City Council direction has directed the city manager to explore a policy that would require you to disclose a home energy score when selling a home. These two motions direct staff to do community engagements, develop a draft ordinance framework, identify potential funding sources, and create implementation road map.

There is one more motion that directs the city manager to develop options for renters. Staff are currently focused on developing the policy for home sales first because it is a much more straightforward pathway. So just a quick refresher on the home energy score tool. It is a standardized tool developed by the U.S. Department of energy to evaluate a variety of physical and mechanical features throughout the home. Provide a score on a scale of 1 to 10 based on the energy use of that home. Can you think of this like a miles per gallon rating for a car. The report also includes energy cost estimates, recommendations on how to improve the score, and rebates, tax credits and loan links. Again, here is some information pulled from a sample score showing how this home scored. Again, the score isn't a reflection of whether a home is bad or good. It is simply indicating how much energy that home uses. Here are some of the recommended improvements. Many of which are eligible for incentives. Many other cities, four in Oregon, have implemented a home energy score disclosure requirement. The way this requirement works is the seller of a home would get a home energy score before they advertise the home for sale. They would include the home energy score report in the MLS database and then any prospective buyer can view the report as they look on Zillow, redfin, etcetera.

In terms of policy goals, again, I went over these last time. There are three primary goals of the policy. The first is to increase transparency by providing clear, consistent information about home energy use and costs. The second goal is to educate homeowners and buyers about opportunities to improve energy efficiency. And finally, to connect homeowners to resources and incentives to help finance upgrades. Many of these goals align with other Council priorities so, again, this is a tool that continues to move the ball down the field with these priorities.

So last work session, I provided an in-depth overview of the engagement and research that was conducted. Those reports are included as attachments E and F in the packet. In summary, staff engaged roughly 630 people. We really tried to be creative so we could engage a wide range of people. In addition to engagement, we hired earth advantage to look at existing research. And other cities, that have implemented the policy. To understand best practices and observe impacts. As well as housing trends in Eugene. Engagement and research was distilled into the following six themes. Both engagement and research reinforced this policy would increase transparency in the real estate market and support buyers in making a more informed purchase. Second, the policy would lead to greater uptake of energy efficiency incentives and completion of

energy improvement projects W research indicating that homes that have done a home energy score can be up to 8 to 23% more likely to pursue projects.

There were many concerns the impact on housing prices but research indicates that disclosure has only been associated with modest price differences for higher scoring homes. Often reflecting the projected energy cost savings. There were some concerns about the policy having operational impacts on the real estate market such as delays or redundancy. These outcomes haven't been observed in other cities where the policy is implemented. In terms of the policy's impact on climate and emissions, there is limited emissions reductions from a disclosure-only requirement. Though greater reductions are possible when homeowners pursue recommended upgrades. And there are various elements related to how the policy would be implemented that were brought up throughout engagements and research.

Again this provides a quick summary from our engagements and research with more details in the packet. Now I will hand it over to Ian to talk about some of the funding implications of the requirement.

>> Ian: Thank you, Danielle, I'm Ian Penn, sustainability manager. I was going to begin with estimated nonpersonal costs if Council chooses to move forward. And more information is found in appendix C. These estimates have been informed by experience in other Oregon cities, with disclosure requirements, and has been scaled to Eugene both our population and housing market. In the first year, costs would largely relate to startup activities, establishing report and data systems. Coordinating with M. Whether S work flows. Ensuring assessors are trained and available before any requirement would take effect. If Council chose to prioritize equity measures such as free or subsidized scores for income qualified households that would represent a program cost. After the initial year, ongoing costs are lower and most relate to things like maintaining systems, updating communication materials, and continuing any subsidy programs.

The other primary cost category is staffing. These are also based on experience gathered from other Oregon cities and staff owes Ty mate that administering the program requires approximately half an FTE. The majority of that time would be focused on program administration. So things like monitoring listing to ensure disclosure occurs. Issuing reminder notice when is needed. Responding to questions from sellers, real estate professionals and community members.

Finally staff capacity would be used for data practical tracking and reporting to allow the city to understand trends in the housing stock and monitor program performance over time. Estimated cost for the half FTE is approximately \$70,000 to \$90,000 annually reflecting the fully-burdened cost of staff time or contractor support. Combined with the nonpersonnel cost, total annual program costs are estimated at roughly 80 to \$100,000. Finally, a few potential funding approaches if Council chose to move forward. Staff are not proposing a specific funding course today. This outlines potential pathways Council could consider if disclosure requirement were adopted. One option would be reprioritize within the existing sustainability program budget, adjusting or current work. Another

option is allocations through a future budget process. Third, Council previously reviewed potential revenue options from the 2024 revenue advisor process which looked at ways to support new or expanded city services including sustainability related work. A summary of that will broader discussion is included as attachment D in your AIS.

Oh they are jurisdictions with disclosure requirements, it is worth noting there's no silver bullet funding approach from the cities that staff found. Staff learned that those programs are typically supported through existing resources, similar to those outlined here. And lastly, staff also continued to monitor external funding opportunities. State and Federal grants, philanthropic support, and partnership opportunities. Those sources could help but are competitive and rarely provide long-term financial stability. To state staff have not identified a grant opportunity well suited to support this work. So ultimately, if moving forward it would require identifying how a disclosure requirement would be supported. Would that I'm going to hand it back to Danielle to talk about regulatory frame works and implementation.

>> Danielle: Staff provided a potential regulatory framework as attachment B. Based on a review of home energy score disclosure programs adopted in other Oregon jurisdictions, this is intended to illustrate the elements commonly addressed in local disclosure regulatory frame works. If Council chose to proceed, an ordinance would reasonably be expected to address the topics listed here. Just to highlight a few, applicability would identify the types of residential properties subject to disclosure requirement. Trigger event, means, which would specify when a home energy score must be obtained and disclosed, typically this is prior to public listing for sale.

Ply compliance how it is satisfied and verified including any procedures necessary to even force the requirement. Exemptions and waivers identifies property types or other circumstances under which the requirement would not apply. Council directed the city manager to develop an implementation plan and so we've broken down what implementation of what the requirement could look like if Council decides to proceed into the following four distinct phases. We're in phase 1 and would need Council direction to move into phase 2. I'll provide more detail about each of these phases. Phase 1 included establishing a foundation for the policy. We have done engagement to gather community perspectives, research to consolidate the lessons learned from other jurisdictions, in my previous slide I highlighted some of the core structural elements addressed in the regulatory framework.

As Ian discussed, we have estimated the staffing and resource needs to understand what implementation would entail. Phase 2 proceeds if Council directs the city manager to prepare draft language. Staff would return with ordinance language for Council to review, public hearing held, then Council may determine whether to adopt. Then the project would move into the administrative phase so phase 3 program design, if adopted this phase focuses on building the operational and administrative systems needed to carry out the requirements.

Ian addressed some of this earlier but includes setting up the work flow, processes for compliance, enforcement, exemptions, coordinating with utilities, expanding the workforce of assessors, and developing outreach materials to educate sellers and real estate professors about the requirement. Phase 4 implementation and evaluation, so once the program is implemented, there will be ongoing oversight, staff would identify metrics and track data to evaluate the policy, and include things like compliance rates, geographic distribution of scores, participation in related programs, etcetera. Staff periodically would report back to Council and evaluation would provide insight into program outcomes and any future refinements. So in summary, home energy score disclosure requirement is something that would expand awareness and understanding of home energy performance, opportunities for improvement, and available incentives. The policy is informed by research and best practices. It aligns with previous goals and priorities that Council has established as well as extensive engagement.

Tonight we have described the cost and potential options for funding this policy. And we have provided an overview of the regulatory framework for implementing the policy should Council decide to proceed. At this time we'd like to open it up. We are happy to answer questions that would inform your decision tonight. With that I turn it back over to the Mayor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff, thank you both for that presentation. I will open up the floor for Council discussion. Councilor Clark, then Councilor groves, then Councilor Zelenka.

>> Councilor Clark: Would you be creating a database of people's scores and readouts for analysis?

>> Danielle: Typically the way the platform works is all of the scores created are published to the green building registry, viewable site where you can view all of the scores that have been done in the area.

>> Clark: It doesn't -- presents them in the aggregate but presents them per individual home, correct?

>> Danielle: By individual home.

>> Clark: If a future Councilman dated people update their homes in some particular way this would be the perfect list to start with, right? Sorry, you don't have to answer that question. If in fact this were a proposal for awareness, I'd be in favor of it. I'd want to do it. If this were something that were voluntary and people wanted to have this tool for the purpose of making sure that their home sold for the most amount of money possible because they had the best available thing for sale I think that would be a reason way for us to proceed. The housing market across the country, certainly in our community, has two problems: We have a housing affordability problem, and we have a housing availability problem. This solves neither problem. It makes it worse.

I can't be in favor of this at this time if it's mandatory, if we're going to insist that everyone experience this, because we know best's. Then I don't believe I could be in fair of that. It would make housing more expensive at a time when we really don't need to be doing that, we need to be doing the exact opposite. Of making housing more affordable and more available to people. It's not like people have a Joyce of 27 different places they could -- a choice of 27 different places to choose to live based on the scores. Usually they have very few options if any. I don't think it's a good idea to proceed with this. Unless we want to make it an opportunity that's not mandatory. On everyone. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor. I'm going to start with the question that mike just raised, why is this not voluntary? Why are we making this a mandated event?

>> Danielle: That's a great question. We have had a voluntary program, people can voluntarily get a home energy score at any moment that they'd like to. Something that anyone can do, call up an assessor and get a home energy score. Either when they list a home and selling a home or any other time. With it being a voluntary program, we haven't seen uptake of it, very large uptake. I forget the exact percentage but low participation with it being only voluntary. And we've also had a subsidized program. So if you are low income or renter you ever historically been able to get it for free. Even with that program we still have seen very low uptake.

>> Clark: How many people know about that --

>> Groves: What do we do to advertise this, push it into the public? How many people know about it?

>> Danielle: The program that I mentioned that had -- offered the program for free was a partnership between the U of O and city of Eugene, and EWEB. There was joint communications around that. There was information put into people's EWEB bill about how to get the score if they met the qualifications to get it for free. The information was listed on our website as well as the partners' websites. Throughout all of our engagement during our last two phases of engagements, since 2024, whenever we were out tabling, we had information about it. So I wouldn't say we had the resources, or time-wise and staff-wise to do an extensive campaign on it. I mean that also takes time and money. But with the opportunistic communications that we were able to do about it, we saw very little participation.

>> Groves: I've lived here for 46 years, out there a lot even before I became a Councilor. I didn't ever hear about this until it was brought to us. So I wouldn't say that it is widespread knowledge. Which is I think a piece of this. Like Councilor Clark, I could support this if it were a voluntary program, especially voluntary pilot, then we can come back, see what that did and come back and look at it down the road. My concern is

none of these things we add by themselves are that big of a deal. It's starting to feel to me like death by a thousand cuts. We have regulation upon regulation upon regulation.

From my observation, with our lack of our economy growing, living wage jobs, employers that are employing our population, we don't need to keep giving people reasons not to locate here. We don't need to keep giving employers that can come in and provide living wage jobs a reason not to locate here. I'm concerned about this. I'm concerned about a number of things that we're looking at right now. What does that do to the employment opportunities? I always like to say when we talk about affordable housing the other side of affordable housing is living wage jobs. The other part of health in a community, poverty, people living in poverty, statistically have shorter lifespans. We need to be lifting people out of poverty, we need to provide good living wage jobs, we need a tax base that supports our service delivery system. I'm skeptical of anything that makes that more difficult. I don't want to throw a wet blanket on things, I would be willing to go forth with a pilot program and see how it works and start off with voluntary with some publication about this. See what that gets us before we go head-long into, nope, we're giving another edict from the DAIS. That's where I am on this. Thank you.

>> Mayor may I respond? I just want to respond to Council, the reason this is coming to you as a requirement is because that's what was in the motion. For us to bring back.

>> Groves: I understand that.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you for that clarification, city manager,er was going to offer a similar one. Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Voluntary systems don't work, that's why we shift them to mandatory, pretty clear. The in this case the benefits far outweigh the costs of doing this. This is a long standing policy option that we've been tossing around as have other communities. This goes back to cap 2.0, when was that?

>> 2018 and 2019.

>> Zelenka: We've been dealing with this for 6, 7, 8, 9 years. Time to move off the -- get going with it. How many energy scores have there been in Oregon?

>> Danielle: Portland, bend, Hillsborough, Milwaukee, and 60,000 homes in Eugene -- in Oregon have done it.

>> Zelenka: And the research shows that it's not a problem. It's not shown to make housing more expensive. It is very low cost. It costs a couple hundred bucks on a quarter million dollar or half a million dollar, that's nothing. You spend that more on closing costs. So it's not -- it has not shown to be those things that people have been fearing. In real life as opposed to theoretically. This provides important information about operating costs of a home. Which is really critical. In is livability and affordability, the two biggest issues we have in Eugene right now. How much energy your house uses and

how much it costs is critical in picking a house. This is basic information. Needs to be done on a large scale for it to work. What does reprioritize existing resources mean? What does it look like?

>> Ian: Thank you for that question. I think basically it means that staff capacity is finite, you're looking at the team. We're basically working at capacity. This was something that was going to -- something to proceed we would have to think about what we do right now and what would have to be de-emphasized or deprioritized.

>> Zelenka: Have other cities found it takes half an FTE?

>> Ian: Somewhere with that, there's scalability but they find it takes about that. Portland has a half FTE plus contractor support on top of that. But they have more home sales per year.

>> Zelenka: On the next steps, this is -- this isn't asking for a final decision, this is going down the step. Next step is figuring out the regulatory framework, bringing that back, then program design. Then we would make the final decision. We're just moving this process forward after nine years into the next step. I'm all in favor of that, thanks.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I think Councilor Kashinsky had her hand up first, I'll defer.

>> Mayor Knudson: Either of you. Councilor Kashinsky?

>> Kashinsky: Thank you for your presentation and the work that you have done on this. I was looking through our packet from last time and trying to -- the data that was associated with this was very robust. I remember one of the things we talked about when this was brought to sustainability commission was about the availability of assessors to do the home energy score. I think you had gotten some information about how many sort of FTE for lack of a better word of jobs would be needed to do all these scores.

>> Danielle: There's four assessors serving the Eugene area currently. Our research shows in order to serve this policy with minimal disruption, it would require 16 to 20 full time assessors.

>> Kashinsky: If I'm remembering correctly, when this policy went into place, in bend, they quickly scaled up from however many they had before, like two, to the 20 or 30 that they needed. It was creating economic opportunities for people in the community, is that right?

>> Danielle: That's correct. Working with our researcher it was -- it hasn't shown that that gap of not having enough assessors has been a problem. It has quickly kind of

ramped up. That can be further supported by the city or staff or contractor support providing additional training to help ramp up that workforce.

>> Kashinsky: The budget line item is to help people do this professionally and have a job doing it.

>> Danielle: Thank you.

>> Kashinsky: That was my main question. Addressing our climate and addressing housing affordability, people's ability to know about these programs and know what resources are available to them and what they're getting into, requires there's no one big action that's going to resolve this. This feels like one of the many small actions that we can take to incrementally address some of the challenges that we're facing as a city. I look forward to seeing the next stage.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor, Danielle and Ian. I'm wondering in the other communities in Oregon -- bend, Portland, Hillsborough, Milwaukee -- if business and industry, solar for example, or windows, siding, companies that sell energy efficient heat pumps, HVAC companies. If they see the long-term benefit for having home energy score. Has there been any engagement with the business sector around that piece in the aforementioned communities? Or here locally.

>> Danielle: That's a great question. We had three different focus groups that included businesses as well as several 1-on-1 interviews. Many of those included business owners of HVAC companies, residential, general contractors, architects. Folks who are intimately involved with that type of sector. A lot of them viewed this as something that would help better educate their clients about the value of making energy efficiency improvements. They get a lot of people who come to them wanting a new kitchen or addition on a house.

They might not be the client might not necessarily be aware of the value of, like, when you do that now is a good time to do insulation. If you are going to be upgrading a piece of equipment it's a really good idea to get the more efficient one even if those types of things are going to add a little bit more money to the overall cost of the project. A lot of the people who we talked to just viewed this home energy score getting a home energy score in the hands of their future clients as something that would better, be another way to educate them about the value of energy efficiency improvements.

>> Keating: Very helpful, Ian?

>> Ian: I don't think we have monetized it but there's discussion in Portland and bend about inducing other trades that might not occur, weatherization, solar panels. But they haven't put a dollar figure to it, but there is an estimation that does induce demand for that work.

>> Danielle: To be thorough in how I capture what we heard, some of the concerns that were shared from some of those conversations were things like this home energy score tool doesn't seem comprehensive enough. Some of them thought, well, if you are going to do an assessment you should do a thorough assessment, a blower door question or HERZ score. These are similar energy -- other energy assessment tools that are out there that are more expansive, and also more expensive. There's tradeoffs to doing that. But I think one reason that we've seen the home energy score tool become the standard across the nation with cities that are exploring this, it is more affordable and it is information that is not overwhelming to the client. They can choose later on if they want to get a more expensive test or assessment but they don't have to be inundated with that information.

>> Keating: You mentioned in other communities that are lessons learned from other jurisdictions. What lessons have been learned?

>> Danielle: There's a lot of lessons learned. So the foundation of our research was looking at what has been observed, like what impacts have been observed in other cities that have these policies already implemented. We learned also, we also looked at what are best practices in terms of how to implement this with things like how to do enforcement, track compliance. So there is a range of lessons that were learned. A lot of that is in attachment D, I think it is, D and E the policy memos that were attached. I'm not sure if there's a more specific question around --

>> Keating: If there's something off the top of your head that rises to the top.

>> Danielle: The takeaway, there's been minimal impacts in terms of homes -- the big question I think that we had going in to research was what's the impact on home sale prices, what are impacts on the real estate market, and what are impacts on climate. I think for all three of those the impact has been minimal. In terms of, like minimal home sale increases, very little disruption to the real estate market. Little climate impact from a disclosure only policy. The real climate benefit comes from when people actually make the recommended upgrades from the report.

>> Ian: What is the systemic market impacts and they're not seeing disruption, not seeing things that are changing in the front. That's been the biggest thing we wanted to learn from observed actual implementation of the policy elsewhere.

>> Keating: In attachment D you alluded to various funding mechanisms that Council has grappled with. Are there any that jump out to you as the most efficient or connected to this sector that we could explore because that's the next step for this body to grapple with should this pass today. I hope it does. What funding mechanisms would you recommend are the easiest to implement that also are the most connected to this work?

>> Ian: That's a loaded term. For the options looked at through the revenue advisor process, those were large sums. I don't think that any of them were necessarily right-

sized for what this program would be. I don't know there's anything from that particular list that would make the most sense. What that leaves is three options. It is something where we make, we absorb this in some capacity other things are de-emphasized and we have less capacity for other things we're trying to focus on. Or this gets resolved through a future budget decision. We will look for opportunities to partner, opportunities for grants, opportunities to find money. But that is not necessarily a stable funding source. It will be one of those three that we would be focusing on that is the most viable pathway forward.

>> Keating: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark. Oh, counselor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Most of my questions have been answered. I'm ready to move this forward. I appreciate staff's research, you did a great job, well above what my expectations that I thought I was going to get, it was out of the park. It's been very helpful. This seems like really a critical transparency for buyers when we're making -- most of us what is our largest investment we will ever make. I guess that's it, I'm just ready to move forward to the next phase, thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, one last question. In any of the four communities in Oregon that have implemented this, did your research show you a corollary decrease in energy use by any particular measure. Households that had good scores or whose scores were particularly high decrease in energy use overall by the community, do you have statistics that this ended with a decrease in energy use because people knew this?

>> Danielle: What comes to mind for me off the top of my head, I'll let Ian fill in, is actually we have pretty local data with the program I mentioned earlier with EWEB and U of O that the home -- out of all of the homes that participated in getting a home energy score they saw quite significant -- they saw -- able to measure the drops in kilowatt usage and BTUs from upgrades they made as a result of getting the score. Directly from getting the score you don't get any energy efficiency or reduction in energy use. Once you implement the recommended improvements that's where you see the energy savings.

>> Clark: I would, for example, be willing to recommend and I probably will when the time comes a motion that this be voluntary as opposed to mandatory. What I'm looking for is if we insist that we know best, and everybody must do this when they sell their home, I'm looking for what should we expect as a decrease in energy use in the community as a result of that policy. It sounds -- I'm not hearing we can expect 5% energy reduction of use in our community as -- or whatever number. As a result of us making this mandatory.

>> Ian: I appreciate that. This is a disclosure policy. There is no requirement to do anything a that's on the list. First and foremost, any benefit you get from an energy perspective is for people willing to and able to actually undertake the actions recommended in the policy.

>> Clark: It is voluntary if they do anything with the information at all at this time.

>> Ian: In all four cities. There's no requirement to do anything. It's informational.

>> Clark the simple awareness doesn't help them --

>> Ian: There's a second piece, page 15 on attachment E, the research report. There was an evaluation done by the energy trust of Oregon uptake of recommendations that were in home energy scores. I'll quote it exactly. On average these 207 homes received \$490 in incentives for upgrades that saved \$477 kilowatt and 29 THERMS. You can take advantage with incentives and recommendation. Taking advantage of what is recommended in the report is what is key.

>> Clark: Thank you very much. My point if what you do about the information is voluntary, it seems like gaining the information should also be voluntary. Because if it's something that people want to know we need to give them the tools to ask for it. But to make everyone spend money and do it makes housing more expensive and we're saying essentially we know better than you do what you should do. I'm comfortable with that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor groves then Councilor Zelenka in the queue but I'm going to insert myself. One of the observations, I appreciate this coming back for discussion at Council in the community. The breadth of options that this body that our city can make available to people to reduce energy consumption and save themselves money, this is an effective policy from what we have seen in other cities. The timing of this policy at the point of sale is also one that makes a lot of sense. I think in some of the comments it may be misconstrued this is a new requirement of all people in homes presently.

In fact, this is a point of sale policy action time. I clarify to you, both nodding yes, that's clearly stated in all of our materials. An opportunity at a generational transition in ownership or a short term transition in ownership. At a point of sale for people to learn more about how their home is performing. Then for that information to be available to future buyers. I have seen many times the energy score bright yellow labels attached to singular appliances presented to a single home buyer as a sign of energy efficiency within a home. This score I think would be much more effective in terms of informing future homeowners, buyers, renters of housing in the future as we pursue that aspect of this work what the actual energy efficiency value of their home is.

Rather than \$1 a month because you have this range rather than that one, a bigger sense where the energy consumption is going. We have had many conversations in the community about the real challenges of transition to more renewable energy sources.

Transmission is a real challenge broadly when we look at the total numbers. The opportunities to support conservation are incredibly important as we're thinking about meaningful progress with climate change. We have a lot of housing stock that was built in the community at the time when energy efficiency, insulation, infiltration were not primary concerns. They weren't primary concerns in the building code and energy code, not energy concerns of people buying homes.

This is an opportunity with a generational shift in ownership to upgrade the experience of the people that would be owning that home into the future and affect potentially their affordability in a positive way. I just wanted to offer that I think that there is this policy as observed by Councilor Kashinsky is a very incremental step towards ambitious and important climate goals that we have as a community. But it is a very clear way to offer much more information to people in our community about the cost of the housing that they might be buying. To have that be accurate information. I think in that way it is of great value to our community. Councilor Groves then Councilor Zelenka.

>> Groves: Thank you. One of my big concerns, too, I feel like the energy score -- first of all I fully support reducing energy consumption, what we should be focusing on. At the same time, you take an older home which a lot of our seniors live in, you take low income which a lot of low income people live in, older construction with 2x4 stud walls on the exterior. You can never bring them up to a 2x6 exterior stud wall in a wrapped house. It is going to be groups of people that are going to be most affected by this. Then my question is, going back to the U of O study, you said, where actually saw a decrease in energy consumption measurable in KILOWatt hours used, was that voluntary or mandatory program?

>> Danielle: The U of O was a voluntary program.

>> Clark: We made progress with the voluntary program.

>> Danielle: That's correct.

>> Clark: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka? [No audio]

>> Zelenka: It is helpful to be clear about requisite enabling programs that then enable greenhouse gas reduction actions like this program. The information is Paramount to taking action. Which also by the way saves people money. There are no mandatory weatherization programs anywhere in the country. I've been in this business for 40 years. Come on, mike, that's a scare tactic. There's not a single example where it happened. I think it is a bogus point. View things we do actually do save people energy and save them money, especially in the energy world, there's not very many things that happen that actually reduce people's cost of operating their house. Energy efficiency is one of those. The Mayor made that point clearly. So most of the time I've seen in my 40 years in the business is that energy efficiency savings far outweigh the cost of doing it.

It is a smart thing to do once you get the information. You have to have the information. I think that what this does is levels the playing field for all of the buyers that are in the marketplace. That wouldn't otherwise be in a voluntary program. Seeing limited uptake in voluntary programs, which is why the ones that are successful are the ones that are required at sale.

>> Danielle: This policy, it's at time of listing. At the time a home is listed for sale. Just wanted to clarify.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, that would make it much more useful than at the moment of sale. Thank you very much, staff. I'm going to turn to our Council Vice President to put a motion forward.

>> Kashinsky: I move draft ordinance for a home energy disclosure requirement as described in the AID and to bring it forward to the Council.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion? Councilor Clark?

>> Clark: I move to amend that to say a voluntary program rather than a requirement.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you. Any further discussion from Council? Councilor Clark?

>> Clark: Thank you, Councilor Groves made the point adequately that when appropriately educated, folks with a high degree of interest as many are take advantage of the opportunity. EWEB where allows people to get information on their energy. I want to say electricity use, and what the costs are over time with any house for free. What we're doing is mandating that a particular type of information be done by everyone. Randy's point is adequate, that voluntary program actually works and does the job. And a mandatory program doesn't have any guarantee of success. The only thing it guarantees is that the buyer of a new house will have to pay a little more money. That's it. That will be the only part that's guaranteed.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Yes, thank you. I feel that staff and previous discussion has clearly articulate idea having this be a requirement at point of listing has a much greater benefit than a voluntary program. I'm struggling to think how a voluntary program would defer much from what people can do now. We already have a voluntary program in existence. And as someone who was a first time home buyer at one point, possibly more recently - some of you may have bought houses since I have. But some of you may not. What I'll say is that particularly for someone who hasn't bought houses before, isn't in the market, having that information would have been very, very helpful. I'm not sure that I

would have known to ask for it at that point. I think having that be provided as part of the listing is helpful for those home buyers. So I do not have a concern about this being mandated program. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating speaking to the substitution?

>> Keating: I can only imagine generations ago if an imaginary Council sat around a table discussing the merits of a voluntary odometer disclosure at the point of sale when you purchased your vehicle. It's illegal for car dealers as I understand it to even give misleading or false information around miles per gallon. It is a consumer protection piece. I see this direction as a 21st Century consumer protection piece around our home energy, actionable item that at the point of sale information both beneficial to the buyer and the seller. As someone who recently sold a home with my brothers, my mom's estate, I trust it would have been wholly informative for perspective buyer as it would have been for my brothers and I to make the home that much more attractive as an energy efficient three-bedroom, two-bath home. As someone who rents in an energy inefficient home, and hopes to some day soon be a homeowner in Eugene, I would love for the next step for renters to have the right incentives in partnership with their landlords. Tenant-landlord relationship that provides the carrot and the stick for those home energy scores for the more than 50% of our community that rents. This is a great first step. The fact that everyone is involved means it is then actionable and the entire community will benefit. I urge a no vote on the amended motion and affirmative on the main motion.

>> Mayor Knudson: I'll take a vote for the motion, this motion, with its changes. Is there anything relating -- I'm sorry, we're on to that point, on the substitution. Is the motion that we are discussing whether or not it will be substituted. We'll take a vote on the substitution. All in favor. Three votes in favor. All opposed? [Raised hands].

>> Mayor Knudson: Five opposed. That motion fails. We'll return to the original motion. Any further discussion from Council? Seeing none I'll take a vote on this motion. All in favor. [Raised hands].

>> Mayor Knudson: 5. All opposed? 3. And the motion passes with a vote of 5-3, thank you. This concludes our first agenda item. Thank you staff for that proceedings. Now turn to the city manager for our second agenda item today. Which is a work session on the city of Eugene naming policy.

>> Matt Rodrigues: This is a work session on naming policy update potential, and we have Jason Dedrick from the city manager's office team here to present.

>> Jason: This is my first in person meeting in six years. Happy to join you again. I'm Jason Dedrick, policy, strategic planning and performance manager for the city of Eugene. I'm here to give you an update on the city's naming policy. The slides are ready. Quick overview of my presentation, we'll do kind of bring you up to speed on the

history of the naming policy and what it entails. How it's been used recently by the Council and the organization.

Prior Council direction on how to update the policy with changes that you would like to make. I'll review at sort of a high level of the updated policy and changes and you will have time for discussion and potentially taking action on a resolution that will update the naming policy. History adopted in 2010, and originally functions currently along side other existing policy and guidance that we have internally for naming related to streets, parks, and libraries. You last revised the naming policy back in 2018 making a couple of small changes to the policy.

However you signaled that you would like to make a more significant change to the policy. So we're returning with that information today. So the existing policy is relatively straightforward. It has a large kind of general guidelines preamble section, a bit of a part of the problem in that we had criteria for naming in the preamble as well as the body of the policy itself. And then essentially it had sections on criteria and process around both naming and renaming. Recent naming efforts that have utilized the policy other internal guidance, renaming of Kesey Square, the renaming of Dr. Edwin Coleman junior community center and Andrea Ortiz park utilized the policy. Downtown Riverfront street in 2019 utilized the policy.

I'll point out that was one of the rare circumstances where we're naming streets in the community they were new public streets which we don't do very often. Renaming of striker park. The previous direction was to update the policy based on four broad areas. One was to clarify guidance on the naming criteria. The correct was to clarify guidance on the naming process. This was to make it more clear inside of the policy itself but also to name make it more clear to community members what the process would be around naming and renaming. Also asked to update the policy to make it inclusive in process as well as criteria utilized for naming. Then finally to make structural changes to streamline and simplify the policy. I'll walk through each of these four areas at a high level for the changes that are in the policy. The first was to clarify guidance on naming criteria. You indicated to clarify because essentially much of the core criteria remains the same. It needed to be made more clear.

As a reminder there are two major ways to think about naming. One is to utilize geographic, natural, historical, cultural. Wild iris ridge as an example. Or something like downtown Riverfront park where it makes it clear what is distinguishing or maybe where a site is located. So that community members can find the facility. Also naming after individuals with criteria around things like character, community contributions and potentially donor requirements or considerations. All of the criteria I mentioned is now in the policy, there's almost no preamble, it makes it clear what is naming criteria and what isn't. That's been a change. Remove some of the redundancies. And we made changes to the criteria for naming after individuals restricting it to individuals who have been deceased for one year or more.

Secondly you asked to us update a around the process particularly community engagement process around naming. There's now a new clearer process which I'll walk through in a minute. Also makes clear that Council will approve each engagement process for a facility. City manager will proper poise engagement process, you have the opportunity to comment on and approve the engagement process before it begins. There are three options that are sort of the basis for engagement that will occur with increasing level of engagement. These are intended as the basis for the city manager as they're putting together those engagement options not necessarily having to particular strictly to them but provide a backbone of expectation. Reviewing those options, the first option 1 is where staff is doing research on names. Then engagement from -- [Microphone issues] [no audio]

>> Jason: The first option sort of recapping is sort of the most minimal amount of engagement staff would do research on names and engagement from an existing group like a neighborhood association or maybe a standing committee. You can think about this as something we would use for something like a natural area, coming up with names that are something about the geological or botanical features of a park or natural area. Second option has increasing level of engagement, this would include things like public meetings and surveys as well as staff vetting of the names that emerge from that. This would be for facilities where there's probably interest from a segment of the community but not the whole community, think about a neighborhood park as being an example.

Using park as a natural area because that is the majority of the naming that the city does of facilities much the third option includes a more open public name submission process where community members are open, invited in to submit names, staff vetting of the names, and community voting. This we would use for facilities that have broad community interest across the communities, think of maybe a metro or community park. This is similar to the process we use for the downtown Riverfront streets use of process similar to this. You asked us to update the policy to build inclusivity into both the process and naming criteria. We have more inclusive language after naming of individuals, removing a bit of clang language, opening it up to community contributions and what makes an individual notable in being considered for naming. We have a much broader community engagement process that's broader and more certain, so the community can have a better understanding of what to expect around the engagement. We're also now opening renaming up to all possible names.

In the past community member or group could submit, suggest that a facility be named differently than what it is currently named. They would often propose a new name. The process typically revolved around considering only that new proposed name versus considering all possible names. So now the policy is more clear that in a renaming process it will trigger the same process as naming. Individuals or community members can submit a possible name for renaming and that would be included in consideration alongside other names that community members might want to suggest. Also built-in involvement of key stakeholders depending on the types or specifics of names that are being proposed. Finally, you asked us to streamline and simplify the policy, it is now

2 1/2 pages long versus 4 1/2 pages. At the highest level it is half as long as it was. With very little meaningful content removed. A lot of redundancy and long preamble removed. We removed.

There was language in the existing policy around other jurisdiction asking for your support around naming or for you making recommendations to other jurisdictions around naming. As the policy is about naming city facilities, those two things seem superfluous to the policy, often too restrictive in criteria around what you can do in those situations. Gives you more purview over what to do if you want to engage about other entities on renaming. It aligns the processes for naming and renaming, essentially the name. The same. Made it more streamlined. That's it, actually. That way kind of a quick high level policy is much shorter, more streamlined, makes it clear who has purview over what naming. So makes clear, it doesn't change this but makes clear that City Council has jurisdiction over naming facilities and the city manager over some facilities and feature, like bookshelves at the library, on picnic pavilions or benches in parks. They remain as they were with the city manager having the authority around naming for those or delegating that authority. Makes it more clear in the policy than it did previously. I'll turn it back to the Mayor for questions. You can potentially take action on in this evening.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you staff for the presentation. And I have Councilor Keating in the queue. We set a little more time -- spent a little more time on the first agenda item, for rounds I've asked staff to set the timer to one minute. I think we'll have plenty of time to wrap up discussion. Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Jason. What is the thinking behind the year delay to posthumously recognize someone in the community with a naming convention? Parks, plaza, street, whatever.

>> Jason: Prior to 2018, from 2010 to 2018 the policy specified that an individual be deceased for two years or longer. At the work session in 2018 where Council made the most recent changes to the policy there was a shift from two years to one year. I can only speak to the fact that in that case the desire of that Council was that less time pass, one year instead of two year. I can't necessarily speak to the original intention in 2010 in terms of why there would be a one year. There were a couple --

>> Keating: I'd like to eliminate that all together. There's a good reason? Okay. We're not restricted to one year for naming conventions if we want to recognize someone in the community who is with us is that accurate? Or they have to be deceased in.

>> Jason: Correct, yes.

>> Keating: That's too bad. I'd love to hear my colleagues' reasons as to why. I heard from community members that this very plaza that I'm looking over, 50 yards from here, would be awesome to be I Catherine "Kitty" Piercy plaza. I wouldn't want to wait many years until former Mayor Piercy would enjoy such an opportunity. And celebration of her

legacy. I look forward to hearing why there's a guardrail for lack of a better term of from two years down to a year. I would want the community to have the most flexibility to honor persons in our community who made the most contributions.

>> Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Thank you Jason, very much. I may be in the minority but I find this kind of policy work extremely interesting. I appreciate you digging into this and bringing it back to us. I think these labels, that we -- these names that we put on buildings we think of them as functional, it's a way to find things. But they're a lot more than that. They're visible public demonstration of our values and what we find important and sometimes what we don't find important. Names of things, parks, buildings are not neutral, never neutral. So when we're making these decisions in our community, we're creating this collective memory, collective culture of the things we're going to memorialize in our community. The choices we have made in the past and the future they can either celebrate our community, our entire community, or they can marginalize people. Depending how we make those choices. What we do with this policy. I think it can be incredibly important. So thank you very much, Jason. A few questions.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh you just passed the one minute and I'm happy to come back around. If you want to ask one question now --

>> Yeh: I'll wait.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka is in the queue, if no one else wants to speak we'll come back to you.

>> Zelenka: The reason we have the waiting period is allows time to vet that person through social media and other sources. Allow that person's legacy to be fleshed out. Often times things don't come out after they die. The reason we moved from two years to one year is because two years seemed like too long but one year seemed sufficient. The reason we don't allow living people is because that inherently becomes too political. People who are -- not that dead people aren't political but it will become much, much messier if we did it for living people. I had a question about the options for engagement. How does that work to select, that process.

>> Jason: So staff will notify the city manager and Council there's an upcoming naming opportunity. The city manager will work to develop an appropriate option in terms of engagement based on the nature of that facility. Size, where it is located, taking into consideration the potential level of community interest. This would be the same for renaming as well. So would start with these three options as the basis to bring forward based on the size, potential interest in the facility. That would guide which of these options come forward. There's possibilities for hybrid options. But then city manager would present that rationale for why that option was chosen as part of your process of reviewing the engagement process.

>> Keating: They're mutually exclusive. So there would be one --

>> Jason: One engagement process picked, yes.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Evans. City Attorney?

>> City attorney: I wanted to point out the word choice in the policy is intentional, the city manager shall base engagement on one of the following three options described. So that it would be option 1 but it could be option 1 with a few features from option 2. The manager has the ability to base it on these. But maybe for a particular reason also include the stakeholder group.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Evans.

>> Evans: In the same vein as Councilor Zelenka said, I look at this as the Joe Paterno rule. If you start naming names after people who are alive, buildings, whatever, the denaming process becomes a lot more difficult if something comes up in that individual's background that is untoward or has implications that we don't want to underscore out there. Like naming something after Jeffrey Epstein and finding out that Jeffrey Epstein is not the person you want to name it after. Do we have, the question is do we have a denaming process?

>> Jason: We have a renaming process that is specified in the policy. That would be the closest thing. If you mean denaming by taking away a name and there is no name we don't specifically address that in the policy. What we do address is the potential to rename.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: I have a few questions Jason. I'm going to start with naming it after people we had a question about the experience of UMSO, several names were recommended that were somewhat popular that didn't fit the criteria as we interpreted it as extraordinary service or gifted to the community. Though were not local people. For example one of them was Marcia P. Johnson, clearly a large national figure in the trans community, but not -- has an impact on the community in that way but not someone who is local. I wonder if with these changes, the way I read it, maybe there might be cases where someone like that or someone like Martin Luther King, Jr. Might qualify, or no?

>> Jason: The section of the policy that I'll direct your attention is under section 1, I think subsection 2C, section 1. Made achievements and contributions that represent a lasting legacy to the mission of the city of Eugene and the community it serves. There can be a fair bit of interpretation there around what someone who doesn't currently reside in the community may have done or the legacy of that and what it means for the community may be separate from whether or not they live here. The policy opens that up for that.

>> Yeh: I want to make sure that's how I read also.

>> Mayor Knudson: I'm going to start another round for you, you're the only Councilor in the queue but I want you to know.

>> Yeh: I only have one more question. Also Jason -- maybe two. Under streets it says that one of the requirements is they cannot be potentially confusing foreign-sounding names. I don't feel that's very inclusive. To be perfectly honest I would take it that way if it was me. I wonder if you could speak on that one.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh you may be looking at the current policy as opposed to attachment B.

>> Yeh: I thought they were together. That one is gone, great. That's great. Jason last question, I'm wondering if in all of this work I don't think you did, did you have an opportunity to think about the current situation, the things named in our community and how we're doing in the areas of having an inclusive landscape of names in the community.

>> Jason: It relates to a previous Council resolution that you passed as well as sort of taking with the potential work being what they're working on taking a look at names around the community for potential renaming as well as thinking about opportunities for naming that we want to. The human rights commission has it on their work plan.

>> Yeh: Excellent, thank you Jason, Mayor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you Councilor Yeh. We'll pause for ament.

>> Mayor Knudson: That, for helping with that technical difficulty. I turn to the Council Vice President to put a motion forward.

>> Kashinsky: I move to adopt the resolution adopting a naming policy for the city of Eugene at attachment B to the AIS.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion from Council? Councilor Keating?

>> Keating: I will be a yes but not to be a wet blanket, I think that we should, a future Council should have a more serious conversation with giving this Council the ability to do what other community like San Jose, or Los Angeles have done, by naming mechanisms after persons who are alive and have had made an historical impact. Barack Obama comes to mind. I would like more flexibility but I won't gum this up, I will be a courtesy yes. But I just wanted to underscore my enthusiasm for this or future Council to have a little more flexibility.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you. City Attorney?

>> City Attorney: I'll point out a similar thing, within the resolution itself we included a provision that makes this mandatory unless the City Council determines extraordinary circumstances call for an exception.

>> Keating: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: City Attorney I want to make sure I'm on here, remind me if I'm correct, it is the case that any Council, regular Council ordinance to name an item may be reviewed by petition or is subject to review by petition of the voters.

>> City Attorney: It would be if it was done by an ordinance but that's generally not how it's done.

>> Clark: If the Council unanimously agreed we want to name something in a certain way but a bunch of people in the community disagreed they would still have the option to file a petition to reverse the Council's decision, am I correct?

>> City Attorney: Not in all cases but they can come and ask you about it and urge to you make a change during your public forum. If you just passed a motion or resolution it's not subject to the same sort of --

>> Clark: All right, thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion from Council? All in favor? Okay, eight. The motion passes with a vote of 8-0. Thank you, Council and staff for your support, technical challenges, for the presentations today. This concludes our agenda. I close the March 9, 2026 City Council work session. We are adjourned.