Eugene City Council
500 E 4th Ave., Suite 302
Eugene, OR 97401
541-682-5010 • 541-682-5414 Fax
www.eugene-or.gov

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

November 9, 2026

5:30 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

City Council meetings will continue to be held in hybrid format using in person and virtual meeting technology. Information about online or other options for access and participation will be available at https://www.eugene-or.gov/3360/Webcasts-and-Meeting-Materials

---

Meeting of November 9, 2026;
Her Honor Mayor Kaarin Knudson Presiding

Councilors

Lyndsie Leech, President	Eliza Kashinsky, Vice President
Matt Keating	Randy Groves
Alan Zelenka	Jennifer Yeh
Greg Evans	Mike Clark

5:30 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1. **WORK SESSION: 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities**

2. **WORK SESSION: Tenant Opportunity to Purchase**

The Eugene City Council welcomes your interest in these agenda items. This meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours' notice. To arrange for these services, contact the City Manager's Office at 541-682-5010. City Council meetings are telecast live on Metro Television, Comcast channel 21, and rebroadcast later in the week.

El Consejo de la Ciudad de Eugene agradece su interés en estos puntos de la agenda. La sala de reuniones del ayuntamiento es accesible para sillas de ruedas. Para personas con dificultades auditivas, se puede proporcionar un intérprete con 48 horas de anticipación. También se puede proporcionar interpretación al español con 48 horas de aviso. Para organizar estos servicios, contacte a la Oficina del Gerente de la Ciudad al 541-682-5010. Las reuniones del Consejo de la Ciudad se transmiten en vivo por Metro Televisión, Canal 21 de Comcast y se vuelven a emitir durante la semana.

For more information, contact the Council Coordinator at 541-682-5010,
or visit us online at www.eugene-or.gov.

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Work Session: 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities

Meeting Date: November 9, 2026
Department: Central Services
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 1
Staff Contact: Brooke Freed
Phone: 541-682-5010

ISSUE STATEMENT

At this work session City Council will receive an overview of the 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document (Attachment A) and the 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document (Attachment B). Council action is requested to provide direction for City staff and elected officials advocating on behalf of the City at the State and Federal level.

BACKGROUND

In October 2023, City Council passed Resolution 5387 that adopted updated Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) Committee Operating Agreements. The Council's IGR Operating Agreements (Attachment C) provide direction on how the City of Eugene sets state and federal policy priorities and directs City resources on high priority items to be reviewed and approved by the Council's IGR Committee.

Current Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) Committee Members include Councilors Evans, Groves, and Yeh. Mayor Knudson attends as a non-voting member. The IGR Committee meets regularly, generally monthly with the ability to hold special meetings during the legislative session. IGR Committee meetings are posted on the City's website and open to the public via Zoom. Information regarding the IGR Committee and testimony on priority bills can be found on the IGR Program webpage.

The last time the Legislative Priorities and Policy documents were reviewed and adopted by City Council was in January 2026, in preparation for the 2026 Legislative Session.

2027 Session Preparation

In preparation for the 2027 Oregon Assembly (January 19 to June 27, 2027), staff from across the organization contributed to the updated Eugene Legislative Policy document, which serves as the policy framework for the City's position on the expected types of bills that may surface during the upcoming legislative session. The updates (highlighted in yellow) reflect a culmination of technical expertise in specific areas, staff experience implementing City Code and Rules, and as members of statewide and national professional associations.

The 2027 Eugene Priorities document outlines the proactive policy or funding items which the City will advocate for in advance of and during the 2027 Legislative Session.

On October 7, 2026 the IGR Committee approved the 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document and 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document (3:0) and sent these on to City Council for their final review and approval.

Following the IGR Committee's approval, at the same meeting, Councilor Groves brought forth draft firefighter cancer presumption legislation. IGR Committee did not take a position on the proposed legislation and voted to move the item to the full council (3:0). Possible policy language is included within Attachment B (highlighted in blue) for Council's consideration.

RELATED CITY POLICIES

City Council Operating Agreements

2026-2028 Strategic Plan The City's 2027 Legislative priorities and policies support numerous 2026-2028 Strategic Plan focus areas, strategies, and tactics. Examples include:

- Financial Stability: Evaluate short-term revenue options that can bridge funding needs until longer-term economic development strategies are realized.
- Community Safety: Strengthen partnerships and services that support behavioral health, crisis response, and prevention/early intervention.
- Thriving, Livable Community: Construct wastewater and water infrastructure in Clear Lake area using identified funds.
- Housing and Homelessness: Advocate with regional partners to increase state shelter funding for the regional shelter network to stabilize funding.
- Transportation and Infrastructure: Expand and formalize strategic partnerships for regional infrastructure acceleration as part of the Lift Off EUG initiative.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION

October 23, 2023 Meeting

Councilor Keating, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to approve items B and C on Consent Calendar 1. Note: Item C was 'Adoption of a Resolution Amending Eugene City Council Operating Agreements and Repealing Resolution No. 5381' which updated the Council's IGR operating agreements
Passed 8:0

January 26, 2026 Work Session

Councilor Leech, seconded by Councilor Zelenka, moved to adopt the 2026 Eugene State and Federal Legislative Policy document and the 2026 Eugene State Legislative Priorities document as approved by the IGR Committee.
Passed 7:0 (Groves absent)

COUNCIL OPTIONS

The City Council could adopt the 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document (Attachment A) and the 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document (Attachment B) as presented; City Council could amend the documents; or City Council could take no action.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

City Manager recommends adopting the 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document (Attachment

A) and the 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document (Attachment B).

POSSIBLE MOTIONS

1. Move to adopt the 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document included as Attachment A.

AND

2. Move to adopt the 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document included as Attachment B.

OR

3. Move to adopt the 2027 Eugene Legislative [Priorities/Policy] document with the following amendments: _____

ATTACHMENTS

A. 2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities document
B. 2027 Eugene Legislative Policy document
C. Council Operating Agreements (includes IGR Operating Agreements)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact:	Brooke Freed, Chief of Staff
Phone:	541-682-5010
Staff E-Mail:	bfreed@eugene-or.gov
Website:	www.eugene-or.gov/368/Intergovernmental-Relations

Eugene Intergovernmental Relations

2027 Eugene Legislative Priorities

Approved by the IGR Committee on October 7, 2026

- **Secure state and federal funding for Eugene Airport Expansion.**
  Request significant capital investment from Oregon Legislature during 2027/29 biennial budget formation. Seek federal pathways to increase direct funding or funding mechanisms such as increasing the Passenger Facility Charge through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Reauthorization Process.
  Strategic Plan focus areas: Transportation and Infrastructure + Thriving, Livable Community

- **Support full funding for Statewide Shelter Program (SSP).**
  Advocate for funding allocation of at least $200M for the Statewide Shelter Program for the 2027/29 biennium.
  Strategic Plan focus area: Housing and Homelessness

- **Expand eligibility of uses for state funding previously allocated to Clear Lake Road Infrastructure.**
  Include in the early session 'Budget Balancing Bill' a statutory clarification that the funding allocated to Clear Lake Road Infrastructure project in 2025 and 2026 can be utilized for water infrastructure and projects in the larger Clear Lake Road Project Area.
  Strategic Plan focus areas: Transportation and Infrastructure + Thriving, Livable Community

- **Support a comprehensive statewide transportation funding package.**
  Advocate for a comprehensive transportation funding package that preserves local funding authorities and the 50/30/20 allocation for all transportation-related revenues.
  Strategic Plan focus areas: Transportation and Infrastructure + Financial Stability

- *Placeholder for protections related to threats to public officials.*

- *Placeholder for behavioral health or City operational item related to health care system(s).*

Eugene Intergovernmental Relations

2027 State and Federal Legislative Policy

Housing Opportunities and Financial Stability for Eugene Residents and Addressing the Homelessness Crisis

Eugene supports the preservation and expansion of the following policy positions, programs, and investments:

1. Housing Policy
    a. Programs and tools to fund the development, preservation, and protections of housing affordable to low-income persons.
    b. Land use and community planning tools that enable the development of affordable housing.
    c. State funding to support local governments implementation of new state laws related to land use, housing supply, and/or urban infrastructure.
    d. Amendments to prevailing wage law to support Affordable Housing and clearly differentiate between direct project support and nearby infrastructure investment.
2. Unhoused Shelter and Homeless Services
    a. Publicly operated emergency shelters and permanent supportive housing investments designed to transition homeless individuals and families into stable housing situations.
    b. Funding for human services, emergency housing assistance, and other programs to meet the needs of homeless persons and those at risk of homelessness.
    c. Robust funding for the Statewide Shelter Program.
3. Human Services
    a. Increased state funding for addiction treatment and recovery, including sobering and detox.
    b. Behavioral health outreach, services, and treatment designed to transition persistently homeless individuals with behavioral health conditions to housing and treatment.
    c. Tools to support financial stability, savings, and asset development for low-income persons.
4. Renter Protections
    a. Ensure Oregon residents do not experience discrimination in housing and may access appropriate information and complaint systems.
    b. Legislation that increases the stability of renter households and maintains appropriate protections for landlord-tenant relations.

Financial Stability

1. Proposals to restructure or change the state's tax and revenue system must allow local government's continued authority to finance the level of services needed by their residents.
2. City governments are the most practical and effective providers of urban municipal services, and state or county tax policies should avoid raising revenues for duplication of city services by other jurisdictions.
3. Eugene opposes the levying of property taxes by the state to fund services that are deemed the responsibility of the state.

4. Eugene supports the ability to maintain local flexibility over revenue systems, retain local apportionment of revenue from state gas, liquor, beer and wine taxes, marijuana taxes and other state-imposed taxes and fees, and the preservation and enhancement of state shared revenues.
5. Eugene opposes the granting of new exemptions, deferrals, or forgiveness of property taxes by the Legislature without reimbursement of the revenue forgone by cities.
6. Eugene supports the repeal of local government preemptions created by state or federal agencies or legislation and opposes federal or state pre-emption of local taxation authority.
7. Eugene opposes subsidizing through taxes, services, or changes to revenue sharing formulas those businesses or households in unincorporated areas.
8. Eugene supports maintaining current tax and fee authority regarding System Development Charges (SDCs) and Urban Renewal Districts.
9. Eugene supports enhancing the effectiveness of the state's emergency communications system through an increase in the 9-1-1 tax.

General Government

1. Eugene supports the exemption from disclosure of attorney-client privileged records under the Public Records Law.
2. Eugene opposes changes in state public records laws that place undue financial burden on municipalities to comply or restrict a municipality's ability to represent its interest throughout an appeal process.
3. Eugene opposes efforts to increase supervisor representation.
4. Eugene opposes changes to collective bargaining laws that reduce local bargaining rights or present unfunded mandates to local governments.

Economic Development

1. Eugene will look for opportunities to strengthen and fund the local entrepreneurial ecosystem.
2. Eugene supports bioscience and advanced manufacturing as regional economic drivers and supports state and federal funding investments to advance local initiatives.
3. Eugene supports the Cultural Arts sector as a primary economic driver.
4. Eugene seeks resources to expand its industrial land supply.
5. Eugene supports state and federal infrastructure investments for economic development.
6. Eugene supports state and federal investment in airport infrastructure as a catalyst for regional economic development, business recruitment, and job creation. The City recognizes Eugene Airport expansion initiatives, including Lift Off EUG, as critical to advancing long-term economic growth and regional competitiveness.

Land Use

1. Eugene opposes state or federal legislative or regulatory pre-emption of local land use laws and authorities.
2. To the extent the legislature establishes mandates that require Eugene to take certain actions, Eugene supports legislation that provides clarity and incorporates flexibility to the extent possible. Eugene also supports timely and efficient state technical support and funding to provide assistance in implementation of such mandates.

3. Eugene supports legislation that streamlines the Urban Growth Boundary expansion and the Urban Reserves establishment processes, providing clarity, and incorporating flexibility to the extent possible. In addition, Eugene supports allowing the adoption of Rural Reserves outside of the Eugene Metro area.
4. Eugene supports the removal of regulatory barriers to housing affordability, availability, and diversity, as well as the removal of regulatory barriers to mixed-use development, all without sacrificing local control.
5. Eugene supports actions that incentivize multi-family and mixed-use development along transit corridors.
6. Eugene seeks appropriate funding from the Legislature to cities to implement new legislation or agency regulatory actions related to climate and land-use.
7. Eugene opposes legislation that eliminates or weakens existing methods of annexation.
8. Eugene supports legislation that creates incentives for annexation.
9. Eugene supports state-wide policy that is permissive of voluntary annexation of non-contiguous properties within an existing urban growth boundary.

Information Technology, Telecommunications, and Municipal Right of Way (ROW) Authority

1. Eugene broadly defines telecommunications activities, services, and facilities to include wireless and wireline voice (including VOIP - voice over internet protocol), data, and video, including cable system communications, and high-speed broadband services such as IPTV (Internet Protocol TV), OTT (Over the Top Programming), and Internet Access.
2. Eugene supports City Ordinance 20083 authority and responsibility to manage the public rights of way (ROW), especially for issuing permits for installations and city pole use contracts for wireless facilities.
3. Eugene supports the City Ordinance 20083 authority to determine and collect fair and reasonable compensation, including in-kind services, for use of public infrastructure and public rights of way.
4. Eugene supports the existing ability of cities and municipal utilities to own, operate, construct and provide telecommunications services, including high-speed broadband.
5. Eugene supports the 2015 net neutrality provisions and opposes actions that would decrease open access to the internet through tiered pricing structures or other strategies.
6. Eugene supports improvements and funding for ensuring effective cyber-security systems and IT modernization at state and local government levels.
7. Eugene supports the preservation and expansion of affordable and accessible broadband services.

Public Safety

Includes Fire/EMS, Courts, Law Enforcement, and Prosecution.

1. Eugene supports increased funding and training for Special Teams to include Urban Search and Rescue (USAR).
2. Eugene supports efforts to maintain fire department input on proposed development projects and to administer all provisions of the Fire Code.
3. Eugene supports afterschool funding for youth that contributes to the prevention and reduction of juvenile crime, including early childhood literacy programs.

4. Eugene supports state and federal funding for local government public safety emergency operations, disaster preparedness, and capital facilities.
5. Eugene supports state and federal funding and policy support for local government community justice style programs, and Teen or Peer Courts that provide early intervention.
6. Eugene supports state-wide efforts that increase police accountability through application of consistent professional standards, implementation of 21st Century Policing-including the reduction of use of force and increased use of de-escalation techniques, and transparency of disciplinary actions.
7. Eugene supports funding to neighborhoods or areas susceptible to wildland fire, commonly known as the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), through prevention, education, mitigation efforts such as but not limited to fuels reduction and building codes.
8. Eugene supports statute changes and new programs that reduce time needed to transfer incarcerated defendants who lack fitness to proceed to the Oregon State Hospital but do not negatively impact the law enforcement, the City of Eugene Criminal Justice System or the welfare of the Eugene community.
9. Eugene supports state and federal funding for technology and communications equipment, systems, and infrastructure to support local and regional police, fire, and first responder's priority needs.
10. Eugene supports efforts to ensure that qualifying firefighters diagnosed with cancer, regardless of type, receive fair and timely access to workers' compensation coverage, while preserving the ability of employers and insurers to rebut claims with appropriate medical evidence through the existing "clear and convincing evidence" rebuttal standard.

Transportation and Infrastructure

1. Airport and Aviation
   a. Eugene supports maintaining and protecting the ability of airports to establish and collect fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory rates and charges, consistent with federal law and grant assurances. Eugene opposes federal or state legislation or regulatory actions that restrict the use of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-supported operational data, including ADS-B, or otherwise impair an airport's ability to assess, administer, or collect lawful user fees necessary to support safe and efficient operations.
   b. Eugene supports expanded and flexible federal and state funding opportunities for airport infrastructure, including Airport Improvement Program (AIP), Airport Terminal Program, and competitive grant programs. Priority should be given to projects that enhance safety, capacity, and system efficiency.
   c. Eugene supports policies that enable airports to utilize a full range of financing tools, including Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs), public-private partnerships, federal credit programs, and revenue bond financing.
   d. Eugene supports maintaining local authority over airport operations, planning, and financial management, and opposes federal or state preemption that limits local decision-making related to airport rates, operations, and infrastructure delivery.
   e. Eugene supports increased federal and state funding for the development of the Eugene Airport Terminal and Apron facilities.
   f. Eugene opposes federal or state withholding of aircraft registration information that utilize Eugene Airport, or any legislation that would limit or prohibit the Eugene

Airport's ability to collect landing fees, aircraft parking fees, or aviation fuel flowage fees.

2. Surface Transportation
   a. Eugene opposes federal or state pre-emption of local permitting and trip fee collection authority of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and/or Mobile Service Providers (MSPs).
   b. Eugene supports policy that ensures the greatest possible flexibility for the use of funds to meet local needs, and that grant priority funding for projects when a local match is available
   c. Eugene supports local option transportation system funding alternatives, including local option fuel taxes and local transportation system maintenance fees.
   d. Eugene will continue to seek right of way and construction funding for the Beltline Hwy Project from River Road to Delta Highway.
   e. Eugene supports funding opportunities to address safety on local and state roadways.
   f. Eugene supports additional state funding for grant programs that provide funding for safe routes to school, shared use paths, and making streets safer for all users including people who walk and bike.
3. Rail
   a. Eugene supports state funding for intercity rail service, and more frequent and more reliable, higher-speed, customer-friendly passenger rail between Eugene and Portland.
   b. Eugene supports additional planning and construction funds for local communities to establish railroad quiet zones, improve safety at grade crossings, upgrade rail beds and acquire rights-of-way to facilitate "passing" areas for passenger trains and freight trains.

Environment and Natural Resources

1. Eugene supports measures that protect or improve surface water and groundwater quality, including potential drinking water sources.
2. Eugene supports funding, programs, and land use planning tools that protect native ecosystems, preserve intact habitats for migratory species, and protect against invasive species.
3. Eugene supports continuation of funding for the implementation of place-based water resources planning projects by the Oregon Water Resources Board and its implementing partners.
4. Eugene supports appropriate limitations on fill and/or removal of wetlands.
5. Eugene supports funding for constructing, maintaining, evaluating and renovating "green" stormwater infrastructure such as bioswales, green roofs and porous pavement.
6. Eugene supports a science-based approach to waterway and wetland protections under the federal Clean Water Act and related state statutes.
7. Eugene supports practical exclusions from regulation under the federal Clean Water Act and any related state statutes for constructed green infrastructure stormwater management facilities.
8. Eugene supports fair and equitable water quality permit fees and accountability for demonstrating progress toward meeting commitments made by regulatory agencies collecting the fees.

9. Eugene supports initiatives that assist designated management agencies in meeting their Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) obligations related to temperature, bacteria, turbidity, and mercury.
10. Eugene supports measures that facilitate economical and environmentally sound practices for managing wastewater and stormwater processes and infrastructure, including resource recovery, maintaining minimum flows to protect infrastructure and reduce the risk of corrosive gas formation.
11. Eugene supports funding and programs to implement measures identified in the regional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan such as street tree planting programs, enhanced fuels reduction programs, restoration of riparian systems and other efforts to reduce the impact of flood, fires, landslides, and extreme storm events.
12. Eugene supports a statewide prescription drug 'take-back' program.
13. Eugene supports the creation of Battery Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) legislation where producers of batteries must share in the end-of-life disposal cost of batteries and battery-containing products. Producers must join a Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO), who will carry out plans to collect and recycle batteries.

Climate Recovery

1. Eugene supports state and federal policies that reflect the true cost of carbon emissions, including market- or investment-based mechanisms, to accelerate the transition to a low-carbon economy and promote clean energy development.
2. Eugene supports continued state funding for community-scale renewable energy and resilience projects, including investments that improve energy reliability for vulnerable populations and critical facilities.
3. Eugene supports the establishment and capitalization of state-level green banks or similar clean energy finance mechanisms to expand access to affordable financing for energy efficiency, electrification, and resilience projects.
4. Eugene supports state programs that ensure equitable access to clean energy and building transition opportunities, including contractor training, workforce development, and support for minority- and women-owned businesses.
5. Eugene supports all implementation aspects of Department of Environmental Quality's 2050 Vision for Materials Management.
6. Eugene supports state funding for electric vehicles, small electric vehicles, e-bikes, electric vehicle infrastructure, fleet incentives, and electric vehicle education programs.
7. Eugene supports state funding for walking, biking and transit infrastructure projects.
8. Eugene supports additional funding for public transportation operations and expanding the definition of public transportation to include shared mobility such as bike share.
9. Eugene supports legislation that calls for Extended Producer Responsibility, in an effort to reduce lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions, and "Right to Repair" legislation, which requires manufacturers to share information necessary for repairs.
10. Eugene supports legislation that allows for changes to the Oregon Building Code to allow for greater use of reused materials in building construction and incentives for adaptive reuse of existing buildings.
11. Eugene supports state funding that improves energy efficiency in housing, reducing the energy burden and overall cost of housing.

Public Health and Wellness

1. Eugene supports Oregon initiatives that connect youth and families to nature, such as Outdoor School and Oregon's Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights.
2. Eugene supports initiatives that promote active, healthy lifestyles through Park and Recreation services.
3. Eugene supports securing regional, state, and federal funding to address the low-head dam on the Willamette River adjacent to the I-5 Bridge.
4. Eugene supports securing regional, state, and federal funding for developing the Golden Gardens Park.

Equity and Inclusion

1. Eugene supports initiatives that affirm the promotion of rights included in the International Declaration of Human Rights.
2. Eugene supports legislation that condemns all forms of hate, xenophobia, racism, white supremacy, Anti- Semitism, Islamophobia, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, sexism and other forms of bigotry. This includes timely condemnation of actions against certain groups in relation to specific events.
3. Eugene supports legislation that protects refugees, regardless of citizenship status.
4. Eugene supports legislation that affirms the City of Eugene's practices of not collecting or maintaining information about the political, religious or social views, associations or activities of any individual, group, association, organization, corporation, business or partnership unless such information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities.
5. Eugene supports legislation that recognizes and celebrates the heritage of the Kalapuya people as original caretakers of the land in which Eugene is located.
6. Eugene supports legislation that includes consideration of equity in the distribution of public resources aimed at removing barriers or correcting historic inequities towards marginalized groups.
7. Eugene supports state and federal legislation that expands protections for people based on source of income, familial status, sexual orientation, and gender identity; regardless of citizenship status.

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL OPERATING AGREEMENTS
RESOLUTION NUMBER 5481
ADOPTED MARCH 9, 2026

INTRODUCTION
The Municipal Charter of the City of Eugene (Charter) and Eugene City Code, 1971 (E.C.), as well as the Oregon Revised Statues (ORS) law govern many meeting requirements and actions of the Council. The Eugene Charter, Chapter 2 of the Eugene City Code, and various sections of ORS 192 and 244 are primary sources of these meeting and other operating requirements.

1. MEETING REQUIREMENTS

1.01 Time of Meetings
Regular meetings of the Eugene City Council (the Council) shall be on the second and fourth Mondays of each month. These meetings shall begin at 7:30 p.m. and shall end at 10 p.m., or when the agenda item considered by the Council at 10 p.m. is concluded. If those days are on a legal or religious holiday, the Council may schedule the meeting for the day immediately following.

1.02 Work Sessions
The Council may meet in work sessions beginning at 5:30 p.m. prior to its regular Monday meetings. Other work sessions may be held on the second, third, fourth, and fifth Wednesdays of the month. These work sessions shall start at noon and generally last for a maximum of 90 minutes. Additional work sessions will be scheduled on the third Monday of the month, as needed, following or in lieu of a public hearing. Except for extraordinary circumstances, the total time for presentations by staff and/or others on a single agenda item shall be no more than 15 minutes.

1.03 Location of Meetings
Eugene City Council meetings shall be held within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City. Training sessions may be held outside the City limits, if no deliberations toward a decision are made. Inter-jurisdictional meetings may be held outside City limits, but should be as close to Eugene as practical. No City Council meeting shall be held at any place where discrimination on the basis of an individual's race, religion, color, sex, national origin, ethnicity, marital status, familial status, age, sexual orientation, source of income or disability, is practiced. For this purpose, meetings do not include visitations or attendance at any national, regional, or state association to which the councilor belongs.

1.04 Notice of Meetings, Special Meetings, Emergency Meetings
Advance notice of at least 48 hours shall be provided for all meetings. Notice shall include written notice to all news media which requested notice. In the case of emergency or when a state of emergency has been declared, notice appropriate to the circumstances shall be provided and reasons justifying the lack of 24-hour notice shall be included in the minutes of such meeting. As per both the Eugene Charter, Section 9, and Eugene Code, Section 2.007 (2), the Mayor or three of the members of the Council, may call a special meeting of the Council in manner provided in E.C. 2.007 (3).

1.05 Public Comment

A public comment period generally shall be the fourth item of every regular meeting of the Eugene City Council, following Committee Reports and Items of Interest, Priority Goal Actions, Consent Calendar 1, and regular Action items. By council majority vote, time-sensitive issues may be moved up in the agenda order.

Persons wishing to speak must sign up to do so not later than five minutes after the meeting has been opened by the Mayor or presiding officer. The Mayor or presiding officer shall inform the audience of the requirement to sign up to speak not later than five minutes after the meeting has been called to order.

Members of the public may speak about any topic during Public Comment, except as provided below. If a member of the public wishes to speak on an item that is scheduled for a public hearing at that same meeting, the speaker shall wait until that public hearing. Public Comment cannot be used to testify about an item that is not a public matter or which has already been heard by a Hearings Official, or to provide or gather additional testimony or information on a quasi-judicial matter after the official record has been closed.

Speakers at Public Comment will be limited to two-and-a-half minutes and Public Comment will be limited to 90 minutes total. Request-to-Speak forms will be shuffled so that speakers are called in random order, with persons who did not speak at the previous Public Comment prioritized ahead of persons who did speak at the previous Public Comment. Official representatives of Boards, Commissions, and Neighborhood associations will be prioritized during Public Comment ahead of other randomized speakers. No persons will be allowed to submit a "Request to Speak" form more than 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting.

At the end of Public Comment each member of the Council has the opportunity to respond to comments made during Public Comment. The time allocated to each member of the Council for such responses shall be up to three minutes.

1.06 Public Hearings

Public hearings shall generally be held on the third Monday of the month, except for those months during which a Council break occurs and shall be held for all ordinances except under the terms delineated in E.C. 2.007(4). Hearings may be scheduled on other items and presentations from standing advisory bodies to the Council may be scheduled at the discretion of the Mayor and the City Manager.

Persons wishing to speak shall submit a "Request to Speak" form not later than five minutes after the commencement of the meeting at which the person wishes to speak. The Mayor or presiding officer shall inform the audience of this requirement to sign up prior to the commencement of a public hearing. In general, speakers will be limited to two-and-a-half minutes and called in a random order. Eugene Code 2.015(7) notwithstanding, councilors may ask clarifying or follow-up questions of individuals providing testimony after that individual has completed his/her testimony. Questions posed by City Councilors should be to provide clarification or additional information on testimony provided. Questions should not be used as an attempt to lengthen or expand the testimony of the

individual. Councilors shall be expected to use restraint and be considerate of the meeting time of the Council when exercising this option. The Mayor or presiding officer may intervene if a councilor is violating the spirit of this guideline. At the end of the Public Hearing, each member of the Council has the opportunity to comment on or discuss testimony given during the Public Hearing.

1.07 Executive Session

All meetings of the Council shall be held in open session, except those meetings that may be closed for purposes specified in the Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual (ORS 192.610 to 192.690). These include the employment or dismissal of public employees, performance evaluation of the council's employees, labor negotiations, real property transactions negotiations, and consulting with legal counsel on pending or threatened litigation.

Notice of executive sessions shall be given as required by state law and that notice must state the specific provisions of law authorizing the session.

The Mayor and City Councilors are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the information discussed in legally noticed and conducted executive sessions as defined in Chapter 192 of the Oregon Revised Statutes.

1.08 Minutes

Written minutes shall be taken for all City Council meetings in accordance with the Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual. The minutes must give a true reflection of the matters discussed but need not be a full transcript, verbatim or recording.

As a matter of courtesy and efficiency, a councilor should notify the Mayor and other councilors that he/she intends to propose an amendment to the minutes and should propose replacement text in advance of the meeting at which those minutes are scheduled to be approved. If the proposed amendment is a simple factual, grammatical, or spelling correction, the amendment may be proposed without consulting the minutes recorder. If, however, the proposed amendment is substantive in nature or seeks to clarify the speaker's intent, or to expand his/her remarks for the record, the councilor should notify the minutes recorder and request verification of the proposed amendment.

1.09 Voting

Section 12 of the Eugene Municipal Charter states that the Mayor only votes on matters before the Council in the case of a tie. Council members may not abstain from voting unless a conflict of interest has been declared.

1.10 Presiding Officer

The Mayor shall preside over City Council meetings when present. The president of the Council shall preside if the Mayor is absent or unable to preside. The Council vice president shall have the powers of the Council president when the Council president is performing the duties of the Mayor. If the Mayor, Council president, and vice president are unavailable, the Council members present shall elect a temporary presiding officer.

1.11 Council Officers

Council officers shall be elected for one-year terms in the manner prescribed in the E.C. 2.009, at the first regular meeting in each calendar year.

2. PLACING ITEMS ON COUNCIL AGENDA

2.01 Contact the City Manager

Contact the City Manager and explain the nature, scope and desired outcome of the item for the agenda or make the request during "Items from Mayor and City Council" at a City Council meeting. The City Manager and Mayor may then decide to place the item on a future agenda.

2.02 Council Poll

Alternatively, an item may be placed on the Council agenda by councilor request. A councilor may ask Council support staff for a work session or consideration of a resolution, and staff shall then poll all councilors, in writing, to ask if the item should be placed on the Council agenda. If, within two weeks of distribution of the poll, with an individualized reminder at five working days, four Councilors respond in the affirmative, the item shall be placed on a future Council agenda within a reasonable time.

Work session polls will generally include the work session topic and related Council goal or priority issues and questions to be addressed and intended outcomes.

2.03 Tentative Agenda on the Consent Calendar

At each regular meeting of the Council, the City Manager shall present the Tentative Agenda. This shall be placed on the Consent Calendar. If there are concerns about items on the Tentative Agenda, it may be removed at the request of any councilors from the Consent Calendar and discussed separately.

2.04 Tentative Agenda Provided Each Week

The Tentative Agenda shall be included in the weekly information packet provided to the Council.

2.05 Scheduling of Items on the Agenda

The City Manager and Mayor shall decide the date that items come before Council for work sessions and for regular meetings.

2.06 Routine Business Items on the City Council Agenda

The City Manager shall continue to place routine and standard items of Council business on the City Council agenda.

3. ORDER OF ITEMS ON A SPECIFIC DATE MEETING AGENDA

3.01 Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

The Eugene City Council shall begin its formal council meetings with a voluntary recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance at those council meetings closest to the following holidays: Memorial Day, Veterans Day, Flag Day, and the Fourth of July.

At the council meeting closest to the Fourth of July, the ceremony will also include readings from the Declaration of Independence and/or United States Constitution.

3.02 Ceremonial Matters

At the first regular meeting of each month, the first agenda item shall be used to acknowledge special recognition or awards given to the City of Eugene or for the Mayor to read proclamations which serve to encourage and educate the community. Proclamations shall be made and placed on the agenda at the discretion of the Mayor. This item shall be called "Ceremonial Matters." Requests for recognition under Ceremonial Matters should be submitted in writing to the Mayor.

3.03 Committee Reports and Items from Mayor, City Council and City Manager

At regular meetings held on the second and fourth Mondays of each month, the first item on the agenda or following Ceremonial Matters and the Pledge of Allegiance, shall be "Committee Reports and Items of Interest from Mayor, City Council and City Manager." This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for the Mayor, councilors and City Manager to raise issues, present ad hoc motions, introduce resolutions and report on committee activities and actions. The time allotted for "Items" is subject to change to accommodate emerging issues.

3.04 Consent Calendar

At regular City Council meetings, in order to expedite the Council's business, routine and standard items shall be placed on the Consent Calendar 1 for Council's consideration prior to Public Comment. Annexations and similar land use action items shall be placed on Consent Calendar 2 for Council's consideration after Public Comment.

Any item on either Consent Calendar may be removed for separate consideration by any member of the Council. Revisions or corrections to meetings minutes shall be considered first, prior to other items removed from the Consent Calendar. The remaining items on the Consent Calendar may then be considered for action by a single vote. The items pulled from the Consent Calendar shall be considered after the approval of the remainder of the Consent Calendar and before the next scheduled item on the agenda, unless requested for later consideration. In general, ordinances, because of charter requirements, should not be placed on the Consent Calendar.

3.05 Public Hearings Given Priority

As a guideline, public hearings shall be placed on the specific meeting agenda before items only requiring action. Further, public hearings expected to draw a small number of speakers shall be placed before public hearings for which a larger number of speakers is expected.

3.06 Action Items

In general, action on ordinances and councilor-introduced resolutions or motions shall be placed on regular City Council meeting agendas and shall be scheduled before Public Comment. This does not preclude taking action on items during work sessions or other portions of the meeting. Action items that are specifically related to City Council Goals and Priorities (Priority Goal Actions) shall be scheduled for action prior to Consent Calendar 1. Examples include items such as Low Income Rental Housing Property Tax Exemptions (LIRHPTE) and other authorizations in support of low-income housing.

4. COUNCIL ACTION ON AGENDA ITEMS

As a guideline, action on issues for which a public hearing has occurred shall not be taken at the same meeting at which the public hearing is held. In the case of an ordinance, the charter requires that an ordinance shall not be adopted by the Council unless it has been considered by the Council during at least two meetings. With the unanimous consent of the Council, the Council may consider and enact an ordinance at a single meeting if the Council does not amend the ordinance in a manner that modifies its substantive effect (Charter, Section 28 (3)).

5. POSTPONING AGENDA ITEMS

Any councilor may request that an item be postponed to another meeting if he/she is unable to attend the meeting at which the item has been scheduled. As a courtesy, councilors should submit in writing a request to postpone to the Mayor as early as possible. If the Mayor is unavailable, the request should be made to the City Manager or the Manager's designated staff member. A request to postpone may be made for either a work session item or a vote on an agenda item. The request to postpone shall be honored unless a majority of councilors present determines that the matter needs to be acted upon at that meeting.

6. COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

6.01 Creation of Committees

While the City Code governs appointments to certain committees, the code grants broad general powers to the Mayor and City Council to create subcommittees or special ad hoc committees of the Council. The Mayor shall nominate and the Council shall appoint the members of any committee established by the Council unless a different procedure is specified at the time the committee is established. The charge to the committee shall be clearly stated at the time the committee is established, and the committee shall disband when its work is complete. Committees may be composed of councilors, interested citizens or both.

6.02 Standing Committees of the Council

There is one standing committee of the Council: Intergovernmental Relations Committee.

6.03 Standing Advisory Bodies to the Council

There are seven standing advisory bodies to the City Council. These are created in the Eugene Code and Charter and exist to provide advice on policy matters. They are: 1) Budget Committee; 2) Planning Commission; 3) Police Commission; 4) Human Rights Commission; 5) Sustainability Commission; 6) Civilian Review Board; and 7) Toxics Board.

7. CONDUCT AT MEETINGS

7.01 Roberts Rules of Order

Conduct at City Council meetings and committee meetings is governed by Robert's Rules of Order, Revised. The Council has the obligation to be clear and simple in its procedures and in its consideration of the questions coming before it. Council members shall avoid invoking the finer points of parliamentary rules which may serve only to obscure the issues.

7.02 Other Meeting Guidelines

The presiding officer shall be responsible for ensuring order and decorum are maintained.

Behavior or actions that are unreasonably loud or disruptive shall be cause for removal from Council meetings. This includes engaging in violent or distracting action, making loud or disruptive noise or using similar language, and refusing to obey an order of the presiding officer.

Council members speak only for themselves and shall be open, direct and candid. They work to keep discussion moving and call for a "process check" if the discussion becomes bogged down. Time limits may be set on topics. When councilors speak to each other during public meetings, last names shall be used during regular meetings, but first names may be used during work sessions. The Mayor is, however, always referred to as "Mayor."

During public meetings, councilors generally should not attempt to edit or rewrite prepared ordinances. Amendments to an ordinance may, however, be appropriate. Generally, councilors should give direction to staff to bring back amended ordinances for Council consideration.

If a member of the Council intends to make a motion at a meeting which is not reflected in the agenda item summary, every effort should be made to contact other members of the Council to inform them of the intent and the text of the motion at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting whenever possible or practicable. City Council support staff should be provided with the same information and may be asked to assist in the notification process.

The Mayor and Council will be limited to commenting only on the main motion prior to discussing any proposed amendments. If an amendment to the motion is made during the initial round on the main motion, subsequent remarks on the amendments will be postponed until all wishing to speak on the main motion have done so.

Comment times for the Mayor and councilors at City Council meetings or work sessions shall be generally limited to no more than three minutes. At the discretion of the Mayor or presiding officer, second and subsequent rounds may be limited further to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to be heard in the time allotted for the item.

7.03 Public Conduct

The rules of conduct for members of the public shall generally be the same as for the Council. City Code prohibits any person from bringing flags, signs, posters, and placards to a City Council meeting unless authorized by the presiding officer. The Eugene Code specifically permits arm bands, emblems, badges, and other articles worn on personal clothing, so long as such items do not extend from the body in such a way as to cause injury to another.

8. COUNCILOR REQUEST FOR STAFF ASSISTANCE

8.01 Two-Hour Rule

Initiatives requiring more than two hours of staff time must be approved by the Council. Requests that involve less than two hours staff time or resources should be directed to the City Manager.

8.02 Major Request

A councilor who desires major policy, ordinance research, or other staff assistance should first raise the issue at a City Council work session. The Council should decide whether to proceed with the issue or ordinance before staff time is spent.

8.03 Tracking Council Requests

Except for routine inquiries, the City Manager shall respond to councilors' requests for information or assistance. The Manager shall assign these requests to appropriate City staff and track progress on the assignments. This process eliminates the possibilities of staff members duplicating each other's efforts or a request being overlooked.

9. REPRESENTING CITY POSITIONS AND PERSONAL POSITIONS

9.01 Written Communications from City Councilors and Mayor

In written communication with other officials or groups and in letters for publication, such as "to the editor," the Mayor and councilors should be careful to decide whether to speak only for themselves or for the Council. In speaking for the Council, when there is a position which the writer wishes to reinforce or explain, it is useful to circulate a copy to the Council for comment before the letter is mailed. Letters to other elected officials or agencies on City issues shall be discussed with the appropriate staff so that the City lobby effort can be coordinated.

When writing as an individual, a councilor or the Mayor is free to take any position he/she feels is appropriate. When it is a point of view different from a Council position, this fact should be included in the letter. Use of City stationery and choice of pronouns shall be left to the discretion of the councilor or the Mayor.

The governing principle is to advise the Council or staff when expressing a City position, and to make differences clear when speaking as an individual.

9.02 State/Federal Lobbying

The effectiveness of City lobbying in Salem or in Washington, D.C. depends on the clarity of the City's voice. When councilors or the Mayor represent the City in a lobbying situation, it is appropriate that the councilors or the Mayor avoid expressions of personal dissent from an adopted Council policy. This policy is stated in Resolution No. 4908, Council Policy on Testimony and Funding Applications.

A councilor or the Mayor in disagreement with an adopted policy should not be deprived of the right to express such views to the appropriate officials at another time and another place. However, the councilor or the Mayor should feel bound to advise those to whom such disagreement is expressed that it is an individual view and that the Council has taken a different position.

9.03 Attending Conferences, Other Meetings

Councilors and the Mayor are encouraged to attend conferences and training sessions which would enhance their skills and knowledge. Any councilor or the Mayor may attend any meeting at which the Council is represented, but only the formally appointed official City Council representative or designated alternate, has the right to vote on matters being considered by the organization or group holding the meeting or conference. Individual councilors or the Mayor may state he or she is representing the City Council if he or she has been formally directed by the City Council to do so.

For local intergovernmental bodies or advisory groups to which an official Eugene City

Council representative has been appointed, the representative is to serve as an "instructed delegate;" that is, to represent pertinent adopted City and City Council policy. If possible, the Mayor or councilors should inform the other members of the City Council of the matters being considered by intergovernmental bodies, and to the greatest extent possible, seek direction from the City Council on issues directly pertaining to the City of Eugene and adopted City policy. The representative may express his or her own opinion, provided it is identified as such, but when voting or considering matters with policy implications or budgetary considerations, the representative must follow adopted City or City Council policy and direction.

Participating in state and national groups such as the League of Oregon Cities and the National League of Cities presents the opportunity to enhance skills and knowledge and is an important avenue for the Mayor and councilors to advocate for the members of the community and the city itself. If the Mayor or councilors attend meetings of these organizations, an official voting delegate should be selected by the City Council. This voting delegate, to the greatest extent possible, informs the Mayor and City Council of issues or matters on which the voting delegate may be asked to vote. If there is existing City or Council policy, the voting delegate will vote in accordance with that policy. When providing a report to the council (see Section 10.05), votes of the delegate should be included in that report.

If the Mayor or individual councilor serves on a committee of a state or national advisory committee and has been selected in an "at large" role, that is, not a specific seat or position for a City of Eugene elected official, that person should state the adopted City or Council policies. However, that person is not bound by the adopted policy and can represent his or her own position, provided that the person makes such a disclaimer.

10. COUNCILOR EXPENSES

10.01 General Guidelines for Reimbursed Expenses

Under the provisions of the City Charter, the City may pay a councilor or the Mayor expenses that are directly related to City business. It is each councilor's and the Mayor's responsibility to determine if expenses are actually City-related. If there are questions about the propriety of such expenditures, the Manager shall first review the issue with the councilor. If the City Manager and the councilor cannot resolve the issue, the Manager shall discuss the matter with the Mayor. Receipts should be secured for any expenses and should accompany City Council expense report forms to record mileage and other expenses. The forms shall be available from the City Manager's Office.

Activities that support or oppose a political campaign shall not be reimbursable.

10.02 Out-of-Town Expenses

Out-of-town expenses include those incurred while attending City-related conventions, conferences, training seminars, or meetings. Expenses that are paid by the City include fees for seminars or conferences; transportation to, from, and at the destination; and lodging, meals, and incidental expenses that are necessary to conduct City business.

10.03 Local Expenses

Local expenses include those incurred while representing the Council on a committee, attending meetings, attending local seminars or conferences, attending local special events, or meeting with groups or individuals to discuss City matters. Expenses that are paid by the City are detailed in Resolution No. 4375 and include meals, conference registration, transportation and necessary incidental expenses, and up to two community group memberships, not to exceed $100 total. Telecommunications outlined in Resolution No. 4375 include, but are not limited to, phone and internet charges as required for conducting business. The reimbursement for bicycle mileage using alternative forms of transportation, including walking and biking and excluding buses, as permitted in Resolution No. 4375, shall be $.25.8 per mile as of July 1, 2020, and shall be adjusted each year at the same rate of increase as that of automobile reimbursement. Special materials such as books or directories may also be eligible for reimbursement.

If receipts are not available, a written description of expenses signed by the Councilor must be submitted along with the Council Expense Report Form. Forms shall be available from the City Manager's Office.

10.04 Spouse/Partner/Guest Expenses

The City shall reimburse councilors or the Mayor for spouse/partner/guest expenses at local events when the councilors or the Mayor and a spouse/partner/guest are jointly invited and the councilors are serving in their official capacity, such as a recognition dinner. The City does not otherwise reimburse councilors or the Mayor for expenses incurred by their spouse/partner/guest. If councilors or the Mayor wish to have their spouse/partner/guest accompany them while attending out-of-town events, the City may make reservations and have travel and lodging expenses billed directly to the City. Councilors or the Mayor must then reimburse the City for their spouse/partner/guest travel and lodging expenses. Reimbursement should be made as soon as possible so that the trip reconciliation process can be completed.

10.05 Travel Guidelines

Prior notification of out-of-town travel shall be given to staff responsible for travel arrangements in the City Manager's Office whenever possible. Registration and travel arrangements should be made well in advance so that the City can take advantage of reduced fares and early registration fees. Staff shall assist councilors in making transportation and lodging arrangements and arrange to have expenses billed directly to the City; contractors shall be chosen by staff, and not by councilors.

While at a conference, councilors or the Mayor shall be expected to attend conference sessions and, within 30 days, issue a written report to share the information and perspectives with the entire City Council. If more than one councilor attends, a consolidated report may be written.

As a general guideline, each councilor is allowed two out-of-state conference trips per fiscal year. If a councilor wishes to make additional trips, the request should be brought to attention of the full Council and should be endorsed by a majority of the Council. This guideline is intended to cover trips made at the discretion of the individual councilor; it is not intended to be applied to trips related to service on national or regional committee, such as a committee of the National League of Cities.

10.06 Overseas Travel

If the Mayor or members of the Council wish to attend a conference or make a Council business-related trip to a destination overseas, this request shall be made in writing well in advance and shall be placed on the Consent Calendar for approval by the Council.

11. ETHICS

11.01 Reporting Requirements in ORS

In accordance with ORS 244.050, the Mayor and all councilors holding office on April 15 shall be required to file an Annual Verified Statement of Economic Interest with the Oregon Government Standards and Practices Commission on or before that date. The report must be filed on the form prescribed by ORS 244.060. Each year the form shall be sent directly to the elected official by the Commission and should be returned directly to the Commission in Salem. Failure to submit the form by the April 15 deadline may result in the imposition of a civil penalty and/or removal from office.

11.02 Local Code of Ethics

The Charter requires that a code of ethics be enacted. This local code, found in the Eugene Code, places additional conflicts of interest requirements upon elected officials and creates a local process for filing complaints.

12. MEETING AND WORK SESSION SEATING ASSIGNMENTS

The Council shall be assigned seats in January, following the election of the Council president and vice president. The Mayor is always seated at the center position with the Council president seated at the Mayor's right and the Council vice president seated at the Mayor's left.

The remaining councilors shall be assigned seats in alphabetical order by last name. When the Council returns after each Council break, each person moves one seat toward the outside and to the opposite side of the table or dais; those in the outermost seats move to the innermost seats on the opposite side. To achieve the intended rhythm between the fall and winter sessions, the cycle shall be repeated every two years. This system allows councilors the opportunity to regularly change seats throughout a four-year term. Below is a detailed listing of the seating sequence.

Year 1 (Odd Numbered Years)

JANUARY	Mayor	
	President	Vice President
	Councilor A1	Councilor B2
	Councilor C3	Councilor D4
	Councilor E5	Councilor F6

APRIL	Mayor
President	Vice President
Councilor F6	Councilor E5
Councilor B2	Councilor A1
Councilor D4	Councilor C3

SEPTEMBER	Mayor
President	Vice President
Councilor C3	Councilor D4
Councilor E5	Councilor F6
Councilor A1	Councilor B2

Year 2 (Even Numbered Years)

JANUARY	Mayor
President	Vice President
Councilor B2	Councilor A1
Councilor D4	Councilor C3
Councilor F6	Councilor E5

APRIL	Mayor
President	Vice President
Councilor E5	Councilor F6
Councilor A1	Councilor B2
Councilor C3	Councilor D4

SEPTEMBER	Mayor
President	Vice President
Councilor D4	Councilor C3
Councilor F6	Councilor E5
Councilor B2	Councilor A1

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
OPERATING AGREEMENTS
ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON OCTOBER 23, 2023

1. Purpose of Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations

The Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (IGR Committee) exists to make recommendations to the City Council on State and Federal legislative issues. At this time, it is the only standing committee of the City Council.

2. Membership

The IGR Committee consists of three City Council members.

The three IGR Committee Council members are appointed annually by the Mayor in the normal course of appointments to various boards and commissions on which City of Eugene elected officials serve. The Mayor will appoint members that represent the City Council's political and ideological diversity.

The Mayor serves as an ex-officio member of the IGR committee.

3. Committee Chair

The IGR Committee shall elect a chair of the committee at the first regularly scheduled meeting after the Mayor has appointed the members to the IGR Committee.

4. Conducting the Business of Meeting

IGR Committee meetings are governed by Roberts Rules of Order, Revised. Like the City Council, the IGR Committee has the obligation to be clear and simple in its procedures and in its consideration of the questions coming before it.

5. Meetings

The IGR Committee meets as needed and generally meets more frequently when the Oregon Legislature is in session. Meetings of the IGR Committee are subject to the requirements of Oregon Public Meetings Law, ORS 192.620. The meetings shall be held within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City.

No IGR Committee meeting shall be held at any place where discrimination on the basis of an individual's race, religion, color, sex, national origin, ethnicity, marital status, familial status, age, sexual orientation, source of income or disability, is practiced.

Advance notice of at least 24 hours shall be provided for all meetings. Notice shall include written notice to all news media that requested notice.

6. Quorum

Two members of the IGR Committee constitute a quorum for the transaction of Committee business. Other members of the City Council may attend meetings of the IGR Committee, but shall have no authority or status to vote on matters considered by the IGR Committee during that meeting.

Unanimous votes of the IGR Committee require 3 votes, not 2 votes, should an IGR Committee member be absent.

An IGR Committee member may designate the Mayor to serve as an alternate in the member's absence.

7. Minutes

Written minutes shall be taken for all IGR Committee meetings in accordance with the Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual. Minutes must give a true reflection of the matters discussed but need not be a full transcript, verbatim or recording.

8. Process for Sessions of the Oregon Legislature

The Oregon State Legislature convenes annually in January in the state capitol of Salem. In odd years, sessions may last 160 days, referred to as "long session." During the "long session" the legislature approves a two-year state budget for the next biennium. In even years, a "short session" is held. A short session can last a maximum of 35 days.
Preparation for the Long Session is begun by IGR staff who meet with the members of the IGR Committee and other City departmental staff to outline legislative policies and concepts for the upcoming session based upon City Council goals, priorities, community needs and organizational issues. These concepts, after being vetted by staff and the IGR Committee, are then submitted to the full City Council for review and approval. Once the concepts are approved, they become the basis for the Oregon Legislative Priorities document and the Legislative Policies document that serves as the cornerstone for position and lobbying efforts on bills during the session.

9. Process for Introducing Legislation

The City may wish to introduce legislative concepts on its behalf to the legislature. The IGR Committee meets and reviews all proposals for legislation prior to submittal to the Legislature.

Any City staff or elected official interested in introducing legislation prepares a written overview of the purpose of the legislative concept and draft language for review by the IGR Committee. The IGR Committee then reviews the proposal, taking action during a regular meeting to revise, adopt, or take no action on the proposal. Once the IGR Committee has voted on proposed legislative concepts, this recommendation moves forward to the full City Council for review and action.

After the proposed legislative concepts have been reviewed and approved by the full City Council, legislative concepts that have been approved are presented to the Legislature or Eugene Area Legislators for drafting.

10. Process for Review and Prioritization of Legislation

In 2013, the City Council adopted Resolution 5081 (Attachment A), which guides the IGR Committee Legislative Review process and Voting process.
Review by City staff:

- Once the bills are introduced, they are assigned by an IGR staff person to the appropriate Legislative Coordinators (LCs) for review.

- Legislative Coordinators (LCs) in the appropriate City department analyze priority introduced bills that may affect the City. LC staff is determined by each Department.
- LC staff turnaround for review and analysis of a bill is expected to be within 10 working days of the assignment of a bill unless the movement of a bill warrants a faster turn-around. In those cases, IGR staff will contact the LC and arrange for a faster review.
- If a bill addresses one or more of the policies presented in the Oregon Priorities or Legislative Policies documents for that session, the particular policy is noted in the LC staff's analysis of the bill.
- LC staff will relay both the pros and cons of a bill in their comments as well as any amendments that would make the bill more favorable.
- In collaboration with the IGR Manager, the LC will assign each bill a priority and a recommendation.

Position Recommendations:

Support: From the City's perspective, we are in favor of the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are in favor of the bill and note any amendments that would make the bill better.

Oppose: From the City's perspective, we are opposed to the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are opposed and make any recommendations that would make the bill better, if applicable.

Priority Recommendations:

- **High Priority Bills:** We will be highly selective in identifying priority bills to be forwarded to the Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IGR). For a bill to be recommended as a high priority bill to be actively lobbied, either in support or in opposition, the bill would have a significant impact on City operations, services, or finances in such ways to fundamentally impact department administration, organization, personnel, allocation of City resources, or local decision-making, either negatively or positively. The issues addressed by the bill are of significant interest to the City even if they do not directly impact operations, services, or finances of the City. Examples of high priority bills could include Telecom/local pre-emption efforts, PERS reform, Public Safety, and transportation funding.

- In addition to be bills identified as high priority, other bills and legislative issues may be forwarded to the IGR Committee to enable staff to provide supportive or opposing written or oral testimony. Examples of issues that may require supportive testimony (as opposed to active lobbying) include support for the Oregon Cultural Trust, support for one of our partner agencies lobbying efforts (University of Oregon, City of Springfield, EWEB), etc.

11. Voting on bills

The IGR Committee votes on all bill priorities and recommendations.

Approved IGR Committee minutes, including votes on bill positions, will be shared with the full City Council by including them with the weekly City Council materials. Any bill that has been reviewed by the IGR Committee may be requested for discussion by the full City Council or by the Mayor.

If a position the IGR Committee has taken on a bill is not unanimous, the position on that bill will be Neutral until the full City Council weighs in and directs a position. If possible, the bill will then be placed on the next available City Council agenda.

12. Communicating with City Council

All Councilors are encouraged to bring items of interest for follow up by the IGR Committee to the IGR Members, the IGR Manager, City Manager, or Mayor at any time.

The IGR Chair will provide regular updates to the Council during the 'Committee Updates and Items of Interest' section of the Regular City Council meetings.

- Outside of Legislative Session, one update per month, during Items of Interest, by the IGR Chair at the first Monday meeting. This will share with Council the outcomes from the monthly IGR Committee Meeting. The IGR Manager will send this update to the Chair prior to the meeting.
- During the Legislative Session, two updates per month to the Council, during Items of Interest, by the Chair, including Committee Meeting outcomes and Priority Bill Update. The IGR Manager will send this update to the Chair prior to the meeting.

During the Legislative Session, the IGR Manager will provide weekly Priority Bill Update Email to the full Council. During Legislative Session, the weekly Priority Bill Update Email will be included within the weekly Council packets.

13. Process for Federal Lobbying Efforts

The IGR Committee and IGR staff address Federal lobbying priorities in concert with a number of the City's local governmental partners.

The Federal priorities begin with a review of opportunities for funding in the next Federal budget and goals that are specific to Eugene or the area. The IGR Committee meets and reviews the list of potential priority projects. Potential projects should be those projects which have already gone through the proper authorization channels and are "shovel ready" projects. Once the IGR Committee reviews the list of potential projects, the Committee develops a list of project goals that are considered to be achievable.

After the proposed goals have been vetted by staff, United Front partners, and other community partners, and the IGR Committee, the priorities list is then presented to the full City Council for review and approval.

The final list becomes part of the "United Front" agenda which is presented to the area's congressional representatives, executive department staff, and other potential funding sources in Washington, D.C. The attendees on the lobbying trips typically include the Mayor, chair of the IGR Committee, and appropriate City staff.

14. Grants and Funding Applications

Under the direction of the City Manager, the IGR Manager will coordinate with departmental staff and Executive Leadership to ensure all City applications for grants or funding are in accordance with adopted City Policy and have existing budget authorization for any match requirements (either in-kind resources or direct funding). Coordination will include, but not be limited to, ensuring city staff are working collaboratively related to funding sources, support communications related to successful funding requests, and building relationships with potential funding partners.

15. Resolution 4908

On April 18, 2007, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 4908, "A Resolution Establishing Policy Governing City Testimony and Funding Requests, and Repealing Resolution No. 4139". This speaks to the issue of testimony before legislative bodies, funding requests and the role of the Council in setting legislative policy. This Resolution is incorporated into this document as Attachment B.

16. City Council Operating Agreements

The operating agreements of the IGR Committee are to be incorporated into the Operating Agreements of the Eugene City Council. As the IGR Committee is a subset of the City Council, any and all process and operating agreements supersede this document. All process and operating agreements of the City Council, by extension and when relevant apply to the IGR Committee.

Attachment A: City of Eugene Resolution 5081.
Attachment B: City of Eugene Resolution 4908.

RESOLUTION NO. 5081

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE 2013 OREGON LEGISLATURE AND THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OPERATING AGREEMENTS ADOPTED BY RESOLUTION NO. 5043.

The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:

A. Section 2.007 of the Eugene Code, 1971, contains provisions regarding Council meetings and the establishment of Council groundrules.

B. The Eugene City Council Operating Agreements (referred to as groundrules in the Eugene Code, 1971) were adopted by Resolution No. 4588 on April 12, 1999, and have subsequently been amended, most recently by Resolution No. 5043 on October 11, 2011.

C. Included in the Operating Agreements is the document titled "City Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations Operating Agreements" which contains the process for the City's participation in sessions of the Oregon Legislature. The City intends to pilot an alternate process for the 2013 Oregon Legislative Session as set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution, and Resolution No. 5043 should be temporarily amended to enable the City to try the pilot process.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:

Section 1. Based on the above findings, the process for review, prioritization and lobbying of legislation for the 2013 Oregon Legislative Session shall be as described in Exhibit A to this Resolution, rather than the process set forth in Resolution No. 5043.

Section 2. A copy of this Resolution shall be appended to Resolution No. 5043.

Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

The foregoing Resolution adopted the 11th day of February, 2013.

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

Exhibit A

PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND PRIORITIZATION OF LEGISLATION FOR THE 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The 2013 session will start on February 4, 2013. The Legislature convenes annually in February at the State Capitol in Salem. Sessions may not exceed 160 days in odd-numbered years and 35 days in even-numbered years. Five-day extensions are allowed by a two-thirds vote in each house. In odd-numbered years, the Legislative Assembly convenes on the second Monday in January, to swear-in newly elected officials, elect legislative leaders, adopt rules, organize and appoint committees, and begin introducing bills.

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION BY CITY STAFF LEGISLATIVE COORDINATORS

In past years, bills have been assigned by the IGR staff to appropriate staff throughout the city. This has resulted in the generation of a tremendous amount of work, both for staff, as well as for the IGR committee, often with limited or no tangible benefit. Very few bills that we take positions on merit targeted lobbying efforts on behalf of the city of Eugene. This year, we will be approaching the legislative session in a much more targeted way, with the goal of being more efficient, and effective in our lobbying efforts.

The most obvious change in the process will be that IGR staff will no longer routinely assign bills to legislative coordinators for comments and positions. Instead, we will rely primarily on departments to identify significant legislative issues/bills that merit taking a position on and actively lobbying. Department/division staff will be asked to rely on professional affiliations and jurisdictional counterparts across the state to stay in touch with legislative issues arising in their area of expertise. In addition to bills identified by departments, bills will be identified in a two other primary ways, through the League of Oregon Cities, and through paid lobbyists. The League of Oregon Cities has recently implemented a new bill tracking software system, which will be a significant new resource this session. Additionally, the city council or city manager may identify issues that come to their attention for IGR staff. It is strongly believed that all significant legislation of potential impact to the city will be identified through this approach.

Once an issue/bill is identified by department staff, legislative coordinators will assess consistency of the issue with adopted City policies and past legislative positions, and will provide comments and a recommended position and priority for referral to the IGR committee. Bills/legislative issues brought to IGR staff should be limited to those determined to be high priority; that is, the bill would have significant impact on City operations, services, or finances in such ways as to fundamentally impact department administration, organization, personnel, allocation of City resources, or local decision-making, either negatively or positively. Examples of legislative issues that have already been identified for this session include PERS reform, telecom, and public safety. Legislation related to these issue areas could have significant

financial or operational impact on the City – therefore we plan to actively lobby the city's interests in these areas.

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY

As described in the previous section, advocacy efforts will be narrowed and targeted to focus on a very few, high priority issues of potential impact to the City. In the past, this was done on the basis of the priority assignment and recommendation system. Because only bills of potential impact will be referred to the CELEG system, the priority assignment system will be modified. Staff will be asked to provide a "support," or "oppose," recommendation for all bills to be reviewed on which we want to take a position. In rare cases, there may be a need to "monitor" a bill. In that case, specific information will be provided to explain the merits of tracking such a bill.

Position Recommendations:

Support: From the City's perspective, we are in favor of the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are in favor of the bill and note any amendments that would make the bill better.

Oppose: From the City's perspective, we are opposed to the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are opposed and make any recommendations that would make the bill better, if applicable.

Priority Recommendations:

- **High Priority Bills:** We will be highly selective in identifying priority bills to be forwarded to the Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IGR). For a bill to be recommended as a high priority bill to be actively lobbied, either in support or in opposition, the bill would have a significant impact on City operations, services, or finances in such ways as to fundamentally impact department administration, organization, personnel, allocation of City resources, or local decision-making, either negatively or positively. The issues addressed by the bill are of significant interest to the City even if they do not directly impact the operations, services, or finances of the City. Examples of high priority bills could include Telecom/local pre-emption efforts, PERS reform, Public Safety, and transportation funding.

- In addition to be bills identified as high priority, other bills and legislative issues may be forwarded to the IGR committee to enable staff to provide supportive or opposing written or oral testimony. Examples of issues that may require supporting testimony (as opposed to active lobbying) include support for the Oregon Cultural Trust, support for

one of our partner agencies lobbying efforts (University of Oregon, City of Springfield, EWEB), etc.

Voting on bills:

The IGR Committee votes on all bill priorities and recommendations.

All unanimous positions are presented on the full City Council's agenda for review and approval. The minutes of the IGR Committee are ratified by the City Council. Any bill that has been reviewed by the IGR Committee may be pulled for discussion at the request of any Councilor or by the Mayor.

If a position the IGR Committee has taken on a bill is not unanimous, the position on that bill will be Neutral until the full City Council weighs in and directs a position. If possible, the bill will then be placed on the next available City Council agenda. If time makes placing the bill on the City council agenda impossible, City council members will be emailed with the details of the bill and asked for their direction.

RESOLUTION NO. 4908

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING POLICY GOVERNING CITY TESTIMONY AND FUNDING REQUESTS, AND REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 4139.

The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:

A. Under the Eugene Charter, it is the exclusive role of the City Council to set legislative policy for the City.

B. On September 13, 1989 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 4139 establishing policy governing testimony and funding requests by City representatives.

C. The City Council has determined that Section 7 of Resolution No. 4139 should be repealed.

D. The Council finds that Resolution No. 4139 should be repealed in its entirety, and its provisions, other than Section 7, be readopted as hereinafter set forth as City policy governing testimony before the Federal government, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon or its committees, State agencies, or municipal corporations, and submission of funding requests to such entities. As used herein, in addition to the Congress of the United States, references to "Federal government" includes all committees, commissions, departments, agencies, bureaus, and governmental divisions or instrumentalities of the United States.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:

Section 1. Based upon the above findings, which are adopted herein, Resolution No. 4139, adopted by the Council on September 13, 1989, and any other Resolution in conflict herewith is hereby repealed as of the effective date of this Resolution, and City policy governing testimony and funding requests is established as hereinafter set forth.

Section 2. Any employee or agent of the City, the Mayor or any member of the City Council or any City board or commission desiring to testify in his or her official capacity on legislative or regulatory matters before the State Legislative Assembly, State agencies, municipal corporations, or the Federal government, or desiring to submit funding requests for municipal activities thereto or to any private foundation, shall present the essence of the testimony or funding request to the Council for prior approval, modification, or disapproval.

Section 3. No employee, agent or officer of the City shall testify on legislative or regulatory matters before a governmental entity or request funding from a public or private source in his or her official capacity contrary to the adopted policies of the Council. The Mayor, members of the City Council, and members of City boards or commissions shall not make a

funding request contrary to the adopted policies of the Council. No such person shall testify contrary to adopted policies of the Council unless prior to the presentation the speaker submits to the governmental entity a written statement of the City's position and orally acknowledges before speaking that the testimony will be contrary to the City's position. Summaries of all testimony delivered under this section shall be provided to the Council. Each summary shall include a description of the time, place and group before which the statement was made.

Section 4. In the event time pressures do not permit the Council to consider the testimony before the intended time of presentation by a representative of a City board or commission, the person may speak for the board or commission, but must explain that the Council has not considered the issue. Summaries of all testimony under this section shall be provided to the Council.

Section 5. Any officer, employee or agent of the City, the Mayor, or a member of the Council or a City board or commission may take a position before or request funding from administrative staff of State agencies, municipal corporations, the Federal government, or private foundations without prior approval of the Council, but must declare that consideration and approval of the Council has not been obtained if that is the case. This declaration need not be given if the position or funding request presented represents application of previously adopted Council policies with respect to the issue being considered.

Section 6. If the City Manager, or his or her designee determines it is important that the City of Eugene speak on a legislative issue or apply for available funds and the hearing schedule or funding application deadline does not permit prior Council approval, the City Manager or his or her designee is authorized to speak on behalf of the City of Eugene after consultation with the Council Legislative Committee Chair. Summaries of all testimony delivered or funding applications submitted under this section shall be provided to the Council.

Section 7. This Resolution is not to be construed to abridge the rights of individuals to testify in their own names.

Section 8. The provisions of this Resolution do not apply to testimony before an agency or court in a quasi-judicial or judicial proceeding.

Section 9. Copies of this Resolution shall be distributed to the departments, boards and commissions of the City of Eugene and, as deemed appropriate by the City Manager, to the Federal government, State Legislative Assembly, State agencies, municipal corporations, and private foundations before presentation of testimony or funding requests. The City Manager is directed to take any other necessary administrative action to implement this Resolution.

Section 10. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

The foregoing Resolution adopted the 18th day of April, 2007.

City Recorder

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Work Session: Tenant Opportunity to Purchase

Meeting Date: November 9, 2026
Department: Planning & Development
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 2
Staff Contact: Amy Cameron
Phone: 541-682-5383

ISSUE STATEMENT

This work session is an opportunity for City Council to review and discuss information on Tenant Opportunity to Purchase (TOPA) policy as requested by Council on February 25, 2026. TOPA establishes specific processes for the sale of rental units providing tenants with an opportunity to buy the building before it is sold on the open market. Council will be asked to provide staff direction regarding next steps.

BACKGROUND

Over 40,000 households in Eugene rent their homes and about 57 percent of them are cost-burdened, creating strain on the financial health and wellbeing of more than half the city's renter population (2024 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) Data). Homeownership is increasingly unattainable, as gaps between incomes and home prices increase and interest rates remain high. Between 2012 and 2024, Eugene's median household income increased by 80 percent while single-detached home sales prices rose 139 percent (2012 and 2024 1-Year ACS Data). Mortgage rates have risen to an annual average of 6.5 percent in 2026, compared to a 3.9 percent annual average rate between 2012 and 2022 (Freddie Mac). The housing crisis disproportionally impacts Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) community members who, due to systemic racism, experience significant disparities in homeownership rates, higher levels of housing cost burden and eviction rates, and lower net worth than their white counterparts.

Policy Overview

Some state and larger metropolitan jurisdictions have adopted tenant and community opportunity to purchase policies, as a strategy to stabilize neighborhoods, preserve affordability, protect housing from the speculative real estate market, and create pathways to homeownership. TOPA comes with a variety of policy options that can mandate individuals, organizations, governments, or other legal entities the opportunity to purchase a property when the owner decides to sell. Opportunity to purchase policies are structured around common elements: the legal right to first offer and/or refusal to purchase and identifying the eligible buyers; assignment of rights; the types of properties and sales subject to the policy; situations exempted from the policy; timelines for notices and real estate transactions; rights and responsibilities of sellers and buyers; and enforcement mechanisms applicable to real estate transactions.

Policy variations are influenced by legal and legislative context, available financial resources, local housing market conditions, historical and political factors, the involvement of public agencies, nonprofit organizations, community groups, and private-sector participants. Each policy aims to address specific housing needs by enabling outcomes such as transition to shared equity housing,

income-qualified Affordable Housing, homeownership opportunities, or market-rate rental housing acquired by a tenant association. Additional policy choices impact outcomes such as allowing/prohibiting tenants to sell their purchase rights, structuring the appraisal process, specifying a tenant association certification process (if applicable), and mandating dedicated support for technical assistance and financing. Careful consideration and refined analysis are needed to determine a policy's intended outcomes and impact on the housing market. Due to these varied and location specific factors, no single jurisdiction provides a model that can be directly replicated for Eugene.

Policy Examples and Outcomes

Several state and large municipal jurisdictions throughout the country have adopted opportunity to purchase policies to varying degrees over the past 40+ years. (See Attachment A for Opportunity to Purchase Policies in Other Jurisdictions). Washington D.C.'s TOPA and San Francisco's Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) are leading examples. In Washington D.C., which has the longest standing TOPA policy, 96 percent of units (18,399) where tenant associations utilized the policy remained rentals between 2006 and 2020. Of those units, 41 percent preserved existing rent control and 42 percent preserved or added income-qualified Affordable Housing restrictions. San Francisco's COPA, enacted in 2019, gives nonprofit developers the opportunity to purchase market rate rental buildings with three or more units and has resulted in 436 converted or preserved affordable homes. (See Attachment B for Case Studies and Additional Research).

Since 2007, manufactured home parks in Oregon are subject to a state-level tenant opportunity to purchase policy that includes organizational tenant services, dedicated funding, and a capital gains tax exemption to incentivize the sale of manufactured home parks to residents and nonprofits. Effective in 2017, House Bill 2002 gives state or local government in Oregon the right of first refusal to purchase Affordable Housing properties that intend to sell within 36 months of exiting their affordability status. The Eugene-Springfield HOME governing board has a procedure similar to COPA that requires the opportunity of a sale to be shared with other local Affordable Housing providers first for housing that is in the HOME affordability period. In 2023, advocates in Oregon supported a statewide TOPA bill at the legislature to extend purchase rights to multi-unit rental housing; the bill died in committee without receiving a public hearing or a vote.

Community Listening Sessions

The City held four community input sessions between April and August 2026 to better understand the opportunities and impacts of TOPA/opportunities to purchase: the Urban Growth Strategies (UGS) community advisory panel; tenants and tenant advocates; rental owners, realtors, property managers, and landlord-tenant attorneys; and individuals representing Affordable Housing providers. A summary of the key takeaways from each session is in Attachment C. Full session notes are available on the City website at eugene-or.gov/renterprotections.

Key Considerations

Based on the initial feasibility research and listening sessions, the key considerations for a local opportunity to purchase policy are the need for dedicated funding, equitable access, short- and long-term financing feasibility and sustainability, additional enforcement framework and capacity, and impact on housing development.

- *Dedicated Funding:* Effective opportunity to purchase policy requires substantial recurring investments in tenant education, technical and legal assistance, capacity building of support organizations, downpayment assistance funds, and dedicated staff to manage a new

program and provide equitable access to TOPA. Feedback from TOPA listening sessions stressed the importance of proactive education and outreach about homeownership, shared equity models, apartment maintenance, and financial literacy. Without these elements, TOPA risks being performative, rather than substantive, and may not yield positive outcomes. Advocates provided staff with estimates of around $50,000 needed for a local per unit City TOPA subsidy. (In comparison, the City's existing Affordable Housing programs net more units produced or preserved (about $8,000-$17,000 per unit) by supporting development and rehabilitation projects that leverage state and federal subsidies and support housing stability for low-income community members exclusively.)

- *Equitable Access:* The UGS community advisory panel expressed concerns about tenant capacity, inclusion, and equity in the TOPA process. Panel members noted TOPA could have barriers to participation for low-income households, people with disabilities, people experiencing mental health issues, people with conviction histories, immigrants, non-English speakers, students, and older adults. Several tenant/tenant advocate participants agreed that without funding, the policy could create a classist system that benefits higher-income residents while leaving out low-income and marginalized community members.
- *Short-Term Financing Feasibility:* Short-term financing for acquisition costs includes earnest money deposits and funds to close the purchase before permanent financing is obtained. UGS panel participants shared that few projects would be financially viable without low-interest rate loans or earnest money support. They also noted that TOPA favors tenants who can organize quickly, raise deposits, and access financing, potentially leaving out marginalized households. Tenants/tenant advocates shared that a local subsidy and revenue-backed programming is needed to support tenant organizing and short-term financing. Successful acquisitions in D.C. and San Francisco depend on dedicated rapid acquisition funds and close coordination between City agencies and nonprofit lenders with sufficient staffing to underwrite quickly and support borrowers effectively. Existing state funding for conversion of market rate / unregulated units to Affordable Housing is subject to long waitlists and limited timeframes that would make it difficult to secure financing within TOPA timelines.
- *Long-Term Financing and Sustainability:* Even if tenants secure short-term financing for TOPA, they may encounter hurdles in securing permanent and affordable loans to sustain the property. TOPA requires fast flexible lending partners familiar with the specific legal and procedural shifts in how TOPA real estate transactions are handled, evaluated, and underwritten. Affordable Housing providers and real estate professionals from the listening sessions noted private lenders are currently risk-averse, making it difficult to secure conventional financing. Developers also expressed concern about converting existing units into Affordable Housing, given high interest rates and administrative costs. Affordable Housing providers noted that high construction and maintenance costs could leave tenant-owned buildings responsible for major capital needs—such as roof, HVAC, or structural repairs—that tenant-owners may not be able to meet.
- *Enforcement:* Several tenants/tenant advocate participants emphasized the need for built in enforcement to ensure notice requirements to tenants are met, appraisal guidelines are followed and offers to purchase are fair and accurate. In addition to administrative oversight, enforcing a local TOPA policy would require expanded enforcement framework, capacity, and code provisions to resolve disputes, declare non-compliance, and enforce

requirements in the context of real estate transactions, which is not currently part of City code compliance.

- *Impact on Affordable Housing Providers:* Affordable Housing providers shared struggles to produce and preserve aging portfolios. Most do not have additional resources to partner with tenant associations under a local TOPA policy. Without incentives or dedicated City funds, Affordable Housing providers are concerned that a local TOPA policy would be ineffective, complicate the real estate market, stifle housing production, and create competition for already limited Affordable Housing funding, or divert scarce local resources away from Affordable Housing production and rehabilitation.
- *Impact on Housing Development:* TOPA has been shown to extend real estate transaction timelines and add administrative burden, which can drive up costs for property owners. Although little empirical evidence is available showing the direct impact of TOPA on housing development, economic theory and anecdotal assertions suggest that it will deter potential buyers and stymie development. Rental owners, realtors, property managers, and landlord-tenant attorneys and Affordable Housing providers listening session participants echoed these concerns.

Possible Implementation Plan

If Council wants to continue exploration of a local opportunity to purchase policy, Attachment D of this AIS provides an overview of the possible process. Opportunity to purchase policy development requires responsiveness to specific market and household needs and use of an equity lens for further analysis of policy elements and programmatic supports. Successful implementation of a local policy would require clear guidelines, dedicated staffing, community participation, strong partnerships with public and community institutions that take time to build, and sustained resources for program operations and housing investment (funding per unit). The estimated cost of implementation depends in part on the policy path chosen.

Three potential policy paths for local opportunity to purchase are included in Attachment E and include:

- Path A (multi-unit buildings) is the broadest of the three paths, focused on i) transitions to shared equity housing or Affordable Housing, or ii) units remaining as rentals with the potential to negotiate repairs, limits on rent increase, and additional protections.
- Path B (Affordable Housing only) is focused on converting market rate housing to Affordable Housing.
- Path C (low-density residential) is focused on conversions to homeownership for low density residential (single detached units, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes).

If Council has interest in further exploration of an opportunity to purchase policy, the next steps would be:

1. Council to select a policy path: Path A multi-unit buildings, Path B Affordable Housing only, or Path C low density residential (Attachment E);
2. Consultant to conduct additional feasibility analysis, identify resource requirements for programmatic supports and financing, and develop a policy proposal. The estimated consultant cost to the Rental Housing Program is approximately $75,000 to 100,000; and

3. Council to hold a work session to discuss, including what sources of funding could be utilized for implementation, and provide direction on next steps.

Alternatively, Council could decide that a state-level approach for opportunity to purchase policies is more appropriate/effective given the current local resource constraints and priorities.

RELATED CITY POLICIES

The City has and continues to implement numerous policies, plans, and programs that emphasize housing production, affordability, choice, stability, and equity as an urgent community need.

Housing Implementation Pipeline (HIP) is the 5-year internal work plan (FY22-27) to coordinate current and future resources, and goals to support housing across the full continuum from people experiencing homelessness to overall housing supply. HIP efforts align closely with the City's strategic goal to achieve housing and homelessness outcomes, including capacity for shelter operations and supportive services, supporting efforts to preserve and construct Affordable Housing units, Permanent Supportive Housing units, and Moderate-Income Housing units, and developing an Anti-Displacement Action Plan, among many others. The HIP potential policy and program exploration list (Appendix A) does not include opportunity to purchase.

The City's Condominium Conversions rule regulates the conversion of rental units to condominiums and provides protections and supports for tenants when a property owner decides to convert a rental building into condominiums.

The City's Affordable Housing Funding Programs provide financial and regulatory incentives for the development of permanent, transitional and emergency housing by partner organizations. Local incentives includes the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF), the Low-income Rental Housing Property Tax Exemption (LIRHPTE), and the Systems Development Charge (SDC) Exemptions. (One time funds for City Fee Assistance of $2.28M that Council approved in December 2021 are fully committed, and, as of May 2026, resulted in 232 units completed and 246 units awarded in the pipeline.)

The City's Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) lobbies on behalf of the City to the Oregon Legislature. In the 2027 State and Federal Legislative Policy agenda, the City supports legislation that increases the stability of renter households and maintains appropriate protections for landlord-tenant relations and programs and tools to fund the development, preservation, and protections of housing affordable to low-income persons.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION

February 25, 2026 City Council Work Session

Council directed 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.

> Councilor Yeh, seconded by Councilor Kashinsky, moved 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.
> Passed 7:0

COUNCIL OPTIONS

1. Focus existing resources on the City's current Affordable Housing programs and not pursue an opportunity to purchase policy at this time.

OR

2. Select one of the following opportunity to purchase policy paths: Path A multi-unit buildings; Path B Affordable Housing only; or Path C low density residential; and direct the City Manager to invest in further exploration of implementation of that path, including the legal, market, and funding considerations, and return to council with more information in a future work session.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

Based on the importance of fostering financial stability and the success of existing Affordable Housing programs, the City Manager recommends that Council not pursue a local opportunity to purchase policy at this time and wait to see what happens at the state level. A statewide program would likely have access to more funding and the state has already adopted an opportunity to purchase program applicable to manufactured dwelling parks.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS

1. Move to direct the City Manager not to explore a local opportunity to purchase policy at this time.

OR

2. Move to direct the City Manager to invest in further exploration of implementation of an opportunity to purchase policy Path [A, B, or C], including a budgetary impact analysis, and return to council with more information in a future work session.

[Note: Path A multi-unit buildings, Path B Affordable Housing only, or Path C low density residential]

ATTACHMENTS

A. Opportunity to Purchase Policies in Other Jurisdictions
B. Case Studies & Research
C. TOPA Listening Sessions Key Takeaways
D. Possible Implementation Plan for TOPA
E. Possible Policy Path Options

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Amy Cameron, Rental Housing Analyst

Phone: 541-682-5383

Staff E-Mail: acameron@eugene-or.gov

Opportunity to Purchase Policies in Other Jurisdictions

Year Enacted	Jurisdiction	Policy Name	Policy Goal	Type of Right	Eligible Buyer (Rights Holder)	Housing Types
1980	Washington D.C. Pop. 693,645	Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA)	Address the lack of affordable housing, prevent the displacement of DC residents, and give tenants a voice in what happens in their neighborhoods	Right of first refusal	Tenants (transferrable rights)	5+ units, certain 2-4 units (2018 Act exempted single-detached)
1980	Montgomery County, MD Pop. 1,074,582	Right of First Refusal to Buy Rental Housing	Preserve affordable housing and prevent tenant displacement	Right of first refusal	County, Housing Opportunities Commission, and certified tenant organizations	4+ units
1986	Takoma Park city, MD Pop. 17,260	Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA)	Provide home ownership opportunities to City residents and promote the conversion of rental to owner-occupied housing	Right of first refusal	Tenants, tenant association, or the City (transferrable rights)	All rentals (different provisions apply to single-detached, 2-6, and 7+ units)
1988	New Hampshire Pop. 1,415,342	Manufactured Home Park Right to Purchase	Preserve affordable homeownership and protect residents from displacement when a manufactured housing park is put up for sale	Right of first refusal	Tenants	Manufactured Home Parks
2007	Oregon Pop. 4,273,586	Manufactured Home Park Opportunity to Purchase	Strengthen the private housing market in Oregon by encouraging all Oregonians to have the ability to participate in the purchase of housing of their choice.	Right of first refusal	Tenants	Manufactured Home Parks

Year Enacted	Jurisdiction	Policy Name	Policy Goal	Type of Right	Eligible Buyer (Rights Holder)	Housing Types
2013	Prince George County, MD Pop. 970,374	Right of First Refusal to Buy Rental Housing	Preserve and expand availability of affordable rental housing	Right of first refusal	County or designee (e.g. Affordable Housing nonprofit or qualified third party)	20+ units
2014	Chicago, IL Pop. 2,731,585	Single Room Occupancy Preservation Ordinance	Preserve affordable housing	Right of first offer	Registered Developers	Single-Room Occupancy (SRO)
2017	Oregon Pop. 4,273,586	Publicly Supported Housing - Contract Preservation (PuSH-CP)	Preserve Affordable Housing	Right of first refusal	Qualified purchasers (e.g. public housing authority or OHCS)	Certain publicly supported housing with 5+ units
2019	San Francisco, CA Pop. 826,079	Community Opportunity to Purchase (COPA)	Prevent tenant displacement and create long-term affordability	Right of first offer and/or refusal	Qualified non-profit organizations	3+ units
2022	Colorado Pop. 6,012,561	Mobile Home Park Residents Opportunity To Purchase	Promote home ownership while preserving the benefits of mobile home parks as affordable housing	Right of first refusal	Tenants	Manufactured Home Parks
2023 *(duplicative of state law passed 2024)*	Baltimore, MD Pop. 569,997	Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA)	Improve path for renters to move into homeownership, build generational wealth, foster community stability, and reduce displacement	Right of first refusal	Tenants	3 or fewer units
2023	Philadelphia, PN Pop. 1,574,281	People's Preservation Package	Preserve government-subsidized Affordable Housing, without disrupting the market	Right of first refusal	Tenant organizations, City, and Affordable Housing providers	4+ units

Year Enacted	Jurisdiction	Policy Name	Policy Goal	Type of Right	Eligible Buyer (Rights Holder)	Housing Types
2024	Maryland Pop. 6,265,347	Renters' Rights and Stabilization Act of 2024: Right of First Refusal	Promote housing stability, prevent sudden displacement, and streamline ordinances across multiple jurisdictions	Right of first refusal	Tenants	3 or fewer units
2025	Chicago, IL Pop. 2,731,585	Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Block (606) District Pilot Program	Minimize displacement, stabilize households facing displacement pressures, promote preservation of affordable rental housing in neighborhoods at risk of gentrification	Right of first refusal	Tenants (transferrable rights)	1-2 units; 3-4 units; and 5+ units in specific geographic areas
2025	San Diego, CA Pop. 1,406,106	Affordable Housing Preservation Ordinance	Preserve existing housing units that have deed restrictions	Right of first offer and/or refusal	Qualified entities	5+ deed restricted Affordable Housing
Active Consideration	Massachusetts Pop. 7,154,084	An Act to Guarantee a Tenant's First Right of Refusal	Enable cities and towns to enact ordinances to give tenants first right of refusal. Increase and protect supply of affordable housing, especially naturally occurring affordable housing.	Right of first refusal	Tenants (transferrable rights)	Multi-unit
	Minneapolis, MN Pop. 430,324	Right of first refusal and/or opportunity to purchase for tenants and qualified developers to the sale of rental housing	Prevent displacement, tenant empowerment, create ownership opportunities for ownership.	Under consideration	Under consideration	Under consideration
	New York City, NY Pop. 8,584,629	Community Opportunity to Purchase (COPA)	Stabilize buildings in greatest need of preservation, combat speculation and displacement, and expand the supply of permanently affordable, community- and tenant-controlled housing	Right of first refusal	Qualified non-profit organizations, including community land trusts	4+ distressed units

	New York State Pop. 20,002,427	Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA)	Prevent displacement of middle and lower-income tenants, preserve affordable housing	Right of first refusal	Tenants, tenant association, or qualified purchaser	3+ units
Failed October 2024	Berkeley, CA Pop. 121,911	Community/ Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA/COPA)	Prevent displacement of lower income tenants and preserve affordable housing	Right of first offer and/or refusal	Tenants and qualified non-profit organizations	All rentals

Case Studies & Additional Research

This attachment provides three tenant opportunity to purchase (TOPA) policy case studies. It includes information on policy context, outcomes, funding, and administrative oversight and enforcement in each jurisdiction. A list of TOPA related research is provided at the bottom of this attachment.

1. Washington D.C.

Context. Washington D.C. enacted TOPA over 45 years ago amid a wave of mass evictions, condominium conversions, rapid gentrification and displacement pressures on long-time residents. Following the passage of a series of tenant protection laws enacted between 1974-1980, the Rental Housing Conversion and Sale Act of 1980 included TOPA and gave tenants the first right of refusal to purchase their units or buildings when an owner intended to sell. The law has been amended several times:

- 1995 to allow tenant associations to assign their purchase rights.
- 2005 to expand the definition of sale to include certain recapitalizations and internal ownership changes.
- 2018 to exclude single-detached units.
- 2025 to modernize and rebalance the Act's impact, including:
    - Exempting new multi-unit construction built within 15 years;
    - Adding a 45-day cooling-off period before tenants can assign their rights to third parties;
    - Exempting two- to four-unit building under certain circumstances;
    - Adding a Qualified Purchaser certification requirement and process.

Outcomes. A 2023 study examining four decades of TOPA concluded that it has a strong record of preserving existing regulated Affordable Housing and empowering tenants but has also faced significant challenges. Between 2006 and 2020, 425 Tenant Associations organized under TOPA and successfully negotiated outcomes for 19,170 units (51% of the units sold following a TOPA notice). Ninety-six percent remained rentals; 41% preserved existing rent control and 42% preserved or added income-qualified Affordable Housing restrictions through assignment of rights. Four percent of the TOPA negotiated units (771) were converted to limited equity cooperatives. Major challenges that hindered D.C.'s program goals include scarce and unpredictable Affordable Housing financing; lack of clear accessible information for tenants; abuse and evasion of TOPA; lack of economies of scale and financing tools to improve conditions and convert small buildings to Affordable Housing. TOPA extended timelines to sell tenant-occupied buildings by about five months. (Coalition for Nonprofit Housing & Economic Development (CNHED)).

Funding. D.C.'s TOPA policy expressly mandates dedicated assistance and financing to help tenants exercise rights. Supports are administered by the District's Department of Housing and Community Development, primarily funded through the First Right Purchase Program, and the Housing

Production Trust Fund, which provide acquisition financing, technical assistance, and preservation subsidies for tenant purchases. CNHED found that the historical under-prioritization of subsidy for preservation in TOPA projects has hindered its full potential, especially for 5-49 unit properties with high deferred maintenance and majority low-income tenants. To fill the funding gap CNHED recommended $30 million of funding for FY25 to explicitly fund the First Right Purchase Program, elevating it from a discretionary $10 million carve-out within the Housing Production Trust Fund to support TOPA purchases.

Administrative oversight and enforcement. D.C.'s Rental Conversion and Sale Division in the Department of Housing and Community Development is tasked with administration and enforcement of TOPA. The Office of Administrative Hearings has authority to hear and decide certain rental housing conversion or sale cases under the Rental Housing Conversion and Sale Act (e.g. TOPA). The District of Columbia Court of Appeals hears appeals from the Superior Court (including cases initially decided at the Office of Administrative Hearings) concerning TOPA-related disputes. Landlords that fail to comply with TOPA, may be liable for damages and penalties including fines, legal fees, and other costs associated with the dispute. Sales may be delayed or cancelled if tenants are able to successfully challenge the sale in court

2. San Francisco

Context. San Francisco enacted its Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) in 2019 after decades of tenant-led activism and pressure for strong protections to prevent displacement amid skyrocketing housing costs, increasing real estate speculation, and concerns about the loss of naturally occurring affordable housing. COPA gives qualified nonprofits the first right of refusal to purchase market rate buildings with three or more units when an owner intends to sell. The law has been amended two times:

- 2020 to give nonprofits new opportunities to buy buildings if a building has not sold after one year, to increase seller obligations to provide more information up front and help nonprofits complete due diligence tasks, to allow conversions to limited equity cooperatives, and clarify exempted properties.
- 2024 to clarify definitions of what buildings are covered and refine rules for vacant lots, to allow third party agents to act on behalf of nonprofits, and to strengthen procedural rules and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) authority to implement and enforce COPA.

Outcomes. MOHCD has not published aggregated COPA statistics. According to a December 2025 Next City article by Kyle Smeallie, policy and communications director for the San Francisco Community Land Trust and Quintin Mecke executive director of the Council of Community Housing Organizations, San Francisco COPA has resulted in dozens of acquisitions and the preservation of affordable housing in 436 homes for more than 1,000 residents in neighborhoods facing high risks of displacement and real estate speculation.

Funding. Qualified Nonprofits have access to financing for COPA deals though the MOHCD Small Sites Program (SSP). The SSP provides low interest (0-3%) loans with an option to forgive unpaid interest subject to the MOHCD's approval. San Francisco sellers benefit from a partial City transfer tax exemption under COPA. One-time investments aimed at tenant outreach, legal preparedness, and acquisition readiness bolstered nonprofit capacity in areas impacted by COPA policy rollout.

Administrative oversight and enforcement. MOHCD is the designated agency responsible for interpreting, implementing, and enforcing the law, as well as providing administrative oversight of the program. Qualified nonprofits may file civil legal action against a seller and seek damages equal to the difference between the market price of the property at the time of the sale and the price the nonprofit could have purchased it. Civil penalties may be assessed if a seller knowingly or willfully violates COPA.

3. Maryland

Context. Multiple jurisdictions in Maryland have enacted variations of opportunity to purchase policies since 1980. In 2024, the Governor's Housing Package focused on increasing housing supply and affordability included a statewide tenant opportunity to purchase law. The new Right of First Refusal (ROFR) law gives tenants the opportunity to purchase their rental properties with three or fewer units before they go on the market. The law leverages state support mechanisms to help tenants exercise their rights.

Outcomes. Maryland has not published ROFR property counts, whether ROFR was exercised, the number of tenant purchases, or any aggregated ROFR statistics.

Funding. The Renters' Rights and Stabilization Act of 2024 established the Office of Landlord and Tenant Affairs (OLTA), a state-funded office that provides administrative, programmatic, and counseling resources designed to guide renters toward homeownership. The Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development offers homebuyer education and helps families purchase homes with competitive loan options, including down payment assistance, and funds that help with closing costs through the Maryland Mortgage Program.

Administrative oversight and enforcement. OLTA staff train landlords, property managers, real estate agents, and other housing industry professionals on requirements of the law and provide a landlord portal to submit required information related to property sales subject to ROFR. Violations of ROFR can result in civil penalties of up to $1,000 per individual requirement (e.g. failure to provide proper notice, failure to meet formatting or timeline requirements) and lead to title insurance or real estate transaction complications, which are enforced through legal or judicial channels.

Research Related to TOPA

Duranti-Martínez, J and Greenberg, D. (2023). *Stable Homes and Resident Empowerment Implementing Effective Tenant and Community Opportunity to Purchase Programs*. Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Duranti-Martínez, J and Greenberg, D. (2024). *TOPA Needs Capital to Succeed*. Shelterforce.

Greenburg, B. (2025). *Surveying and Evaluating Tenant and Community "Opportunity to Purchase" Proposals*. NYU Furman Center.

Harvey, D., Burton, E. & Nobel, O. (2026). *Financing and Technical Assistance Considerations for an Opportunity to Purchase Policy*. Urban Institute.

Hill, B., Moulden, D. & Keller, J. *Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act in Washington D.C.: A brief history*. Radical Housing Journal.

Meima, J. (2020). *Lessons from 20 years of enabling tenants to buy their buildings*. Shelterforce.

Portland Housing Bureau. (2026). *Advancing Housing Stability in Portland: Applied Lessons from Social Housing and Other Innovated Housing Models*.

Sayin, Y. & Calma, E. (2025). *TOPA's Promise and Pitfalls Balancing tenant rights, affordability, and housing investment in Washington, D.C.* D.C. Policy Center: The Wilkes Initiative for Housing Policy.

Smeallie, K. & Mecke Q. (2025). *COPA Has Helped Prevent Displacement in San Francisco. It Can Work in New York City, Too*. Next City.

Trout, R. et al. (2023). *Sustaining affordability: The role of TOPA in D.C. housing*. Coalition for Nonprofit Housing and Economic Development.

Virginia Housing Commission. (2025) *Policy Brief – Right of First Refusal and Other Purchase Opportunity Policies Used to Buy Housing*.

TOPA Listening Sessions – Key Takeaways

This attachment provides key takeaways from four community input sessions held between April and August 2026 to better understand the opportunities and impacts of TOPA/opportunities to purchase: the Urban Growth Strategies (UGS) community advisory panel; tenants and tenant advocates; rental owners, realtors, property managers, and landlord-tenant attorneys; and individuals representing Affordable Housing providers. Staff shared an overview of TOPA and key discussion questions. Full session notes are available on the City website at eugene-or.gov/renterprotections.

UGS community advisory panel – April 8, 2026

Panel members consisting of community members who represent people with disabilities, LGBTQ+, Black, Indigenous, Native American, Latino/Latina, Asian, Pacific Islander, and historically marginalized communities expressed significant concerns about the ability of TOPA to provide successful outcomes. The program would need extensive support, community outreach and education, and to be tailored to fit Eugene's unique housing conditions. Panel members discussed the benefits of overall renter education opportunities to collaborate and create associations, and interest in preserving affordability and increasing homeownership opportunities. Key takeaways include:

Dedicated funding and the right market conditions needed for success

- Resources are needed to help people overcome financial barriers to homeownership.
- Few projects will be financially viable without low-interest rate loans or earnest cash.
- TOPA favors tenants who can organize quickly, raise deposits, and access financing.
- Panelists voiced concerns about the impact of extended timelines on sellers and local markets.
- TOPA provides opportunity for tenants to assign purchase rights to a third-party developer and negotiate affordability, which panelists viewed as a renter protection.

Concerns about tenant capacity, inclusion, and equity issues

- Many tenants may be left out: especially low-income renters, people with disabilities,
- people experiencing mental health issues, people with conviction histories, immigrants, non-English speakers, students, and older adults.
- Panelists expressed concerns that tenants who are unable or choose not to join a TOPA rental association could be displaced by TOPA.
- A successful program would need social workers, coaches, or trusted organizations to help tenants organize, understand options, and navigate legal and financial steps.

TOPA success depends on robust renter education, outreach, and ongoing support

- TOPA is contingent on significant, proactive education and outreach about the program, homeownership, building maintenance responsibilities, and financial literacy.
- Increasing the number of tenant associations could be valuable: they provide an avenue for resolving conflicts and solving maintenance issues.

- Owning a single property with several individuals poses significant challenges, especially for those impacted by systemic barriers.

Barriers to forming tenant associations and getting agreement from 51% of renters

- Panelists felt it would be very difficult to organize a tenant association within a 45-day period.
- They shared concerns about internal conflicts and tenants with limited ability to participate.
- Meetings and decision-making processes may deter people who fear discrimination or lack of trust.

Complexity of implementation

- Uncertainty about how co-ops/tenant association secure loans.
- Panelists considered the potential for loopholes to avoid triggering TOPA.
- Concerns related to the details of implementation, such as how the policy interacts with condo regulations, owner-occupied units, and small buildings.

Tenants and tenant advocates - July 23, 2026

Overall themes

- Participants generally supported the idea of TOPA policy.
- Revenue-backed support for education, organizing, financing, and enforcement is essential to the success of the program.
- Participants discussed practical implementation and provided a high level of input on policy variations.

The key problems that TOPA would address:

- Housing instability and displacement
- Unaffordable rentals and decreasing supply of affordable rentals
- Lack of housing choice and control
- Out-of-state corporations purchasing properties
- Poor habitability and maintenance of rentals

Intended outcomes of TOPA:

- Long-term community housing stability and security
- Increase in permanently affordable housing for renters and homeowners
- Empower tenants to have a say in what happens to their building
- More housing choice, autonomy, and control, especially for low-income residents
- Increase in local property ownership
- Better habitability of housing stock
- Community education on housing, rental, cooperative, and ownership options, financial planning, community building, and conflict resolution.

Unintended consequences:

- Several participants agreed that without funding, the policy could create a classist system that benefits higher-income residents while leaving out low-income and marginalized community members.
- One participant is concerned that, without a dedicated source of funding, TOPA would compete for existing affordable housing development and preservation dollars.
- Another participant recognized that TOPA could extend the real estate transaction timeline.
- A positive impact could be an increase in business for residential realtors, title, legal, and insurance companies.

Input on specific policy variations for Eugene:

- The four participants who weighed in on the policy variations encouraged the City to pursue a broad TOPA policy.
- Including single-family units would increase opposition to implementation (challenge) but also increase the policy impact (positive).
- While some participants believed COPA (Community Opportunity to Purchase) would be the primary method of implementation, others said it would limit tenant autonomy and the number of successful outcomes.
- Both ROFR (Right of First Refusal) and ROFO (Right of First Offer) provide needed enforcement methods. Three participants prefer ROFR over ROFO, and a fourth participant did not have a preference.
- To provide the largest positive impact, keep policy exceptions to a minimum.

Rental owners, realtors, property managers, and landlord-tenant attorneys - August 13, 2026

The majority of participants shared the following perspectives during the two-hour session:

Overall themes

- TOPA will discourage investment in housing production and stifle the real estate market.
- To solve the housing affordability crisis, the City should consider using incentives, not regulatory measures. Regulations will make the problem worse.
- Building more housing units is the core solution, and TOPA does not do that.
- Currently, tenants can organize and collectively purchase property. There is no need to limit property rights and complicate the regulatory environment.

The key problems that TOPA would address:

- Many participants suggested deleting the phrase "..that TOPA would address" from the key question because they did not believe TOPA would address key housing problems.
- Most participants agreed the overall problem is housing affordability and stability. TOPA would increase the problem, not decrease it.
- Some participants phrased the problem as housing displacement and lack of maintenance.

- Low wages are a significant factor in housing affordability. We should increase economic development and wages.

Intended outcomes of TOPA:

- One participant thought that TOPA would increase housing affordability, community empowerment, and pride in homeownership.
- Other participants stressed unintended outcomes, see below.

Unintended consequences:

- Reduces local real estate investment and development
- Creates more barriers in an already-constrained Eugene market
- Added risk to the lending market and discourage banks and equity partners
- Deteriorating property maintenance
- Giving the community false hope
- Added administrative and financial burden to limited City resources
- Creates "sale running:" owners find out about TOPA and then sell all their investment properties.

Input on specific policy variations for Eugene:

- Most participants did not support any of the policy variations in the presentation because they are noted as adding regulatory measures that discourage investment and development.
- One participant felt that Community Opportunity to Purchase (COPA) was an opportunity, and Right of First Offer (ROFO) and Right of First Refusal (ROFR) provided valuable protections for renters.
- Policies that encourage voluntary actions or incentives were supported by participants.

Affordable Housing providers – August 18, 2026

The majority of participants shared the following perspectives during the two-hour session:

Overall themes

- Eugene needs more housing and preservation dollars. More regulations don't solve that problem.
- Concerns about where funding for TOPA would come from and diverting scarce resources away from Affordable Housing production and preservation.
- Unclear on the primary goal and outcomes of TOPA. Is it to create income-qualified Affordable Housing opportunities or shared-equity opportunities? The answer to this question is essential to crafting a viable solution.
- Preference for voluntary/incentive-based program opportunities rather than regulatory policies to preserve Affordable Housing.
- Most Affordable Housing developer attendees shared that they do not have the interest or resources to utilize a TOPA policy.

The key problems that TOPA would address:

- The lack of new Affordable Housing and the deterioration of existing Affordable Housing stock are the most important problems to solve.
- Most participants did not think TOPA would be the most effective or most efficient way to increase housing affordability or stability.

Intended outcomes of TOPA:

- One participant shared that TOPA is a tool to help convert naturally occurring affordable housing into housing that is affordable in the long term and to give renters leverage they wouldn't otherwise have when their building is sold.

Unintended consequences:

- TOPA would complicate the real estate market and negatively impact housing development.
- TOPA would discourage private investment making Affordable Housing production difficult.
- TOPA could reduce current funding available for Affordable Housing production and preservation.
- Residents in co-op owned buildings could be committing themselves to capital spending requirements they can't meet.

Input on specific policy variations for Eugene:

- One participant felt that COPA could be helpful to tenants and the community, but most other participants did not support the proposed regulatory measures.
- Other participants brainstormed alternative voluntary methods to achieve the same goals as TOPA:
    - Reduce regulatory barriers for non-profits who want to convert rental units to homeownership.
    - Create a program that helps community-based organizations access lower interest rates when purchasing market rate buildings for Affordable Housing.
    - To solve problems, consider market incentives and avoid regulatory measures.

Possible Implementation Plan for Opportunity to Purchase

If Council wants to continue exploration of a local opportunity to purchase policy, this attachment provides an overview of the possible process. Opportunity to purchase policy development requires responsiveness to specific market and household needs and use of an equity lens for further analysis of policy elements and programmatic supports. Successful implementation of a local policy would require clear guidelines, dedicated staffing, community participation, strong partnerships with public and community institutions that take time to build, and importantly, sustained resources for program operations and housing investment (funding per unit). The estimated cost of implementation depends in part on the policy path chosen.

If Council has interest in further exploration of an opportunity to purchase policy, the first step would be for Council to select a policy path: Path A multi-unit building, Path B Affordable Housing only, or Path C low density residential. (The three paths are described in Attachment E.) The subsequent steps would include analysis and policy development, Council discussion and direction including on source of funding, implementation set up (program implementation, technical and financial supports implementation), and ongoing program management and enforcement.

Analysis & Potential Policy Development

- *Content:* Consultant analysis and policy development on the path selected by Council
    - Additional TOPA analysis: market, programmatic supports, equitable access, short- and long-term financing, legal framework, and enforcement
    - Identify resources needed for policy/program implementation
- *Funding:* Rental housing program annual door fee revenue; estimated cost $75,000 to $100,000
- *Timing:* 6-8 months

Council Discussion & Direction

- *Content:* Council work session to discuss a) results of the analysis and policy development work, b) sources of funding that could be utilized for implementation especially for the per unit subsidy, and c) provide direction on next steps. If direction includes moving forward, public hearing on draft ordinance followed by further Council discussion and action
- *Funding:* Revenue backed (rental housing program annual door fee revenue)
- *Timing:* 6-8 months, depending on volume of discussion and whether a public hearing is requested

Implementation

- *Content*: Includes program set-up, technical and financial supports, and program management and enforcement implementation.
    - *Program set*-up: Hire staff to implement program, administrative rule writing, enforcement framework expansion, technical assistance provider requests for proposals and contracts, and develop suite of supporting materials, tracking, and reporting system.

    - *Technical & financial supports*: Secure technical and legal assistance partners, down payment assistance and other financing assistance, community education and outreach campaign, including robust communications plan.

- *Funding*: Program set-up could be revenue backed through an increase in the rental housing program annual door fee revenue. Technical & financial supports could be about $50k/unit or more and the source would be based on direction Council provides about source of funding.
- *Timing*: 12-18 months

<u>Management & Enforcement</u>

- *Content:* Program management and administrative oversight, code compliance and enforcement.
- *Funding:* Could be revenue backed through an increase in the rental housing program annual door fee revenue.
- *Timing:* Ongoing.

Possible Policy Path Options

This attachment provides information on three possible opportunity to purchase policy paths Council could choose for further exploration. Additional information on each policy path is provided below the table. If Council decides to move forward with continued exploration on one of these paths, additional feasibility analysis would need to be done to identify resource requirements for programmatic supports and financing, and develop a policy proposal along with unintended consequences.

	Path A – Multi-Unit Buildings	**Path B – Affordable Housing only**	**Path C – Low Density Residential**
Housing Outcomes	• Shared equity housing. • Affordable Housing. • Remain as rentals with the potential to negotiate repairs, limits on rent increase, additional protections.	• Add low-income affordability restrictions on rentals. • Income-qualified shared equity housing.	Low density homeownership.
Goals	Prioritize tenant empowerment and choice, expand ownership opportunities, prevent displacement, stabilize housing costs, and mitigate speculative real estate transactions.	Expand and preserve affordable housing, prevent displacement, stabilize housing costs, and mitigate speculative real estate transactions.	Create pathways to homeownership, prevent displacement, and stabilize housing costs.
Purchase Rights	Right of first offer/refusal to purchase for tenants or tenant associations with the option to assign their rights to a buyer of their choice.	Right of first offer/refusal to purchase for qualified non-profits.	Right of first offer/refusal to purchase for tenants.
Building Type(s)	Market rate apartment buildings and Middle Housing with 5+ units.	Market rate apartment buildings with 5+ units.	Single-detached, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes.
Timeline*	265-405 days	90 days	100-130 days

*These timelines are for the notice of purchase to closing and are based on example jurisdictions and could be adjusted based on further analysis of the impact.

Path A – multi unit buildings. This path prioritizes tenant choice by giving tenants the right to first offer/refusal or assignment of rights to a third party, and provides the broadest set of potential outcomes for converting multi-unit market rate housing into:

1. Shared equity housing for households with low and moderate incomes (e.g. East Blair Housing Cooperative, SquareOne's Peace Village, and DevNW's Nelson Place);

2. Subsidized Affordable Housing that serves low-income households where residents spend no more than 30% of their income on housing costs; or

3. If tenants decide not to pursue #1 or 2, they have leverage to negotiate with potential buyers for additional renter protections such as limits on future rent increases and/or building repairs or renovations.

Timelines for Path A are longer (between 265 and 405 days from the notice of purchase offer to closing) than Path B and C to provide tenants with sufficient time to organize and consider purchase offers, do feasibility analysis and contract execution, secure financing and close. During the initial organizing period (45 days) tenants must collectively decide if they want to purchase the building, form a tenant association with at least 51% of the residents, notify the seller, and register their interest in exercising purchase rights with the City. During the feasibility and contract execution period, tenants evaluate the best outcome (1, 2, or 3 above), seek a development partner if applicable, estimate the total cost of redevelopment, raise earnest money deposit, and sign a purchase contract. In the final period, the development team finalizes the plan and secures financing, hires a property manager for the new ownership structure (if applicable), and closes the purchase.

Additional policy choices that would need to be explored: prohibit or allow tenants to sell their purchase rights in exchange for cash (commonly referred to as a buyout), exemptions, establishing a specific appraisal and/or tenant association certification process, and a funding mechanism for technical assistance and City financial assistance.

Path B – Affordable Housing only. This path prioritizes expanding Affordable Housing for income-qualified households by giving qualified non-profits the right of first offer/refusal to purchase multi-unit market rate housing (5+ units) to convert them into:

1. Subsidized Affordable Housing rentals that serve low-income households where residents spend no more than 30% of their income on housing costs; or

2. Shared equity housing as described above in Path A #1.

Timelines for Path B are shorter (90 days from the notice of purchase offer to closing) than Path A because qualified non-profit purchasers already have organizational infrastructure, experience, and access to funding to redevelop properties. The initial period gives qualified nonprofits a short period of time (5 days in San Francisco) to express interest after the seller provides a notice of sale to all qualified nonprofits. A second timeline allows the nonprofit to perform feasibility analysis (25 days in San Francisco) and submit an offer. Once the offer is accepted, a 60-day

window provides time to close escrow—covering due diligence, financing, and transaction finalization.

Additional policy choices that would need to be explored: exemptions, establishing a specific appraisal process, and additional local funding mechanism to support purchases and repairs.

Path C – Low Density Residential. This path prioritizes homeownership opportunities for households living in low density rental housing by giving the tenant the right of first offer/refusal to purchase a single-detached unit, duplex, triplex, or quadplex, which would result in traditional homeownership.

Timelines for Path C provide tenants an exclusive negotiation period and time to submit an offer (30 days from the notice of purchase offer); the landlord then reviews and responds to the offer, accepting or making a counteroffer (5 days); and if applicable, the tenant replies to a counteroffer and finalizes the purchase contract (5 days). After a sales agreement is reached, tenants have 60-90 days to close.

Additional policy choices that would need to be explored: prohibit or allow tenants to sell their purchase rights in exchange for cash (commonly referred to as a buyout), exemptions, establishing a specific appraisal process, establishing a local funding mechanism for helping tenants with down payments.