

Portland City Council Agenda
Written Testimony - Item 1084/1058

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1058	Anonymous	Support with changes	I'm worried that our city bureaus aren't charging sufficient fees to adequately staff city agencies. Consequently, essential services like inspections of hazardous rental homes are delayed by weeks or even months. It appears that our city council and agency leadership lacks the foresight to charge fees that adequately fund agencies. Instead, we consistently cut budgets instead of increasing fees to ensure proper funding. And we wonder why our city has become less efficient and effective.	No	11/30/24 12:12 AM
1058	Matthew Skelton on behalf of Provenance hotels	Support	<p>Members of the City Council,</p> <p>My name is Matthew Skelton, I've worked in Portland's hotel market for ten years and am reaching out today as an employee of Provenance hotels.</p> <p>Please consider supporting updating Title code 24 to properly regulate transient lodgings in the community.</p> <p>The past four years in Portland have been difficult for the hotel industry. Demand has sunk, costs are increasing exponentially, and our hotels' ability to be profitable is consistently at risk. These issues are serious and have been spoken about at length, however I'm reaching out regarding the number of unsafe and unsanitary short-term rentals that have infiltrated our market since the onset of the pandemic.</p> <p>Over the past few years, I've heard countless hotel guests come to check-in with our staffs detail dishonest listings, unsanitary conditions, and menacing "hosts" at short term rentals they had booked hoping to explore our city in safety.</p> <p>These individuals are rattled by the conditions they are met with and often immediately dissatisfied with the safety of our community given their first impression is far below what they expected. I've helped individuals who were threatened, robbed, or scared they were being stalked. I've seen pictures of squalor that was sold as luxury space.</p> <p>While I am always happy to take the business of a dissatisfied short-term rental client, I am deeply concerned that they can operate with little-to-no regulation regarding their operations. No one is stopping this trend from continuing to grow. No one is holding the individuals who prey on travelers accountable.</p> <p>By establishing standards like those that hotels and other professional lodgings offer, we create a baseline that allows visitors to understand they will be safe and will be treated professionally during their time in our community. It provides these travelers with the most basic of needs.</p> <p>Passing this amendment allows us to begin to build a safety net for visitors by eliminating lodgings that fall below our standards of health and safety. Without proper regulation and control more illegal and immoral short-term rentals will continue to pop up and hapless visitors will feel that Portland does not welcome them or support their desire to explore our beautiful community.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your time,</p>	No	12/03/24 11:48 AM

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1058	Hayden Laverty	Oppose	<p>The proposed ordinance cites safety concerns as a primary justification for requiring compliance with the commercial code for short-term rentals. However, this framing fails to address the significant financial and practical impacts that come with such a requirement. While the ordinance does not explicitly mandate sprinklers, compliance with the commercial code inherently triggers the need for sprinkler systems and other costly upgrades. This effectively makes sprinklers a requirement without acknowledging their financial and operational impact on property owners.</p> <p>I have repeatedly asked Matt and Jody to provide data demonstrating that short-term rentals pose a greater safety risk compared to long-term residences, and they have been unable to provide any evidence. Taking the initiative, I reached out to my insurance provider and obtained data indicating that short-term rentals are actually less risky. According to this data, fire-related incidents in short-term rentals occur as much as 50% less frequently than in primary residences.</p> <p>Over a dozen building officials nationwide, along with a 40-year code veteran and the Director of Architectural & Engineering Services at the International Code Council (ICC), as well as the Administrator and Structural Program Chief at the Oregon State Building Codes Division (BCD), have all reached the same conclusion: short-term rentals in one- and two-family dwellings do not require a change of occupancy and pose no greater safety risks than long-term residences. I personally reached out to every building official in Oregon, and while not all responded, those who did were unanimous in rejecting Portland's interpretation.</p>	Yes	12/03/24 4:34 PM
1058	Anonymous		AirBnB and other vacation rentals are in the same industry as hotels. Thus, they should be treated accordingly to the same safety and security expectations. The Portland market has been flooded with vacation rentals creating a surplus of supply in a market that is distressed as is for demand for the travel and tourism industry. Hotels, especially in the core business district, are fighting tooth and nail for the limited amount of travelers coming to the city. Much of the business is funneled into vacation rental homes due to the abundant supply and ease of setting up. I feel the least the city could do is hold vacation rentals to the same standard that hotels must abide by.	No	12/04/24 10:43 AM
1058	Joseph Banks	Oppose	<p>As a firefighter, I dedicated my career to ensuring the safety of communities through immediate emergency response and effective fire prevention measures. My proactive efforts included educating commercial and residential occupants on the safety standards outlined in the International Fire Code and the Oregon State Building Codes. The standard firefighters hold themselves to is to protect and serve, actively safeguarding lives and property.</p> <p>Fire sprinklers are among the most reliable tools for protecting lives and property. However, their implementation must be thoughtful and applied in contexts where they address actual safety risks. The proposed requirement to enforce commercial codes—specifically increased sprinkler system mandates—on residential properties used as short-term rentals in Portland raises significant concerns about maintaining consistent standards. Enforcing a code that contradicts or extends beyond state regulations risks putting Portland residents' safety at stake by creating unnecessary complexity for housing providers and local Fire Marshals.</p> <p>It is important to note that short-term rentals are not subject to such sprinkler requirements anywhere else in Oregon. This prompts the question: why should Portland adopt extreme measures for properties that do not present a demonstrable increase in risk compared to long-term residences? Fire safety regulations should always be grounded in data and expert consensus—not arbitrary decisions or excessive caution. Statistically, the likelihood of a car accident is higher than that of a structure fire. Additionally, the probability of a fire occurring in a residential property is higher than in a short-term rental. Given that residential properties face less regulation, it would make more sense to explore other preventative measures for short-term rentals, such as enhanced safety documentation for visitors, fire extinguishers, or restrictions on the use of flammable items (e.g., Christmas trees, candles, fireplaces, gas stovetops, etc.).</p> <p>While I believe in the value of fire sprinklers and support their use when warranted, applying these requirements to small-scale short-term rentals introduces unnecessary complexity and creates an undue financial burden on property owners. It also increases demand on local Fire Marshals. Short-term rentals should be regulated in alignment with statewide practices and informed by data-driven insights to ensure both public safety and fairness for operators.</p> <p>I encourage Portland policymakers to reevaluate this approach and align their requirements with the broader standards and practices upheld across Oregon. Fire safety must remain a priority, but it must also be balanced with equitable and evidence-based decision-making.</p>	No	12/04/24 11:32 AM

Written Testimony Regarding Proposed Amendment to Portland City Code Title 24

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance that would mandate compliance with commercial building codes for properties used as short-term rentals. This policy is not only misaligned with expert guidance and data but also imposes undue financial and operational burdens on property owners and operators.

Lack of Data Supporting Safety Concerns

The proposed ordinance cites safety concerns as a primary justification for requiring compliance with the commercial code for short-term rentals. However, this framing fails to address the significant financial and practical impacts that come with such a requirement. While the ordinance does not explicitly mandate sprinklers, compliance with the commercial code inherently triggers the need for sprinkler systems and other costly upgrades. This effectively makes sprinklers a requirement without acknowledging their financial and operational impact on property owners.

I have repeatedly asked Matt and Jody to provide data demonstrating that short-term rentals pose a greater safety risk compared to long-term residences, and they have been unable to provide any evidence. Taking the initiative, I reached out to my insurance provider and obtained data indicating that short-term rentals are actually less risky. According to this data, fire-related incidents in short-term rentals occur as much as 50% less frequently than in primary residences.

The city's approach appears to lack a data-driven rationale. By requiring compliance with the commercial code, the city is imposing significant financial burdens without substantiating the necessity of these measures. This raises serious concerns about whether the ordinance is truly about safety or whether it is an indirect way to discourage the operation of short-term rentals.

Misinterpretation of Building Codes

Over a dozen building officials nationwide, along with a 40-year code veteran and the Director of Architectural & Engineering Services at the International Code Council (ICC), as well as the Administrator and Structural Program Chief at the Oregon State Building Codes Division (BCD), have all reached the same conclusion: short-term rentals in one- and two-family dwellings do not require a change of occupancy and pose no greater safety risks than long-term residences. I personally reached out to every building official in Oregon, and while not all responded, those who did were unanimous in rejecting Portland's interpretation.

The BCD's formal opinion states unequivocally:

“Authority to regulate short-term rentals, vacation rentals, occupied housing, etc., cannot be derived from the state building code or from delegation of local inspection programs.

The division advises Portland not to enforce any such requirements relying on the code as its sole authority to do so.”

Even Portland’s own private Board of Appeals has overruled the city three times on this issue. Board members have privately expressed concerns over the validity of the city’s interpretation. Despite this overwhelming consensus, the city is now attempting to create a new policy to justify its stance.

Economic Impact on Property Owners

Mandating compliance with commercial building codes imposes significant financial and operational burdens on property owners, particularly those operating small-scale short-term rentals. For example, under the commercial code requirements, installing a sprinkler system alone can cost upwards of \$50,000 for a \$350,000 house—a prohibitive expense. This figure does not even account for the additional architectural and permitting fees created by this process. These requirements not only strain property owners financially but also render most projects economically infeasible, effectively discouraging small-scale operators who contribute positively to the local economy.

Adding to this burden is the city’s sudden imposition of a short timeline for permitting properties already owned by operators. Until very recently, the city required these properties to comply with commercial code—a mandate that contradicted years of clear state guidance and lacked any legal or safety justification. It was only after a formal letter from the State Building Codes Division that the city finally conceded its error, acknowledging that it had been improperly enforcing these requirements without authority. While we have worked diligently to submit permits under the correct residential code as quickly as possible, the city’s rushed attempt to enact new policy under the guise of an emergency undermines the integrity of the process and unfairly penalizes property owners who have followed the law in good faith. This abrupt shift in policy appears less about ensuring safety and more about maintaining a flawed interpretation that the state has already deemed invalid.

The operational burden created by this process is equally concerning. Property owners must navigate an inefficient and costly system that wastes significant city staff hours. In my case alone, I have been forced to submit over 50 appeals related to issues arising from the implementation of this policy—appeals that have been necessary even as the policy was applied in direct conflict with clear state guidance. This process not only burdens property owners but also diverts valuable city resources from addressing more pressing priorities, such as expanding housing options and supporting small businesses.

Beyond the direct financial impact, the enforcement of commercial code requirements on residential properties threatens to result in the loss of dozens of entry-level jobs that depend on these properties’ operation. Rather than addressing legitimate safety concerns, enforcing these requirements creates unnecessary roadblocks for property owners and reduces the affordability and availability of short-term rental options in Portland. These policies harm both operators and consumers, while undermining the city’s stated goals of fostering economic growth, supporting housing diversity, and maintaining accessible housing options.

Precedents and Inconsistencies

Historically, properties used for short-term rentals in Portland have been regulated under the **Oregon Residential Specialty Code (ORSC)** without requiring sprinkler systems or significant structural modifications. This approach was consistent with the framework established by the original City Council when short-term rental regulations were enacted in 2014. At the time, Council discussions made it clear that short-term rentals were not considered a change of occupancy under the building code and could operate within the framework of the residential code. This foundational understanding has been upheld for years.

The current move to impose commercial code requirements, effectively mandating sprinkler systems and other upgrades, marks a significant departure from these established practices. Not only does this shift lack clear, data-driven rationale, but it also creates confusion and inconsistency in enforcement. For example, many properties operating under **Type A and Type B permits**—designated for accessory short-term rentals—are allowed to function without these extensive upgrades. These permits allow for short-term rental use for up to 90 days (Type A) or even beyond (Type B) with minimal oversight, and little to no effort is being made by the City to ensure these properties are complying with their stated limitations or other safety standards. The selective enforcement creates an uneven playing field that unfairly targets certain property owners.

Additionally, the term “accessory,” as it pertains to short-term rentals, is being misapplied. The word has no basis in the building code but has been used in zoning discussions to differentiate certain types of permits. If the City now argues that short-term rentals in commercially zoned properties must comply with commercial codes because of their use, then all properties being used as short-term rentals—whether accessory or not—would logically need to comply with the same commercial standards. This would include hundreds of Type A and Type B permit holders, which is both impractical and inconsistent with the intent of the zoning and building codes. The notion that a property becomes inherently safer or less safe depending on its permit type is both illogical and unsupported by any data.

The City’s failure to uniformly apply its own reasoning highlights the arbitrary nature of this policy. By selectively enforcing commercial code requirements on some properties while ignoring potential violations by others, the City undermines trust in the regulatory process. Moreover, if properties zoned for short-term rentals are truly required to meet commercial standards, then the logical conclusion would be to apply these same standards universally—a proposition that is both unworkable and nonsensical.

This inconsistency not only creates confusion but also significantly undermines confidence in Portland’s regulatory process. Property owners who have historically followed the established rules are now being penalized with costly requirements, while others are allowed to operate without any meaningful

scrutiny. Rather than pursuing piecemeal policies that selectively impose burdens, the City should return to the original intent of its short-term rental laws: to regulate these properties under the residential code while focusing on meaningful, consistent, and enforceable safety standards.

Conclusion

I urge the City Council to reconsider the proposed ordinance requiring compliance with commercial building codes for short-term rentals. This policy is not supported by data, imposes significant financial and operational burdens, and contradicts expert guidance and established practices.

On a personal note, I am deeply committed to contributing to Portland's housing solutions and have plans to build middle housing in the city. I have repeatedly asked how I might consult with the City's building department to help address the inefficiencies and inconsistencies that have plagued it for years. I closely tracked the mayoral race, and every sitting commissioner has acknowledged how broken this department is. This situation exemplifies those flaws.

The building department has wasted thousands of hours of both its own staff and private sector professionals, such as myself and my architects, on an issue that is a non-issue in every other jurisdiction in the state. Instead of fostering a collaborative, forward-thinking environment, the department's approach reflects a culture that is adversarial and out of touch.

If Portland staffers are unwilling to listen to the highest-ranking building code officials in the world, the state, and every other building code official in Oregon, what makes you think they will listen to or work collaboratively with their constituents? Why does Portland's building division insist on making regulations based on feelings or biases, especially when concrete data suggests the exact opposite of their claims?

We must completely overhaul the culture of this department, creating a system that prioritizes collaboration, fairness, and the efficient use of resources. Portland deserves a regulatory framework that supports housing solutions, protects public safety, and builds trust with its residents and stakeholders. I urge the Council to reject this flawed proposal and refocus efforts on meaningful reforms that will truly benefit the city and its people.

Thank you for considering my perspective on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Hayden

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1058	George Schweitzer	Support	<p>Testimony in Support of the Ordinance Amending Title 24 to Regulate Transient Lodging</p> <p>Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,</p> <p>I am George Schweitzer, Regional Director of Operations for The Benson Hotel in Portland. I am writing to express my full support for the proposed ordinance to amend Title 24 and formalize the regulation of transient lodging. As a hotel operator, I understand firsthand the importance of maintaining high safety standards for both our guests and our employees. This ordinance is an important step in ensuring that all transient lodging establishments in Portland, regardless of size or type, are held to the same rigorous fire and life safety standards.</p> <p>The hotel industry in Portland is a vital part of our city's economy, providing essential services to visitors and contributing to the local business community. With the rise in popularity of short-term rentals and other non-traditional forms of lodging, it is crucial that these establishments are subject to the same safety regulations that have long been required of hotels. By ensuring that both traditional hotels and short-term rental properties are built and maintained with proper safety measures, this ordinance helps level the playing field and ensures that all types of transient lodging contribute to the city's commitment to the health, safety, and security of its residents and visitors.</p> <p>I believe this ordinance is a positive step for Portland's hotel industry, ensuring that we continue to provide a safe and welcoming environment for all who visit our city. I urge the Council to pass this ordinance swiftly, as it will strengthen the integrity of Portland's lodging options while safeguarding the interests of both guests and property owners alike.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, George Schweitzer Regional Director of Operations, West Coast Hospitality The Benson Hotel</p>	No	12/04/24 12:58 PM

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1058	Anonymous	Oppose	<p>This amendment to Title 24 is dishonest in intent, is unsubstantiated by any data whatsoever, and wreaks of a predetermined outcome driven by political bias.</p> <p>Disguised under the facade of an emergency safety concern, there is overwhelming data that suggests that short term rentals in single-family and multi-family homes have less than half the amount of fires as long-term occupancies. This data is backed by common sense: long-term renters use the kitchen more to cook at home (the number one cause of home-related fires and deaths), whereas travelers go out to eat to support local businesses.</p> <p>In addition, not one single building code official in the United States outside of Portland's fragmented and broken department contend that short-term rentals should be regulated by building codes. In fact, it's universally the opposite. The most highly tenured and respected building code officials in the State of Oregon and the International Code Council are in agreement - building codes should not be used to regulate short-term rentals.</p> <p>While it should come as no surprise to anyone that's been monitoring Portland's permitting and development department for the past half-decade, this amendment is more of the same from the city: pre-determined political and policy outcomes driven by feelings and bias, that will inevitably shoot the city in the foot and drive people away.</p> <p>All it takes is one glance at the speakers supporting this measure to see in plain sight that this is not an emergency safety measure. Each supporter is a multimillionaire hotelier and/or large hotel operator in Portland, lobbying local politicians with their special business interests and crying about supply and demand. Has a single supporter testified with a legitimate safety concern? Why not? Because they'd be unfounded. These are business interests.</p> <p>Why would Type A and Type B permits not have the same safety mandates? Is there data behind that decision?</p> <p>After reviewing internal email records between the city and its constituents, one thing has been made abundantly clear: the development and permitting arm of the government refuses to provide any substantiated evidence that this is a safety concern. Can City Council provide this information?</p> <p>These policies will not reduce homelessness and do not increase any meaningful housing supply. That will only happen if Portland gets out of its own way and lets people build middle and affordable housing units.</p> <p>While "safety concerns" may be a politically friendly way to shield an unpopular political hot button issue such as "short-term rentals," forcing through a measure that is void of data and fact and relies on political bias and predetermined outcomes, not only erodes trust in public officials, but also is endemic to shortfalls in the democratic process all together.</p> <p>Mayor Wheeler and City Council, I assume the outcome of this public hearing is predetermined. Please surprise us all and reject this amendment.</p>	No	12/04/24 1:59 PM

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1058	Parker Fire Protection		<p>As a fire sprinkler professional, I have dedicated my career to ensuring the safety of buildings and their occupants. I believe deeply in the work we do and the critical role sprinklers play in saving lives and protecting property. However, I feel compelled to speak out when I see fire safety systems being weaponized inappropriately and applied in ways that deviate from their intended purpose.</p> <p>I've witnessed firsthand how the City of Portland's policies have forced unreasonable and excessive requirements onto small businesses, particularly those operating short-term rentals. There have been multiple instances where sprinklers have been used not as a genuine safety measure but as a tool to impose unnecessary financial and operational burdens.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •I've seen duplexes required to install sprinkler systems designed for high-rise buildings—systems far beyond what is necessary for the scale and risk of the property. •I've seen RVs classified as tiny houses forced to be sprinklered, even though such requirements defy logic and have no basis in practical fire safety standards. <p>These mandates go beyond ensuring safety. They create unnecessary hardships for property owners while eroding trust in the very systems designed to protect the public. In my professional opinion, these requirements are not about enhancing fire safety but are being used as a punitive measure against a specific business model.</p> <p>As someone who makes a living installing sprinklers, I have no financial incentive to oppose these policies. In fact, these excessive requirements would likely generate more revenue for businesses like mine. But that's not what this industry is about. Fire sprinkler systems should be applied where they are necessary and effective, not as a tool to arbitrarily penalize businesses or burden property owners with costs they cannot afford.</p> <p>I urge policymakers to take a step back and evaluate these requirements through the lens of actual fire safety data and expert guidance. Short-term rentals in single-family and duplex properties do not pose the same risks as large commercial or high-occupancy buildings, and they should not be treated as if they do. Let's focus on meaningful, evidence-based solutions that protect the public without creating unnecessary obstacles for small businesses and homeowners.</p> <p>Thanks you!</p>	No	12/04/24 2:22 PM
1058	Makenzie Marineau, ORLA			Yes	12/04/24 2:33 PM
1058	Crowne Plaza Portland	Support	I urge the City Council to approve this amendment and take a proactive step towards safeguarding our community. Bringing short-term rentals in compliance will help elevate housing shortages and help the hotel industry recover by reducing the supply of ad hoc short-term rentals that put profit first and do not have to comply with the costly regulations hoteliers have to comply with. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.	No	12/04/24 4:42 PM



Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

I am Makenzie Marineau, here today representing the Oregon Restaurant and Lodging Association. On behalf of our members, which include a wide range of over 2,400 lodging establishments throughout Portland and Oregon, I am here to express our strong support for the proposed ordinance to amend Title 24 and formalize the regulation of transient lodging. This ordinance is a crucial step toward ensuring the continued safety, fairness, and consistency within the hospitality industry in Portland. Short term rentals and other lodging should be held accountable to the same standards as hotels have worked so hard and dedicated themselves to uphold.

As an association representing both small and large lodging businesses, we understand the importance of maintaining the highest standards of fire and life safety for all transient lodging establishments, including short-term rentals. These safety measures are fundamental not only for protecting guests but also for supporting the long-term sustainability of Portland's tourism and hospitality sector. By aligning short-term and vacation rentals with the same safety requirements as traditional hotels, the ordinance ensures a level playing field for all lodging providers, which is essential to both our industry and our community.

The rise of short-term rentals and other non-traditional lodging options has created an evolving landscape for our industry. It is essential these properties are subject to the same safety regulations hotels and other commercial lodging businesses must follow. This ordinance accomplishes by ensuring all transient lodging—whether new or repurposed—complies with the necessary construction and safety standards. By doing so, Portland is safeguarding public health and ensuring all types of lodging meet the same rigorous criteria for fire prevention, structural safety, and guest well-being.

The Oregon Restaurant and Lodging Association fully supports the proposed amendments to Title 24 because they reflect a fair and transparent approach to addressing the recent changes in state building codes. The amendment will provide clarity and consistency in how transient lodging is regulated, ensuring that all properties, regardless of their size or function, operate under the same set of guidelines. This is not only important for the safety of guests but also for ensuring businesses, particularly smaller operators, are not faced with confusing or unfair regulatory burdens.

Additionally, we appreciate that this ordinance does not impose any financial or staffing burdens on the city, while providing critical updates to the local building code helping protect both guests and operators. We are confident this will contribute to the continued success of Portland's hospitality sector, while reinforcing the city's commitment to high safety standards for all types of transient lodging.

In conclusion, we urge the City Council to adopt this ordinance. It is an essential step to ensure that all lodging providers in Portland, from traditional hotels to short-term rentals, continue to meet the necessary safety requirements protecting the health and well-being of our residents, visitors, and the broader community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Makenzie Marineau

Government Affairs Coordinator

[Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association](#)

8565 SW Salish Lane, Suite 120 | Wilsonville | Oregon 97070

Main Office: 503.682.4422

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1084	David O'Connor	Support	<p>Members of the City council,</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to hear arguments on updating Title 24 code on 12/4/2024. I'm reaching out after the initial meeting because of the misleading information shared by a member of the public who was allowed an outsized opportunity to speak.</p> <p>CHJ Development LLC, operated by Hayden Laverty, spoke to members of the council under the guise of a small business however in reality it is a \$20 million dollar asset portfolio that has been choking the life out of Portland for years.</p> <p>This company purchases homes and evicts tenants to perform shoddy updates then offer the units up on Airbnb with no standards, no safety, and very little regulation. The relationship between this organization and the community is parasitic at best. A quick google of his name yields numerous court cases where lifelong Portlanders have been forced from their homes for their ever-growing scheme. They directly exacerbate the housing crisis that our community is experiencing for profits that far outweigh their costs.</p> <p>At multiple points during the testimony, they referred to "units" but failed to account for how many separate Airbnb rentals are in each domicile. Additionally, their cheap building practices and poor relations with neighbors cause issues with our community.</p> <p>They misspoke by claiming that other cities were not enforcing similar regulations to curtail the negative impact of Commercial STRs on their local communities' multiple times when in fact many metropolitan cities, especially those that rely on tourism such as ours are passing much more severe restrictions. Even going as far as to inconsistently claim that applying safety standards would cost their employees' jobs.</p> <p>Fingers were often pointed at City officials for inconsistent processes but their agents pick and choose code based on what best suits them at the time and continuously skirt around regulation. They often rely on code that was written before the technology they rely on was ever invented. The shell game they play wastes valuable time of our city employees and stresses resources that could be used to better our community.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate you taking the time to consider this issue. It is paramount to me that regular people have a place to live and that companies like this do not misconstrue the facts to better serve their profit margins.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	No	12/05/24 1:07 PM
1084	Anonymous		<p>Having collaborated with diverse stakeholders—from compliant operators to tenant activists opposing all short-term rentals—we collectively support the city's adoption of minimum safety requirements and Mr. Laverty's proposal to extend them to *all* entire-home short-term rentals. Nearly 100% of these units operate as full-time hotels in residential neighborhoods, with no actual residents. A \$25K–\$50K investment in essential safety measures is more than reasonable, as a 5-bedroom unit earning \$45K annually long-term can easily generate \$120K short-term, recovering costs in less than a year. This proposal not only enhances public safety but also provides a straightforward way to curb illegal units and preserve housing stock, avoiding complex zoning changes. While we support additional zoning measures like caps or eliminating entire-home rentals altogether, extending these life-safety requirements is a significant step toward solving the issue—immediately.</p>	No	12/11/24 8:59 AM
1084	Anonymous	Support	<p>Having collaborated with diverse stakeholders—from compliant operators to tenant activists opposing all short-term rentals—we collectively support the city's adoption of minimum safety requirements and Mr. Laverty's proposal to extend them to *all* entire-home short-term rentals. Nearly 100% of these units operate as full-time hotels in residential neighborhoods, with no actual residents. A \$25K–\$50K investment in essential safety measures is more than reasonable, as a 5-bedroom unit earning \$45K annually long-term can easily generate \$120K short-term, recovering costs in less than a year. This proposal not only enhances public safety but also provides a straightforward way to curb illegal units and preserve housing stock, avoiding complex zoning changes. While we support additional zoning measures like caps or eliminating entire-home rentals altogether, extending these life-safety requirements is a significant step toward solving the issue—immediately.</p>	No	12/11/24 9:06 AM

Portland City Council Meeting
Wednesday, December 4, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.
Verbal Testimony

	Agenda Item	Name
1	1058	Hayden Laverty
2	1058	Trevor Stout
3	1058	Shanna Corona
4	1058	Bianca Leilany Nuñez Marin
5	1058	Kimberly Soto
6	1058	Jonathan Cohen
7	1058	Jessie Burke
8	1058	Gabe Krebs
9	1058	Paul Patino
10	1058	Maricruz Diaz
11	1058	Alice Engelstad
12	1058	Connor Laverty
13	1058	Jordan Egbert
14	1058	Bob Schatz
15	1058	Mark Goeman
16	1058	Makenzie Marineau