



Clarifying Misunderstandings in Recent Opposition Testimony to HB 3136A

Chair Pham, Vice-Chair Anderson, and members of the Senate Committee on Housing and Development,

It appears that there is a common misunderstanding about the effect of HB 3136A as indicated by recently submitted written opposition testimony. This letter is intended to provide clarification regarding these misunderstandings.

- Misunderstanding: Goal 1 (Public Participation) expects cities and counties to appoint a commission that constitutes a representative sample of their constituents.
 - Clarification: HB 3136A would not change this expectation, nor would it require any city or county to appoint two real estate professionals to their planning commission.
- Misunderstanding: If two members of the same profession serve on a 5-member Planning Commission, they comprise 40% of the voting membership, 29% of a 7-member Commission, and 22% of a 9-member Commission.
 - Clarification: The -2 amendments were adopted so that 5-member commissions could maintain the existing restriction on the number of real estate professionals allowed to serve concurrently on a planning commission – in addition to the existing restriction on more than two voting members being from the same type of business, trade, or profession.
- Misunderstanding: Dominance of one type of business, trade, or profession in any Commission would tend to lead to lack of representation of other points of view and could be discriminatory.
 - Clarification: Inequitable representation of viewpoints on planning commissions is the issue HB 3136A seeks to address. Under current law, while an orchardist, a cattle rancher, and a grass seed grower may all serve concurrently, a real estate broker, an architect, and a builder could not.

We hope that you and other interested stakeholders find this letter helpful in understanding the intent and impact of HB 3136A.

Oregon REALTORS® urges your AYE vote on HB 3136A to ensure fairness in the composition of planning commissions.