



TO: House Consumer Protection and Government Efficiency Committee

FROM: Oregon Recreation & Park Association
Stephanie Redman, Executive Director

DATE: March 23, 2015

RE: Opposition to HB 3321 & HB 3322

On behalf of nearly 1,000 members of the Oregon Recreation and Park Association (ORPA), including park and recreation agencies, professionals, and volunteers, we are writing to express concerns about HB 3321 and HB 3322.

ORPA membership includes 62 park & recreation agencies that will be affected by this legislation. Statewide, and likely in each of your districts, our member agencies struggle to find resources required to meet the needs of the public. Using valuable staff time and other resources to meet to regulations that are essentially unfunded mandates make things more difficult, not necessarily better, if of great concern to us. In fact, one of the standing positions in our legislative platform is to “generally oppose legislation that imposes unfunded mandates on park and recreation agencies” and to support “the legislature’s consideration of the impact of any and all unfunded mandates on park and recreation agencies and services.”

HB 3321 and HB 3322 will require additional agency staff time and resources to comply with posting requirements, impact studies, open meetings, contractor comparisons and individual contract analysis and reporting. These additional measures would be on top of our existing public procurement procedures and disclosure requirements, be they imposed by the state or adopted locally for purposes of fairness and transparency. Further, HB 3321 is likely to increase total cost of public contracts and projects as the contractor likely will incur additional staff time and other costs to ensure the contractor’s compliance with this bill: a lose-lose for the public sector agency and the private sector business.

We do not believe these changes to public contracting procurement, processes and postings will positively impact the parks and recreation field in Oregon or further the services and mission of parks and recreation in Oregon (including enhancing its natural resources, quality of life, resident health or a healthy economy) so we must oppose both bills. We feel that these bills add an undue layer of bureaucracy in what is already an open and effective contracting process that is already monitored at multiple public levels.

Please join us instead in directing legislation and supporting initiatives that promote connecting Oregon’s citizens to nature and encourage active, healthy lifestyles through park and recreation services. We urge you not to support legislation that takes funding and time out of parks and puts it into procurement predicaments.

Should you have further questions about our concerns related to these two bills, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.