February 2nd, 2026

RE: Written Testimony in Opposition to SB 1513

Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Daniel Gandee, and I am a licensed Principal Broker in the State of Oregon (License #201235300). I currently operate one of the largest real estate teams in Oregon and, according to the Wall Street Journal 2025 rankings, my team is ranked #6 in the state by both sales volume and transaction sides.

Importantly, my team name does not include the terms “Real Estate” or “Realty,” meaning this legislation would not directly impact my business. I submit this testimony because, from both an industry and regulatory perspective, SB 1513 reflects unsound public policy that imposes costs without advancing consumer protection.

SB 1513 proposes to restrict or delay the use of common descriptive terms such as “Real Estate” or “Realty” in real estate team names, while offering a temporary extension until July 1, 2027.

While the bill may be well-intentioned, it fails core principles of effective regulation widely taught in administrative and consumer-protection law, including those emphasized in regulatory analysis: evidence of harm, proportionality, and use of the least restrictive means.

First, the premise of consumer confusion is unsupported by the existing legal framework. Any consumer who transacts with a real estate agent in Oregon must sign listing agreements and buyer representation agreements that clearly and explicitly disclose:

- The legal name of the brokerage
- The identity of the principal broker
- The nature of the agency relationship

These disclosures are mandatory and occur before representation begins, not after. In addition, every Oregon real estate licensee is tied to a unique license number that identifies the licensee’s parent brokerage. This information is publicly available through the Oregon Real Estate Agency’s online license lookup system, allowing any member of the public to instantly verify who an agent works for by name and/or license number.

From a regulatory-law perspective, when multiple, enforceable layers of disclosure already exist, additional naming restrictions are legally redundant and unsupported by evidence of actual consumer harm.

Second, Oregon has already adopted a less restrictive and more effective solution. As of January 1, 2026, Oregon requires Real Estate Team Disclosure, further clarifying that teams operate under a principal broker and brokerage. Under widely accepted

administrative-law principles, regulators should prefer solutions that increase transparency without restricting lawful business speech or imposing unnecessary costs.

A narrowly tailored alternative would be to:

- Add a clearly labeled “Team Name” field to the existing Oregon Real Estate Agency license lookup system

This would achieve the stated transparency goal without disrupting businesses or creating unintended economic consequences.

Third, the bill fails the proportionality test. Regulatory analysis taught at institutions such as Harvard Law emphasizes that laws should regulate conduct that causes harm, not nomenclature, absent compelling evidence. Consumers do not choose or trust real estate professionals based on team names. They care about:

- Fiduciary duties
- Ethical conduct
- Clear agency relationships

At a time when consumers are already navigating confusion due to recent changes in buyer representation laws, adding naming restrictions increases complexity rather than clarity.

Fourth, the economic impact is severe, foreseeable, and unnecessary. Mandatory name changes would require:

- New DBA registrations
- Website and domain changes
- Email system and signature updates
- Replacement of signage
- Revisions to advertising, marketing, and social media assets

Collectively, this would cost millions of dollars statewide and divert resources away from consumer service. Sound regulatory policy cautions against imposing such costs where no corresponding public benefit can be demonstrated.

I speak from direct experience. I previously received a cease-and-desist order related to a trademarked common word, which forced a full rebrand. The cost exceeded $30,000, excluding lost time and brand equity. SB 1513 would replicate this harm across Oregon without improving consumer outcomes.

Fifth, proven and legally sound models already exist. California requires a clearly displayed DRE license number on all advertising, a disclosure-based approach frequently cited in regulatory scholarship as effective, narrowly tailored, and constitutionally sound. Oregon could adopt a similar framework rather than restricting team naming conventions.

Real estate teams are not attempting to portray themselves as brokerages. They are organizations operating within brokerages, often subject to higher internal compliance standards, and frequently led by Principal Brokers who are legally accountable for consumer protection.

Measured against established principles of administrative and consumer-protection law, SB 1513:

- Identifies no demonstrable consumer harm
- Imposes disproportionate economic costs
- Fails to use the least restrictive regulatory means

Disclosure already exists. Transparency already exists. Enforcement already exists. SB 1513 creates regulatory burden without public benefit.

For these reasons, this bill should be opposed.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Gandee
Principal Broker | License #201235300