

Submitter: Bryson Baker

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB429

I am writing in opposition to SB 429, a bill that, while well-intended, presents significant concerns regarding its potential impact on businesses, consumers, and government efficiency in Oregon. Though the bill aims to address a specific issue, its broad implications may lead to unintended negative consequences that outweigh its intended benefits.

### 1. Overreach and Increased Regulatory Burden

SB 429 imposes additional regulatory requirements that could disproportionately affect businesses, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises. Many companies already comply with extensive federal and state regulations, and adding further restrictions may lead to increased costs, administrative complexity, and legal uncertainties. Rather than fostering compliance, this bill risks creating unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles that hinder economic activity.

### 2. Economic and Employment Consequences

Excessive regulation has a chilling effect on business investment, job creation, and overall economic growth. SB 429 may deter businesses from expanding operations in Oregon or even push them to relocate to states with more balanced regulatory frameworks. This could lead to job losses, reduced economic opportunities, and lower state tax revenues—ultimately harming the very people the bill intends to protect.

### 3. Vague Language and Potential for Misinterpretation

One of the most concerning aspects of SB 429 is the potential for vague or overly broad language, which could result in inconsistent enforcement. Ambiguous provisions may create legal uncertainty, leaving businesses and individuals unsure about how to comply with the law. This lack of clarity could lead to costly legal battles, delays in business operations, and unfair enforcement practices.

### 4. Unintended Consequences for Consumers

Regulations that restrict business operations often lead to higher costs for consumers. Whether through increased prices, reduced availability of products or services, or longer wait times for essential goods, SB 429 could negatively impact everyday Oregonians. Instead of helping consumers, the bill may inadvertently limit

their choices and drive up costs in an already inflationary economy.

## 5. Need for a More Balanced Approach

Rather than implementing SB 429 in its current form, I urge lawmakers to consider alternative solutions that achieve the bill's intended goals without imposing unnecessary burdens. These alternatives may include:

- Strengthening existing enforcement mechanisms instead of creating new, complex regulations.
- Encouraging voluntary compliance through education and incentives rather than punitive measures.
- Conducting further economic impact assessments to ensure businesses and consumers are not unduly harmed.

## Conclusion

While I appreciate the intent behind SB 429, the bill's potential economic and regulatory consequences make it unworkable in its current form. It risks increasing costs, reducing economic opportunities, and creating legal uncertainties that could harm businesses and consumers alike. I urge the committee to reject SB 429 and work toward more balanced, practical policy solutions that benefit all Oregonians.