



May 13, 2025

TO: Members of the House Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

FR: Derek Sangston, Oregon Business & Industry

RE: Opposition to SB 430

Chair Sosa, Vice-chair Osborne, Vice-Chair Chaichi, members of the House Committee on Commerce and Consumer. For the record, I am Derek Sangston, policy director and counsel for Oregon Business & Industry (OBI).

OBI is a statewide association representing businesses from a wide variety of industries and from each of Oregon's 36 counties. In addition to being the statewide chamber of commerce, OBI is the state affiliate for the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Retail Federation. Our 1,600 member companies, more than 80% of which are small businesses, employ more than 250,000 Oregonians. Oregon's private sector businesses help drive a healthy, prosperous economy for the benefit of everyone.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to SB 430A. While OBI and others have attempted to work with the proponents of SB 430A throughout this session and we are thankful for that opportunity, OBI remains opposed because the bill would enact a broad regulatory scheme that would further a patchwork of regulations imposed on online retailers in Oregon. The broad regulation proposed by SB 430A is made more problematic by the existence of other bills that address the problem that gave rise to it – transparency with online ticket sales – through much more narrow means.

While the -A7 amendment would improve the bill in ways that make it easier for some of the online retailers regulated by it to comply with its regulations, OBI believes SB 430A would still needlessly complicate transactions for many online sales for which consumers already receive the necessary transparency they need to make their purchases. By so broadly regulating these sales, OBI is concerned SB 430A would not allow sufficient flexibility to online retailers and is ripe to produce unintended consequences that would lead to increased litigation in Oregon's already overburdened court system.

In the two states – Minnesota and California – that have passed so-called fee transparency bills that are similar to SB 430A, each included commonsense provisions that acknowledge there are certain fees or charges no retailer can accurately disclose prior to the final sale of the good or service. Even in those states, online retailers, including smaller retailers with online sales, have at times struggled to comply with the newly adopted laws. To avoid a similar situation in Oregon, OBI continues to push for a longer implementation timeline, a broader exemption for disclosing taxes and fees imposed by the state or a local government that arise from the transaction, and enforcement by the Attorney General rather than through a private right of action.

For those reasons, I urge this committee to pause on adopting broad changes to Oregon's regulation of online sales and oppose SB 430A. Thank you for your consideration.

Contact: dereksangston@oregonbusinessindustry.com