

March 2, 2026



**Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce
House Committee on Rules**

Opposition to SB 1517A, support for SB 1593

Chair Fahey and members of the House Rules Committee;

On behalf of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, representing thousands of employers across Lane County and the greater Eugene area, I write to reiterate our **opposition to SB 1517A as currently structured**, while expressing **support for the -11** amendment and strong opposition to the -18 amendment.

As we outlined in our prior testimony, the central concern with SB 1517 has been its fragmented approach to liability reform. Oregon's recreation, health, and wellness economy is interconnected and operates within a shared legal and risk environment. Carving out relief for one narrow segment of providers while leaving others exposed does not resolve the broader uncertainty created in the wake of Bagley, it simply shifts and redistributes risk.

The Oregonian's recent editorial on SB 1517A correctly raises concerns that a piecemeal statutory fix may create additional loopholes and inconsistencies rather than durable clarity. A narrow legislative solution that privileges one category of operators while leaving similarly situated businesses subject to different standards invites further litigation, not less. It also risks incentivizing forum shopping and creative pleading strategies that undermine the predictability providers are seeking.

For that reason, we support the -11 amendment. It moves the conversation closer to a more coherent and defensible framework by improving clarity and reducing some of the inequities inherent in the base bill. While not a comprehensive solution, it is directionally more consistent with the principle that liability standards should apply evenly across the recreation ecosystem.

We remain neutral on the -15 amendment. To the extent it attempts to refine definitions or procedural elements, we appreciate the effort to improve statutory precision. However, our broader concern remains: Oregon would be better served by a comprehensive, statewide approach, such as the framework advanced in SB 1593, rather than a series of incremental carve-outs.

We strongly oppose the -18 amendment. Expanding or layering additional narrow provisions onto an already segmented bill compounds the very **problem identified by the Oregonian** editorial: it creates more exceptions, more complexity, and more opportunity for inconsistent judicial interpretation. Businesses and nonprofit recreation providers are not asking for special treatment, they are asking for clarity, consistency, and fairness.

The recreation and wellness economy is a cornerstone of Lane County's livability and Oregon's tourism brand. Providers range from youth sports organizations and camps to gyms, climbing



facilities, outfitters, and community nonprofits. They need predictable standards that balance consumer protection with economic sustainability. Targeted exemptions and industry-specific patches do not provide that stability.

We respectfully urge the Committee to reject SB 1517A as currently drafted, adopt improvements contained in the -11 amendment if the bill proceeds, refrain from advancing the -18 amendment, and instead continue working toward a comprehensive solution that treats Oregon's recreation economy as the integrated ecosystem it is.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brittany Quick-Warner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Brittany Quick-Warner
President & CEO
Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce