

Submitter: Austin Koontz

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Revenue

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB110

I'm writing to submit my testimony in opposition to SB 110, which "increases the amount of incremental baseball tax revenues that the Oregon Department of Administrative Services may grant for the purpose of constructing a major league baseball stadium."

My family is from Nevada, where in 2016 a special legislative session where a \$750 million subsidy to fund the construction of a stadium in Las Vegas, in order to attract the Oakland Raiders NFL team. Despite my family members fighting strongly against this subsidy for a sports stadium, it was approved. I did not expect to encounter a similar effort here in Oregon.

This increase in tax revenue for a baseball stadium in Portland is different than a tax subsidy for a football stadium in Las Vegas, but the overall issue is the same. Proponents of this bill claim that it will increase jobs and boost the economy, but economic studies have repeatedly shown that not to be the case generally (see Brookings Institution article here: [https://hyperallergic-newspack.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2013/07/Sports-Jobs-Taxes\\_-Are-New-Stadiums-Worth-the-Cost\\_-\\_Brookings-Institution.pdf](https://hyperallergic-newspack.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2013/07/Sports-Jobs-Taxes_-Are-New-Stadiums-Worth-the-Cost_-_Brookings-Institution.pdf)). Devoting this additional \$1 billion to the stadiums will lead to fewer dollars available for police, fire, schools and other public services the team and stadium require.

Devoting this additional \$1 billion to the stadiums will lead to fewer dollars available for police, fire, schools and other public services the team and stadium require. Please, for the sake of fairness and common sense, do not pass yet another write off for a stadium.

Thanks for your consideration.