## PUBLIC HEARING AND WORK

## SESSION ON SB 774 AND SB 1056 TAPES 131 - 132 A/B

### SENATE REVENUE COMMITTEE

#### APRIL 30, 1997 - 9:00 A.M. - HEARING ROOM B - STATE CAPITOL BUILDING

Members Present: Sen. Ken Baker, Chair Sen. Neil Bryant, Vice Chair (left meeting at 9:40 a.m.) Sen. Joan Dukes (left meeting at 9:21 a.m.) Sen. Verne Duncan Sen. Tom Hartung (left meeting at 9:40 a.m.)

Sen. Randy Leonard

Witnesses: Stephen Smith, Oregon Chapter, American Fisheries Society Kent Weiser, Associate Athletic Director, Oregon State University Kirk Bailey, Director of Legislative Relations, University of Oregon Greg Goracke, Associate Athletic Director, Oregon State University Jon Carey, Director of Athletics, Western Oregon University Chris Groener, Associated Students of Portland State University Bruce Stern, Chair of Intercollegiate Athletics Board, Professor of Business Administration, Portland State University Ann McCoy, Associate Athletic Director, Senior Women's Administrator, Portland State University

Kevin McCann, Director of Community and Government Relations,

Oregon State University

Staff: Brian Reeder, Economist

Richard Yates, Economist

Carol Phillips, Committee Assistant

TAPE 131, SIDE A

-

005 Chair Baker Opened meeting at 9:06 a.m.

**OPENED PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 774** 

016Stephen<br/>SmithHe reviewed the (-1) Amendments to SB 774 and has no objection to their content. Feels<br/>they reflect the issues raised at the last hearing of this bill. These Amendments combined<br/>with those discussed at an earlier meeting are acceptable to the American Fisheries<br/>Society.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 774

# **OPENED PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1056**

647 Kent Weiser
653 Chair Baker
648 Chair Baker
648 Stated he had not given that any thought and come back to the Committee when he had a response.
653 Chair Baker
663 Chair Baker
663 Chair Baker
664 Suggested Weiser give it some thought and come back to the Committee when he had a

As Goracke reviewed SB 1056 he tried to determine who would be the biggest sufferers 064 Greg Goracke regarding the proposed reduction to OSU. Biggest losers would be women's athletics and non-revenue sports. 076 Sen. Asked if Goracke considered wome Leonard women's athletics at Oregon State. Asked if Goracke considered women's athletics at Portland State to be as important as Did not say one was more important than the other. Would encourage an opportunity to 079 Goracke work toward benefit for everyone. 095Sen.Advised Goracke that Oregon State getup 100kile Portland State gets only 17 \_%. Advised Goracke that Oregon State gets one-third of all Sports Action Lottery funds, 098Sen.Asked why women's athleticDuncanreduction is to be equitable. Asked why women's athletics suffer more of a reduction than men's sports if the Stated all sports would suffer loss in the long run if funding was reduced. As it is now 101 Goracke with Sports Action Lottery funding, OSU can provide additional enhancements to sports. 107 Sen. Dukes Asked how many women's and non-revenue raising sports does OSU have and how many people participate in those sports. Answered there are eight women's and five men's non-revenue sports participated in by 109 Weiser approximately 475 to 485 student athletes. 128 Sen. Dukes Asked Kirk Bailey the same question. Did not have the answer because Athletic Department personnel could not attend this 129 Kirk Bailey meeting. Believes the numbers would be approximately the same as OSU's. Bailey will get that information for the Committee within 24 hours. Asked if U of O and OSU could get additional funding from other sources for their athletic programs. Stated that PAC 10 schools share in television revenues and Bowl 135 Sen. Bryant revenues which go directly into athletic budgets. Smaller universities don't have that opportunity. Asked if that was a consideration when dollars are divided regarding Sports Action Lottery Answered yes, OSU receives substantial television money, Bowl revenue, etc. for their 146 Goracke athletic program. PAC Ten revenue is first, gate receipts second, and Sports Action funding third. Added that the larger schools probably have booster-type clubs that help provide funding and those funds probably go into athletic budgets. Believes that is an important consideration in working through this bill. Asked Goracke if he thought what was being Sen.

| Bryant<br>157                 | proposed in this bill is unfair; but it also seems unfair to Sen. Bryant that what has been done in the past seems a bit arbitrary. All sources of funding must be considered before a relevant decision can be made.  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 177 Weiser                    | Regarding PAC Ten allocation of funds, it is correct that being a member of the PAC Ten provides opportunities for additional revenue. But the other side of that is that to be a member of that conference requires certain scheduling and travel, the cost of which impacts all the teams. They do share in additional revenue, but also have additional expenses.   |
| 190 Sen.<br>Leonard           | Asked Weiser if he was aware that this past year PSU has begun process to be included<br>in the Big Sky conference and that they, too, will be faced with increased expenses<br>associated with that.  |
| 211 Chair<br>Baker            | Will bring SB 1056 back next week for further discussion.  |
| 223 Sen.<br>Duncan            | When this is brought back would like more detail on the history and rationale for distribution formula.  |
| 229 Sen.<br>Leonard           | Stated that at the time the formula was devised two senators from Eugene were involved, and that was the rationale.  |
| 233 Sen.<br>Hartung           | Page 2 line 12 of the bill states that "All additional money to the State Scholarship<br>Commission for the need grant program." Asked to see the figures of what money has<br>gone to that program. Believes the need grant program would be an appropriate place to<br>redistribute funds if there are going to be big cutbacks  |
| 243 Bailey                    | In response to Sen. Bryant's point about being involved in any particular conference, stated that being a member of the PAC Ten brings benefits, but it also has costs associated with it. As an example, in the year when U of O went to the Rose Bowl the athletic department broke even, despite television and other revenues.   |
| 276 <mark>Jon</mark><br>Carey | Exhibit A - Written testimony. The revenues derived from the Sports Action Lottery are significant to the operation of the athletic program as WOSU. Funds provide salaries for assistant coaches, are used for talent grants, and augmenting travel, special projects, facility upgrades, maintenance, etc. of facilities that are not possible with any other revenue source. WOSU is in the process of moving from NAIA to NCAA Division II affiliation, from which Portland State is leaving. There will be increased costs for more travel, scholarship funding, etc. |
| 314 Carey                     | One of their concerns with existing statute is that there appears to be no way to accommodate for change in level. They will affiliate with the Pacific Northwest conference which will require travel to Alaska and Northern California. Feels it will positive for WOSU. Here only to speak for the benefits that would be enjoyed by  |

Western Oregon; not here to talk against other schools. 90% of their 300 athletics are from Oregon.

335 Chris Groener Exhibit B - Read written testimony.

Portland State University is in its first of two years of compliance moving up to Division I. PSU is a full member of the Big Sky Conference as of this year. PSU has approximately 320 student athletes now, of which 110 are women. Expense involved in this move is still being assessed. Members of Big Sky include Cal. State Northridge, Cal. State Sacramento, Portland State, Idaho State, Northern Arizona, University of Montana, Montana State, and Eastern Washington.

## TAPE 132, SIDE A

| 036 McCoy                     | Anticipating expenses to go up a minimum of \$300,000 per year because of this move.<br>Recently added men's basketball back to PSU.   |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 044 Sen.<br>Leonard           | Asked if McCoy was familiar with current distribution formula. Asked if their distribution formula has changed, now that PSU has moved up a conference.  |
| 050 МсСоу                     | Understands the distribution then and now is a process of evolution. Does not know why formula has not been adjusted in the past. PSU places a high importance in women's athletics. Feels their athletics programs are just as important as those at U of O or OSU. |
| 065 Chair<br>Baker            | Asked McCoy her impression of the other schools (Western, Southern, Eastern, OIT) athletic programs.   |
| 069 McCoy                     | Stated that her opinion is that anything an individual school within a state system can do to improve itself helps the system. Any move to a higher conference is beneficial to the state system as a whole.   |
| 097 Sen.<br>Leonard           | Asked McCoy if she felt that since these are tax dollars being distributed from the state, should the state ought to have in its criteria the level of effort being made by individual institutions to generate further funds to support its programs?               |
| 100 McCoy                     | Personal opinion is that she would want to know what an individual school was doing to increase its funding on its own aside from tax dollars or lottery dollars.  |
| 109 <sup>Chair</sup><br>Baker | Believes it was a courageous move to join Big Sky Conference because of the increased expense.   |
| 118 Kevin<br>McCann           | Asked athletic department people to come today to articulate to the Committee what this different formula would impose in the way of impact on OSU. Wanted to clarify position in revisiting formula. It may be time to do this. Wants to find solution that allows  |

everyone to get more money. But wants to do that without penalizing OSU and U of O in the short run.

| 148 Sen.<br>Leonard | His view is that this distribution formula is not unlike distribution formulas for support |
|---------------------|--|
|                     | of public schools in the 1950s which took moneys gladly from inner-city and minority       |
|                     | neighborhoods and redistribute that money gladly to wealthy white schools. Does not see    |
|                     | this formula any different from that. Inner-city youth have little choice where they can   |
|                     | go to a university, and they are thankful they have one like PSU available. Believes       |
|                     | current system was devised to give two-thirds to the two largest universities.             |
|                     | ,  |
| Chair               |  |

- 162 Chair Baker Will bring SB 1056 back Wednesday, May 7 for further consideration.
- 167 Chair Baker Adjourned meeting at 9:45 a.m.

# Carol Phillips

Committee Assistant

Kim James

-

Office Manager

Exhibit Summary:

A. SB 1056, Carey, Written testimony dated 4/30/97, 2 pages

B. SB 1056, Groener, Written testimony dated 4/30/97, 2 pages

C. SB 774, Reeder, (-1) Amendments (BS/ps) 4/29/97, 2 pages