

February 15, 2024

Jessica Herron
Legislative Clerk
Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce
House Committee on Energy and Commerce
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6115

Re: Chase Griffins Responses to Additional Questions for the Record

Dear Ms. Herron:

I want to thank the Subcommittee for inviting me to appear before it on January 18, 2024 to testify at the hearing entitled "*NIL Playbook: Proposal to Protect Student Athletes' Dealmaking Rights.*"

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I am attaching my answers to additional questions for the record, in the required format.

Thank you again for your help, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Chase Griffin

Chase Griffin
QB, UCLA Football

Mr. Chase Griffin

Attachment - Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Gus M. Bilirakis

- 1. Despite analogies to the National Football League, it remains unclear how proposed revenue sharing in collegiate sports would work. For example, the NFL teams do not pay each of their players the same amount. Aside from the impact college athlete revenue sharing would have by redistributing funds being shared with other male and female sports on campus, how would a sports program administer amongst the players on a team? Would time on the field or in competition be a factor?**

Thank you for the question. College athletics can and should create its own revenue sharing model, distinct from the NFL. After a negotiation (collective bargaining) with informed and representative college athletes on each campus there would be an agreed upon revenue share for the players in each sport. Once the players' share is agreed upon that amount would be split equally among the scholarship players on the team. Playing time would not be a factor in the revenue share split. This bargaining process would occur for each team, with scholarship athletes, in the athletics department - including women's sports. Once athletes are informed and aware of the financial realities of each team, we have to trust their representatives to bargain for the best deal that fairly compensates the athletes and maintains/enhances the financial stability of each team. I am a firm believer that once athletes have a fair revenue share deal they will have a vested interest in growing the revenue of the team (eg. by promoting ticket sales, soliciting donations, and using their social media and influence to drive television tune-in and other forms of revenue for their programs).

NIL represents a separate avenue for more prominent and enterprising players to capitalize on their greater visibility. Income earned from NIL is paid directly to the more prominent and marketable players and not split with the team.

- 2. One can argue that revenue sharing is already present in college athletics – it moves money from football to provide scholarships and other athletics opportunities for women, men and women in non-revenue generating sports. Are you concerned that these opportunities could be taken away? Do you think the focus should be that players may go to the NFL sooner in order to achieve their value?**

At present, athletic aid (via scholarship and stipends) that go to college athletes only represent between 10-15% of an athletic program's total revenue. By contrast coach and administrator compensation represents over 25-35% of an athletic department's total revenue. College Football drives the majority of that revenue followed by Men's Basketball and in some cases women's basketball. Athletes in the revenue-generating sports deserve compensation at least on par with coaches and administrators in the aggregate. Athletes in non-revenue generating sports should be empowered and incentivized to negotiate compensation with their athletic departments and participate in the marketing and growth of those sports to make them revenue-generating (ie. athletes participating in ticket sales and securing donations for those sports). At present that

Mr. Chase Griffin

athlete 's financial incentive to grow those sports does not exist. I also believe there are large inefficiencies and misplaced spending priorities in most athletics departments. By not having to fairly compensate athletes, a moral hazard exists because athletics departments do not have true market-based incentives to run and manage their programs to maximize value creation. As far as the NFL, athletes are barred from entering the draft until three years after high school graduation and college is really the only place for football athletes to go to develop and increase their prospects of being drafted. The option to go to the NFL sooner does not exist and those three+ years spent in college programs generate billions of dollars in value for college athletics departments and athletes deserve to be fairly compensated for that value created.