JFO Sports Betting Revenue Model and Estimates

Sports Betting Study Committee Graham Campbell, Senior Fiscal Analyst, JFO October 17, 2022



1 Baldwin Street • Montpelier, VT 05633-5701 • (802) 828-2295 • https://ljfo.vermont.gov

Quick Terminology

- *Handle*: the amount wagered over a given period. The total amount of dollars placed by bettors
- *Revenue*: the amount of money retained by the operator out of money wagered, after all winning bets are paid out.
- *Hold*: the amount of revenue retained by the operator as a share of handle
 - Ie, the percentage of handle that is retained by the operator after all bets are paid out.



Sports Gambling Revenue is a function of...

- The maturity of the sports gambling market: all else equal, more gambling occurs in more mature markets.
 - Ramp up period from year 1 to year 2 of market.
- *The legal and regulatory structure:* how many operators are allowed in the state? Are they public or private? Are the operators competitive? Online or in person or both?
- The tax rate or revenue share: does the state opt for a low tax rate or a high tax rate/revenue sharing agreement?



Maturity of the Sports Betting Market

 Per capita handle is almost always higher in years 2 and 3 versus year 1 of sports gambling markets

	Per Capita Ha	andle by State	
		Covid-19 Adjusted Per Capita Handle	
State	Date Legalized	Year 1	Year 2
	Low Tax Rate,	Many Operators	
New Jersey	June 2018	\$318.26	\$630.55
West Virginia	August 2018	\$81.61	\$244.22
Iowa	May 2019	\$145.21	\$402.38
Indiana	May 2019	\$233.93	\$448.06
Michigan	December 2019	\$90.31	\$476.96
Colorado	November 2019	\$1,724.22	\$801.06
Illinois	June 2019	\$389.33	\$583.13
Virginia	July 2020	\$306.68	\$482.20
Tennessee	April 2019	\$306.56	\$520.21
	High Tax Rate,	Many Operators	
Pennsylvania	November 2018	\$65.23	\$354.50
Rhode Island	November 2018	\$178.89	\$323.66
New Hampshire	July 2019	\$250.82	\$485.18
	Low Tax Rate,	Few Operators	
Mississippi	August 2018	\$106.31	\$168.23
Arkansas	November 2018	\$9.04	\$19.34
	High Tax Rate,	Few Operators	
Delaware	June 2018	\$162.17	\$132.62
Oregon	August 2019	\$56.32	\$72.86
Montana	May 2019	\$37.01	\$43.22
Note: Nevada exclude	ed since sports betting h	as been legal since	1949

Note: Nevada excluded since sports betting has been legal since 1949

For states with more than 4 months but less than 12 months of data in a given year,

data were extrapolated for the missing months

Date legalized refers to when legislation was passed

Data updated to Feb/March 2022



Legal and Regulatory Structure

- States make various decisions about how they want to structure their markets:
 - *Number of operators/competition*: how many and how competitive?
 - Many states permit many operators to take bets, or they allow a limited number to take bets but ensure the betting lines are nationally competitive.
 - A handful of states allow limited operators or manage a government-run operator through their lottery systems.
 - Online vs in-person betting
 - Usually, those states with many operators allow both online and in-person betting
 - Some states may allow online betting, but only in permitted locations like a casino.



Tax rates and revenue sharing

- Most states apply a tax rate to operator revenue, although the definitions of that base vary.
- In states with limited operators, the "tax rate" is structured as a revenue share.
- States with government-run lottery sports gaming collect the net sportsbook profit.

Table 2: State Tax Rates or Revenue Sharing for Sports Gambling		
Tax Rate		
13% or 20%		
10%		
13.75%		
50% of total revenue		
15%		
9.50%		
6.75%		
8.40%		
8% state, 4% local tax		
Net state sportsbook profit		
51% of gross revenue		
8.5% or 14.25% if online		
10%*		
Net state sportsbook profit		
34% tax with 2% local option tax		
51% of revenue		
20%		
15%		
10%		

*New York expanded online betting, and law states

sportsbook must pay at least 50% of revenues

Note: Table is from OLC/JFO report, not all legal markets included



JFO Revenue Model

- At the time of publication, there was no final legislation on how Vermont's sports gambling market would take shape.
- JFO created scenarios based upon simple parameters of a regulatory market:
 - *Many Operators, Low Tax Rate:* Vermont would operate a model similar to NJ, WV, IA, IN, MI, CO, IL, VA, TN
 - *Many Operators, High Tax Rate:* Vermont would operate a model similar to PA, RI, NH
 - Few Operators, Low Tax Rate: Vermont would operate a model similar to MS, AR
 - Few Operators, High Tax Rate: Vermont would operate a model out of the Department of Liquor and Lottery, like OR, MO, DC



Year 1 Estimated Revenues

Table 4: Preliminary Potential State Revenues under Differing Frameworks Year 1 of Operations					
	Many Operators		Few Operators		
	Low Tax Rate	High Tax Rate	Low Tax Rate	High Tax Rate	
Total Handle	\$198,200,000	\$124,900,000	\$37,900,000	\$57,600,000	
Per Capita Handle	\$308	\$194	\$59	\$90	
Hypothetical Hold	8.0%	7.7%	11.2%	9.1%	
Hypothetical Tax Rate	10%	50%	15%	50%	
Potential Revenue	\$1,550,000	\$4,810,000	\$640,000	\$2,610,000	

- Note: Holds and Tax rates are assumptions. Changing them lead to different revenue estimates
- Estimates updated to March 2022



Year 2 Estimated Revenues

Year 2 of Operations					
	Many Operators		Few Operators		
	Low Tax Rate	High Tax Rate	Low Tax Rate	High Tax Rate	
Total Handle	\$313,600,000	\$267,000,000	\$66,400,000	\$51,900,000	
Per Capita Handle	\$488	\$415	\$103	\$81	
Hypothetical Hold	7.4%	8.0%	13.7%	9.8%	
Hypothetical Tax Rate	10%	50%	15%	50%	
Potential Revenue	\$2,270,000	\$10,640,000	\$1,360,000	\$2,550,000	

- Note: Holds and Tax rates are assumptions. Changing them lead to different revenue estimates
- Estimates updated to March 2022



Quick Note on Fees

- Fees vary significantly across states.
- While not strictly the case, fees theory cover the regulatory costs to the state and localities.
- In September 2021, Department of Liquor and Lottery estimated ongoing expenses of \$460,000:
 - Sports betting manager position and two customer service positions
 - Estimated \$55,000 in start up and equipment costs.

State	Fee		
Arkansas	No license fees		
Colorado	The Master License Fee is \$2,000 and a retail operator and mobile operator fee is \$1,200 each. These are also the renewal fees every two years.		
	Up to \$500,000 initial license fee.		
D.C.	\$250,000 every five years renewal fee.		
Delaware	No additional fee for sports wagering.		
	Land-based: \$10 million initial license fee.		
Illinois	Online: \$20 million initial license fee.		
	\$1 million every four years renewal fee.		
Indiana	\$100,000 initial fee; \$50,000 annual renewal.		
lowa	\$45,000 initial fee; \$10,000 annual renewal.		
Michigan	\$150,000 licensing fee; \$50,000 application fee;		
Michigan	\$50,000 yearly renewal fee.		
Mississippi	No additional fee for sports wagering.		
Montana	\$1,000 annual fee for platform operators; \$100 fee		
New Hampshire	No licensing fees		
New Jersey	\$100,000 annual fee.		
New York	No licensing fees		
Oregon	None		
Pennsylvania	\$10 million initial license fee. \$250,000 renewal fee every five years.		
Rhode Island	No licensing fees		
Tennessee	\$750,000 annual fee.		
Virginia	\$250,000 3 yr. license; \$200,000 renewal; \$50,000 application fee.		
West Virginia	\$100,000 fee; renewed every five years.		

National Conference of State Legislators, March 1, 2021



Closing Comments

- Vermont is unlikely to operate a *Low Tax Rate, Few Operators* system like Mississippi or Arkansas
 - Vermont has no casinos, nor a tradition of casinos
- Many operators in Vermont may be challenging for firms
 - Vermont's small market might not make it worth it for many operators.
 - For this reason, if the committee establishes a tax rate or revenue share that is high, JFO expects there to be relatively few operators in Vermont if legalized.
- Number of operators isn't necessarily most important from a revenue perspective
 - More important is that the operators that do operate in the state are offering competitive lines and promotions, as if they were operating in a highly competitive market. See RI/NH
- Revenues from sports betting are not a panacea and should not be relied upon for major state spending programs:
 - Like cannabis, revenues in the most mature markets are leveling off (NJ, RI, WV).

