

Submitter: Stephen Demergasso
On Behalf Of: SELF
Committee: House Committee On Revenue
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4134

I am strongly opposed to this tax increase.

Introduction:

My family operates a small hotel in Oregon. We have worked very hard over the past six years to repair the buildings and grow the business. We welcome guests from all over the world. These guests already pay the existing 14.5% hotel tax. Asking them to pay an additional 1.25% is a slap in the face. It is also very angering to me, as I ask, why should I invest and work my ass off to build up my own tiny little business here in Oregon, when the politicians, both Democrats and Republicans, are going to target me for an extra 1.25% revenue stream, when you already have grown tax receipts 10% per year for the past 10 years?

Reason for Opposition:

#1 i take issue with the rate

#1 our guests already pay 14.5%

#2 the bill language stating that the tax is going from 1.5% to 2.75% is deceptive; in actuality, the rate is going from 14.5% + to 15.75%. the bill neglects to mention all the local taxes that exist.

#3 guests at our small hotel paid over \$13,000 in these taxes last year; apparently the politicians scoff at this, and want more. Is it ever enough?

#2 this is special interest politics

#1 what does our small hotel have anything to do with fish conservation?

#2 you are making us hotel operators feel like suckers for trying to do business in this state, and now burdening us and our guests, in perpetuity, with some special-interest fish project

#3 "lets tax these people over here, with something completely unrelated over there"- how about no

#3 pigs at the trough

#1 it is disgusting that you want to raise this tax rate, because as currently construed your tax receipts have been growing at 10% per year for the past 10 years.

#2 our small business has been up and down, and now it is stagnant with what we were doing 10 years ago.

#3 why does the state get to grow at 10% per year, while small business not only is stuck in place, but must also now burden a higher tax rate?

OPPOSE