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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Central to New Hampshire’s decision on expanding gambling in the state is the social impact such a decision will have on current residents. This report examines how gambling regulatory bodies, state legislatures, and departments of health have addressed expanded gambling in thirty-four states. In addition to the findings generated from these contacts, this report contains a synopsis of academic research on the social impacts of gambling and how states fund problem gambling services, while offering policy recommendations to the Commission. Due to the lack of consensus on the social impacts of gambling, this report does not offer concrete conclusions regarding the effects of expanding gambling, but rather examines how states with expanded gambling have dealt with gambling-related issues.

Our research has found two potential social impacts related to expanded gambling: increased problem gambling and increased crime. Both problems have geographic consistencies and are generally concentrated within a fifty-mile radius of a new casino. Regulatory bodies that oversee state gambling vary in structure and power, as well as board-selection processes. The post-legalization involvement of these agencies, as well as state legislatures and health departments, also varies across states. Problem gambling funding ranges from zero public funding to $2.50 per resident. New Hampshire currently allocates no public funding specifically to problem gambling.

This report presents four main recommendations for consideration in proceeding with gambling legislation:

1. Analyze the infrastructure of New Hampshire’s Department of Health and Human Services to determine how gambling addiction services and treatment will be administered across the state. Work with national problem gambling agencies to start a local chapter of the non-profit National Council on Problem Gambling.

2. Determine how the state will fund gambling addiction services. This report contains a chart of how thirty-four states currently fund these services and shows that states typically allocate 0.25 percent to 2.0 percent of gambling net revenue to gambling addiction services and treatment. New Hampshire may wish to allocate up 2.0 of gambling net revenues to these programs to service potential problem gamblers adequately.

3. Consider the commitment of the state legislature to overseeing future social impacts. Of the states studied, only eight have committees dedicated to gaming, while only five of those have held hearings on the social impacts of gambling in the state. Many states have also passed self-exclusion legislation, which creates a database of state residents who have asked not to be allowed into casinos; New Hampshire may wish to examine the possibilities in replicating such legislation.

4. Commit to regular systematic collection of data on problem gamblers in the state, regularly evaluate publicly-funded programs, and track other long-term social impacts of expanded gambling, such as changes in crime rates and
1. METHODOLOGY

In this report, we sought information on the social trends (or “social costs”) that have emerged in other states as a result of legalizing casino gambling. We contacted the gaming commissions, state legislatures, and departments of public health or health and social welfare in all of the states that have legalized casino gaming. We asked leaders in each of the institutions to identify the appropriate agency, if anyone, in charge of monitoring the social costs of gambling, or any agency that may have taken independent initiative to do so. We found that very few long term efforts have been made to track the social costs of gaming legalization. Legislative committees have rarely held hearings, and the potentially relevant agencies of state government, although they do provide services to problem gamblers, have not conducted studies or undetaken any systematic data analysis.

Tables 1 and 2 in the next section of this report summarize these findings, while Tables 4, 5 and 6 in the Appendix detail the situations in individual states.

1.1 State Regulatory Body Methodology (See Table 4 in Appendix for Complete Findings)

We contacted each of the state commissions/boards tasked with regulating gaming in each of the states under analysis. We found that the vast majority of commissions did not have relevant information. Since legalization, they had not been tasked with regularly examining the social costs of gambling and had not observed significant changes in their communities. These commissions focused on regulations, licensing, and sometimes tourism. Some of them worked in conjunction with health departments to provide outreach and support to problem gamblers, but they had not conducted empirical research relating to the social costs of gambling.

1.2 State Legislature Methodology (See Table 5 in Appendix for Complete Findings)

In states where the Senate or House had committees dedicated to gambling or gaming, we contacted the Chairs and/or ranking members and asked them for information regarding any hearings on the social costs of gaming/gambling. In states where a dedicated committee did not exist, we contacted the offices of the Senate President and House Speaker and asked what committee(s) had jurisdiction and what hearings had been held. In most states, the findings are minimal. The state legislatures do have oversight over gambling, but their scope seems to be limited to monitoring revenue and debating potential new laws or restrictions. For example, the Illinois state Senate has a committee dedicated to gambling, but that committee’s most recent hearing on the social impact of gambling was in 1999.
1.3 Health Department/Problem Gambling Treatment Programs Methodology (See Table 6 in Appendix for Complete Findings).

Upon the recommendation of many of the state board officials, we attempted to contact departments responsible for public health and welfare in their states. We quickly found that programs are structured differently in each state; therefore, it was difficult to ensure that we talking to the “right” people or that we were getting a complete picture of the programs in that state. We found that in most states with legalized gaming, a portion of the gambling revenues (0.25 percent to 2.0 percent) are designated for programs to identify and aid problem gamblers. Programs are sometimes administered by the state, and sometimes by independent nonprofit agencies. Although these programs often keep track of the number of problem gamblers identified in their state, it is impossible to draw conclusions from trends in these findings. For example, while some states report slight increases in the number of problem gamblers once casinos were opened, the increase also coincided with extensive outreach to problem gamblers; such outreach efforts had not been made prior to the legalization of casino gambling.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 POTENTIAL SOCIAL COSTS

For the purposes of this report, we considered the most likely potential social costs of gambling to be increases in crime and in pathological or problem gambling in the regions where casinos are opened.

2.2 REGULATORY STRUCTURES

To determine the social impacts of gambling in the United States effectively, we examined every gaming regulatory body in thirty-four states which support some aspect of casino gambling. Table 4 in the Appendix of this report includes detailed information about these regulatory institutions. Our findings indicate that there is great variance in the way states have decided to structure these sectors and divide responsibilities. Twenty-three states have formed a commission, committee, or board. Six states have created departments to oversee gambling, or placed the duties within a division under an existing state executive department. Two states have added the duties of gambling management to the existing lottery commission and added a new division within the organization. Oklahoma’s overall gambling infrastructure is regulated by the Office of State Finance: Gaming Compliance Unit, while each Indian tribe maintains its own gaming commission. Likewise, Oregon tribes have individual commissions, while the Oregon State Police: Gaming Division regulates the state’s gambling industry.

Regardless of the regulatory body’s structure, each has four similar duties: adopting administrative rules, providing licenses to gambling operators, collecting gambling taxes, and testing and approving gaming machines. Enforcing laws and regulations may fall under the specified gaming commission or is carried out by another body. Many Native
American tribes have created gaming control boards in accordance with the National Indian Gaming Commission regulations.

The composition of gaming commissions also varies by state. In twenty-one states, the governor appoints members for a specified term. These appointments typically come with stipulations regarding political party and political office. Additionally, the consent of the legislature is generally required. In three states, the board is comprised partly of members appointed by the executive branch and partly of members appointed by the legislature. Four states regulate gaming through a department, where the director is appointed by the governor. The two states that have included gaming regulation under the existing state lottery do not have additional boards and their director is appointed by the governor. Finally, two states have chosen to regulate gaming through existing law enforcement institutions—Oregon and Montana utilize the State Police and Department of Justice, respectively, to regulate gaming.

2.3 GOVERNMENTAL MONITORING OF SOCIAL COSTS, POST-LEGALIZATION

Despite many stakeholders throughout varying states providing anecdotal evidence of the social costs of legalizing and expanding gambling, there is still a paucity of comprehensive empirical research that would define the relationship between gambling and social costs at the state level. The mechanisms of state governments that might be involved in such monitoring, such as regulatory boards, relevant committees within state legislatures, or departments of public health, have not done so with regularity. Although some states have collected data on incidences of problem gambling, they do not have studies with representative samples that control for other potential intervening factors. Regulatory boards often do not have such a mandate or jurisdiction. State legislatures contacted during the course of this study, even those with committees dedicated to problem gaming, reported not having held hearings. Therefore it is not possible to conclude, based on the lack of systematic empirical studies undertaken by state governments, that legalization or expansion of gambling has had significant social costs; however, it is not possible to say that it has not as well. Nonetheless, in all states one pattern is consistent—none of the governmental organizations receives a mandate and/or funding designated to conduct research the potential social costs of gambling. We found that the governmental focus following legalization or expansion of gambling was on revenue collection and distribution.

Table 1: Summary of State Regulatory Bodies, State Legislative Committees, and Their Monitoring of the Potential Social Costs of Gambling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of States With a Regulatory Body</th>
<th>Number of states with commissions that have reports examining the social</th>
<th>Number of legislatures with committees dedicated to gaming:</th>
<th>Number of hearings held that addressed social costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 REGULATORY BODIES (SEE TABLES 1 AND 4)

We found that different state governments monitor and react to social impacts with disparate forms of regulatory structure. For example, gaming “commissions” and regulatory “boards” consisting of several unelected officials that are appointed by the state’s governor, state level agencies like the Department of Gaming in Arizona and the Department of Business and Professional Regulation in Florida are indicative of the various approaches to gambling regulation. Depending on the state, the authority and specific role of the institution varies from issuing licenses, to setting the tax rate, to making recommendations to the legislature and/or governor, to enforcing state gambling laws.

2.5 STATE LEGISLATURES (SEE TABLES 1 AND 5)

State legislatures contacted during the course of this study, even those with committees dedicated to gaming, reported not having held hearings on social costs, post-legalization. Although some had held hearings, they were sporadic and often for seemingly political reasons. For example, the Illinois State Senate Gaming Committee was considering an expansion of casino gambling in 1999, and held a hearing allowing detractors to express their concerns. However, following the approval of the legislation, no follow-up hearings were held.

Table 2: Summary of State Departments of Public Health/Social Welfare and Nonprofit “Councils on Gambling”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of states with health department administered programs to address</th>
<th>Number of those departments that have conducted longitudinal studies on problem gambling</th>
<th>Number of states with state level departments and/or divisions dedicated to gaming and/or problem gambling</th>
<th>Number of those departments that produced reports on social costs</th>
<th>States with a chapter of the nonprofit &quot;council on gambling&quot; that provides services and advocacy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 (out of 34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Council on Problem Gambling. (http://www.ncpgambling.org/4a/links/?pageid=3283&showTitle=0#Affiliatepercent20Links)

All other data for the tables come from primary research; sources are listed after tables in the Appendix.

2.6 DEPARTMENTS OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SEE TABLES 2 AND 6)

Within health departments and other government agencies, we found no state that established or funded a department, commission, or agency whose mission is to monitor and research the potential social costs of gambling legalization or expansion. Rather, states react to increased demand for problem gambling services. According to the National Council on Problem Gambling, “2 million (one percent) of U.S. adults are estimated to meet criteria for pathological gambling in a given year. Another 4-6 million (two-to-three percent) would be considered problem gamblers; that is, they do not meet
the full diagnostic criteria for pathological gambling, but meet one of more of the criteria and are experiencing problems due to their gambling behavior.” Therefore, it is evident that, regardless of the lack evidence to define a gambling-social cost relationship, demand for problem gambling programs exists. With the exception of Arkansas and Colorado, who provide no public funding for remedial problem gambling services, we found that states earmark funds in the range of 0.25 percent to 2.0 percent of collected gambling-related revenue to fund remedial services implemented by the Department of Health, the Department of Health and Human Services, or some other department or division relating to public health. Although these programs keep statistics, these programs do not include long-term tracking of all potential social costs of gambling at the local level.

2.7 PROBLEM GAMBLING FUNDING (SEE CHARTS 2 AND 5)

According to the Association of Problem Gambling Service Administrators (APGSA), the average per capita state spending on problem gambling services ranges from less than $0.01 to $2.50. Of the states studied in this report, twenty-eight have public funding allocated to problem gambling or legislation requiring casinos to donate a percentage of their net revenue to problem gambling programs. Five states have no public funds dedicated to problem gambling and rely entirely on nonprofit organizations to address the problems. Iowa has the highest per-capita allocation, with $2.50 per resident, while California has the highest overall allocation with $8,557,000. Fourteen states depend on a percentage of state lottery revenues to fund problem gambling activities. New Hampshire’s current funding allocation of lottery revenues does not include money for problem gambling (56 percent for prizes, 30 percent for education, 12 percent for sales/advertising, and 2 percent operations/management). For further information on how funding is allocated, see “Public Funding for Problem Gambling in the United States” in the Appendix.

The National Council on Problem Gambling operates a 24-hour confidential nationwide help line, with funding from individual and corporate contributions, along with conference and affiliate fees. NCPG also administers National Certified Gambling Counselor credential, holds an annual national conference on problem gambling, distributes problem gambling literature, organizes National Problem Gambling Awareness Week, and acts as a resource to federal, state, tribal, and international government agencies. Thirty of the states studied have a local NCPG chapter, providing these services on a more local level. NCPG and its chapters do not support or oppose gambling, as their “primary concern is to help problem gamblers and their families.” New Hampshire does not currently have an NCPG chapter and does not allocate funding to problem gambling.
2.8 ACADEMIC LITERATURE

Of the potential social costs due to legalized gambling, the specter of increases in crime and problem gambling often receive the most attention. We found that the crimes studied as potential social costs are the seven Federal Bureau of Investigation Index I Offenses: aggravated assault, rape, robbery, murder, larceny, burglary, and auto theft. While many academic reports have sought to define the relationship between these crimes and gambling, studies reach a variety of conclusions. Ultimately we, as undergraduate researchers, found that the multitude of different conclusions reached by different practitioners in the academic community preclude us from making any authoritative characterization of a gambling-crime relationship. (See Appendix II for a listing of relevant academic articles and government reports.)

We also found that states rarely conduct or fund prevalence studies that could be used to identify the effects of increased problem gambling on the state or local crime rates. Yet the National Gambling Impact Study Commission “found that the presence of a gambling facility within 50 miles roughly doubles the prevalence of problem and pathological gamblers.” This finding suggests that a crime increase may also occur within fifty miles of a gambling facility. We found that states have not necessarily concentrated their efforts on mitigating problem gambling based on the locations of gambling facilities. Rather a designated amount of funding is added to the budget for specific departments or agencies that address problem gambling.

2.9 LEGALIZATION NOT REPEALED BY LEGISLATURES

No state that has legalized or expanded gambling has ever repealed or downsized gambling legislation once it has been signed into law. In short, if gambling is legalized and becomes a source of revenue within a state, it is unlikely to leave.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 ADDRESSING SOCIAL IMPACTS

While considering legalization, New Hampshire and the Commission may want to consider the potential for changes in the crime rates and pathological gambling rates in the geographic regions in which casinos may be opened. Although proof of causation between gambling and these social changes does not exist, there is theoretical and anecdotal evidence that it does, and research-based evidence has not disproven causation.

3.1.1 INFRASTRUCTURE

Analyze the infrastructure of New Hampshire’s Department of Health and Human Services to determine how gambling addiction services and treatment will be
administered across the state. Work with national problem gambling agencies to start a local chapter of the nonprofit National Council on Problem Gambling.

3.1.2 FUNDING

Determine how the state will fund gambling addiction services. This report contains a chart of how thirty-four states currently fund these services and shows that states typically allocate 0.25 percent to 2.0 percent of gambling net revenue to gambling addiction services and treatment. New Hampshire may wish allocate resources up to the 2.0 percent of gambling net revenues established as the upper level in other states to these programs in order to serve potential problem gamblers adequately. We suggest asking: does the state have the ability to help problem gamblers? Does the state have the ability to track pathological gambling, identify increases, and address them if they occur? Additionally, is the state factoring in 0.25 percent to 2.0 percent of revenue to designate for problem gambling programs? We suggest that New Hampshire consider taking a three-pronged approach to problem gambling: reactive programs (treatment), preventative programs, and long term assessment programs (to collect and analyze data about the potential social costs of legalization). Therefore, it might be wise to consider making an allocation on the higher side of state averages, such as 2.0 percent of revenue.

3.2 LEGISLATIVE INVOLVEMENT

Consider the commitment of the state legislature to overseeing future social impacts. Of the states studied, only eight have committees dedicated to gaming, while only five of those have held hearings on the social impacts of gambling in the state. Many states have also passed self-exclusion legislation and New Hampshire should examine the implications of replicating such legislation.

3.3 SYSTEMATIC DATA COLLECTION

If casino gambling is legalized, New Hampshire is in a position to consider its priorities and values in relation to the practices of other states. Although officials in most other states said that they felt there were social costs of gambling, such as crime changes or increases in problem gambling, they did not have information about a potentially large impact that gambling was having in their state. As New Hampshire continues to consider legalization, we recommend that there be a discussion about this phenomenon, and whether it is important to the state to do things differently.

If New Hampshire decides that the social costs of gambling are of importance, it would be prudent to commit to regular systematic data collection of problem gamblers in the state, regularly evaluate publicly-funded programs, and track the long-term social impacts of expanded gambling. New Hampshire can lead the country in gambling-related research by making an early commitment to track social impacts.
4. APPENDIX

4.1 Appendix I. Primary Research – State by State Data Collection.

4.1.1 TABLE 3: STATE REGULATORY BODIES AND THEIR MONITORING EFFORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Commission Name</th>
<th>Date Gaming Legalized</th>
<th>Gaming Prevalence (ex: annual revenue, number of casinos)</th>
<th>Is any group mandated to consider non-revenue related effects of gaming?</th>
<th>Has anyone tracked those effects or produced reports on them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>AL Racing Commission</td>
<td>Intermittent – open for some time closed, reopened</td>
<td>Primarily Native American bingo operations. Pari-mutuels (greyhounds and horses) are also allowed. Electronic gaming is not.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Department of Gaming</td>
<td>Legalized 1993.</td>
<td>Twenty-two casinos: slots, table games, pari-mutuels, lottery. There is no roulette, craps, or sports-book betting.</td>
<td>See next.</td>
<td>Department of Gaming has an Office for Problem Gambling. Does not do research - provides services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Gambling Control Commission (GCC), DOJ Division of Gambling Control, Office of Problem Gambling (OPG)</td>
<td>Prop 1A: 2000: Tribal casinos can have slots, blackjack. Cardrooms for 100 years, but regulated in 1998. 60 tribal casinos, 90 card rooms. Lottery and pari-mutuels. Fee-per-slot machine. Since 2000, $5.1 Billion annual revenue</td>
<td>GCC: regulatory OPG: remedial treatment</td>
<td>No studies done on social impact. Political reasons are suggested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Department of Revenue-Division of Gaming</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>42 total. 2 are tribal. FY 2009: Casino AGP: $735 Million. Not clear yet how much goes to state.</td>
<td>Division of Gaming-regulation.</td>
<td>Problem Gambling Coalition of CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Div. of Special Revenue</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2 Indian mega-casinos and lottery. FY 2007: $750 million in revenue</td>
<td>General Assembly suppose to fund study every 5 years since 1991</td>
<td>In 2009, Spectrum Gaming Group conducted study for CT on economic and social impacts of gambling in the state. See article analysis grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Delaware Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>1996- slots at racetracks. See below.</td>
<td>3 casinos</td>
<td>The control board regulates and makes recommendations to the GA</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Regulatory Body</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of Casinos/Casino Resorts</td>
<td>Social Impact Studies</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Department of Business and Prof. Regulation- Div. of Pari-Mutuel Wagering</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-Dept. of Rev. pending</td>
<td>Department of Business and Prof. Regulation regulates but no social impact studies</td>
<td>House Select Committee on Seminole Indian Compacts questioned Grinols on social costs. See article grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois Gaming Board</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ten riverboat casinos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annual report does not include social cost research but does discuss problem gambling; has programs for problem gamblers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana Gaming Commission</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Riverboat casinos, pari-mutuel, casino hotels, slot machines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annual Report discusses problem gambling; nothing longitudinal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa Racing and Gaming Commission</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14 Casinos/Casino resorts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kansas Racing and Gaming Commission</td>
<td>Legal in 2007</td>
<td>First casino opened in December.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky Charitable Gaming Association</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Riverboat casino gambling a major industry.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Works in conjunction with state attorney general’s office and nonprofits to provide services to problem gamblers; one study conducted in conjunction with a think-tank that examined changes in pathological gambling rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maine Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>One casino – opened in 2005.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tracks police calls from casino – findings demonstrate that they are no more frequent than other local, non-gambling related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Board/Commission</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Problem Gaming Prevention</td>
<td>Problem Gaming Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Three casinos in Detroit.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Only “pull tabs, raffles, wheels, bingo” – no casinos.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annual report includes info about problem gaming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri Gaming Commission</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12 Casinos Revenue: $1.682 billion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Montana Gambling Control Division Department of Justice</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>68 Casinos Revenue: $422.82 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>266 Casinos Revenue: $11.599 billion</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Health</td>
<td>Not by gaming commission, some by DOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>New Jersey Casino Control Commission</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11 Casinos, Revenue: $4.503 billion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico Gaming Control Board</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5 Racetrack Casinos, Revenue: $258.08 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York State Racing and Wagering Board</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8 Racetrack Casinos, $947.28 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oklahoma Office of State Finance: Gaming Compliance Unit</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>60+ Casinos, 3 Racetrack Casinos, Revenue: $92.48 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon State Police – Gaming Division</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>9 Tribal Casinos Revenue (2007): $598 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date Gaming Legalized</td>
<td>Gaming Prevalence (annual revenue, number of casinos)</td>
<td>IS there a committee dedicated to gaming and it’s oversight? If not, does a specific committee have jurisdiction?</td>
<td>How many hearings have they held that heard testimony on “social costs,” or non-revenue related effects of gambling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Intermittent – non-Indian casinos closed and then reopened.</td>
<td>AL Policy Institute estimates potential revenue, to be between 62 - 284 million. 6 casinos - 2 are non-Indian.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Legalized in 1993. Early 2000’s regulation was introduced; tribes had bingo games for many years before</td>
<td>18 Native American casinos, exclusive rights to tribes in exchange for % of profits. FY 2009: $86 Million</td>
<td>Not legislative: Department of Gaming serves regulatory functions.</td>
<td>They have released a report that I have summarized in the article grid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Lottery, pari-mutuels no date certain. It’s been a long time. Electronic gaming legalized in 2006.</td>
<td>2 pari-mutual casinos. FY 2006: $86 Million</td>
<td>No- although the National Council on PG reports that AK spends no money of PG prevention/treatment. The FY 2011 budget will allocate funding.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Prop 1A: 2000: Tribal casinos can have slots, blackjack. Cardrooms for 100 years, but regulated in 1998.</td>
<td>60 tribal casinos, 90 card rooms. Lottery and pari-mutuels. Fee-per-slot machine. Since 2000, $5.1 Billion annual revenue</td>
<td>Gambling Control Commission (GCC), DOJ Division of Gambling Control, Office of Problem Gambling (OPG)</td>
<td>No studies done on social impact. Political reasons are suggested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of Gambling</td>
<td>Year Legalized</td>
<td>Number of Casinos</td>
<td>Regulatory Body</td>
<td>Funding for Problem Gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Casinos, slots</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>42 total, 2 are</td>
<td>State Division of Gaming, Problem Gambling Coalition of Colorado, Colorado Gambling Association. None are legislative.</td>
<td>No studies, although funding is earmarked for PG treatment and prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>See Commission chart.</td>
<td>See commission chart.</td>
<td>Div. of Special Revenue regulates but no studies conducted</td>
<td>General Assembly required to fund studies every 5 years although this does not happen regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1996 video slots at race tracks. Race tracks since the 50s.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No-gaming commission and a Delaware Council on Gambling Problems. They are not legislative in nature. I am searching for more info on the commission, because they do make recommendations to the GA.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>See commission chart for all available info.</td>
<td>10 riverboat casinos</td>
<td>Yes (for gaming – not for social costs specifically)</td>
<td>Last one in 1999 when considering allowing casino boats to remain docked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ten riverboat casinos</td>
<td>Yes (for gaming – not for social costs specifically)</td>
<td>Last one in 1999 when considering allowing casino boats to remain docked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Riverboat casinos, pari-mutuel, casino hotels, slot machines</td>
<td>No (state senate has formed a gaming study committee to explore changes)</td>
<td>Senate President/House speaker’s office unaware of any recent hearings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14 Casinos/Casino resorts</td>
<td>No (Commerce Committee has jurisdiction in House and Senates)</td>
<td>Senate President/House speaker’s office unaware of any recent hearings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Legal in 2007</td>
<td>First casino opened in December.</td>
<td>No (Commerce has jurisdiction)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Riverboat casinos a major industry.</td>
<td>Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction, according to Senate President/House Speakers offices.</td>
<td>Judiciary staff unsure – not in past five years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>One casino.</td>
<td>Joint Standing Committee on Legal and Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>No response from Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Three casinos in Detroit.</td>
<td>Commerce and Tourism.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Only &quot;pull tabs, raffles, wheels, bingo&quot; – no casinos.</td>
<td>Commerce committee (checks revenue).</td>
<td>Commerce committee has info on revenues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Casinos 1990 (some gambling in 1972)</td>
<td>Over 50, massive state industry.</td>
<td>Gaming Committees</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12 Casinos</td>
<td>Revenue: $1.682 billion</td>
<td>House Special Committee on General Laws</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of Casinos</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Committee/Task Force</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$422.82 million</td>
<td>Senate Judiciary</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>$11.599 billion</td>
<td>Gaming Policy Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$4.503 billion</td>
<td>Regulatory Oversight and Gaming</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$258.08 million</td>
<td>No Committee, all tribal gaming</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$947.28 million</td>
<td>State Assembly Committee on Racing and Wagering</td>
<td>Yes, hearing on geographic disparity of funds, including social impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>$92.48 million</td>
<td>No – All tribal gaming with little oversight by legislature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$598 million</td>
<td>House Human Services Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1.616 billion</td>
<td>Gaming Oversight Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$407.50 million</td>
<td>Special House Committee to Study Gaming</td>
<td>Yes, 2003 Final Report and Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$102.26 million</td>
<td>House Health and Human Services</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
<td>Labor, Commerce, &amp; Consumer Protection Senate Committee</td>
<td>Yes – Problem Gambling Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$951.21 million</td>
<td>Judiciary Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1.24 billion</td>
<td>Committee depends on bill, State Affairs and Homeland Security for general matters</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Funding of State Problem Gambling Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Budget for Problem Gambling</th>
<th>Public Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure (Budget/Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **34 States** | Range: $0-$8,557,000              | Revenue percentage allocations, general fund, lottery, tribal contributions, fees, none | Range: $0.00-$2.50  
Median: $0.13  
Average: $0.36 |
<p>| Alabama     | $0                                | No funding allocated.                                                                    | $0.00                                     |
| Arizona     | $1,800,000                        | 1. Tribal allocations to the State from casino revenue. 2% of the funds deposited into the Arizona Benefits Fund. 2. Lottery, amount allocated annually by the legislature. | $0.33                                     |
| Arkansas    | $0                                | No funding allocated.                                                                    | $0.00                                     |
| California  | $8,557,000                        | 1. Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund. 2. Business and Professions Code, $100/licensed gaming table. 3. Lottery. | $0.08                                     |
| Colorado    | $0                                | No funding allocated.                                                                    | $0.00                                     |
| Connecticut | $1,841,637                        | 1. Lottery. 2. Racing performance fees at simulcast facilities. 3. General fund commitment from Dept Mental Health and Addiction Services. | $0.53                                     |
| Delaware    | $1,000,000                        | 1. Proceeds of video lottery terminal: $1,000,000 or 1%, whichever is greater, of funds retained by the state lottery. | $1.16                                     |
| Florida     | $1,801,310                        | 1. Lottery. 2. Casinos.                                                                  | $0.10                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Budget for Problem Gambling</th>
<th>Public Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure (Budget/Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 34 States     | Range: $0-$8,557,000             | Revenue percentage allocations, general fund, lottery, tribal contributions, fees, none   | Range: $0.00-$2.50  
Median: $0.13  
Average: $0.36 |
| Illinois      | $960,000                         | 1. General fund.                                                                         | $0.07                                     |
| Indiana       | $5,250,000                       | 1. Riverboat Casino admission tax.  
2. Fees on slot machines at race tracks.                                                  | $0.67                                     |
| Iowa          | $7,470,285                       | 1. 0.5% of adjusted gross receipts from the casinos.  
2. 0.5% of the gross lottery revenue from Iowa State Lottery.                             | $2.50                                     |
| Kansas        | $100,000                         | 1. General Fund.  
2. Bingo.  
3. 2% of gaming revenues will be directed to the Problem Gambling and Addictions Grant Fund. | $0.04                                     |
| Kentucky      | $0                               | No funds allocated.                                                                     | $0                                        |
| Louisiana     | $2,500,000                       | 1. Louisiana Lottery: 1% proceeds to maximum of $500,000.  
2. Casinos: 1% proceeds to maximum of $500,000.  
3. Riverboat Casinos: 1% proceeds to maximum of $500,000. | $0.58                                     |
| Maine         | $100,000                         | 1. General fund.  
2. 1% net revenue from slot machines.                                                    | $0.08                                     |
| Maryland      | $16,000                          | 1. Lottery.                                                                             | $0.003                                    |
| Massachusetts | $1,210,058                       | 1. Lottery: Unclaimed prize money and proceeds of multi-jurisdictional lottery game.  
2. Set amount: racetracks.                                                              | $0.19                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Budget for Problem Gambling</th>
<th>Public Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Revenue percentage allocations, general fund, lottery, tribal contributions, fees, none</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure (Budget/Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 34 States     | Range: $0-$8,557,000             |                          | Range: $0.00-$2.50
<pre><code>           |                                  |                          | Median: $0.13                                                                 | Average: $0.36                           |
</code></pre>
<p>| Michigan      | $3,000,000                       | 1. Casino fees.          |                                                                                     | $0.30                                    |
|               |                                  | 2. Lottery.               |                                                                                     |                                          |
| Minnesota     | $2,525,000                       | 1. Lottery.               |                                                                                     | $0.49                                    |
| Mississippi   | $100,000                         | 1. General fund.         |                                                                                     | $0.03                                    |
| Missouri      | $485,000                         | 1. Compulsive Gamblers Fund, determined annually. 2. One (1) cent of admission charge from excursion gambling boat. |                                          | $0.08                                    |
| Montana       | $0                               | No funds allocated.      |                                                                                     | $0.00                                    |
| Nevada        | $1,500,000                       | 1. Tax revenue equivalent of $2 per gaming machine per quarter. |                                                                                     | $0.58                                    |
| New Jersey    | $956,130                         | 1. General Fund – First $600,000 of casino fines is credited toward this amount. 2. Assessments on off-track wagering facilities. 3. General Fund with a cost of living adjustment. |                                          | $0.11                                    |
| New Mexico    | $2,421,446                       | 1. 0.25% of net win revenues at state-regulated casinos. 2. 0.25% of net win revenues. 3. General Fund. |                                          | $0.32                                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Budget for Problem Gambling</th>
<th>Public Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure (Budget/Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 States</td>
<td>Range: $0-$8,557,000</td>
<td>Revenue percentage allocations, general fund, lottery, tribal contributions, fees, none</td>
<td>Range: $0.00-$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median: $0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average: $0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$4,477,000</td>
<td>1. General Fund, not designated from gambling revenue.</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>1. Lottery – unclaimed winnings. 2. Tribal compacts.</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$6,197,680</td>
<td>1. 1% of lottery revenues.</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>1. Compulsive Gambling Treatment Fund - $1.5 million or amount equal to .001 multiplied by the total gross revenue of all active and operating licensed gaming entities, whichever is greater.</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>1. Lottery.</td>
<td>$0.0737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>1. Lottery. 2. Casinos.</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>1. 0.13% of revenue for lottery, horseracing, and games of chance 2. Tribal casinos – voluntary contributions.</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>1. Lottery. 2. Tribal gaming grants.</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>1. $1.5 million from racetrack, lottery, and limited video lottery 2. $500,000 from table games.</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart Sources:

Population figures from United States Census Bureau
http://www.census.gov/

Association of Problem Gambling Service Administrators
http://www.apgsa.org/State/ShowStatePartial.aspx

New Mexico Compulsive Gambling Final Report: July 2009

National Coalition on Problem Gambling: Fact Sheets
http://www.ncpgambling.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3397

Washington State Problem Gambling Program
http://www.dshs.wa.gov/dasa/services/opplr/problemgamblingprgm.shtml

Problem Gamblers Help Network of West Virginia Annual Report: 2009
http://www.1800gambler.net/Portals/0/FY%202009%20Annual%20Report%20for%20website.pdf
4.2 Appendix II. Relevant Articles (Academic and Governmental Reports)

   http://www.indiangaming.org/library/resources/index_pub.htm

   http://www.ncsl.org/programs/esnr/gaming.htm


   http://www.fsu.edu/~iog/psgcs.html

   Research Center at the University of Chicago. Gambling Impact and Behavior 

   Gaming Policy and Its Socio-economic Effects 
   http://www.indiangaming.org/library/resources/index_pub.htm 
   (Reference Number: 1004)

   http://www.library.ca.gov/CRB/97/03/crb97003.html

8. Duke University. State Lotteries at the Turn of the Century: Report to the National 
   http://indiangaming.org/library/resources/index_pub.htm
   Reference Number: 1011

9. National Indian Gaming Association. Public Sector Gaming Study Commision: 
   http://www.indiangaming.org/library/resources/index_pub.htm Reference 
   Number: 1009

    Law Survey. 1996. 
    http://sierra.uchastings.edu/plri/spr96tex/calgam.html

    Social Impacts. 2009. 
    e_state_of_connecticut.pdf


2002.

http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/ngisc/reports/fullrpt.html


http://ideas.repec.org/a/bla/revpol/v10y1991i2-3p130-137.html


http://ccd-web.louisiana.edu/Portals/0/2008_Louisiana_Study_on_Problem_Gambling.pdf


http://www.hks.harvard.edu/hpaied/pubs/pub_010.htm
http://jayalbanese.com/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/Albanese_ACityCasinos_1985.354141820.pdf

http://www.springerlink.com/content/f45luye3b1d6jqae/

http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/120004340/abstract


http://www.health.state.nm.us/gambling/New%20Mexico%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf

30. New Mexico Department of Health Problem Gambling Prevention Program.
http://www.health.state.nm.us/gambling.shtml

http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/gaming/


33. United States General Accounting Office. *Impact of Gambling: Economic Effects More Measurable Than Social Effects* 

http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/556/1/124

http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/97/03/crb97003.html#toc
PRIMARY REFERENCES BY STATE

Alabama
Alabama Office of the Governor
Alabama Department of Revenue
Alabama Department of Health

Arizona
Arizona Department of Gaming - Division of Problem Gambling

California
California Gambling Control Commission
California Department of Justice Division of Gambling Control
California Office of Problem Gambling in the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

Colorado
Colorado Department of Revenue- Division of Gaming
Colorado Limited Gaming Control Commission

Connecticut
Connecticut Division of Special Revenue
Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services

Delaware
Delaware Lottery Commission

Florida
Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation - Division of Pari-Mutuel Wagering
Department of Revenue- Tax Research Group

Illinois
Stacey Wilson, Legislative Affairs Staffer, Illinois State House of Representatives Gaming Committee
Sen. Tracy Link, Illinois State Senate, Gaming Committee Member

Indiana
Jeff Neuenswander, Indiana Gaming Commission Staff Attorney
Ross Hooten, Attorney for the Indiana General Assembly Gaming Study Committee

Iowa
Julie Herrick, Assistant Administrator of the Gambling Commission
Mark Vanderlinden, Program Coordinator, Iowa Department of Public Health Problem Gambling Program
Kansas
Mike Deines, Director of Communications and Responsible Gambling, Kansas Racing and Gambling Commission
House Committee on Judiciary, Office of Lance Kinzer, Chairperson
Senate Committees on Judiciary Office of Tim Owens, Chairperson

Kentucky
Leah Cooper Boggs, Treasurer of the Kentucky Charitable Gaming Association
Office of Sen. Larry Clark – Economic Development and Tourism Joint Committee

Louisiana
Katie Chabert, Louisiana Attorney General’s Gambling Treatment Referral Program
Natalie Thurman, Executive Staff Officer, Louisiana Gaming Control Board.
Stacy DeLaney, Secretary, Louisiana State Senate Judiciary Committee

Maine
Department of Public Safety Gambling Control Board - Rob Welch, Executive Director
Rep. Pamela Jabar Trinward (D-Waterville), Chair – House Veterans and Legal Affairs
Sen. Nancy B. Sullivan (D-York County), Chair – Senate Veterans and Legal Affairs

Michigan
Eric Esh, Committee Clerk, Michigan State House – Tourism Committee, Senate – Commerce and Tourism
Jim Plaks, Michigan Gaming Control Board

Minnesota
Staff member, Minnesota Gambling Control Board
Commerce and Labor, Office of Rep. Joe Atkins

Mississippi
Rep. Bobby Moak, Chairman, State House Gaming Committee
Sen. Gary Tollison, Chairman State Senate – Judiciary Committee, Division B
Leigh Ann Wilkins, Mississippi Gaming Commission, Communications Department
http://www.ncpgambling.org/i4a/links/?pageid=3283&showTitle=0#Affiliate%20Links

Missouri
Missouri Gaming Commission Communications Office
Representative Timothy Jones’ Office, Chairman of House Special Committee on General Laws

Montana
Rick Ask – Montana Gaming Control Division, Administrator
Nevada
Marc Warren – Senior Research Specialist for Nevada Gaming Control Board
State of Nevada Office of Governor Jim Gibbons
Nevada Department of Health and Human Services – Director’s Office
http://dhhs.nv.gov/

New Jersey
New Jersey Casino Control Commission Office of Communications
Risa Martinez Kruger – Regulatory Oversight and Gaming Commission
Donna Pasqualine – New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services
Dennis Donovan – Department of Human Services, Division of Addiction Services
Jeff Beck – New Jersey Council on Compulsive Gambling

New Mexico
Georgene Lewis – New Mexico Gaming Control Board State Gaming Representative
Tracey Kimball – New Mexico Legislative Services State Librarian
Deborah Busemeyer – Department of Health Communications Director
http://www.health.state.nm.us/gambling.shtml

New York
New York State Racing and Wagering Board Public Information
Hasna Kaddo – Principal Clerk at New York State Racing and Wagering Board
New York State Assembly Committee on Racing and Wagering
New York State Library Research
Rebecca Martel – New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services
New York State Mental Health Office

Oklahoma
Mia Monenerkit – Director of Compliance, Comanche Nation Gaming Commission
Jennifer Brock – Oklahoma State Senate Communications Specialist
Brad Wolgamott – Oklahoma House of Representatives Senior Research Analyst
Pam Williams – Oklahoma Department of Health
Jeff Dismute – Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse

Oregon
Carolyn Engler – Oregon State Police Gaming Division Office Specialist II
Kirk Harvey – Oregon Department of Justice
Sandy Thiele-Cirka – Oregon Senate Human Services Committee Administrator
Paul D. Potter - Addictions and Mental Health Division Problem Gambling Services Manager
http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/addiction/gambling.shtml

Pennsylvania
Nanette Horner – Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, Director of Compulsive and Problem Gambling
Pennsylvania House Gaming Oversight Committee
Rhode Island
Tom Evans – Rhode Island State Library State Librarian
Terry Kiernan – Rhode Island Lottery

South Dakota
Terry Porter – South Dakota Gaming Commission Pari-Mutuel Auditor
David Ortbahn – South Dakota Legislative Services

Washington
Kathleen Buckley – Washington State Legislature
Evergreen Council on Problem Gambling: http://www.evergreencpg.org/

West Virginia
West Virginia Lottery Commission
West Virginia House Judiciary Committee Communications

Wisconsin
Peggy Hendrickson – Wisconsin Division of Gaming Public Record Coordinator
Executive Staff Assistant
Wisconsin State Library Database
Jamie McCarville – Bureau of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Program Coordinator