

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1274

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

2003 HOUSE JUDICIARY

HB 1274

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Lu Costa Rickford

10/2/03

Date

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1274 & 1495

House Judiciary Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 2-5-03

| Tape Number | Side A | Side B | Meter # |
|---|--------|--------|---------|
| 1 | | xxx | 17-end |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Committee Clerk Signature <i>APenrose</i> | | | |

Minutes: 13 members present.

Chairman DeKrey: We will open the hearing on HB 1274 and HB 1495. They will be heard together.

Rep. Dave Weiler: Introduced HB 1274.

Rep. Boehning: Introduced HB 1495.

Rep. Delmore: Support HB 1495 and HB 1274. I have always been an advocate for the charitable gaming industry. We set it up to give them some money towards their good causes.

Rep. Tom Kelach: Support - we need to allow the charities to run gaming (see attached testimony and survey, tape 1, side b, 19.4-31).

Rep. Klemin: With this combination of bills, will this allow charities to run casinos with all the games.

Rep. Kelach: Right now they would be able to operate some type of casino if they want, to operate the games that are allowed now. If both passed, they would be able to operate an

Page 2

House Judiciary Committee

Bill/Resolution Number HB 1274 & 1495)

Hearing Date 2-5-03

establishment that had poker and also had the game devices. Whether they would operate a casino like Prairie Knights Casino, I don't know that that would happen, but I don't know of anything that would prohibit that.

Rep. Klemin: Could they?

Rep. Kelsch: I don't think there would be anything to prevent them from doing it now, with the games that are allowed.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Rick Stenseth, Charitable Gaming Association of ND: We support both bills (tape 1, side b, 33-41).

Rep. Onstad: Has charitable gaming ever considered a joint venture with casinos.

Mr. Stenseth: No, this haven't been pursued, since tribal pacs are negotiated with the Governor and ours are administered by the Legislative body.

Rep. Klemin: I don't know anything about what is in the agreements with the tribes, is there anything in those agreements that would preclude charitable gaming?

Mr. Stenseth: No, I don't think so. Those are individual tribal pacs negotiated with the Governor and don't effect the legislative authority over charitable gaming.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Remy Brook, Charitable Gaming Association: Support. (43.2-44.6)

Gary Fournier, Gaming Manager for the Greater Grand Forks Convention & Visitors

Bureau: Support (44.8-47.0).

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Page 3

House Judiciary Committee
Bill/Resolution Number HB 1274 & 1495)
Hearing Date 2-5-03

Warren DeKrey, ND Council on Gambling Problems: Oppose (Tape 1, side b, 47.7-end, Tape 2, side a 0-1.8) ND already has legal charitable games.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Governor Link, ND Council on Gambling Problems: Opposed (Tape 2, side a 1.8-5) What is the impact of gambling in ND. All we are talking about here is the money that will be raised, at what cost to the people of ND.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Wayne Wolf: Opposed (5-11.3) Gambling ruined my life, now that I have my life back, I moved to North Dakota since South Dakota is filthy with gambling. Don't make ND the same as SD.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Warren Wenzel, Methodist pastor: Opposed (see attached testimony, 11.6-16).

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Christina Kendel, ND Family Alliance: Opposed (see attached testimony, 16.1-22.4). Enough is enough, we are gambling with the future of our children.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Stephen Wisthoff, ND Council on Gambling Problems: (see attached testimony) Opposed.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Kurt Luger, Indian Gaming: Opposed (24.6-34.5).

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Any questions.

Rep. Onstad: What are the tribal councils doing on behalf of the gambling addiction of your members.

Page 4

House Judiciary Committee

Bill/Resolution Number HB 1274 & 1495)

Hearing Date 2-5-03

Mr. Luger: We worked with the 1996, and in 1997 we signed a statewide gambling contract with Mental Health Association. We again increased our contribution this year by 21%, and we also spend \$50,000 on the reservations separately.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you.

Keith Lauer, A.G.'s office: The AG is neutral.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. We will now close the hearing.

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1274

House Judiciary Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 2-5-03

| Tape Number | Side A | Side B | Meter # |
|---|--------|--------|---------|
| 2 | | x | 45-50 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Committee Clerk Signature <i>Al Penrose</i> | | | |

Minutes: 13 members present.

Chairman DeKrey: What are the committee's wishes in regard to HB 1274.

Rep. Klemin: There are amendments proposed to this bill. I move the amendments from Rep.

Kelsch, pg 1, line 9 after "tournament" insert "or nontournament".

Rep. Kretschmar: Seconded.

Voice vote: Carried.

Rep. Grande: I move a Do Not Pass as amended.

Rep. Bernstein: Seconded.

7 YES 6 NO 0 ABSENT DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED CARRIER: Rep. Bernstein

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
01/14/2003

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1274

1A. State fiscal effect: Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.

| | 2001-2003 Biennium | | 2003-2005 Biennium | | 2005-2007 Biennium | |
|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | General Fund | Other Funds | General Fund | Other Funds | General Fund | Other Funds |
| Revenues | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$0 |
| Expenditures | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Appropriations | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect: Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.

| 2001-2003 Biennium | | | 2003-2005 Biennium | | | 2005-2007 Biennium | | |
|--------------------|--------|------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------|
| Counties | Cities | School Districts | Counties | Cities | School Districts | Counties | Cities | School Districts |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

2. Narrative: Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.

The bill would allow a licensed gaming organization to conduct the game of poker, including a poker tournament, on more than two occasions per year. The bill would allow an organization to conduct a variation of poker in which a player would play against the organization, rather than against other players, and a prize would be based on a predetermined pay schedule.

3. State fiscal effect detail: For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:

A. Revenues: Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.

The bill would increase General Fund revenues because the estimated increase in adjusted gross proceeds (gross proceeds less prizes) for the game of poker would be subject to the gaming tax.

Qualification: If two or more bills propose to increase gaming activity, each of the bills may impact or interact with each other and reduce the combined fiscal effect of both bills.

B. Expenditures: Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.

Not applicable

C. Appropriations: Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.

Not applicable

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Name: | Charles Keller/Kathy Roll | Agency: | Office of Attorney General |
| Phone Number: | 328-4482/328-3622 | Date Prepared: | 01/22/2003 |

38288.0101
Title.0200

Adopted by the Judiciary Committee
February 5, 2003

YK
2/5/03

HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1274 JUD 2/6/03

Page 1, line 9, after "tournament" insert "or nontournament"

Renumber accordingly

Page No. 1

38288.0101

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Date: 2/5/03
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2003 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1274

House Judiciary Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 38288.0101 .0200

Action Taken Do Not Pass as Amended

Motion Made By Rep. Maragos Seconded By Rep. Boehning

| Representatives | Yes | No | Representatives | Yes | No |
|-----------------------|-----|----|-----------------|-----|----|
| Chairman DeKrey | ✓ | | Rep. Delmore | | ✓ |
| Vice Chairman Maragos | | ✓ | Rep. Eckre | | ✓ |
| Rep. Bernstein | ✓ | | Rep. Onstad | | ✓ |
| Rep. Boehning | | ✓ | | | |
| Rep. Galvin | ✓ | | | | |
| Rep. Grande | ✓ | | | | |
| Rep. Kingsbury | ✓ | | | | |
| Rep. Klemin | ✓ | | | | |
| Rep. Kretschmar | | ✓ | | | |
| Rep. Wrangham | ✓ | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Total (Yes) 7 No 6

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Rep. Bernstein

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 6, 2003 8:24 a.m.

Module No: HR-23-1780
Carrier: Bernstein
Insert LC: 38288.0101 Title: .0200

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1274: Judiciary Committee (Rep. DeKrey, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS and when so amended, recommends DO NOT PASS (7 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1274 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 9, after "tournament" insert "or nontournament"

Renumber accordingly

2003 SENATE JUDICIARY

HB 1274

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB1274

Senate Judiciary Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 03/19/03

| Tape Number | Side A | Side B | Meter # |
|---|--------|--------|----------|
| 1 | X | | 0.0 - 51 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Committee Clerk Signature <i>Maria L. Solberg</i> | | | |

Minutes: Senator John T. Traynor, Chairman, called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all committee members present. Sen. Traynor requested meeting starts with testimony on the bill:

Testimony in Support of HB 1274

Rep Dave Weiler - Dist 30, Introduced the bill (meter 0.2) This bill removes the limited playing of poker similar to the game 21. This is already permitted in all the tribal casinos in the state. You can play poker in your own home and it is legal in South Dakota, Montana and Minnesota. You can even play it on the Internet. This bill will allow poker to be played by charitable organization.

Rick Stenseth - Fargo, Representing Fargo-Morehead Community Theater. Discussed statute.

Sen. Nelson questioned when poker is being played is a staff person on site? Yes, it would operate like black jack, this game is not played on a machine.

Do they need special training? No.

Page 2

Senate Judiciary Committee

Bill/Resolution Number 1274

Hearing Date 03/19/03

Discussion of how many people can play the game? One to five people-you can play against the house. In this game you can play against each other or the house. The rules regarding these games and the type of games allowed would have to be determined by the Attorney General's office.

Sen. Dever asked if the games were profitable? No they are not. Discussion (meter 9.0) I am looking for the word "table" on this bill.

Sen. Nelson questioned if this bill would not allow any video or electronic poker. No.

Sen. Lyson questioned how do you supervise games that are played against each other?

Todd Kranda - Kelsh Law Firm (meter 13.6) Read Testimony - Attachment #1. Referred to Prairie Knights Casino and activities presently going on. Handed out Attachment #3 - Revenues are produced by gambling. Read through Highlights of a Survey - Attachment #2a and 2b.

Sen. Traynor questioned the lack of participation do to present legislation. (meter 20.9)

Remy Brook - President Charitable Games of North Dakota. (meter 21.7)

Testimony in Opposition of HB 1274

Warren DeKrey - Chairman of the ND Council of Gambling Problems. Read Testimony of the history of gambling legislation.- Attachment #4. We have poker at casino's already? We do have enough-why do we need more?

Bob Wedding - Retired Clergy (meter 31.4) Concerned with when enough is enough. Reviewed more history.

Lois & Marv Erdman - Representing the community (meter 34.1) Came to ND in 1977 and have stayed do to our enjoyment of the community. We need to stop the "instant gratification" that we

Page 3

Senate Judiciary Committee

Bill/Resolution Number 1274

Hearing Date 03/19/03

have in society today. Stated what gamblers qualify in their mind. Sited side effects that gambling causes.

Warren L. Wenzel - Pastor, United Methodist Church. (meter 38.8) Read Testimony - Attachment #5.

Christina Kindal - ND Family, (meter 46.3) Concerned about the message we give to young people. Read a New York article. We need to slow down on gambling issues/games as the commission in article stated.

Testimony Neutral to HB 1274

None

Senator John T. Traynor, Chairman closed the hearing

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1274

Senate Judiciary Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 03/24/03

| Tape Number | Side A | Side B | Meter # |
|---|--------|--------|-------------|
| 1 | X | | 33.4 - 36.9 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Committee Clerk Signature <i>Maria L. Solberg</i> | | | |

Minutes: Senator John T. Traynor, Chairman, called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all committee members present. Sen. Traynor requested meeting starts with committee work on the bill:

Discussion of video surveillance and how setting limits would be unenforceable.

Motion Made to DO NOT PASS HB 1274 Sen. Nelson and seconded by Sen. Lyson

Roll Call Vote: 5 Yes. 0 No. 1 Absent

Motion Passed

Floor Assignment: Sen. Lyson

Senator John T. Traynor, Chairman closed the hearing

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Date: March 25, 2003

Roll Call Vote #: 1

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1274

Senate JUDICIARY Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken DO NOT PASS

Motion Made By Sen. Nelson Seconded By Sen. Lyson

| Senators | Yes | No | Senators | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------|-----|----|---------------------|-----|----|
| Sen. John T. Traynor - Chairman | X | | Sen. Dennis Bercier | A | A |
| Sen. Stanley Lyson - Vice Chair | X | | Sen. Carolyn Nelson | X | |
| Sen. Dick Dever | X | | | | |
| Sen. Thomas L. Trenbeath | X | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Total (Yes) FIVE (5) No ZERO (0)

Absent ONE (1)

Floor Assignment Senator Stanley W. Lyson, Vice Chairman

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
March 24, 2003 12:23 p.m.

Module No: SR-52-5524
Carrier: Lyson
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
HB 1274, as engrossed: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Traynor, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (5 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). Engrossed HB 1274 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

(2) DESK, (3) COMM

Page No. 1

SR-52-5524

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Ja Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

2003 TESTIMONY

HB 1274

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Y. Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Kelsch

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1274

Page 1, line 9, after "tournament" insert "or nontournament"

Renumber accordingly

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Kelsch ①

INFORMATION SHEET IN SUPPORT OF HB 1274

- Under current law the game of poker cannot be conducted on more than two occasions per year.
- Due to this limitation the forecast of gross proceeds from poker for this biennium is only \$4,000.
- HB 1274 removes the limitation. It also provides for poker games to be played against the house similar to 21, with the same wager limits as 21.
- HB 1274 is the same bill as HB 1305 from last session. That bill passed the house with more than a 65% favorable vote.
- HB 1274 allows charitable organizations to conduct poker for those people who are already playing poker at Tribal casinos but would prefer to support their local charities.
- A recent survey conducted in North Dakota showed substantial support for allowing charitable gaming to conduct the same games as are allowed at Tribal casinos.
- 73% of the people surveyed supported expanded gaming if a portion of the proceeds went to charities.
- HB1274 will help charitable gaming in North Dakota, and the many worthwhile charities that depend upon gaming for their support, and will bring more tax revenue into the state.

P

| | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Total taxes paid by Charitable Gaming | \$13,275,232 - 45% | \$12,359,653 - 44% |
| Net Gaming Proceeds to the organizations | \$16,300,544 - 55% | \$15,747,911 - 56% |

Please vote in favor of a DO PASS recommendation on House Bill 1274

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature


10/3/03
Date

Regarding House Bill No. 1274

The current proposal of moving poker from an occasional fun night for organizations to a full-time, ongoing game is to place it in the realm of other addictive forms of gambling. Arguments in the past to include poker as a carnival or poker night activity is that it would not be addictive since it is limited to only two nights per year.

I would encourage the committee to help slow the frenzy of gambling that has hit the legislature since the November ballot. Yes, these same bills appear session after session, but there is more temptation to pass them this time around since lottery has opened the door. It is important that bills such as 1274 be marked with a "do not pass" in order to slow the frenzy until the state can get a handle on organizing and conducting the lottery.

Respectfully,



Stephen C. Wisthoff

February 5, 2003
Testimony of Christina Kindel
For North Dakota Family Alliance
House Judiciary Committee
H.B. 1274

Chairman DeKrey and Committee Members:

My name is Christina Kindel. I'm appearing today on behalf of the North Dakota Family Alliance. We oppose this bill.

H.B. 1274 represents yet another attempt to expand gambling activity in North Dakota. North Dakota Family Alliance is opposed to all such expansion, and asks this committee to carefully consider the potential consequences of approving more gambling expansion here in our state.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

North Dakota State House of Representatives
Hearing on House Bill 1495
February 5, 2003

Rev. Warren L. Wenzel, Pastor
Linton, North Dakota
701-254-0166

Chairman DeKrey and members of the committee:

1274

I am here representing myself and I ask you to defeat House Bill 1495. There are many reasons that this bill is a bad bet for North Dakota. The first is that it is another expansion of gambling. Dr. James Dobson, a member of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission, said, "Clearly, 'Gambling fever' has engulfed the nation." We see today that North Dakota is no exception. You have before you this bill, the lottery bill, a poker bill and other expansion of gambling legislation. We are already one of the highest per capita gambling states in the nation. Gambling lives off the productive side of our economy. It does not produce anything and becomes a drain on the rest of the economy. It cannibalizes other businesses in that it takes consumer dollars away from other businesses. Its appetite never ends. It is an economic cancer. I have a chart that shows the costs of Drug abuse versus Gambling abuse in the United States. Drug Abuse costs our country \$70 billion per year and Gambling Abuse costs our country \$80 billion a year. There were 13.2 million Drug Abusers and 15.4 million gambling abusers in the U.S. population. These were figures from 1997. The American Legion magazine of June 2002 has a good study entitled, "Gambling's Dark Side". A May 7, 2001, Business Week magazine, article quotes Kip Peterson, a consultant at Transnational Market Development Inc., describing the turning to more and different kind of games by the gambling industry as, "It's a self-destructive cycle."

Dick Elefson, addiction counselor from here in Bismarck, said, "Compulsive gambling is the fastest growing addiction in North Dakota, costing North Dakotans millions of dollars in taxes, lost income, increased bankruptcy and crime." We all bare the costs of the expansion of gambling. Lisa Vig, another North Dakota addiction counselor, said, "The thing we don't realize is that when the compulsive gambler embezzles, has a court appointed attorney, goes to jail, get out, has a probation officer, ...we as taxpayers pick up the tab. for that..." It has been well documented that society pays a high price for gambling problems and any increase in gambling opportunities increases the problems.

I was in Texas last week. In the Houston Chronicle, Friday, Jan. 24, 2003, U.S. Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson, Thursday, in Austin said, "We're not very healthy in America." He said, "To truly stem the epidemic of preventable diseases that threaten too many Americans, we need to move from a health care system that treats disease to one that avoids disease through wiser personal choices." This bill will not lead to a healthier North Dakota. The gambling industry is a predator. This bill and also House Bill 1274 need to be defeated. These bill are not in best interest of the people of North Dakota.





Figure 1

U.S. Costs of Drug Abuse Versus Gambling Abuse Socio-Economic Costs, 1997


\$70 billion/year = Drug Abuse
\$80 billion/year = Gambling Abuse



Sources: See Tables 1-3, infra and accompanying footnotes.

Figure 2

Drug Abuse Versus Gambling Abuse Percentages and Numbers of U.S. Population, 1997



Sources: See Tables 1-3, infra and accompanying footnotes.

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Augusta Rickford

10/13/03
Date

GAMBLING RESEARCH BRIEF

Kindel

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report:

**What Does It Say?
What Does It Mean?**

August 1999

**by Ronald A. Reno
Senior Research Analyst**



FOCUS ON THE FAMILY • PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
1400 WYOMING DRIVE • COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80920 • (719) 531-2400

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Introduction

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission (NGISC) Final Report, issued on June 18, 1999, provided the first comprehensive assessment of gambling's effects on the United States in 23 years. The NGISC raised a plethora of concerns about the negative impacts of gambling that have arisen in the more than two decades since the first federal gambling commission completed its work.

The nine-member Commission faced numerous obstacles in its work, the foremost being a united and relentless effort on the part of the gambling industry and its political allies to sabotage the Commission's work. In fact, the gambling industry succeeded in placing three members of the Nevada casino industry on the Commission. Another member was appointed to represent Native American gambling interests.

In spite of this, the Commission's final report paints a dark—and often devastating—portrait of the effects of widespread legalized gambling on America's families and communities. The report received unanimous support from all nine commissioners. Given the composition of the commission, its findings must be taken as the bare minimum regarding the harms and ills associated with legalized gambling. In actuality, the damages attributable to casinos and other forms of state-sanctioned wagering may be far greater even than those outlined in the NGISC's work. Commissioners acknowledged as much, frequently noting the dearth of research regarding the social implications of this activity and calling on federal, state, and tribal governments, as well as academia and other institutions, to begin a much more thorough assessment to measure gambling's true toll.

The following document contains excerpts from key sections of the NGISC's final report. Language in *italics* is excerpted directly from the report. Text in bold letters is so noted to highlight key statements or conclusions.

A copy of the entire report may be obtained through the Internet at www.ngisc.gov. For additional information regarding the negative effects of legalized gambling, please see www.family.org/gambling.

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes without prior permission from Focus on the Family. Moderate editing for length, which does not change its substance or intent, is also permissible. Copyright © 1999 Focus on the Family. All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured. Printed in the U.S.A.

When reproducing under another organization's name, please cite as follows: Originally published by Focus on the Family. Copyright © 1999 Focus on the Family.

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Melissa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Gambling Addiction: A Growth Industry

The NGISC report clearly states that gambling addiction is increasing in the United States as gambling expands. Further, the Commission anticipates continued increases in the future. The report cites numerous pieces of evidence linking the increased availability of gambling with the growth in the numbers of people victimized by a gambling addiction.

"As the opportunities for gambling become more commonplace, it appears likely that the number of people who will develop gambling problems also will increase." (p. 4-19)

"NORC (The National Opinion Research Center) examined the nearby presence of gambling facilities as a contributing factor in the incidence of problem and pathological gambling in the general population. In examining combined data from its telephone and patron surveys, NORC found that the presence of a gambling facility within 50 miles roughly doubles the prevalence of problem and pathological gamblers...."

"Seven of the nine communities that NORC investigated reported that the number of problem and pathological gamblers increased after the introduction of nearby casino gambling."

"RC's (the National Research Council's) review of multiple prevalence surveys over time concluded that '[S]ome of the greatest increases in the number of problem and pathological gamblers shown in these repeated surveys came over periods of expanded gambling opportunities in the states studied.'"

"An examination of a number of surveys by Dr. Rachel Volberg concluded that states that introduced gambling had higher rates of problem and pathological gambling. The relationship between expanded gambling opportunities and increased gambling behaviors was highlighted in the personal testimony received by the Commission. Ed Looney, executive director of the New Jersey Council on Compulsive Gambling, testified that the national helpline operated by his organization received significant increases in calls from locations where gambling had been expanded." (p. 4-4)

How Many Are There?

The Commission reported on a wide range of estimates of the number of Americans with a significant gambling problem. Two key studies indicated that between 15 and 20 million Americans are displaying some signs of a gambling addiction. Further, the Commission emphasized that estimates of the number of problem and pathological gamblers may be significantly understated.

"For millions of Americans, problem and pathological gambling is a serious consequence of legal and illegal gambling. Part of our challenge has been to pin down the exact number of individuals suffering from these disorders. Virtually every study

varies in these estimations. For example, a Harvard University meta-analysis concluded that approximately 1.6 percent, or 3.2 million, of the American adult population are pathological gamblers. The combined rate of problem and pathological gambling in 17 states where surveys have been conducted ranges from 1.7 to 7.3 percent. In Oregon, the lifetime prevalence of problem and pathological gambling is 4.9 percent. Recent studies in Mississippi and Louisiana indicate that 7 percent of adults in these states have been classified as problem or pathological gamblers.

"The two principal studies sponsored by this Commission found that the prevalence of problem and pathological gambling in America is troubling. NRC estimates that, in a given year, approximately 1.8 million adults in the United States are pathological gamblers. NORC found that approximately 2.5 million adults are pathological gamblers. Another three million of the adult population are problem gamblers. Over 15 million Americans were identified as at-risk gamblers." (pp. 7-19, 7-20)

"In its 1997 meta-analysis of literature on problem and pathological gambling prevalence, the Harvard Medical School Division on Addictions, using 'past year' measures, estimated at that time that there were 7.5 million American adult problem and pathological gamblers (5.3 million problem and 2.2 million pathological). The study also estimated there were 7.9 million American adolescent problem and pathological gamblers (5.7 million problem and 2.2 million pathological)." (p. 4-1)

"Despite the lack of basic research and consensus among scholars, the Commission

The Commission strongly urges those in positions of responsibility to move aggressively to reduce the occurrence of this malady in the general population and to alleviate the suffering of those afflicted." (p. 4-3)

"It is possible that the numbers from the NRC and NORC studies may understate the extent of the problem. Player concealment or misrepresentation of information and the reliance of surveyors on telephone contact alone may cause important information on problem or pathological gamblers to be missed. For example, among pathological gamblers, a common characteristic—in fact, one of the DSM-IV criteria—is concealing the extent of their gambling. Data in the NORC survey support the theory that even non-problem gamblers tend to understate their negative experiences related to gambling. And, in fact, survey respondents greatly exaggerated their wins and underreported their losses. Similarly, respondents were five times more likely to report that their spouse's gambling contributed to a prior divorce than to admit that their own gambling was a factor. Thus, the actual prevalence rates may be significantly higher than those reported. Additional research is needed to verify the full scope of problem and pathological gambling." (p. 4-9)

A Highly Addictive Activity

The gambling industry has attempted to downplay the magnitude of gambling addiction in this country by stating that the vast majority of Americans display no visible signs of a gambling addiction. However, the Commission's findings portray gambling as a highly addictive activity. In addition to concerns about underreporting, the reality is that a significant number of Americans do not gamble, and thus are at no risk for gambling addiction. NORC's survey found that 37% of American adults did not place a bet in the past year (NORC, p. 25). The extreme rates of gambling addiction among casino employees provides further evidence of the link between exposure to gambling environments and the development of severe gambling problems.

"The incidence of problem and pathological gambling among regular gamblers appears to be much higher than in the general population. In NORC's survey of 530 patrons at gambling facilities, more than 13 percent met the lifetime criteria for pathological or problem gambling, while another 18 percent were classified as 'at risk' for developing severe gambling problems." (pp. 4-5, 4-9)

"The NRC also stated that between 3 and 7 percent of those who have gambled in the past year reported some symptoms of problem or pathological gambling." (p. 4-5)

"The Commission heard testimony that the prevalence of pathological gambling behavior may be higher among gambling industry employees than in the general population and Dr. Robert Hunter, a specialist in pathological gambling treatment, has estimated that 15 percent of gambling industry employees have a gambling problem." (p. 4-11)

Vulnerable Populations

The Commission found that gambling addiction is more prevalent among various ethnic groups, the poor, and youth, as will be addressed in greater depth later.

"Both [the NRC and NORC] studies found that pathological, problem, and at-risk gambling was proportionally higher among African Americans than other ethnic groups. Although little research has been conducted on gambling problems among Native American populations, the few studies that have been done indicate that Native Americans may be at increased risk for problem and pathological gambling." (p. 4-11)

"NORC reported that pathological gambling occurs less frequently among individuals over age 65, among college graduates, and in households with incomes over \$100,000

per year. NRC concluded that pathological gambling is found proportionately more often among the young, less educated, and poor." (p. 4-11)

A Devastating Addiction

The NGISC report underscores the depth of pain and misery that accompanies a gambling problem. The Commission stated repeatedly that the personal, familial and societal devastation resultant from a gambling addiction is wide-ranging and profound.

"[According to the National Research Council]

With the increased availability of gambling and new gambling technologies, pathological gambling has the potential to become even more widespread." (p. 4-1)

* * *

"Problem or pathological gambling can affect the life of the gambler and others in varied and profound ways. The NRC study stated that 'although the research in this area is sparse, it suggests that the magnitude and extent of personal consequences on the pathological gambler and his or her family may be severe.' That report notes that many families of pathological gamblers suffer from a variety of financial, physical, and emotional problems, including divorce, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, and a range of problems stemming from the severe financial hardship that commonly results from problem and pathological gambling. Children of compulsive gamblers are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviors such as smoking, drinking, and using drugs, and have an increased risk of developing problem or pathological gambling themselves.

According to NRC, 'As access to money becomes more limited, gamblers often resort to crime in order to pay debts, appease bookies, maintain appearances, and garner more money to gamble.' NRC also states that 'Another cost to pathological gamblers is loss of employment. Roughly one-fourth to one-third of gamblers in treatment in Gamblers Anonymous report the loss of their jobs due to gambling.'

"In addition, according to NRC, 'Bankruptcy presents yet another adverse consequence of excessive gambling. In one of the few studies to address bankruptcy, Ladouceur et al. (1994) found that 28 percent of the 60 pathological gamblers attending Gamblers Anonymous reported either that they had filed for bankruptcy or reported debts of \$75,000 to \$150,000.'

"Others who are impacted by problem and pathological gambling include relatives and friends, who are often the source of money for the gambler. Employers may experience losses in the form of lowered productivity and time missed from work. Problem and pathological gamblers often engage in a variety of crimes, such as embezzlement, or simply default on their financial obligations. During our site visits, the Commission

rd testimony from social service providers that churches, charities, domestic violence
rs, and homeless shelters are often significantly burdened by the problems created
b, problem and pathological gamblers.

"Some costs can be assigned a dollar figure. The Commission heard repeated testimony
from compulsive gamblers who reported losing tens and even hundreds of thousands of
dollars to gambling. Problem and pathological gamblers appear to spend a
disproportionate amount of money on gambling compared to non-problem gamblers.
According to NRC, these individuals report spending 4½ times as much on gambling
each month as do non-problem gamblers." (pp. 4-13, 4-14)

"This Commission heard testimony about the growing numbers of individuals
suffering from problem and pathological gambling, which often results in bankruptcy,
crime, suicide, divorce, or abuse. While recent studies have attempted to 'quantify' these
costs to society, the Commission knows that no dollar amount can represent what a lost
or impaired parent, spouse or child means to the rest of the family. Furthermore, many of
these costs are hidden and it is difficult to quantify the emotional damage and its long-
term impact on families and their children. As NORC indicated in its report, 'In a
number of respects the tangible impacts from problem gambling can be thought of as
analogous to the economic impacts of alcohol abuse. In both situations, inappropriate
and/or excess participation in a legal and widely pursued leisure activity can exact an
indestructible toll in individuals, family, friends, and the surrounding community.' In
ality, it is these hidden costs—the emotional costs of addictive behavior—that concern
far more than the annual economic expense of problem and pathological gamblers."
(p. 7-2)



Specific Impacts

The Commission's report discusses at some length several specific outcomes relative to
gambling addiction. The sections regarding those outcomes are excerpted below.

Suicide

"Commissioners heard repeated testimony about suicide and attempted suicide on the
part of compulsive gamblers. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] in Chicago,
Commissioners heard about a middle-aged couple in Joliet, Illinois, who both committed
suicide after the wife accumulated \$200,000 in casino debt. When evaluating the

economic benefits of a proposed new facility, policymakers should also give serious consideration to consequences such as these.

"According to the National Council on Problem Gambling, approximately one in five pathological gamblers attempts suicide. The Council further notes that the suicide rate among pathological gamblers is higher than for any other addictive disorder.

"A survey of nearly 400 Gamblers Anonymous members revealed that two-thirds had contemplated suicide, 47 percent had a definite plan to kill themselves, and 77 percent stated that they have wanted to die.

"University of California-San Diego sociologist Dr. David Phillips found that 'visitors to and residents of gaming communities experience significantly elevated suicide levels.' According to Phillips, Las Vegas 'displays the highest levels of suicide in the nation, both for residents of Las Vegas and for visitors to that setting.' In Atlantic City, Phillips found that 'abnormally high suicide levels for visitors and residents appeared only after gambling casinos were opened.' Visitor suicides account for 4.28 percent of all visitor deaths in Las Vegas, 2.31 percent of visitor deaths in Reno, and 1.87 percent of visitor deaths in Atlantic City. Nationally, suicides account for an average of .97 percent of visitor deaths. (p. 7-25)

"Other observers have noted the fact that Nevada regularly reports the highest rate of suicide among all 50 states. For 1995, that rate was more than twice the national average. Testimony before the Commission indicated that, for numerous reasons, the magnitude of the link between gambling and suicide may be understated. For instance, Commissioners heard that gambling-related suicides and suicide attempts often are not reported as suicides, not tied to gambling, or disguised so as not to look like a suicide." (p. 7-26)

Divorce

"The Commission likewise heard abundant testimony and evidence that compulsive gambling introduces a greatly heightened level of stress and tension into marriages and families, often culminating in divorce and other manifestations of familial disharmony. In Las Vegas, Michelle 'Mitsi' Schlichter testified how she eventually ended her marriage to former NFL quarterback Art Schlichter after his second incarceration for gambling-related activities. In Biloxi, Mississippi, a school teacher testified how her 30-year marriage to a prominent Gulf Coast attorney crumbled after the husband developed an obsession with casino gambling. In Tempe, Arizona, Gwen Bjornson testified before the Commission how her 5- and 7-year-old sons' 'lives are forever changed because I was compelled to divorce their father, a compulsive gambler. Divorce is one of the most painful things that we, as adults, sometimes must face. Yet, without divorce, I am very much in doubt that I would have skirted a complete mental breakdown.'

"In NORC's survey, 53.5 percent of identified pathological gamblers reported having been divorced, versus 18.2 percent of non-gamblers and 29.8 percent of low-risk

blers. Further, NORC respondents representing two million adults identified a
re's gambling as a significant factor in a prior divorce.

"NRC concluded, 'Many families of pathological gamblers suffer from a variety of financial, physical, and emotional problems.' NRC reviewed studies showing that spouses of compulsive gamblers suffer high rates of a variety of emotional and physical problems. In a survey of nearly 400 Gamblers Anonymous members, 18 percent reported experiencing a gambling-related divorce. Another 10 percent said they were separated as a direct consequence of their gambling." (p. 7-26, 7-27)

Homelessness

"Individuals with gambling problems seem to constitute a higher percentage of the homeless population. The Atlantic City Rescue Mission reported to the Commission that 22 percent of its clients are homeless due to a gambling problem. A survey of homeless service providers in Chicago found that 33 percent considered gambling a contributing factor in the homelessness of people in their program.

"Other data presented to the Commission further substantiated this link. In a survey of 1,100 clients at dozens of Rescue Missions across the United States, 18 percent cited gambling as a cause of their homelessness. Interviews with more than 7,000 homeless individuals in Las Vegas revealed that 20 percent reported a gambling problem." (p. 7-27)

Abuse and Neglect

"Family strife created by gambling problems also appears in the form of abuse, domestic violence or neglect. In Biloxi, Mississippi, a witness testified before the Commission how her husband's gambling problem affected their relationship: 'I lived in fear daily due to his agitation and outbursts of violence: broken doors, overturned furniture, broken lamps, walls with holes in them. I haven't the words to describe the hell that my life became on a daily basis.'

"NRC cites two studies showing that between one quarter and one half of spouses of compulsive gamblers have been abused. Six of the 10 communities surveyed in NORC's case studies reported an increase in domestic violence relative to the advent of casinos.

"One domestic violence counselor from Harrison County, Mississippi, testified that a shelter there reported a 300 percent increase in the number of requests for domestic abuse intervention after the arrival of casinos. A substantial portion of the women seeking refuge reported that gambling contributed to the abuse.

"Other casino communities report similar experiences. Rhode Island Attorney General Jeffrey Pine reported a 'significant increase' in domestic assaults in the community of Westerly, R.I. after the opening of the Foxwoods casino 20 minutes away. Maryland Attorney General J. Joseph Curran, Jr. has likewise reported a linkage between expanded gambling and increases in domestic violence in numerous locales. The Commission even received testimony of several cases of spousal murder and attempted murder linked to problem and pathological gambling.

"Children of compulsive gamblers are often prone to suffer abuse, as well as neglect, as a result of parental problem or pathological gambling. The Commission heard

testimony of numerous cases in which parents or a caretaker locked children in cars for an extended period of time while they gambled. In at least two cases, the children died. It was brought to the Commission's attention that cases of parents leaving their children in the Foxwoods casino parking lot became so commonplace that Foxwoods management posted signs warning that such incidents would be reported to the police. The well-publicized murder of a seven-year-old girl in a Nevada casino during the formation of this Commission has brought significant attention to the issue of children abandoned by their parents inside gambling establishments.

"In its case studies of 10 casino communities, NORC reported, 'Six communities had one or more respondents who said they had seen increases in child neglect, and attributed this increase at least in part to parents leaving their children alone at home or in casino lobbies and parking lots while they went to gamble.' Respondents in these communities did not report noticeable increases in child abuse.... The NRC, however, reported on two studies indicating between 10 and 17 percent of children of compulsive gamblers had been abused." (pp. 7-27, 7-28)

The Costs to Society

The costs of pathological gambling extend beyond the individual victim and his or her family, often including employers, business associates, neighbors, relatives, social service providers and others. The Commission attached an estimated financial pricing to a handful of the costs incurred by pathological gamblers. The intensity of these costs alone is troublesome—and points to the reality that if all the financial costs of problem and pathological gambling were tabulated, the totals would be staggering.

"In addition to the costs of problem and pathological gambling borne by the individual and his or her family, there are broader costs to society. NORC estimated that the annual average costs of job loss, unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, poor physical and mental health, and problem or pathological gambling treatment is approximately \$1,200 per pathological gambler per year and approximately \$715 per problem gambler per year. NORC further estimated that lifetime costs (bankruptcy, arrests, imprisonment, legal fees for divorce, and so forth) at \$10,550 per pathological gambler, and \$5,130 per problem gambler. With these figures, NORC calculated that the aggregate annual costs of problem and pathological gambling caused by the factors cited above were approximately \$5 billion per year, in addition to \$40 billion in estimated lifetime costs.

"NORC admittedly 'focused on a small number of tangible consequences' and did not attempt to estimate the financial costs of any gambling-related incidences of theft, embezzlement, suicide, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, and the non-legal costs of divorce. As a result, its figures must be taken as minimums." (p.4-14)

Cultivating the Next Generation of Gamblers

The Commission report devoted extensive print to the epidemic of youth gambling, and the concomitant high level of gambling problems among adolescents. The Commission also cited numerous data indicating the alarming frequency with which youth are able to access legal gambling venues, indicating that many gambling entities either ignore or fail

force age limitations. The report further noted the fact that many adolescents are
nized by a parent's gambling addiction.

*"Although illegal in every state, the sale of lottery tickets to minors nevertheless occurs
with a disturbing frequency."*

*"In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other states, lottery tickets are available
to the general public through self-service vending machines, often with no supervision
regarding who purchases them. Thus, it is not surprising that a survey conducted by the*

*"Pathological gamblers are more likely than non-pathological gamblers to report that their
parents were pathological gamblers, indicating the possibility that genetic or role model
factors may play a role in predisposing people to pathological gambling."*

*"Although the full scope of this problem remains to be
defined, the Commission is unanimous in urging elected officials and others to focus on
implementing more effective measures to address the problem of adolescent gambling."*

*There is much that the Commission does know regarding adolescent gambling, and much
of it is troubling:*

*"The NRC estimates that as many as 1.1 million adolescents between the ages
of 12 and 18 are past year pathological gamblers, a much higher percentage than
adults. In the NORC study, the rate of problem and pathological gambling among
adolescents was found to be comparable to that of adults, but the rate of those 'at-risk'
was more than that for adults."*

- "Based on its survey of the research literature on problem and pathological gambling
among adolescents, the NRC reported that estimates of the 'past year' rate of
adolescent problem and pathological gambling combined range from 11.3 to 27.7
percent, with a median of 20 percent. Estimates of 'lifetime' adolescent pathological
and problem gambling range between 7.7 and 34.9 percent, with a median of 11.2*

percent." (pp. 4-11, 4-12)

"With a growing number of underage gamblers, the social consequences of this illegal behavior are significant. In NRC's survey of literature, they found that the percentage of adolescents who report having gambled during their lifetime ranges from 39 to 92 percent, with 39 percent functioning as an outlier, with the next highest percentage as 62. The median was 85 percent. NRC also found that the prevalence of adolescent gambling during the past year ranged from 52 to 89 percent, with a median value of 73 percent.

"And the impact is felt throughout the nation. In a survey of 12,000 Louisiana adolescents, one-quarter reported playing video poker, 17 percent had gambled on slot machines and one in 10 had bet on horse or dog racing. In Oregon, 19 percent of youths ages 13 to 17 reported having gambled in a casino, with 12 percent having done so in the past year. In Massachusetts, 47 percent of seventh-graders, and three-quarters of high school seniors, reported having played the lottery.

"The conclusion is startling, but confirmed by every study: children are gambling, even before they leave high school. NORC did note 'adolescents were notably absent from casino play, with barely one percent reporting any casino wagers. This presumably reflects well on the enforcement efforts of casino operators, among other factors.'

While the majority gamble on illegal activities, a significant number gamble on legal forms of gambling. This fact alone raises serious and troubling concerns regarding the accessibility of gambling, particularly convenience type, and the ineffective safeguards that are presently in place." (pp. 7-20, 7-23)

"It may be important to note the impact of proximity to legalized gambling on adolescents. One study found that college students in New York, New Jersey, and Nevada had higher rates of gambling than did students in Texas and Oklahoma." (p. 7-23)

"One recent study found that gambling behavior was significantly associated with multiple drug and alcohol use. For 28 percent of those surveyed in the same study, gambling was associated with carrying a weapon at least once in the past 30 days, and for those who reported a problem with gambling the figure rose to 47 percent. Violence was also associated with gambling: while nearly one-fourth of the non-gambling students reported having fought in the last 30 days, the figure rose to 45 percent for those who reported gambling and 62 percent for those who reported problems attributed to

bling. In addition, the researchers suggested that the data may have been significantly underreported." (pp. 7-23, 7-24)

Revenue from Addicts

The gambling industry takes in billions of dollars each year from individuals addicted to gambling. The report highlights the pittance that the gambling industry throws at the problem in comparison to the vast amount of money it seduces from problem and pathological gamblers and their families. Given the aforementioned concerns about underreporting on the part of addicted gamblers, the estimates that problem and pathological gamblers account for between 15 percent to one-third or more of total gambling revenues should be viewed as extremely conservative projections.

"[I]ndustry funds earmarked for treatment for pathological gambling are miniscule compared to that industry's total revenue. Critics have assailed the relatively modest industry efforts in this area by asserting that a large percentage of gambling revenues are derived from problem and pathological gamblers. NORC calculated that they account for about 15 percent of total U.S. gambling revenues, or about \$7.6 billion per year (based on total annual gambling revenues of \$50 billion). Dr. Henry Lesieur calculated that problem and pathological gamblers account for an average of 30.4 percent of total gambling expenditures in the 4 U.S. states and 3 Canadian provinces he examined.

"Other recent studies at the state level provide further evidence. A 1998 study commissioned by the state of Montana found that problem and pathological gamblers account for 36 percent of electronic gambling device (EGD) revenues, 28 percent of live horse expenditures, and 18 percent of lottery scratch ticket sales. A 1999 study for the Louisiana Gaming Control Board indicated that problem and pathological gamblers in Louisiana comprise 30 percent of all spending on riverboat casinos, 42 percent of Indian casino spending, and 27 percent of expenditures on EGD machines." (pp. 4-15, 4-16)

Picking up the Pieces

The Commission highlighted several disturbing facts about treatment for gambling addiction: the minuscule percentage of afflicted individuals who seek help, the difficulty of treating the condition, and the pittance of money devoted to treating compulsive gamblers by those who profit from their losses.

"According to therapists and other professionals in the field, pathological gambling is a difficult disorder to treat. As with substance abuse, treatment for pathological gambling is a costly, time-consuming effort, often without quick results and with a high degree of re-occurrence." (p. 4-14)

"Not surprisingly, the effectiveness of ... various treatments are 'not well substantiated in the literature.' However, one thing that is known is that each has a high recidivist rate. For example, the only known survey on the effectiveness of Gamblers Anonymous

found that only 8 percent of GA members were in abstinence after one year in the group." (p. 4-15)

"Even where treatment is available, however, only a small percentage of pathological gamblers may actually seek help. According to NORC, preliminary research suggests that only 3 percent of pathological gamblers seek professional assistance in a given year." (p. 4-15)

"According to the NCPG's (National Council on Problem Gambling's) 1998 National Survey of Problem Gambling Programs, the combined resource allocation [to treat gambling addiction] by states is approximately \$20 million annually to 45 different organizations. This amount represents only .01 percent of the total \$18.5 billion that states receive from gambling." (p. 4-17)

No Master Plan

The Commission found that legalized gambling's growth over the past decade has not been the product of careful forethought and analysis. Rather, it has been driven primarily by politicians ravenous for more revenues, while the substantial social and economic costs which accompany such expansion have been virtually ignored.

"This Commission ... believes that gambling is not merely a business like any other and that it should remain carefully regulated. Some Commissioners would wish it to be far more restricted, perhaps even prohibited. But overall, all agree that the country has gone very far very fast regarding an activity the consequences of which, frankly, no one really knows much about." (p. 1-7)

"Inevitably for a Commission of such diverse makeup, some differences in viewpoint refuse to melt away and the existing evidence is insufficient to compel a consensus. But there is an encouraging breadth of agreement among Commissioners on many individual issues, such as the immediate need to address pathological gambling; and on one big issue: The Commissioners believe it is time to consider a pause in the expansion of gambling.

"The purpose of the pause is not to wait for definitive answers to the subjects of dispute, because those may never come. Additional useful information is, of course, to be hoped for. But the continuing evolution of this dynamic industry has produced visible changes even in the short lifetime of this Commission and indicates that research will always trail far behind the issues of the day and moment. Instead, the purpose of this recommended pause is to encourage governments to do what to date few if any have done: To survey the results of their decisions and to determine if they have chosen wisely.

restate: Virtually every aspect of legalized gambling is shaped by government decisions. Yet, virtually no state has conformed its decisions in this area to any overall plan, or even to its own stated objectives. Instead, in almost every state whatever policy exists toward gambling is more a collection of incremental and disconnected decisions than the result of deliberate purpose. The record of the federal government is even less laudatory. It is an open question whether the collective impact of decisions is even recognized by their makers, much less wanted by them....

"Without a pause and reflection the future does indeed look worrisome. Were one to use the experience of the last quarter century to predict the evolution of gambling over the next, a likely scenario would be for gambling to continue to become more and more common, ultimately omnipresent in our lives and those of our children, with consequences no one can profess to know.

"The Commission, through its research agenda, has added substantially to what is known about the impact of gambling in the United States. The Commission also has tried to survey the universe of information available from other sources. But it is clear that Americans need to know more. In this context, the Commission's call for a pause should be taken as a challenge—a challenge to intensify the effort to increase our understanding of the costs and the benefits of gambling and deal with them accordingly. Policymakers and the public should seek a comprehensive evaluation of gambling's impact so far and of the implications of future decisions to expand gambling. In fact, state and local versions of this Commission may be an appropriate mechanism to oversee such research. Such groups are formed they will find as did the Commission that the search for answers takes time.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

"The record of state decisionmaking regarding riverboats is not comforting. In the hierarchy of considerations of state policymakers, the original arguments in favor of tourism and economic development have often been displaced by the need to generate and maintain tax revenues. The various states' decisions have been driven to a surprising extent not by a steadfast concern for the public welfare but by a fierce interstate competition for tax dollars (and in the process revealing remarkably similar patterns of decisionmaking)." (p. 2-7)

“Despite the intense search for money from outside their borders, the resulting counteractions have meant that the net revenue gains from, and losses to, non-resident populations tend to cancel each other out. But the very same strategy has ensured that every state's population is now within an easy commute of the casinos. In setting out to tap into their neighbors' pocketbooks, state governments have ended up tapping into that of their own citizens.” (p. 2-7)

“[M]ost government decisionmaking has been chasing rather than leading the industry's growth and evolution and has often focused on less-than-central concerns, to the neglect of the larger public interest. One of the more damning criticisms of government decisionmaking in this areas is the assertion that governments too often have been focused more on a shortsighted pursuit of revenues than on the long-term impact of their decisions on the public's welfare.” (p. 3-2)

Lotteries

[REDACTED] The Commission, in its recommendations, urged lotteries to cease aggressive advertising practices, stop targeting poorer individuals via marketing schemes, and halt the current trend whereby many lotteries now offer casino-style gambling.

Fleeing the Poor

“As Dr. Philip Cook, a leading researcher under contract to the Commission, stated, ‘It's astonishingly regressive. The tax that is built into lottery is the most regressive tax we know.’ In addition, the inordinate number of lottery outlets in poor neighborhoods and the reliance upon a small number of less-educated and poor individuals for the bulk of the proceeds causes us serious concern. In fact, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Further, high school dropouts spend four times as much as college graduates. Blacks spend five times as much as whites. In addition, the lotteries rely on a small group of heavy players who are disproportionately poor, black, and have failed to complete a high school education. The top 5 percent of lottery players (who spend \$3,870 or more) account for 51 percent of total lottery sales.” (p. 7-10)

“How can we begin to measure the social impact of individuals who spend their children's milk money or cash their welfare checks to buy lottery tickets, as the Commission heard during visits to convenience stores? We cannot, but the Commission can acknowledge that when gambling is promoted as ‘the only way to get ahead’ and, in particular, targets those who do not have ‘leisure dollars’ to spend, the economic and social, indeed, the moral fabric of our nation is damaged.” (p. 7-18)

A Giant Shell Game

though earmarking might be an excellent device for engendering political support for a lottery, there is reason to doubt if earmarked lottery revenues in fact have the effect of increasing funds available for the specified purpose. When expenditures on the earmarked purpose far exceed the revenues available from the lottery, as is the case with the general education budget, there is no practical way of preventing a legislature from allocating general revenues away from earmarked uses, thus blunting the purpose of the earmarking.

[REDACTED]

"Most lottery directors testified that the impact of lottery revenue was beneficial to the state and its citizens, but, [REDACTED]"

[REDACTED]

Peddling False Hope

"A further criticism is that, in pursuit of revenues, some lotteries have employed overly aggressive—and even deceptive—advertising and other marketing methods. Lottery advertising has advanced in recent years from simple public-service announcement type ads to sophisticated marketing tools. Critics charge that they are intentionally misleading, especially regarding such matters as the miniscule odds of winning the various jackpots."

[REDACTED] Others assert that lottery advertising often exploits themes that conflict with the state's obligation to promote the public good, such as emphasizing luck over hard work, instant gratification over prudent investment, and entertainment over savings." (p. 3-5)

"While gambling advertising is generally a controversial topic, it is even more controversial when state governments themselves actively promote gambling through advertising. Running a lottery places states in a new business. Many states 'have adopted the tools of commercial marketing, including product design, promotions, and advertising' to promote their lotteries. In 1997 state lotteries spent a total of \$400 million to advertise, about one percent of total sales."

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

While the Federal Trade Commission requires statements about probability of winning in commercial sweepstakes games, there is no such federal requirement for lotteries. Lottery advertising rarely explains the poor odds of winning. Many advertisements imply that the odds of winning are even 'better than you might think.' For example, one video presented to the Commission stated that 'chances are good you can be \$10,000 richer.' An ad aired in Texas compared the odds of winning the lottery to the odds of some everyday events, implying that winning the lottery is possible, perhaps even probable.

For example, many advertisements emphasize luck over hard work, instant gratification over prudent investment, and entertainment over savings. New York's 'All you need is a dollar and a dream' ad campaign was particularly emblematic of the theme that lotteries provide an avenue to financial success. The idea that the lottery is an investment in your future is particularly troublesome when targeted toward populations that are least able to afford to play.

"Lottery advertising is also manipulative when it encourages players to play the lottery in order to contribute to state programs. Because lottery revenues are often earmarked for specific purposes, such as education, lottery advertising sometimes exploits the idea that playing the lottery can make you 'feel good.' This message implies that buying a lottery ticket is akin to supporting social programs, with the added benefit that you could become a millionaire yourself in the process. One video clip presented to the Commission emphasized that lottery dollars provide education and job training, encouraging the idea that by playing the lottery, a gambler can help other people improve their lives.

"There is also concern that lottery ads target particularly vulnerable populations, specifically youth and the poor."

(pp. 3-15, 3-16, 3-17)

Indian Gambling

The Commission heard extensive testimony from Native Americans about the revenues received from casino gambling on tribal lands. However, the Commission also reported important additional information regarding some of the less-publicized aspects of Indian gambling:

"The Chairman of the Hopi tribe testified before this Commission.

'One need only visit an Indian casino to realize that a significant number of casino patrons are Indian people from the reservations on which the casino is located or from other nearby reservations, including non-gaming reservations. ... I believe it is also safe to conclude that most Indian people do not routinely have a surplus disposable income which should be expended on games of chance. Most

of our people on most reservations and tribal communities find it difficult enough to accumulate enough income on a monthly basis to meet the most basic needs of their families. While the decision to expend those funds in gaming activities is an individual choice, the impacts on family members who frequently do not participate in that choice are nevertheless affected." (p. 6-16)

"Although tribal members make up a majority of tribal casino employees in a few smaller rural tribal casinos, the great majority of tribal casino employees are not Native Americans; for example, in California, more than 95 percent of the estimated 15,000 tribal casino employees are not Indians; at Foxwoods, in Connecticut, there are a little more than 500 members of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation and more than 13,000 employees." (p. 6-18)

"Connecticut State Senator Edith Prager, Chair of the Labor Committee for the Connecticut General Assembly, gave testimony on the relationship between tribal sovereignty and workers' rights:

'Federally recognized tribes enjoy sovereignty which is guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. Along with sovereignty, there is a responsibility to maintain a basic respect for human rights. This is the balance we need. The reason there is no balance at Foxwoods is because of how the Mashantucket Pequots have chosen [to use] their sovereign rights....

I am not opposed to sovereignty. I am however opposed to a tribe using sovereignty as a weapon to shield themselves from having to behave fairly and decently with their workers. There are just over 500 members of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, there are just over 13,000 workers at Foxwoods Casino, some of them may be Mashantucket Pequots, the great majority of them are not. And what rights do these workers have?'

"In addition, the Commission heard testimony from former employees of the Foxwoods Casino, including Fred Sinclair, who described his experience there:

"I am part Cherokee and I support the dream of the Pequots and their success. I was at the original employer rally in 1992 and actually believed that they cared about their employees. I put my heart, soul, and thousands of uncompensated hours into Foxwoods. Even though my part may be considered small, I helped the Pequots achieve their dream, only to be severely injured, harassed, stripped of my position, my rights, my job, and my health benefits by the abusive upper management they are responsible for." (pp. 6-18, 6-19)

"One perceived economic benefit to both the tribes and the general population—reduction of the reliance upon taxpayer-funded federal assistance—has not manifested itself to date. For the most part, requests for federal assistance from tribes involved in gambling have continued. As an example, the Mashantucket Pequots, whose

Foxwoods facility in Connecticut is the largest casino in the world and grosses more than \$1 billion in annual revenues for the 550 tribal members, still received \$1.5 million in low-income housing assistance in 1996 and continues to receive other federal funds.

"While casinos have been an extraordinary economic success story for a handful of Indian tribes, for most they have brought considerably fewer benefits. Wayne Taylor, chairman of the Hopi tribe, testified, 'With the exception of a very few, very small and very fortunate tribes ... who have had extraordinary success with tribal gambling, the majority of tribes across the country still find it very difficult to reconcile the obligation and responsibilities side of their ledger with the income side.' As of the writing of this report, the unemployment rate among Native Americans continues to hover around 50 percent." (pp. 7-9, 7-10)

Gambling on Main Street

The Commission expressed strong concerns about the spread of "convenience," or neighborhood, gambling. In fact, it recommended a moratorium on future operations and a rollback of existing ones.

And in the past few years, Internet gambling sites enabled slot machine and video poker style gambling to come right into our homes.

Economic Impacts

Gambling advocates pitch casinos and other forms of legalized betting as a form of economic development. While noting that localized economic benefits have been derived in places like Las Vegas—which has been highly successful at inducing heavy gambling losses from non-residents—the Commission dispelled the idea that gambling brings widespread economic development. Further, it stressed the magnitude and the lack of knowledge regarding the social costs incurred by legalized gambling.

her citizens testified to the lack of job security they had encountered in tribal casinos, absence of federal and state anti-discrimination laws, and the lack of workers' compensation benefits.

"NORC found 'no change in overall per capita income' after the introduction of casinos, 'as the increases [in certain industries] are offset by reductions in welfare and transfer payments as well as a drop-off in income from restaurants and bars.'

"In its survey of leaders in 10 casino communities, NORC found mixed perceptions about the economic impact of casinos. Respondents in 5 of the 10 communities cited new employment opportunities as a 'very positive advantage.' However, 'Respondents in the other four communities indicated that unemployment remained a problem, despite former hopes to the contrary.' Unemployment among Indian tribes remains extremely high. Respondents in six of the communities complained that the casinos provided low-paying and/or part-time jobs with no benefits.

"It bears stating the obvious in this discussion: A number of formerly struggling communities across this nation have undergone an economic renaissance in recent years without turning to gambling. It is also worth noting that much of a recent wave of casino expansion occurred in the early 1990's when the country was mired in an economic recession. So, for example, while the Commission heard testimony of the casino-inspired 'Mississippi Miracle,' in reality the unemployment rate in Mississippi declined at about the same rate as the national average in the years from 1992 to 1998." (p. 7-5)

"Even in the face of the apparent benefits touted by many in Atlantic City, at the time the Commission visited in January 1998, the unemployment rate stood at 12.7 percent, not mentioning the legalization of gambling in 1978. That rate was considerably above both the national rate and the rate of unemployment for the rest of New Jersey at that time." (p. 7-11)

"There is general agreement that legalized gambling has offered regulators the opportunity to locate gambling activities where incomes are depressed, thus providing, in some cases, an economic boost to needy people and places. So doing, however, has the negative consequence of placing the lure of gambling proximate to individuals with few financial resources. The Commission is concerned about the significant danger posed by the continuing expansion of legalized gambling into places where the economy is already prospering. In the extreme, the Commission can imagine competition among localities driving the extent and location of gambling toward an outcome in which most gambling establishments are just one more business in prosperous areas, most employees are people who easily could get other jobs, and therefore, the economic benefits are small. Not only are the net benefits in these new areas low, but the benefits to other, more deserving places are diminished due to the new competition. And, as competition for the gambling dollar intensifies, gambling spreads, bringing with it more and more of the social ills that led us to restrict gambling in the first place. It is easy to imagine

Jurisdictions competing for the gambling dollar, with the consequent overexpansion of legalized gambling; shrinking social benefits are overwhelmed by rising social costs.

"What the Commission can agree on is that analysis of the economic effects of gambling is poorly developed and quite incomplete. Further, almost all studies have been conducted by interested parties. These typically have gone no further than to estimate local jobs and income from the gambling industry. But since the economic effect of an activity is its value added above what the same resources would be adding to value if employed elsewhere, these studies are deficient and may mislead readers to conclude that the introduction of gambling activities in an area will result in significant benefits without attendant costs, which may, in fact, overwhelm the benefits. Without an estimate of the opportunity cost of the resources used in gambling, the Commission can generate no meaningful estimate of its net effect. Beyond this, the social costs of gambling are so important to regulatory decisions that even an accurate estimate of the net income generated by the gambling industry would constitute only the start of a full cost-benefit analysis. No one—not tribal leaders, governors, mayors or citizens—should make, or should be forced to make, a decision without an assessment of both economic and social benefits and costs." (p. 7-12)

"Other economic impacts are mentioned elsewhere in this report. Costs include lost productivity of workers impaired by problem or pathological gambling and the cost to society for treatment programs. While precise dollar costs are not yet available to measure these losses, the rapid expansion of gambling into so many communities is likely to produce exponential growth in these costs with attendant burdens in business and social services." (p. 7-16)

"Roughly 85 percent of Nevada's gambling revenues come from out-of-state tourists. Thus, Nevada receives the economic benefits of the dollars lost to gambling, while the attendant social and economic impacts of unaffordable gambling losses are visited on the families and communities in the states from which those individuals come. Every other gambling venue in the United States is far more reliant on spending by citizens in a far more concentrated geographic area. In many cases, gambling operations are overwhelmingly dependent on spending by local citizens. For instance, a survey of 800 riverboat gamblers in Illinois found more than 85 percent lived within 50 miles of the casino in which they were gambling." (p. 7-17)

Fraud, Forgery, and Felonies

The Commission found significant evidence of the long-suspected link between gambling and crime. That link is seen most clearly among addicted gamblers who turn to illegal activities to finance their craving to gamble.

"The Commission found wide-spread perception among community leaders that indebtedness tends to increase with legalized gambling, as does youth crime, forgery

or credit card theft, domestic violence, child neglect, problem gambling, and alcohol drug offenses." (p. 7-14)

"Some of the more thorough studies examine crime and pathological gambling. Not surprisingly, the findings reveal that many problem and pathological gamblers steal or commit other crimes to finance their habit. According to the National Research Council, 'As access to money becomes more limited, gamblers often resort to crime in order to pay debts, appease bookies, maintain appearances, and garner more money to gamble.' In Maryland, a report by the Attorney General's Office stated: '[c]asinos would bring a substantial increase in crime to our State. There would be more violent crime, more juvenile crime, more drug- and alcohol-related crime, more domestic violence and child abuse, and more organized crime. Casinos would bring us exactly what we do not need—a lot more of all kinds of crime.' Some commentators link crime to pathological gambling, where addicted gamblers steal or commit other crimes to finance their habit. The Commission heard repeated testimony of desperate gamblers committing illegal acts to finance their problem and pathological gambling, including a Detroit man who faked his own son's kidnapping to pay back a \$50,000 gambling debt, a 14-year hospital employee in Iowa who embezzled \$151,000 from her employer for gambling, and the wife of a Louisiana police officer who faced 24 counts of felony theft for stealing to fund her pathological gambling. In a survey of nearly 400 Gamblers Anonymous members, 57 percent admitted stealing to finance their gambling. Collectively they stole \$30 million, an average of \$135,000 per individual. One witness before the Commission indicated that 80 to 90 percent of people in Gamblers Anonymous will tell you they did something illegal in order to get money to gamble. A lot of them do white collar crimes, fraud, credit card and employee theft.' In Louisiana, one man confessed to robbing and murdering six elderly individuals to feed his problem with gambling on electronic gambling devices." (p. 7-13)

"The NORC study found that pathological gamblers had higher arrest and imprisonment rates than non-pathological gamblers. A third of problem and pathological gamblers had been arrested, compared to 10 percent of low-risk gamblers and 4 percent of non-gamblers. About 23 percent of pathological gamblers have been imprisoned, and so had 13 percent of problem gamblers. There are economic costs associated with arrests and imprisonment. Problem and pathological gamblers account for about \$1,000 in excess lifetime justice costs each. The 32 percent of pathological gamblers arrested had a lifetime average cost of \$10,000." (p. 7-14)

Gambling on Credit

The Commission noted the key role that easy access to credit plays in the development of gambling problems. Among its recommendations to address the problem was that of removing ATM-style machines from gambling premises.

Augusta Rickford

Operator's Signature

10/3/03

Date

"One of the issues of most concern to this Commission is the ready availability of credit in and around casinos, which can lead to irresponsible gambling and problem and pathological gambling behavior. Forty to sixty percent of the cash wagered by individuals in casinos is not physically brought onto the premises. Each year casinos extend billions of dollars in loans to their customers in the form of credit markers. Additional sums are charged casino customers on their credit cards as cash advances. Casinos charge fees for cash advances ranging from 3 percent to 10 percent or more.

"According to the Casino Chronicle (as footnoted by I. Nelson Rose), the twelve casinos in Atlantic City issued approximately \$2.13 billion in credit markers in 1997. Of this extended credit, \$543,174,000 remained outstanding after customers left the casinos. However, through the banking system, an additional \$434,400,000 of outstanding debt is collected, leaving only 1.3 percent left in unpaid loans, which is generally lower than other unpaid consumer debt. Still, the true debt—that is, the amount the customers owed when they walked out of the casinos, still exceeded \$108 million—20 percent of the debt." (pp. 7-14, 7-15)

"Providing estimates on the amount of credit extended for gambling purposes through credit cards remains problematic. Unlike casinos, credit card companies do not have to report the amounts borrowed for gambling purposes. Nor do casinos report information on credit card advances, according to the president of Central Credit. Furthermore, casinos do not know how much money is received by customers directly from a credit card advance or ATM machine. Many ATM's and debit cards have limits on the amount of money dispensed within a 24-hour period and on each withdrawal. According to International Gaming & Wagering Business, 'Casinos have found a way around this dilemma by utilizing credit card cash advance services ... [that] allow players to access as much cash as they want.' As a result, some individuals are able to spend far more than they can afford and incur dangerously high debts.

"In at least one tribal casino (Foxwoods), Commissioners were told that ATM machines offered cash advances without even the safeguard of a so-called 'PIN' to prevent misuse of stolen or lost credit cards. It seems clear to us that additional consideration of the restriction and regulation of credit practices permitted in and around casinos must be given by policymakers reviewing gambling activities in and near their communities.

"During the Commission meeting in Nevada, Thomas Coates, the Director for Consumer Credit Counseling Services in Des Moines, Iowa, testified on the changes in credit availability and bankruptcy in Iowa with the rise in available gambling outlets. According to his testimony, at the beginning of the project in the late 1980's, two to three percent of the people seeking counseling services attributed their credit problems to gambling. Today, approximately 15 percent of counseling goes to individuals with gambling attributed to the core of their credit concerns. The project has grown to six offices treating over 400 new cases each month. Furthermore, the agency offers a gambling hotline to provide assistance with individuals who feel they have a gambling problem. This hotline, 1-800-BETSOFF, averages almost 300 crisis calls each month.

"*Quater shared with the Commission a suicide note from one man in Iowa who had used \$60,000 in credit card debt at a local casino: 'I never thought of gambling prior to two or three years ago. I really can't blame anyone but myself but I sincerely hope that restle. us are placed upon credit card cash availability at casinos. The money is too easy to access and goes in no time. My situation is now one of complete despair, isolation and constant anxiety.'*"

"The Commission also heard numerous stories of pathological gamblers forced into bankruptcy as a result of problem and pathological gambling. Nearly one in five (19.2 percent) of the identified pathological gamblers in the NORC survey reported filing bankruptcy. This compares to rates of 4.2 percent for non-gamblers and 5.5 percent for low-risk gamblers. Twenty-two percent of nearly 400 members of Gamblers Anonymous surveyed had declared bankruptcy."

"Personal anecdotes were very compelling. The Commission heard about a couple along the Mississippi Gulf Coast, both of whom began gambling excessively at the casino, who lost approximately \$70,000. When they received a letter from a credit card company demanding \$10,000 in payment, the couple made a last-ditch effort to recoup the money at the casino. They lost \$2,000, then filed bankruptcy."

"Nineteen percent of Chapter 13 bankruptcies in the State of Iowa involved gambling-related debt. Bankruptcies in Iowa increased at a rate significantly above the national average in the years following the introduction of casinos. Nine of the 12 Iowa counties with the highest bankruptcy rates in the state had gambling facilities in or directly adjacent to them." (pp. 7-15, 7-16)

WWW.GamblingProblems

The Commission unanimously endorsed a ban on Internet gambling. Much of its rationale for so doing is indicated below.

"Because the Internet can be used anonymously, the danger exists that access to Internet gambling will be abused by underage gamblers. In most instances, a would-be gambler merely has to fill out a registration form in order to play. Most sites rely on the registrant to disclose his or her correct age and make little or no attempt to verify the accuracy of this information. Underage gamblers can use their parents' credit cards or even their own credit and debit cards to register and set up accounts for use at Internet gambling sites." (p. 5-4)

"Of particular concern is the special attraction of youth to on-line sports wagering, tournaments, and sweepstakes. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has voiced its concern over the problem of Internet sports gambling among college students. In testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information, Director of Agent and Gambling Activities Bill Saum stated that sports gambling 'remains a growing problem on college campuses.... If left unchecked, the growth of Internet gambling may be fueled by college students. After all, who else has greater access to the Internet?' " (p. 5-5)

"Pathological gamblers are another group susceptible to problems with Internet gambling. In addition to their accessibility, the high-speed instant gratification of Internet games and the high level of privacy they offer may exacerbate problem and pathological gambling. Access to the Internet is easy and inexpensive and can be conducted in the privacy of one's own home. Shielded from public scrutiny, pathological gamblers can traverse dozens of Web sites and gamble 24 hours a day. Experts in the field of pathological gambling have expressed concern over the potential abuse of this technology by problem and pathological gamblers. The director of the Harvard Medical School's Division on Addiction Studies, Dr. Howard J. Shaffer, likened the Internet to new delivery forms for addictive narcotics. He stated, 'As smoking crack cocaine changed the cocaine experience, I think electronics is going to change the way gambling is experienced.' Bernie Horn, the executive director of the National Coalition Against Legalized Gaming, testified before Congress that Internet gambling 'magnifies the potential destructiveness of the addiction.'

"The problems associated with anonymity extend beyond youth and pathological gambling. Lack of accountability also raises the potential for criminal activities, which can occur in several ways. First, there is the possibility of abuse by gambling operators. Most Internet service providers (ISPs) hosting Internet gambling operations are physically located offshore; as a result, operators can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes. This mobility makes it possible for dishonest operators to take credit card numbers and money from deposited accounts and close down. Stories of unpaid gambling winnings often surface in news reports and among industry insiders. In fact, several Web sites now exist that provide analysis of the payout activity for Internet gambling operations.

"Second, computer hackers or gambling operators may tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit. Unlike the physical world of highly regulated resort-destination casinos, assessing the integrity of Internet operators is quite difficult. Background checks for licensing in foreign jurisdictions are seldom as thorough as they are in the United States. Furthermore, the global dispersion of Internet gambling operations makes the vigilant regulation of the algorithms of Internet games nearly impossible.

"Third, gambling on the Internet may provide an easy means for money laundering. Internet gambling provides anonymity, remote access, and encrypted data. To launder money, a person need only deposit money into an offshore account, use those funds to gamble, lose a small percent of the original funds, then cash out the remaining funds. Through the dual protection of encryption and anonymity, much of this activity can take place undetected. In a study prepared for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Critical Technologies Institute, David A. Mussington and colleagues examined the potential for money laundering on the Internet. The study raises several essential concerns regarding the use of the Internet for money-laundering activities, including the lack of uniform international law and oversight or regulatory regime, the fluidity of funds crossing international borders, and the high degree of anonymity." (pp. 5-5, 5-6)

Sports Gambling

The Commission recognized that the legal sports gambling industry in Nevada is largely responsible for the high level of illegal sports betting that takes place in this country. Concerns over gambling's threats to the integrity of sporting contests led the Commission to recommend a ban on all gambling on amateur and collegiate athletic events.

"This Commission heard testimony that sports wagering is a serious problem that has devastated families and careers. Sports wagering threatens the integrity of sports, it puts student athletes in a vulnerable position, it can put adolescent gamblers at risk for gambling problems, and it can devastate individuals and careers.

"There is considerable evidence that sports wagering is widespread on America's college campuses. Cedric Denpsey, executive director of the NCAA, asserts that 'every campus has student bookies. We are also seeing an increase in the involvement of organized crime on sports wagering.'

"Students who gamble on sports can be at risk for gambling problems later in life. There is evidence that sports wagering can act as a gateway to other forms of gambling. Therefore, it is important to understand the scope of the problem and educate students to the dangers of sports wagering." (pp. 2-14, 2-15)

The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act (Pub.L. 102-559) is the primary regulatory document for sports wagering activity. The law was passed to ensure the integrity of athletic events. At the time of the passage, Sen. Bill Bradley (D-NJ) said:

"Based on what I know about the dangers of sports betting, I am not prepared to risk the values that sports instill in youth just to add a few more dollars to state coffers... State-sanctioned sports betting conveys the message that sports are more about money than personal achievement and sportsmanship. In these days of scandal and disillusionment, it is important that our youngsters not receive this message... sports betting threatens the integrity of and public confidence in professional and amateur team sports, converting sports from wholesome athletic entertainment into a vehicle for gambling... sports gambling raises people's suspicions about point-shaving and game-fixing... All of this puts undue pressure on players, coaches, and officials." (pp. 3-8, 3-9)

"Legal sports wagering—especially the publication in the media of Las Vegas and offshore-generated point spreads—fuels a much larger amount of illegal sports wagering. Although illegal in 48 states, office betting is flourishing." (p. 3-9)

"[S]ports wagering does have social costs. Sports wagering threatens the integrity of sports, it puts student athletes in a vulnerable position, it can serve as gateway behavior for adolescent gamblers, and it can devastate individuals and careers." (p. 3-10)

"One argument for strengthening sports wagering regulation is that athletes themselves are often tempted to bet on contests in which they participate, undermining the integrity of sporting contests. According to the findings of a University of Michigan survey on collegiate sports gambling, more than 45 percent of male collegiate football and basketball athletes admit to betting on sporting events, despite NCAA regulations prohibiting such activities. More than 5 percent of male student-athletes provided inside information for gambling purposes, bet on a game in which they participated, or accepted money for performing poorly in a game." (p. 3-10)

Key Recommendations

The NGISC passed 76 recommendations, including at least 20 outlining future research initiatives. Some of the most notable recommendations are listed below.

3.2 "The Commission recommends that all legal gambling should be restricted to those who are at least 21 years of age and that those who are under 21 years of age should not be allowed to loiter in areas where gambling activity occurs."

3.3 "The Commission recommends that gambling 'cruises to nowhere' should be prohibited unless the state from which the cruise originates adopts legislation specifically legalizing such cruises consistent with existing law."

3.4 "The Commission recommends that warnings regarding the dangers and risks of gambling, as well as the odds where feasible, should be posted in prominent locations in all gambling facilities."

3.5 "The Commission recognizes the difficulty of campaign finance reform in general and an industry-specific contribution restriction in particular. Nonetheless the Commission believes that there are sound reasons to recommend that states adopt tight restrictions on contributions to state and local campaigns by entities—corporate, private, or tribal—that have applied for or have been granted the privilege of operating gambling facilities."

3.6 "The Commission received testimony that convenience gambling, such as electronic devices in neighborhood outlets, provides fewer economic benefits and creates potentially greater social costs by making gambling more available and accessible."

3.7 "The Commission recommends that the betting on collegiate and amateur athletic events that is currently legal be banned altogether."

4P
"The Commission urges states with lotteries to disallow instant games that are
lations of live card and other casino-type games. Generally, the outcome of an
instant game is determined at the point of sale by the lottery terminal that issues the
ticket."

3.11 "The Commission recommends that all relevant governmental gambling
regulatory agencies should ban aggressive advertising strategies, especially those that
target people in impoverished neighborhoods or youth anywhere."

3.12 "The Commission recommends that states should refuse to allow the introduction of
casino-style gambling into pari-mutuel facilities for the primary purpose of saving a pari-
mutuel facility that the market has determined no longer serves the community or for the
purpose of competing with other forms of gambling."

3.16 "The Commission recommends that states and tribal governments should conduct
periodic reassessments of the various forms of gambling permitted within their borders
for the purpose of determining whether the public interest would be better served by
limiting, eliminating, or expanding one or more of those forms."

3.17 "The Commission recommends that federal, state, and tribal gambling regulators
should be subject to a cooling-off period that prevents them from working for any
gambling operation subject to their jurisdiction for a period of 1 year. Federal, state, or
tribal lottery employees should be subject to a cooling-off period that prevents them from
working for any supplier of lottery services for a period of 1 year."

3.18 [REDACTED]

3.19 [REDACTED]

3.21 [REDACTED]

Further, with respect to all
forms of legal and illegal gambling, the Commission recommends that all relevant
governmental gambling regulatory agencies enact and enforce harsh penalties for abuse
in this area involving underage gamblers. Penalties and enforcement efforts regarding
underage gambling should be greatly increased."

3.22 [REDACTED]

4.1 "The Commission respectfully recommends that all relevant governmental gambling regulatory agencies require—as a condition of any gambling facility's license to operate—that each applicant adhere to the following:

- Adopt a clear mission statement as to applicant's policy on problem and pathological gambling.
- Appoint an executive of high rank to execute and provide ongoing oversight of the corporate mission statement on problem and pathological gambling.
- Contract with a state-recognized gambling treatment professional to train management and staff to develop strategies for recognizing and addressing customers whose gambling behavior may strongly suggest they may be experiencing serious to severe difficulties.
- Under a state "hold harmless" statute, refuse service to any customer whose gambling behavior convincingly exhibits indications of problem or pathological gambling.
- Under a state "hold harmless" statute, respectfully and confidentially provide the customer (as described above) with written information that includes a state-approved list of professional gambling treatment programs and state-recognized self-help groups.
- Provide insurance that makes available medical treatment for problem and for pathological gambling facility employees."

4.2 "The Commission recommends that each state and tribal government enact, if it has not already done so, a Gambling Privilege Tax, assessment, or other contribution on all gambling operations within its boundaries, based upon the gambling revenues of each operation. A sufficient portion of such monies shall be used to create a dedicated fund for the development and ongoing support of problem gambling-specific research, prevention, education, and treatment programs. The funding dedicated for these purposes shall be sufficient to implement the following goals:

- Undertake blended research by a nonpartisan firm, experienced in problem gambling research, to estimate the prevalence of problem and pathological gambling among the general adult population. Specific focus on major sub-populations including youth, women, elderly and minority group gamblers should also be included. An estimate of prevalence among patrons at gambling facilities or outlets in each form of gambling should also be included.
- Initiate public awareness, education, and prevention programs aimed at vulnerable populations. One such purpose of such programs will be to intercept the progression of many problem gamblers to pathological states.
- Identify and maintain a list of gambling treatment services available from licensed or state-recognized professional providers, as well as the presence of state recognized self-help groups.
- Establish a demographic profile for treatment recipients and services provided, as state and federal laws permit. Develop a treatment outcome mechanism that will compile data on the efficacy of varying treatment methods and services offered, and determine whether sufficient professional treatment is available to meet the demands of persons in need.
- When private funding is not available, subsidize the costs of approved treatment by

licensed or state-recognized gambling treatment professionals for problem and pathological gamblers, as well as adversely affected persons. Additionally, such funds shall ensure that persons in need of treatment can receive necessary support based upon financial need. Treatment cost reimbursement levels and protocols will be established by each state."

4.4 "The Commission recommends that each gambling facility must implement procedures to allow for voluntary self-exclusion, enabling gamblers to ban themselves from a gambling establishment for a specified period of time."

4.6 "The Commission recommends that each state-run or approved gambling operation be required to conspicuously post and disseminate the telephone numbers of at least two state-approved providers of problem-gambling information, treatment, and referral support services."

5.1 "The Commission recommends to the President, Congress, and the Department of Justice (DOJ) that the federal government should prohibit, without allowing new exemptions or the expansion of existing federal exemptions to other jurisdictions, Internet gambling not already authorized within the United States or among parties in the United States and any foreign jurisdiction. Further, the Commission recommends that the President and Congress direct DOJ to develop enforcement strategies that include, but are not limited to, Internet service providers, credit card providers, money transfer agencies, makers of wireless communications systems, and others who intentionally or unintentionally facilitate Internet gambling transactions. Because it crosses state lines, it is difficult for states to adequately monitor and regulate such gambling."

5.2 "The Commission recommends to the President, Congress, and state governments the passage of legislation prohibiting wire transfers to known Internet gambling sites, or the banks who represent them. Furthermore, the Commission recommends the passage of legislation stating that any credit card debts incurred while gambling on the Internet are unrecoverable."

5.3 "The Commission recognizes that current technology is available that makes it possible for gambling to take place in the home or the office, without the participant physically going to a place to gamble. Because of the lack of sound research on the effects of these forms of gambling on the population and the difficulty of policing and regulating to prevent such things as participation by minors, the commission recommends that states not permit the expansion of gambling into homes through technology and the expansion of account wagering."

6.2 "The Commission recommends that IGR4's classes of gambling be clearly defined so that there is no confusion as to which forms of gambling constitute Class II and Class III gambling activities. Further, the Commission recommends that Class III gambling activities should not include any activities that are not available to other persons, entities or organizations in a state, regardless of technological similarities. Indian gambling should not be inconsistent with the state's overall gambling policy."

7.1 "Because of the easy availability of automated teller machines (ATM's) and credit machines encourages some gamblers to wager more than they intended, the Commission recommends that states, tribal governments, and pari-mutuel facilities ban credit card cash advance machines and other devices activated by debit or credit cards from the immediate area where gambling takes place."

7.9 [REDACTED]

HH # 1

INFORMATION SHEET IN SUPPORT OF ENGROSSED HOUSE BILL NO. 1274

- Under current law the game of poker cannot be conducted more than twice a year.
- Due to this limitation the forecast of gross proceeds from poker for the biennium is only \$4,000.
- HB 1274 removes the twice a year limitation and provides for poker games to be played against the house similar to 21, with the same wager limits as 21.
- HB 1274 will provide the charities with an opportunity to financially support and contribute to the various eligible uses for the benefit of the citizens of North Dakota.
- HB 1274 allows charitable organizations to conduct poker for those people who are already playing poker at Tribal casinos but would prefer to support their local charities.
- A recent survey conducted in North Dakota showed substantial support for allowing charitable gaming to conduct the same games as are allowed at Tribal casinos.
- 73% of the people surveyed supported expanded gaming if a portion of the proceeds went to charities.
- HB1274 will help charitable gaming in North Dakota, and the many worthwhile charities that depend upon gaming for their support, and will bring more tax revenue into the state.

| | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Total taxes paid by Charitable Gaming | \$13,275,232 - 45% | \$12,359,653 - 44% |
| Net Gaming Proceeds to the organizations | \$16,300,544 - 55% | \$15,747,911 - 56% |

Please support a DO PASS recommendation for HB 1274

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

2a
Kranzler Kingsley Communications, Ltd.

Charitable Gaming Association of North Dakota

Gaming Issues Survey

Prepared by

WINKELMAN CONSULTING

PO BOX 11375 • FARGO, ND 58106-1375

701-799-0877 • Cell/Voice Mail

701-237-6877 • Fax Machine

701-237-2283 • Office

MRWinkelman@prodigy.net

October 2002

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/02
Date

5P

| | |
|--|------------|
| METHODOLOGY | 1-1 |
| PURPOSE | 1-1 |
| SAMPLING FRAME & SAMPLE SIZE | 1-1 |
| MARGIN OF ERROR | 1-1 |
| COLLECTION TECHNIQUE & TIMING | 1-2 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 2-1 |
| PURPOSE #1: MEASURE GENERAL GAMING HABITS. | 2-1 |
| PURPOSE #2: ASSESS OPINIONS RELATED TO EXPANDING GAMING IN NORTH DAKOTA. | 2-3 |
| PURPOSE #3: IDENTIFY FACTORS THAT MAY AFFECT ONE'S LEVEL OF SUPPORT (OR OPPOSITION) TO EXPANDING GAMING IN NORTH DAKOTA. | 2-5 |
| PURPOSE #4: MONITOR SUPPORT (OR OPPOSITION) FOR PAST AND PROPOSED GAMING MEASURES. | 2-7 |
| FIGURES & CHARTS | 3-1 |
| THE QUESTIONNAIRE | 4-1 |
| CONTINGENCY TABLES | 5-1 |

Section

1

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this research study was to obtain information that will provide a better understanding of North Dakota residents' opinions toward various gaming-related issues. To do this, the study focused on the following objectives:

- ☐ Measure general gaming habits.
- ☐ Assess opinions related to expanding gaming in North Dakota.
- ☐ Identify factors that may affect one's level of support (or opposition) to expanding gaming in North Dakota.
- ☐ Monitor support (or opposition) for past and proposed gaming measures.

Sampling Frame & Sample Size

The population for this study consisted of North Dakota residents who are 21 years of age or older. Telephone numbers were obtained from a list company that specializes in generating samples for survey research. A proportionate, stratified, random-systematic sampling technique was employed in this study to select households.

From the selected sample of households, 400 questionnaires were completed.

Margin of Error

The 400 completed questionnaires provide a 95% confidence level with an overall minimum and maximum margin of error of $\pm 2.9\%$ and $\pm 4.9\%$, respectively, in estimating the proportion of the population who possess a certain characteristic or opinion. In other words, if 100 samples (all of 400 in size) were drawn from this population, approximately 95 of the samples would have

proportions within $\pm 2.9\%$ and $\pm 4.9\%$ of the proportions of the entire population for the characteristic or opinion being measured.

The margin of error explained previously only applies to responses of the entire sample. As shown in the next chart, the margin of error will be larger when looking at the responses of smaller segments.

| Populations | Comp. tions | ND Adults | Margin of Error for results at or about... | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | | 10%/90% | 20%/80% | 30%/70% | 40%/60% | 50%/50% |
| Total Sample | 400 | 481,351 | 2.9% | 3.9% | 4.3% | 4.8% | 4.9% |
| Williston Region | 17 | 20,301 | 14.3% | 19.0% | 21.8% | 23.3% | 23.8% |
| Minot Region | 55 | 65,564 | 7.9% | 10.6% | 12.1% | 12.9% | 13.2% |
| Devils Lake Region | 25 | 30,104 | 11.6% | 15.7% | 18.0% | 19.2% | 19.6% |
| Grand Forks Region | 57 | 69,012 | 7.6% | 10.4% | 11.9% | 12.7% | 13.0% |
| Fargo Region | 103 | 123,488 | 5.6% | 7.7% | 8.8% | 9.5% | 9.7% |
| Jamestown Region | 39 | 47,385 | 9.4% | 12.5% | 14.4% | 15.4% | 15.7% |
| Bismarck Region | 80 | 96,754 | 6.6% | 8.8% | 10.0% | 10.7% | 11.0% |
| Dickinson Region | 24 | 28,623 | 12.0% | 16.0% | 18.3% | 19.6% | 20.0% |
| General | 350 | 421,182 | 3.1% | 4.2% | 4.8% | 5.1% | 5.2% |
| Sub-segments | 300 | 361,013 | 3.4% | 4.5% | 5.2% | 5.5% | 5.7% |
| | 250 | 300,844 | 3.7% | 5.0% | 5.7% | 6.1% | 6.2% |
| | 200 | 240,676 | 4.2% | 5.5% | 6.3% | 6.8% | 6.9% |
| | 150 | 180,507 | 4.6% | 6.4% | 7.3% | 7.8% | 8.0% |
| | 100 | 120,338 | 5.9% | 7.8% | 9.0% | 9.6% | 9.8% |
| | 75 | 90,253 | 6.8% | 9.0% | 10.4% | 11.1% | 11.3% |
| | 50 | 60,169 | 8.3% | 11.1% | 12.7% | 13.6% | 13.9% |
| | 25 | 30,084 | 11.6% | 15.7% | 18.0% | 19.2% | 19.6% |

*The maximum margin of error is shown in the "50%/50%" column and the minimum margin of error is shown in the "10%/90%" column.

Collection Technique & Timing

All data was collected through the use of telephone interviews. Data collection was conducted from September 6-10, 2002. The data collection was completed in compliance with specifications established by Winkelman Consulting. Interviewing was supervised and performed by trained personnel from Performance Centers, Inc.-Fargo.

Section

2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

When reviewing the executive summary, the findings and conclusions will be more thoroughly understood if several other sections of the report are also reviewed. First, the questionnaire in Section 4 provides the actual phrasing for each question. A solid understanding of the context in which each question was asked will enable you to more accurately interpret the findings. Second, the contingency tables in Section 5 provide detailed results for many different sample segments. Since the condensed nature of this summary report format does not allow us to address all of these findings, we strongly recommend that you review the contingency tables and use them to facilitate any major decisions you make.

Purpose #1: Measure general gaming habits.

■ Conclusion #1: Nearly eight of every ten respondents has gambled – nearly six of every ten in the past year.

- All respondents were asked how likely they are to vote in the November election. Figure 1 shows that nearly eight of every ten respondents said they will definitely vote in November.
- Respondents were also asked how recently they have wagered money on games of chance (see Figure 2). Nearly eight of every ten respondents have gambled – 57.6% in the past year, 33.8% in the past month, and 16.0% in the past week.
- The contingency tables, commonly referred to as "cross-tabs", can be found in Section Five. These tables present the findings in an easy-to-understand, table form and provide the categorical data that is used most frequently in marketing. They allow us to break down the results by a variety of characteristics, such as age, gender, income, and area of residence. As can be seen in the contingency table, the proportion of respondents who said they will definitely vote in the November election increases as age increases. Also, a

slightly higher proportion of those 45 to 64 years of age, with incomes of \$35,000 to \$49,999 or \$75,000 or more, and/or living in small towns reported gambling within the past month.

■ **Conclusion #2: A large majority of respondents have played charitable games or been to a North Dakota casino.**

- Respondents who have ever gambled were asked how recently they have played charitable games in North Dakota, been to a reservation casino in North Dakota, been to a casino in another state, played slot machines in South Dakota or video poker in Montana, or bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state or had someone buy tickets for them (see Figure 2). Of these respondents, nearly three of every four said they have played charitable games or been to a North Dakota reservation casino. More than six of every ten reported they have bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state or been to a casino in another state.
- The detail in the contingency table shows that a slightly higher proportion of women and those under 35 years of age have played charitable games. Also, the proportion of respondents who said they played charitable games in the past month seems to decrease as one's intention to vote increases. In other words, those who are most likely to vote are less likely play charitable games.

■ **Conclusion #3: Charitable games received better satisfaction ratings than did other types of gaming.**

- Respondents who have played charitable games in North Dakota, been to a reservation casino in North Dakota, or bought out-of-state lottery tickets were asked to rate the activity in being an enjoyable form of entertainment and giving them a reasonable chance to win (see Figure 3). Of the respondents who played each type of game, slightly higher proportions of those who played charitable games rated the games as being "excellent" or "good" in being an enjoyable form of entertainment and giving them a reasonable chance to win.

Purpose #2: Assess opinions related to expanding gaming in North Dakota.

■ **Conclusion #1: The largest share of respondents feel charitable gaming should be expanded.**

- All respondents were asked to look into the future, then indicate the direction they feel the legislature should take with laws that control the games that charitable gaming sites are allowed to provide (see Figure 4). Nearly one of every two respondents indicated that they feel charitable gaming sites should be allowed to provide all or most of the games currently available at reservation casinos.
- The detail in the contingency table shows that a slightly higher proportion of those under 35 years of age, earning \$35,000 to \$74,999, and/or who have gambled in the past month indicated charitable gaming sites should be allowed to provide all or most of the games currently offered at casinos.

■ **Conclusion #2: If state-operated machines are allowed in North Dakota, a majority of respondents feel the machines should be allowed in bars or clubs only. The largest share of respondents said they would play state-operated machines more than once a year, but less than once a week.**

- Respondents were asked where they feel people should be allowed to play state-operated machines, similar to those in Montana and South Dakota, if the state of North Dakota allows them (see Figure 5). Roughly six of every ten respondents indicated that they feel the state-operated machines should be allowed in bars or clubs that have a liquor license and/or charitable gaming.
- Respondents were asked how often they feel they would play state-operated machines if they were allowed in the state (see Figure 6). More than six of every ten respondents said they would play the machines, with the largest share saying they would play them more than once a year, but less than once a week.
- The detail in the contingency table shows that a slightly higher proportion of those under 35, with incomes of \$50,000 or more, definite voters, and those who have gambled (but

not in the past month) reported that state-operated machines should be allowed at charitable gaming sites.

■ **Conclusion #3: If state-operated lottery tickets are allowed in North Dakota, a majority of respondents feel the tickets should be sold in convenience stores, grocery stores, and bars or clubs with a liquor license. The largest share of respondents said they would play state-operated games once a month or more.**

- Respondents were asked where they feel lottery ticket sales should be allowed if the state of North Dakota establishes state-operated lottery ticket sales similar to Powerball (see Figure 5). At least six of every ten respondents indicated that they feel the sale of state-operated lottery tickets should be allowed in convenience stores, grocery stores, and bars or clubs that have a liquor license.
- Respondents were asked how often they feel they would buy tickets for a state-operated lottery if allowed in the state (see Figure 6). Nearly three of every four respondents said they would buy tickets, with the largest share saying they would buy them at least once a month.

■ **Conclusion #4: A large majority of respondents feel that our state and citizens would benefit from having residents support an in-state lottery rather than current out-of-state lottery games.**

- Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of agreement (or disagreement) with a few statements related to out-of-state slot machines, video poker machines and ticket lottery games (see Figure 7). Roughly eight of every ten respondents "agree" that many North Dakotans play out-of-state slot machines, play out-of-state video poker machines, or buy out-of-state lottery tickets and that our state and residents would benefit if the money that North Dakotans spend playing out-of-state lottery machines and buying out-of-state lottery tickets were spent on a North Dakota lottery.

Purpose #3: Identify factors that may affect one's level of support (or opposition) to expanding gaming in North Dakota.

■ **Conclusion #1: Respondents oppose casinos operated by private businesses. They also prefer that the state or charitable organizations operate and benefit from any expanded gaming in the state.**

- Respondents were asked if they would be more likely to support or oppose various proposals to expand gaming in North Dakota (see Figure 8). A slight majority of respondents said they would strongly or somewhat favor charitable gaming sites operating electronic gaming, charitable organizations operating casinos, and/or the state to operate casinos.
- Respondents were then asked who they would most (and least) prefer to have operate and benefit from expanded gaming if gaming laws in North Dakota are changed (see Figure 9). The largest proportion would most prefer to have the state or charitable organizations operate and benefit from expanded gaming. On the other hand, they least prefer having private businesses and Native American tribes or reservations operate and benefit from expanded gaming.
- The detail in the contingency table shows that a slightly higher proportion of those under the age of 45, who earn \$35,000 or more, and/or have gambled in the past year favor charitable gaming sites operating electronic gaming and charitable organizations operating casinos. Also, a slightly higher proportion of those 25 to 44 years of age most prefer to have charitable organizations operate and benefit from expanded gaming, while a higher proportion of those 45 or older prefer the state.

■ **Conclusion #2: Respondents said they are more likely to support efforts to expand gaming if it keeps money in the state and benefits worthy causes.**

- Respondents were asked to indicate how much they feel various factors may affect their support or opposition for efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota (see Figure 10). For all of the factors measured, a majority of respondents said the factors would make them much more or somewhat more likely to support efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota. However,

the highest proportion of respondents indicated they would support efforts that:

- ☐ Keep the money in North Dakota that North Dakotans currently spend on out-of-state slot machines, video poker machines and lottery tickets.
- ☐ Use a portion of the revenue to fund public kindergarten through 12th grade schools in the state
- ☐ Use a portion of the revenue to fund services for senior citizens in the state
- ☐ Give a portion of the revenue to charities in the state
- ☐ The detail in the contingency table shows that a slightly higher proportion of those 25 to 54 years of age and/or have gambled would be more likely to support efforts to expand gaming if they give a portion of the revenue to charities in the state.

■ **Conclusion #3: Respondents see many reasons for increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state. However, they are also cognizant of the social and moral concerns related to this issue.**

- ☐ Respondents were also asked what they feel are some reasons why North Dakotans may favor (or oppose) increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state (see Charts A & B). The most frequent reasons for favoring the expansion of gaming to fund charities include the feeling that charities need the money, keeping the money in the state, the entertainment value of gaming, and the financial benefit to the state. In contrast, respondents frequently named gambling addiction, moral issues, and opposition to gambling in general as reasons for opposing this issue.
- ☐ These questions were open-ended questions. In other words, respondents were asked to express their opinions rather than simply choosing from a fixed set of response choices. The actual comments made by the respondents were then recorded. The "qualitative" data collected through this type of question is excellent for collecting top-of-mind thoughts and opinions. Therefore, the results are an excellent barometer of the thoughts or opinions that were at the top of respondents' minds at the

time the interviews were completed. Given the qualitative nature of an open-ended question, however, the results cannot be used to estimate, with a known level of statistical accuracy, the number or proportion of the population who share the specific thought or opinion expressed by the respondents.

For each open-ended question, respondents were allowed to give up to three responses. Therefore, the results will exceed 100% when the percentages are added together.

■ **Conclusion #4: In some cases, supporting efforts to expand gaming may not be detrimental to legislators.**

- Respondents were asked how much more (or less) likely they feel they would be to vote for a candidate for the state legislature who supports various efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota (see Figure 11). Nearly six of every ten respondents are much more or somewhat more likely to vote for a candidate who supports a multi-state lottery similar to the Powerball, while nearly five of every ten are more likely to vote for a candidate who supports charitable gaming sites operating electronic gaming.

Purpose #4: Monitor support (or opposition) for past and proposed gaming measures.

■ **Conclusion #1: Given that past efforts for a state lottery have failed, it is surprising to see that the largest share of respondents reported they had voted in favor of previous measures.**

- Respondents were asked, to the best of their recollection, how they voted on previous measures to allow a lottery in North Dakota (see Figure 12). It is interesting to note that the proportion that said they always or usually favored previous measures (47.8%) exceeds the proportion that reported they always or usually opposed previous measures (26.0%).
- The detail in the contingency table shows that the highest proportion of those under 35 years of age, some of the strongest supporters of charitable gaming, said they have never voted on these issues in the past. Also, higher proportions of definite voters and/or those 55 or older said they usually or always voted against previous measures.

■ **Conclusion #2: A majority of respondents said they would vote in favor of several different proposals to expand gaming.**

- Respondents were then asked how they would most likely vote on proposals for a multi-state lottery similar to Powerball, to allow charitable gaming sites to offer more of the games currently available at reservation casinos only, and to allow charitable gaming sites to offer all of the games currently available at reservation casinos only (see Figure 13). Nearly seven of every ten respondents reported they would definitely or possibly favor a multi-state lottery, while a slight majority said they would favor both proposals to expand charitable gaming.
- The detail in the contingency table shows that support for proposals to expand charitable gaming appears to diminish as age increases and gambling frequency decreases.

Section

3

FIGURES & CHARTS

Figure 1. How likely are you to vote in the November elections? (Includes all respondents)




Figure 2. How recently have you... (The first question includes all respondents. The following questions include all respondents who have gambled.)




Figure 3. How would you rate the following? (Includes only those who have ever played charitable games, who have been to a ND reservation casino, or who have played out-of-state lottery games)




Figure 4. What direction do you feel the legislature should take with laws that control the games that charitable gaming sites are allowed to provide? (Includes all respondents)




Figure 5. If North Dakota allowed machines similar to those in South Dakota and Montana and/or participated in a multi-state lottery similar to that offered in Minnesota and Montana, where do you feel people should be allowed to play/buy them? (Includes all respondents)




Chart A. What do you feel are some reasons why some North Dakotans may favor increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? (Includes all respondents)

| Comments | Percent |
|---|---------|
| Money for charities, hard to raise funds | 20.8% |
| Keep money in the state | 14.3% |
| Like gambling, enjoyable entertainment | 8.3% |
| Money for state, economy, budget shortfalls | 6.8% |
| Helps people, needs increasing | 4.5% |
| Worthy cause | 3.8% |
| Help economy, create jobs | 3.8% |
| Keep taxes down, from increasing | 3.5% |
| Help education | 3.3% |
| Not sure | 36.3% |
| Total responses | 400 |

Chart B. What do you feel are some reasons why some North Dakotans may oppose increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? (Includes all respondents)

| Comments | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Addiction, gambling problems | 29.8% |
| Moral reasons | 12.3% |
| Oppose gambling in general | 11.5% |
| Conservative, resist change | 7.8% |
| Problems affect poor the most | 6.8% |
| Fear money won't be spend wisely, give them too much money | 5.0% |
| Money root of evil, greed, cheating, crime | 3.3% |
| Easy to gamble, increase gambling | 3.0% |
| Not sure | 23.8% |
| Total responses | 400 |

Figure 11. How likely do you feel you would be to vote for a candidate for the state legislature who supports... (Includes all respondents)




Figure 12. How did you vote on previous measures to allow a lottery in North Dakota? (Includes all respondents)





Figure 13. How do you feel you would vote for the following? (Includes all respondents)



Section

4

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire was designed with assistance from Jim Fugle and Wayne Kranzler (Kranzler Kingsley Communications) and Remi Brooke, Rick Stenseth, and Todd Kranda (Charitable Gaming Association of North Dakota).

The questionnaire in this report was used for all interviews conducted for this study.

Case #: _____ Employee #: _____ Date: ____/____/____ Start Time: ____ : ____ a.m. p.m. Resp. #: _____

- Q1. [Do Not Read] Enter respondent's gender.
1 Male (50% in each region)
2 Female (50% in each region)

Q2. [Do Not Read] Enter county code from list: _____

- Q3. [Do Not Read] Enter region from list.
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 Area #1: Williston (17) | 5 Area #5: Fargo (103) |
| 2 Area #2: Minot (55) | 6 Area #6: Jamestown (39) |
| 3 Area #3: Devils Lake (25) | 7 Area #7: Bismarck (80) |
| 4 Area #4: Grand Forks (57) | 8 Area #8: Dickinson (24) |

Hi, my name is (Your First Name) from Winkelman Consulting in Fargo, and I'm not selling anything - I'm simply conducting a survey about issues that North Dakota residents and the legislature may vote on in the near future. The survey will only take about 10 minutes, there are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will be kept confidential. This survey is for people 21 or older. Are you 21 years of age or older?

Y..... Yes

ASK to speak to someone 21+. <<<<<< N..... No/Not Sure/No Response
Call back (CB) if NOT available
Discontinue Close (DC1) if none in HH.

DC2. Do you or any members of your household work for...

| | Yes | Not sure | No |
|---|-----|----------|----|
| a. A market research firm? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| b. An advertising agency? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| Discontinue Close (DC2) if respondent said "Yes" or "Not sure" to one or more of the above. | | | |

DC3. As you may already know, elections for several state and local races will be held in November. To the best of your knowledge, will you be eligible to vote in North Dakota for the November election?

1..... Yes

Discontinue Close (DC3) << 2..... No/Don't think so/Not Sure/No Response

Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election - would you say you will...

- 1..... Definitely vote,
2..... Possibly vote, or
3..... You will not vote in the November Election?
91..... [Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q5. For this survey, we will be talking about gaming in North Dakota. Even if you have never gambled, your opinions are still needed on these important issues! When I talk about "gaming", I mean bingo played at bingo parlors; blackjack, bingo, or pull-tabs played at a bar or restaurant; or slot machines, poker, blackjack, or other games played at a reservation casino. If you would like me to repeat this at any time during the survey, please ask.

First, how recently have you wagered money on games of chance, such as slot machines, blackjack, bingo, poker, pull-tabs, horse races, or other games - would you say...

- 1 Within the past week,
2 Within the past month,
3 Within the past year, or
4 More than a year, or
5 Never?
91 [Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

SKIP to Q14 <<

SKIP to Q14 <<

Q6-10. [IF never gambled or "not sure" (Q5 >= 5), then SKIP to Q14 (Q6-Q13b = 99).] Using the same scale - within the past week, past month, past year, more than a year, or never - how recently have you...

| | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
|--|-----------|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| Q6. Played bingo, blackjack, pull-tabs, horse races, or other charitable games in North Dakota at a bingo hall, bar, club or restaurant? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q7. Been to a reservation casino in North Dakota? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q8. Been to a casino in another state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q9. Played slot machines in South Dakota or video poker in Montana? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q10. Bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state or had someone buy them for you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q11a-b. [IF never played charitable games or "not sure" (Q6 >= 5), then SKIP to Q12 (Q11a-b = 98).] Using a scale of excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor, how would you rate the charitable games you have played in North Dakota at a bingo hall, bar, club or restaurant in...

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Very poor | Not sure |
|--|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|----------|
| a. Being an enjoyable form of entertainment? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| b. Giving you a reasonable chance to win? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q12a-b. [IF never been to ND reservation casino or "not sure" (Q7 >= 5), then SKIP to Q13 (Q12a-b = 98).] Using a scale of excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor, how would you rate the reservation casinos you have visited in North Dakota in...

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Very poor | Not sure |
|--|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|----------|
| a. Being an enjoyable form of entertainment? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| b. Giving you a reasonable chance to win? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q13a-b. [IF never bought lottery tickets or "not sure" (Q10 >= 5), then SKIP to Q14 (Q13a-b = 98).] Using a scale of excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor, how would you rate the out-of-state Powerball or lottery ticket games you have played in...

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Very poor | Not sure |
|--|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|----------|
| a. Being an enjoyable form of entertainment? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| b. Giving you a reasonable chance to win? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q14. In North Dakota, the law currently allows gaming at reservation casinos and gaming operated by and for charities in bars, clubs, and restaurants. Currently, reservation casinos are allowed to offer slot machines, blackjack, poker, roulette and craps. However, charitable gaming sites in bars, clubs, and restaurants are allowed to provide blackjack, bingo, and pull-tabs. Looking into the future, what direction do you feel the legislature should take with laws that control the games that charitable gaming sites are allowed to provide – would you say the North Dakota legislature should pass laws that allow charitable gaming to provide...

- 1All of the games currently available at reservation casinos only,
 2More of the games currently available at reservation casinos only, or
 3Only the games currently allowed at charitable gaming sites?
 90[Do Not Read] Other [Specify: _____]
 91[Do Not Read] Not sure, no response

Q15. As you may already know, South Dakota and Montana currently have slot machines and video poker machines. They allow machines in bars, restaurants, and convenience stores, and a large portion of the revenue from the machines goes to the state. If the state of North Dakota allowed machines similar to those in South Dakota and Montana, where do you feel people should be allowed to play them – would you say...

| | Yes | No | Not sure |
|--|-----|----|----------|
| a. Only in bars, clubs, or bingo halls that currently offer charitable gaming? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| b. All bars or clubs that have a liquor license? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| c. Restaurants that have a liquor license? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| d. Convenience stores? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| e. Grocery stores? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| f. Any private business that chooses to offer them? | 1 | 2 | 91 |

Q16. If the state of North Dakota allowed slot machines and video poker machines similar to those in South Dakota and Montana, how often do you feel you would play them – would you say...

- 1At least once a week,
 2At least once a month,
 3At least once a year,
 4Less than once a year, or
 5Never?
 91[Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q17. As you may also know, Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota all currently participate in a multi-state lottery like Powerball – a game where people pick numbers and win money if the lottery numbers match the numbers they picked. These states allow lottery tickets to be sold at gas stations, convenience stores, and grocery stores and the revenue from the lottery tickets goes to the state. If the state of North Dakota participated in a multi-state lottery similar to that offered in Minnesota, Montana, where do you feel people should be buy lottery tickets – would you say...

| | Yes | No | Not sure |
|--|-----|----|----------|
| a. Only in bars, clubs, or bingo halls that currently offer charitable gaming? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| b. All bars or clubs that have a liquor license? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| c. Restaurants that have a liquor license? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| d. Convenience stores? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| e. Grocery stores? | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| f. Any private business that chooses to offer them? | 1 | 2 | 91 |

Q18. If the state of North Dakota participated in a multi-state lottery like Powerball, how often do you feel you would buy lottery tickets in North Dakota – would you say...

- 1At least once a week,
- 2At least once a month,
- 3At least once a year,
- 4Less than once a year, or
- 5Never?
- 91[Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q19-20. Next, I'm going to read several statements related to out-of-state slot machines, video poker machines and ticket lottery games. After I read each, please tell me if you strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, strongly disagree, or have no reaction to the statement.

Here is the first statement...

| | Strongly agree | Slightly agree | Neither | Slightly disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Q19. Many North Dakotans play out-of-state slot machines, play out-of-state video poker machines, or buy out-of-state lottery tickets? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q20. Our state and residents would benefit if the money that North Dakotans spend playing out-of-state lottery machines and buying out-of-state lottery tickets were spent on a North Dakota lottery? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q21-24. Over the years, the legislature has considered many proposals to expand gaming in North Dakota. I'm going to read several of these proposals. After I read each, please tell me if you feel you would strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, strongly oppose, or have no reaction to the proposal to change the gaming laws in North Dakota.

| How much do you feel you would favor or oppose a proposal to change the laws to allow... | Strongly favor | Somewhat favor | No reaction, Neither | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Not sure |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Q21. Charitable gaming sites to operate slot machines, video poker, or other forms of electronic gaming? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q22. Charitable organizations to operate casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at reservation casinos <u>without</u> being located on or affiliated with an Indian reservation? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q23. The state to operate casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at reservation casinos <u>without</u> being located on or affiliated with an Indian reservation? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q24. Private businesses to operate casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at reservation casinos <u>without</u> being located on or affiliated with an Indian reservation? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q25. If gaming laws in North Dakota were changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from the expanded gaming – would you say...

- 1Charitable organizations,
- 2The state government,
- 3Private businesses, or
- 4Native American tribes or reservations?
- 91[Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q26. If gaming laws in North Dakota were changed, who would you least prefer to have operate and benefit from the expanded gaming – would you say...

- 1 Charitable organizations,
- 2 The state government,
- 3 Private businesses, or
- 4 Native American tribes or reservations?
- 91 [Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q27-34. I'm going to read several factors that may affect how much you support or oppose efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota. After I read each, please tell me if you feel the item would make you much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or have no impact on your support for efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota.

| How likely do you feel you would be to support efforts to expand gaming in North Dakota if... | Much more likely | Somewhat more likely | No impact, Neither | Somewhat less likely | Much less likely | Not sure |
|---|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|
| Q27. It created a number of new jobs in the state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q28. It provided funding for programs and service that would be cut otherwise because of the state's recent budget shortfall? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q29. It stimulated tourism and tourism-related economic development? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q30. It kept the money in North Dakota that North Dakotans currently spend on out-of-state slot machines, video poker machines and lottery tickets? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q31. A portion of the revenue went to charities in the state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q32. A portion of the revenue was used to fund public kindergarten through 12 th grade schools in the state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q33. A portion of the revenue was used to fund services for senior citizens in the state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q34. A portion of the revenue was used to increase current funding for gambling addiction treatment services in the state? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q35. What do you feel are some reasons why some North Dakotans may favor increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? [Clarify] [Probe for up to 3 responses] What are some other reasons why you feel some North Dakotans may favor increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? [Clarify]

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

Q36. What do you feel are some reasons why some North Dakotans may oppose increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? [Clarify] [Probe for up to 3 responses] What are some other reasons why you feel some North Dakotans may oppose increasing the revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming in the state? [Clarify]

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

Q37-40. Using the same scale – much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or no impact – how likely do you feel you would be to vote for a candidate for the state legislature who supports...

| | Much more likely | Somewhat more likely | No impact, Neither | Somewhat less likely | Much less likely | Not sure |
|---|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|
| Q37. Charitable gaming sites to operate slot machines, video poker, or other forms of electronic gaming? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q38. A multi-state lottery similar to the Powerball games played in Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q39. Allowing charitable gaming sites to offer more of the games currently available at reservation casinos only? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |
| Q40. Allowing charitable gaming sites to offer all of the games currently available at reservation casinos only? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91 |

Q41. As you may already know, North Dakotans have voted several times in the past on measures for a lottery. To the best of your recollection, how did you vote on previous measures to allow a lottery in North Dakota – would you say you...

- 1Always voted in favor of a lottery,
- 2Usually voted in favor of a lottery,
- 3Voted in favor of and to oppose a lottery equally,
- 4Usually voted to oppose a lottery, or
- 5Always voted to oppose a lottery?
- 90[Do Not Read] Did not ever vote on ND lottery measures, Never voted in ND
- 91[Do Not Read] Not sure/No response

Q42. In November, North Dakota residents will vote on an initiated measure which will allow the state to participate in a multi-state lottery similar to the Powerball games played in Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota. The revenues generated from this lottery will go the state. If the election were held today, how do you feel you would vote – would you say you would...

- 1Definitely vote in favor of the measure,
- 2Possibly vote in favor of the measure,
- 3Possibly vote against the measure,
- 4Definitely vote against the measure, or
- 5You have no opinion related to this measure?
- 91[Do Not Read] Not sure/no response

Q43. If you were asked to vote on a measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer more of the games currently available at reservation casinos only, how do you feel you would vote - would you say you would...

- 1 Definitely vote in favor of the measure,
- 2 Possibly vote in favor of the measure,
- 3 Possibly vote against the measure,
- 4 Definitely vote against the measure, or
- 5 You have no opinion related to this measure?
- 91 [Do Not Read] Not sure/no response

Q44. If you were asked to vote on a measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer all of the games currently available at reservation casinos only, how do you feel you would vote - would you say you would...

- 1 Definitely vote in favor of the measure,
- 2 Possibly vote in favor of the measure,
- 3 Possibly vote against the measure,
- 4 Definitely vote against the measure, or
- 5 You have no opinion related to this measure?
- 91 [Do Not Read] Not sure/no response

Q45. For classification purposes, may I have your age please? [IF RELUCTANT OR REFUSE, READ GROUPS: Please stop me when I read the age group which includes you...]

- 1 21 to 24,
- 2 25 to 34,
- 3 35 to 44,
- 4 45 to 54,
- 5 55 to 64, or
- 6 65 or older?
- 91 [Do Not Read] Choose not to answer

Q46a. Do you live on a farm or a ranch?

- SKIP to Q47 ← ←
- 4 Yes
 - 91 No/Not sure

Q46b. Which town do you live in or closest to?

- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 Bismarck | 2 Beulah | 3 Other (Specify: _____) |
| 1 Dickinson | 2 Bottineau | 91 Choose not to answer |
| 1 Fargo | 2 Carrington | |
| 1 Grand Forks | 2 Devils Lake | |
| 1 Jamestown | 2 Grafton | |
| 1 Mandan | 2 Harvey | |
| 1 Minot | 2 Rugby | |
| 1 West Fargo | 2 Valley City | |
| 1 Williston | 2 Wahpeton | |

Q47. What was your household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001 - would you say...

- 1 Less than \$20,000,
- 2 \$20,000 to \$34,999,
- 3 \$35,000 to \$49,999,
- 4 \$50,000 to \$74,999, or
- 5 \$75,000 or more?
- 91 [Do Not Read] Choose not to answer

VERIFICATION CLOSE: That's all the questions I have for you. Lastly, let me verify that I dialed ____ - _____. Again, my name is (Your First Name), and on occasion a small percentage of people like yourself are called back just to verify that this interview actually took place. May I please have your first name, and first name only, so my supervisor will know who to ask for in case this interview is verified. Thank you for your time and have a good evening/day.

Resp. First Name: _____ Phone: (____) _____ - _____ End Time: _____

Section

5

CONTINGENCY TABLES

Contingency tables are commonly referred to as "cross-tabs". They present the findings in an easy-to-understand, table form and provide the categorical data that is used most frequently in marketing. We strongly recommend that you review these tables and use them to facilitate any major decisions you make.

The contingency tables on the following pages show the proportion of all respondents who gave various responses to each question, as well as the proportion of specific sample segments (i.e. gender, age group, area of residence, etc.) who provided a particular response. This detail will enable you to determine which segments are more likely (or less likely) to have certain habits, intentions, opinions, and/or perceptions.

Please note the tables are separated into sections. The tables in each section have the same "banners" or sample segments across the top. Within each section, the tables are in order by question number, which appears on the top, left-hand side of each table.

Q4-5: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4-5. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | Urban area | Suburban area | Urban fringe | Rural area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area | Unincorporated area |
| Q4. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 79.5% | 88.2% | 80.0% | 80.0% | 80.0% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% | 77.7% |
| Q5. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 14.8% | 11.8% | 16.4% | 16.0% | 16.0% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 14.6% |
| Q6. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 3.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.8% |
| Q7. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 2.0% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% |
| Q8. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 16.0% | 5.9% | 14.9% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% | 18.4% |
| Q9. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 17.8% | 17.6% | 25.9% | 16.0% | 16.0% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% | 16.9% |
| Q10. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 23.8% | 11.8% | 25.9% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% | 23.9% |
| Q11. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 22.3% | 41.2% | 18.2% | 28.0% | 28.0% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% | 20.4% |
| Q12. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 20.0% | 23.9% | 16.4% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% | 21.4% |
| Q13. How many times have you moved in the last 12 months? | 3% | | | | | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 29 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q6-10: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | | | Q4. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| Total | | Western area | North area | South area | East area | Central area | Mountain area | Other area | Other area | Other area | Other area | Other area | Other area | Other area | Other area | |
| Q6. How recently played charitable games in ND? | Past week | 12.5% | 15.4% | 10.9% | 10.0% | 23.9% | 9.9% | 17.2% | 9.9% | 4.8% | 10.8% | 23.3% | 17.9% | 8.7% | | |
| | Past month | 15.4% | 7.7% | 13.0% | 30.0% | 8.7% | 13.0% | 10.3% | 20.6% | 23.8% | 18.2% | 13.0% | 12.8% | 8.7% | | |
| | Past year | 21.0% | 15.4% | 17.4% | 30.0% | 21.7% | 19.8% | 13.8% | 22.2% | 33.3% | 18.2% | 30.0% | 17.9% | 28.3% | 100.0% | |
| | More than a year | 26.0% | 46.2% | 28.3% | 15.0% | 28.3% | 28.4% | 20.7% | 25.4% | 14.3% | 28.1% | 20.0% | 25.6% | 21.7% | | |
| | Never | 25.1% | 15.4% | 30.4% | 15.0% | 17.4% | 28.4% | 37.9% | 22.2% | 23.8% | 24.6% | 16.7% | 25.6% | 32.6% | | |
| Q7. How recently been to reservation casino in ND? | Past week | 8.9% | 7.7% | 8.7% | 15.0% | 13.0% | 8.0% | 6.9% | 14.3% | 4.8% | 6.4% | 20.0% | 15.4% | 4.3% | | |
| | Past month | 14.7% | 7.7% | 17.4% | 35.0% | 13.0% | 12.3% | 13.8% | 15.9% | 4.8% | 15.3% | 26.7% | 23.1% | 15.2% | | |
| | Past year | 29.2% | 23.1% | 28.3% | 20.0% | 30.4% | 22.2% | 37.9% | 34.9% | 38.1% | 28.1% | 30.0% | 23.1% | 39.1% | 100.0% | |
| | More than a year | 21.0% | 23.1% | 32.6% | 20.0% | 17.4% | 21.0% | 24.1% | 19.0% | 14.3% | 21.2% | 30.0% | 23.1% | 17.4% | | |
| | Never | 25.7% | 30.8% | 13.0% | 10.0% | 39.1% | 35.8% | 17.2% | 15.9% | 38.1% | 29.1% | 20.0% | 15.4% | 23.9% | | |
| Not sure | | 3% | 7.7% | | | | | | | | | 3.3% | | | | |
| Q8. How recently been to casino in another state? | Past week | 1.9% | | | | 2.2% | 4.9% | | 1.6% | | 2.0% | 3.3% | | 2.2% | | |
| | Past month | 7.2% | 7.7% | 6.5% | 5.0% | 6.9% | 6.2% | 10.3% | 7.9% | 9.9% | 6.9% | | 15.4% | 6.9% | | |
| | Past year | 19.4% | 30.8% | 19.6% | 15.0% | 23.9% | 21.0% | 17.2% | 14.3% | 19.0% | 19.2% | 20.0% | 15.4% | 23.9% | | |
| | More than a year | 33.5% | 30.8% | 30.4% | 25.0% | 39.1% | 37.0% | 13.8% | 41.3% | 28.6% | 35.0% | 43.3% | 33.3% | 21.7% | | |
| | Never | 37.9% | 30.8% | 43.5% | 55.0% | 28.3% | 30.9% | 58.6% | 34.9% | 42.9% | 36.9% | 33.3% | 35.9% | 45.7% | 100.0% | |
| Q9. How recently played slot machines in SD or video poker in MT? | Past week | 9% | | 2.2% | | | 1.2% | | 1.6% | | 1.0% | | 2.6% | | | |
| | Past month | 3.4% | 7.7% | 2.2% | | 2.2% | 1.2% | 3.4% | 3.2% | 19.0% | 1.9% | 3.3% | 10.3% | 6.9% | | |
| | Past year | 9.7% | 23.1% | 10.9% | | | 7.4% | 17.2% | 12.7% | 19.0% | 11.8% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 10.9% | | |
| | More than a year | 15.7% | 30.8% | 13.0% | 25.0% | 8.7% | 18.9% | 3.4% | 19.0% | 14.3% | 16.3% | 13.3% | 17.9% | 13.0% | | |
| | Never | 70.2% | 34.9% | 71.7% | 75.0% | 89.1% | 71.6% | 75.9% | 63.9% | 47.6% | 69.9% | 80.0% | 66.7% | 69.0% | 100.0% | |
| Q10. How recently have you bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state? | Past week | 14.4% | | 4.3% | | 37.6% | 30.9% | 6.9% | 1.6% | 4.8% | 16.3% | 20.0% | 7.7% | 8.7% | | |
| | Past month | 11.0% | 23.1% | 15.2% | | 8.7% | 13.0% | 3.4% | 11.1% | 9.9% | 13.3% | 3.3% | 10.3% | 4.3% | 100.0% | |
| | Past year | 20.4% | 7.7% | 19.0% | 25.0% | 19.6% | 17.3% | 17.2% | 22.2% | 38.1% | 17.7% | 30.0% | 28.2% | 19.6% | | |
| | More than a year | 16.9% | 46.2% | 21.7% | 10.0% | 15.2% | 12.9% | 17.2% | 20.6% | 4.8% | 19.2% | 6.7% | 12.8% | 17.4% | | |
| | Never | 37.0% | 23.1% | 39.1% | 65.0% | 23.9% | 25.9% | 55.2% | 42.9% | 42.9% | 33.0% | 40.0% | 41.0% | 50.0% | | |
| Not sure | | 3% | | | | | | | 1.6% | | 5% | | | | | |
| Total Responses | | 319 | 13 | 46 | 20 | 46 | 81 | 29 | 63 | 21 | 203 | 36 | 39 | 46 | 1 | |

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/02
Date

Q11a-b: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|-------|--------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------|
| | | W. Michigan area | Adrian area | Dowdle Lake area | Grand Haven area | Flag area | Kalamazoo area | Plainfield area | Dekalb area | Q | Michigan town | Small town | Suburban | Not sure |
| Q11a. How rate ND charitable games in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Excellent | 10.0% | 9.1% | 12.5% | 11.8% | 5.3% | 10.3% | 10.2% | 25.0% | 12.4% | 12.4% | 13.8% | 3.2% | 3.2% | |
| Good | 43.5% | 36.4% | 34.4% | 29.4% | 50.0% | 43.1% | 44.9% | 43.8% | 39.9% | 39.9% | 48.3% | 41.9% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| Fair | 31.0% | 27.3% | 37.5% | 23.5% | 26.3% | 31.0% | 38.8% | 23.0% | 34.0% | 34.0% | 20.0% | 27.4% | 29.0% | |
| Poor | 5.4% | 9.1% | 3.1% | 23.5% | 5.3% | 5.2% | 2.0% | 6.3% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 3.4% | 12.9% | 12.9% | |
| Very poor | 1.7% | 1.7% | 3.1% | 11.8% | 5.3% | | 2.0% | | 2.0% | 2.0% | | 3.2% | 3.2% | |
| Not sure | 8.4% | 18.2% | 9.4% | 11.8% | 7.9% | 10.3% | 2.0% | | 7.2% | 7.2% | 6.9% | 9.7% | 9.7% | |
| Q11b. How rate ND charitable games in giving you reasonable chance to win? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Excellent | 5.9% | 9.1% | 9.4% | 5.9% | | 6.9% | 6.1% | 12.9% | 8.9% | 8.9% | 3.4% | | | |
| Good | 28.9% | 27.3% | 37.5% | 11.8% | 28.9% | 29.3% | 38.9% | 18.8% | 28.1% | 28.1% | 36.0% | 31.0% | 22.0% | 100.0% |
| Fair | 31.4% | 18.2% | 28.1% | 29.4% | 26.3% | 35.2% | 34.7% | 37.8% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 32.0% | 20.7% | 32.3% | |
| Poor | 16.3% | 18.2% | 6.3% | 29.4% | 21.1% | 13.8% | 12.2% | 25.0% | 13.7% | 13.7% | 8.0% | 27.4% | 25.8% | |
| Very poor | 8.8% | 9.1% | 9.4% | 23.5% | 15.8% | 1.7% | 12.2% | | 7.2% | 7.2% | 8.0% | 17.2% | 9.7% | |
| Not sure | 8.8% | 18.2% | 9.4% | | 7.9% | 12.1% | 11.1% | 6.1% | 6.3% | 9.2% | 16.0% | | 9.7% | |
| Total Responses | 239 | 11 | 32 | 17 | 38 | 58 | 18 | 49 | 16 | 153 | 25 | 29 | 31 | 1 |

Includes all respondents who ever played charitable games

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q12a-b: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Rating of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | | Western area | Midwest area | South Lake area | Great Central area | North West area | South West area | Mountain area | Blackfoot area | Blackfoot area | Blackfoot area | Blackfoot area | Blackfoot area | Blackfoot area |
| Q12a. How rate ND reservation casinos in being enjoyable from an entertainment? | | Excellent 13.0% | Excellent 15.0% | Excellent 11.1% | Excellent 3.0% | Excellent 13.5% | Excellent 16.7% | Excellent 33.3% | Excellent 37.7% | Excellent 30.8% | Excellent 13.0% | Excellent 24.2% | Excellent 8.0% | Excellent 100.0% |
| | | Good 37.7% | Good 37.5% | Good 27.8% | Good 46.4% | Good 36.5% | Good 33.3% | Good 33.3% | Good 37.7% | Good 30.8% | Good 30.8% | Good 36.4% | Good 31.4% | Good 31.4% |
| | | Fair 30.1% | Fair 35.0% | Fair 22.2% | Fair 35.7% | Fair 26.9% | Fair 37.5% | Fair 37.5% | Fair 26.4% | Fair 30.8% | Fair 30.8% | Fair 18.2% | Fair 31.4% | Fair 31.4% |
| | | Poor 9.3% | Poor 5.0% | Poor 11.1% | Poor 3.0% | Poor 13.5% | Poor 8.3% | Poor 13.5% | Poor 11.3% | Poor 7.7% | Poor 17.4% | Poor 12.1% | Poor 17.1% | Poor 17.1% |
| | | Very poor 2.5% | Very poor 3.0% | Very poor 5.0% | Very poor 3.0% | Very poor 1.9% | Very poor 1.9% | Very poor 1.9% | Very poor 5.7% | Very poor 2.8% | Very poor 2.8% | Very poor 9.1% | Very poor 5.7% | Very poor 5.7% |
| | | Not sure 6.8% | Not sure 7.5% | Not sure 22.2% | Not sure 7.1% | Not sure 7.7% | Not sure 4.2% | Not sure 4.2% | Not sure 3.8% | Not sure 15.4% | Not sure 8.7% | Not sure 6.1% | Not sure 5.7% | Not sure 5.7% |
| Q12b. How rate ND reservation casinos in giving you reasonable chance to win? | | Excellent 4.7% | Excellent 5.0% | Excellent 16.7% | Excellent 14.3% | Excellent 19.2% | Excellent 20.8% | Excellent 38.5% | Excellent 37.7% | Excellent 15.4% | Excellent 20.8% | Excellent 27.3% | Excellent 20.8% | Excellent 100.0% |
| | | Good 21.6% | Good 37.5% | Good 27.8% | Good 53.6% | Good 38.5% | Good 45.8% | Good 38.5% | Good 37.7% | Good 38.5% | Good 42.4% | Good 43.9% | Good 37.1% | Good 37.1% |
| | | Fair 39.4% | Fair 35.0% | Fair 33.3% | Fair 10.7% | Fair 21.2% | Fair 25.0% | Fair 25.0% | Fair 20.8% | Fair 23.1% | Fair 14.6% | Fair 30.4% | Fair 24.2% | Fair 28.6% |
| | | Poor 19.5% | Poor 10.0% | Poor 22.2% | Poor 14.3% | Poor 7.7% | Poor 4.2% | Poor 4.2% | Poor 7.7% | Poor 7.7% | Poor 9.0% | Poor 4.3% | Poor 9.1% | Poor 11.4% |
| | | Very poor 8.9% | Very poor 5.0% | Very poor 7.7% | Very poor 7.1% | Very poor 7.7% | Very poor 4.2% | Very poor 4.2% | Very poor 7.7% | Very poor 7.7% | Very poor 6.9% | Very poor 4.3% | Very poor 2.9% | Very poor 2.9% |
| | | Not sure 5.9% | Not sure 7.5% | Not sure 18 | Not sure 7.1% | Not sure 7.7% | Not sure 4.2% | Not sure 4.2% | Not sure 7.7% | Not sure 7.7% | Not sure 6.9% | Not sure 6.1% | Not sure 2.9% | Not sure 2.9% |
| Total Responses | 236 | 8 | 40 | 18 | 28 | 52 | 24 | 53 | 13 | 144 | 23 | 33 | 35 | 1 |

Includes all respondents who have ever been to a ND reservation casino

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

Q13a-b: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Rating of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4c. Where do you live? | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | W/children area | Mixed area | Double Lath area | Good Folio area | Range area | Lowest area | Midrange area | Delectable area | Q4 | Medium area | Suburb area | Suburb area | Urban area | Not sure | | |
| Q13a. How rate out-of-state Pennsylv or lottery games in being employable sum of entertainment? | Excellent | 9.0% | 20.0% | 10.7% | 14.3% | 5.7% | 11.7% | 8.6% | | | 8.9% | 11.1% | 17.4% | | | | |
| | Good | 33.0% | 20.0% | 17.9% | 14.3% | 25.7% | 33.3% | 30.8% | 75.0% | | 33.3% | 16.7% | 39.1% | 34.8% | 100.0% | | |
| | Fair | 33.0% | 20.0% | 39.3% | 14.3% | 34.3% | 35.0% | 30.3% | 25.0% | | 34.1% | 33.3% | 21.7% | 39.1% | | | |
| | Poor | 12.5% | 20.0% | 7.1% | 42.9% | 20.0% | 13.3% | 7.7% | 5.7% | | 11.1% | 16.7% | 13.0% | 17.4% | | | |
| | Very poor | 3.5% | 10.0% | 3.6% | | 5.7% | | 15.4% | 2.9% | | 3.0% | 5.0% | | 8.7% | | | |
| Not sure | 9.0% | 10.0% | 21.4% | 14.3% | 8.6% | 6.7% | | 15.4% | | 9.0% | 16.7% | 8.7% | | | | | |
| Q13b. How rate out-of-state Pennsylv or lottery games in giving you reasonable chances to win? | Excellent | 3.9% | | 3.6% | 14.3% | 2.9% | 5.0% | 2.9% | | 3.7% | | 8.7% | | | | | |
| | Good | 19.0% | 30.0% | 17.9% | | 8.6% | 21.7% | 30.8% | 16.7% | 19.3% | 22.2% | 17.4% | 17.4% | | | | |
| | Fair | 31.5% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 28.6% | 34.3% | 28.3% | 38.9% | 50.0% | 32.0% | 38.9% | 26.1% | 26.1% | | | | |
| | Poor | 24.0% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 14.3% | 25.7% | 30.0% | 15.4% | 8.3% | 22.2% | 22.2% | 30.4% | 30.4% | | | | |
| | Very poor | 15.5% | 20.0% | 7.1% | 28.6% | 22.9% | 13.3% | 15.4% | 11.4% | 25.0% | 15.6% | 5.6% | 8.7% | 26.1% | | | |
| Not sure | 6.5% | 10.0% | 21.4% | 14.3% | 5.7% | 1.7% | | 5.7% | | 6.7% | 11.1% | 8.7% | | | | | |
| Total Responses | 200 | 10 | 28 | 7 | 35 | 60 | 13 | 35 | 12 | 135 | 18 | 23 | 23 | 1 | | | |

Includes all respondents who have ever played out-of-state lottery games

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q14: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q14: By Region of Residence | | | | | | | | Q14: By Area of Residence | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|----------|-------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | North | South | East | West | Central | Mountain | Other | Total | North | South | East | West | Total |
| Q14: What direction should the legislature take with laws that control the electronic games industry? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All casino games | 34.8% | 41.2% | 21.8% | 32.0% | 33.3% | 39.8% | 33.9% | 36.3% | 36.3% | 26.3% | 37.3% | 30.3% | 30.3% | 100.0% |
| Most casino games | 11.8% | 17.6% | 21.8% | | 10.9% | 11.7% | 5.1% | 10.0% | 16.7% | 7.9% | 11.8% | 10.2% | | |
| Only current charitable games | 36.5% | 17.6% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 29.8% | 38.8% | 46.2% | 35.0% | 33.3% | 44.7% | 28.4% | 39.8% | | |
| Opposed to gaming | 5.8% | 17.6% | 5.5% | 8.0% | 7.0% | 2.9% | 2.0% | 7.3% | 4.2% | 2.0% | 9.8% | 8.5% | | |
| Allow lottery | .8% | | 1.8% | 4.0% | | | | 1.3% | | | | | | |
| Should be state operated | .5% | | | | 3.9% | | | | | | | 3.4% | | |
| Misc. other | .8% | | | | | 1.9% | 2.0% | | | | | 1.7% | | |
| Not sure | 9.3% | 5.9% | 9.1% | 16.0% | 15.8% | 4.9% | 7.7% | 10.0% | 8.3% | 8.4% | 11.8% | 6.8% | | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 29 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q15a-f: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4c. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|----------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| | | West | North | South | East | Midwest | Northwest | Southwest | Central | North | South | East | Midwest | Central |
| Q15a. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 61.5% | 47.1% | 63.0% | 52.0% | 61.4% | 64.1% | 60.0% | 58.3% | 64.1% | 63.2% | 49.0% | 59.3% | 100.0% |
| | No | 33.8% | 52.9% | 37.7% | 44.0% | 35.1% | 31.1% | 33.8% | 37.9% | 31.1% | 34.2% | 47.1% | 33.9% | |
| | Not sure | 4.8% | | 3.6% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 4.9% | 7.7% | 4.2% | 4.8% | 2.6% | 3.9% | 6.8% | |
| Q15b. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 59.8% | 52.9% | 52.7% | 64.0% | 47.4% | 67.0% | 61.5% | 70.8% | 62.2% | 51.3% | 54.9% | 55.9% | 100.0% |
| | No | 37.0% | 41.2% | 45.9% | 32.0% | 49.1% | 29.1% | 33.3% | 29.2% | 34.3% | 39.5% | 45.1% | 40.7% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 2.9% | 3.6% | 5.3% | 3.4% | 3.4% | |
| Q15c. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 38.8% | 35.3% | 41.8% | 44.0% | 24.0% | 35.9% | 41.0% | 50.0% | 39.8% | 47.4% | 37.3% | 28.8% | 100.0% |
| | No | 59.3% | 64.7% | 58.2% | 52.0% | 73.7% | 61.2% | 53.8% | 50.0% | 59.4% | 50.0% | 60.8% | 64.4% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | | 4.0% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 2.9% | 5.1% | 1.9% | 2.8% | 2.6% | 2.0% | 6.8% | |
| Q15d. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 24.5% | 29.4% | 21.8% | 28.0% | 17.5% | 21.4% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 22.3% | 36.8% | 31.4% | 20.3% | |
| | No | 73.8% | 70.6% | 78.2% | 68.0% | 80.7% | 76.7% | 71.8% | 58.3% | 76.1% | 60.5% | 68.6% | 76.3% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.8% | | 4.0% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 2.9% | 1.6% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 3.4% | |
| Q15e. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 17.8% | 23.5% | 16.4% | 28.0% | 14.0% | 13.6% | 17.9% | 33.3% | 17.9% | 13.2% | 25.5% | 15.3% | |
| | No | 81.0% | 76.5% | 83.6% | 72.0% | 84.2% | 86.4% | 80.0% | 66.7% | 80.9% | 84.2% | 76.5% | 83.1% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | | | | 1.8% | | 2.9% | 1.7% | 1.2% | 2.6% | 1.7% | 1.7% | |
| Q15f. Allow members in churches in your area? | Yes | 22.5% | 11.8% | 18.2% | 32.0% | 14.0% | 26.2% | 20.8% | 37.5% | 23.9% | 18.4% | 27.5% | 15.3% | |
| | No | 74.5% | 82.4% | 81.8% | 68.0% | 82.9% | 71.8% | 76.9% | 62.5% | 72.5% | 76.3% | 72.5% | 83.1% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 3.0% | 5.9% | | | 3.5% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 7.9% | 3.6% | 3.3% | | 1.7% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q16: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q8. Radius of residence? | | | | | | | | Q16. When do you surf? | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Within 10 miles | 10 to 20 miles | 20 to 30 miles | 30 to 40 miles | 40 to 50 miles | 50 to 60 miles | 60 to 70 miles | 70 to 80 miles | 80 to 90 miles | 90 to 100 miles | 100 to 110 miles | 110 to 120 miles | 120 to 130 miles |
| Q16. How often do you surf? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1+ per week | 9.3% | 5.9% | 14.5% | 8.0% | 8.8% | 3.9% | 7.7% | 12.9% | 16.7% | 7.2% | 10.5% | 17.0% | 10.2% | |
| 1+ per month | 21.3% | 11.5% | 21.8% | 12.0% | 13.8% | 24.3% | 17.9% | 18.8% | 50.0% | 23.5% | 18.4% | 21.0% | 11.9% | 100.0% |
| 1+ per year | 21.8% | 17.0% | 23.0% | 20.0% | 22.8% | 24.3% | 17.9% | 23.8% | 8.3% | 22.7% | 18.4% | 17.0% | 23.7% | |
| <1 per year | 11.0% | 17.0% | 9.1% | 16.0% | 12.3% | 12.0% | 15.4% | 6.3% | 4.7% | 10.8% | 13.2% | 3.9% | 16.9% | |
| Never | 35.5% | 47.1% | 30.9% | 44.0% | 38.0% | 34.0% | 38.5% | 36.3% | 20.8% | 34.7% | 39.5% | 35.3% | 57.3% | |
| Not sure | 1.3% | | | | 1.8% | 1.0% | 2.0% | 2.9% | | 1.2% | | 3.9% | | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/02
Date

Q17a-f: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4a. Where do you live? | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | North | South | West | East | Midwest | Southwest | Northwest | Southwest | West | East | Midwest | Southwest | Northwest | Southwest |
| Q17a. Do you have a car? | 33.3% | 17.0% | 30.0% | 20.0% | 29.8% | 33.0% | 46.2% | 32.5% | 45.8% | 35.9% | 28.9% | 25.9% | 32.2% | 32.2% | 100.0% |
| Q17b. Do you have a car? | 63.5% | 76.5% | 63.0% | 72.0% | 66.7% | 64.1% | 46.2% | 66.3% | 54.2% | 61.8% | 68.4% | 62.2% | 62.7% | 62.7% | 100.0% |
| Q17c. Do you have a car? | 3.3% | 5.9% | 5.5% | 8.0% | 3.5% | 1.0% | 7.7% | 1.3% | 9.1% | 2.4% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 100.0% |
| Q17d. Do you have a car? | 61.5% | 64.7% | 54.5% | 64.0% | 50.9% | 58.3% | 59.0% | 68.8% | 91.7% | 63.7% | 57.9% | 51.0% | 64.4% | 64.4% | 100.0% |
| Q17e. Do you have a car? | 34.8% | 35.3% | 38.2% | 32.0% | 45.6% | 37.9% | 35.9% | 28.8% | 8.3% | 32.7% | 36.8% | 45.1% | 32.2% | 32.2% | 100.0% |
| Q17f. Do you have a car? | 3.8% | 7.3% | 7.3% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 2.5% | 3.6% | 3.6% | 5.3% | 3.9% | 3.4% | 3.4% | 100.0% |
| Q17g. Do you have a car? | 56.0% | 58.8% | 63.6% | 60.0% | 36.8% | 54.4% | 51.3% | 57.5% | 87.5% | 58.2% | 57.5% | 43.1% | 57.6% | 57.6% | 100.0% |
| Q17h. Do you have a car? | 41.3% | 35.3% | 34.5% | 36.0% | 63.2% | 41.7% | 46.2% | 38.8% | 12.5% | 39.6% | 39.3% | 54.9% | 37.3% | 37.3% | 100.0% |
| Q17i. Do you have a car? | 2.8% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 2.6% | 3.8% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.6% | 2.0% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 100.0% |
| Q17j. Do you have a car? | 74.5% | 64.7% | 76.4% | 68.0% | 70.2% | 88.6% | 66.7% | 73.8% | 83.3% | 75.7% | 73.7% | 68.6% | 74.6% | 74.6% | 100.0% |
| Q17k. Do you have a car? | 24.5% | 35.3% | 23.6% | 28.0% | 29.8% | 19.4% | 30.8% | 23.8% | 16.7% | 23.9% | 23.7% | 29.4% | 23.7% | 23.7% | 100.0% |
| Q17l. Do you have a car? | 1.0% | 1.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 4.6% | 4.6% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 100.0% |
| Q17m. Do you have a car? | 63.3% | 52.9% | 69.1% | 60.0% | 52.0% | 68.0% | 53.8% | 66.5% | 70.8% | 64.5% | 57.9% | 58.8% | 64.4% | 64.4% | 100.0% |
| Q17n. Do you have a car? | 35.3% | 47.1% | 30.9% | 36.0% | 45.6% | 32.0% | 41.0% | 31.3% | 29.2% | 34.7% | 36.8% | 39.2% | 33.9% | 33.9% | 100.0% |
| Q17o. Do you have a car? | 1.5% | 1.5% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 5.1% | 2.5% | 5.8% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 100.0% |
| Q17p. Do you have a car? | 45.0% | 41.2% | 50.9% | 48.0% | 33.3% | 42.7% | 35.9% | 51.3% | 63.5% | 47.8% | 36.8% | 41.2% | 42.4% | 42.4% | 100.0% |
| Q17q. Do you have a car? | 51.3% | 58.8% | 47.5% | 44.0% | 61.4% | 55.3% | 51.3% | 46.3% | 37.9% | 51.0% | 52.6% | 51.0% | 50.8% | 50.8% | 100.0% |
| Q17r. Do you have a car? | 3.8% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 8.0% | 5.3% | 1.9% | 12.8% | 2.5% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 10.9% | 7.8% | 6.8% | 6.8% | 100.0% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

includes all respondents

10/3/03
Date

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

Q19-20: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q19. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q20. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | Williamston area | Kennett area | Doyles Lake area | Central area | Fargo area | Lawrence area | Bellevue area | Dickinson area | Other | Not sure | Not sure | Not sure | Not sure |
| Q19. Many NDans play out-of-state slot machines, play out-of-state video poker machines, or buy out-of-state lottery tickets? | | 52.9% | 67.3% | 60.0% | 56.1% | 71.8% | 48.7% | 57.5% | 62.5% | 65.3% | 57.9% | 64.7% | 45.8% | 100.0% |
| Strongly agree | 61.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly agree | 20.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | 3.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly disagree | 5.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 5.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | 4.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q20. Our state and residents would benefit if the money that NDans spend playing out-of-state slot machines | | 58.8% | 63.6% | 60.0% | 49.1% | 65.0% | 59.0% | 63.8% | 70.8% | 62.8% | 73.7% | 62.7% | 45.8% | 100.0% |
| Strongly agree | 15.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly agree | 2.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | 4.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly disagree | 11.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 4.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 99 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q21-24: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q46. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | | Wilkes area | Nelson area | Dorset area | Gravel area | High area | Low area | Blackburn area | Blackburn area | High area | Low area | High area | Low area | Not sure |
| Q21. Reaction to allowing charitable gaming after to operate slot machines, video poker, or other forms of electronic gaming? | 35.0% | 29.4% | 27.3% | 32.0% | 33.3% | 37.9% | 17.9% | 42.5% | 54.2% | 37.1% | 23.7% | 39.2% | 23.8% | 100.0% |
| Strongly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q22. Reaction to allowing charitable organizations to operate casinos that provide all of the games? | 37.3% | 35.3% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 24.6% | 37.9% | 23.1% | 43.8% | 58.3% | 37.5% | 28.9% | 43.1% | 35.6% | 100.0% |
| Strongly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q23. Reaction to the state operating casinos that provide all of the games currently? | 36.3% | 35.3% | 30.9% | 48.0% | 21.1% | 41.7% | 25.6% | 40.0% | 54.2% | 35.1% | 50.0% | 41.2% | 28.8% | |
| Strongly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q24. Reaction to private business operating casinos that provide all of the games? | 29.0% | 25.9% | 30.9% | 28.0% | 29.8% | 23.3% | 35.9% | 33.8% | 16.7% | 29.9% | 21.1% | 37.3% | 22.0% | 100.0% |
| Strongly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly favor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No reaction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slightly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly oppose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not sure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 30 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 39 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q25-26: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q25. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q26. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|----------|
| | | William area | Minor area | Devils Lake area | Grand Forks area | Range area | Laurel area | Minnetonka area | Dickinson area | City | Medium town | Small town | Part of town | Not sure |
| Q25. If have changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from expanded zoning? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Charities | 37.8% | 41.2% | 30.9% | 44.0% | 33.3% | 37.9% | 41.0% | 36.3% | 34.2% | 37.5% | 44.7% | 35.3% | 35.6% | 100.0% |
| State govt | 42.5% | 47.1% | 45.5% | 32.0% | 45.0% | 44.7% | 41.0% | 41.3% | 33.3% | 45.8% | 34.2% | 41.2% | 35.6% | |
| Private business | 4.8% | 5.9% | 5.5% | | 5.3% | 5.8% | | 6.3% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 5.3% | 7.8% | 5.1% | |
| Native Americans | 3.5% | | 1.8% | | 3.5% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 2.6% | 3.9% | 1.7% | |
| Not sure | 11.5% | 5.9% | 16.4% | 24.0% | 12.3% | 7.8% | 12.8% | 11.3% | 4.2% | 8.2% | 13.2% | 11.8% | 22.0% | |
| Q26. If have changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from the expanded zoning? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Charities | 3.0% | | | 12.0% | 3.5% | 3.9% | 2.6% | 2.5% | | 3.2% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 1.7% | |
| State govt | 12.0% | | 12.7% | 20.0% | 14.0% | 7.8% | 17.9% | 11.5% | 16.7% | 11.2% | 15.8% | 13.7% | 10.2% | 100.0% |
| Private business | 37.3% | 23.2% | 27.3% | 24.0% | 43.9% | 41.7% | 43.6% | 41.3% | 25.0% | 37.8% | 28.9% | 39.2% | 39.0% | |
| Native Americans | 30.3% | 35.3% | 45.5% | 28.0% | 17.5% | 35.9% | 20.5% | 28.8% | 20.8% | 32.7% | 31.6% | 27.5% | 22.0% | |
| Not sure | 17.9% | 41.2% | 14.3% | 16.0% | 21.1% | 10.7% | 15.4% | 16.3% | 37.5% | 15.1% | 18.4% | 17.6% | 27.1% | |
| Grand Totals | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q27-30: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q27. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q28. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|-------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
| | | W/Bltn area | Black area | Doyle Lake area | Gravel area | Range area | Summit area | Blair area | Dickinson area | Q | North town | Small town | Big city | Not sure |
| Q27. How likely to support expanded spending if it guaranteed new jobs? | 51.3% | 52.9% | 70.9% | 52.0% | 43.9% | 47.6% | 35.9% | 50.0% | 66.7% | 50.6% | 52.6% | 38.8% | 45.8% | 100.0% |
| Much more likely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Somewhat more likely | 19.5% | 17.6% | 12.7% | 16.0% | 22.8% | 23.3% | 20.5% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 22.7% | 21.1% | 9.8% | 13.6% | |
| No impact | 7.0% | 3.9% | 3.6% | 16.0% | 5.3% | 4.9% | 12.8% | 8.8% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 5.3% | 11.8% | 16.9% | |
| Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | | | | 10.5% | 4.9% | 10.3% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 5.6% | | 3.9% | 5.1% | |
| Much less likely | 16.8% | 23.5% | 12.7% | 12.0% | 15.8% | 19.4% | 20.5% | 17.5% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 18.4% | 15.7% | 16.9% | |
| Not sure | 8% | | | 4.0% | 1.8% | | | | 4.2% | 4% | 2.6% | | 1.7% | |
| Q28. How likely to support expanded spending if it guaranteed funding for services that would be cut due to shortfall? | 50.8% | 47.1% | 69.1% | 44.0% | 38.6% | 51.5% | 41.0% | 50.0% | 62.5% | 52.2% | 44.7% | 54.9% | 45.8% | |
| Much more likely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Somewhat more likely | 18.3% | 11.8% | 10.9% | 24.0% | 19.3% | 18.4% | 30.8% | 17.5% | 12.5% | 18.3% | 18.4% | 13.7% | 20.3% | 100.0% |
| No impact | 6.8% | | 5.5% | 12.0% | 5.3% | 4.9% | 7.7% | 5.0% | 8.3% | 4.4% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 11.9% | |
| Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | | 1.8% | | 12.3% | 4.9% | | | 8.3% | 5.2% | 2.6% | 2.0% | 6.8% | |
| Much less likely | 16.3% | 29.4% | 12.7% | 12.0% | 17.5% | 19.4% | 12.8% | 17.5% | 4.2% | 17.5% | 18.4% | 13.7% | 11.9% | |
| Not sure | 3.3% | | | 8.0% | 7.0% | 1.0% | 7.7% | 2.5% | 4.2% | 2.4% | 10.5% | 2.0% | 3.4% | |
| Q29. How likely to support expanded spending if it guaranteed tourism and business-related economic development? | 47.3% | 47.1% | 56.4% | 44.0% | 40.4% | 43.7% | 38.5% | 50.0% | 66.7% | 47.4% | 42.1% | 58.8% | 39.0% | 100.0% |
| Much more likely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Somewhat more likely | 21.8% | 5.9% | 14.5% | 24.0% | 24.6% | 23.3% | 33.3% | 22.5% | 12.5% | 22.3% | 23.7% | 11.8% | 27.1% | |
| No impact | 7.5% | 11.8% | 9.1% | 12.0% | 8.8% | 5.8% | 5.1% | 6.3% | 8.3% | 5.2% | 10.5% | 11.8% | 11.9% | |
| Somewhat less likely | 5.5% | | 5.5% | | 10.5% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 8.3% | 6.8% | | 3.9% | 5.1% | |
| Much less likely | 16.0% | 23.5% | 12.7% | 12.0% | 14.0% | 21.4% | 15.4% | 16.3% | 4.2% | 17.5% | 15.8% | 11.8% | 13.6% | |
| Not sure | 2.0% | 11.8% | 1.8% | 8.0% | 1.8% | 1.0% | 2.6% | | | 8% | 7.9% | 2.0% | 3.4% | |
| Q30. How likely to support expanded spending if it kept money in ND currently spent out-of-state? | 61.0% | 64.7% | 76.4% | 56.0% | 54.4% | 56.3% | 51.3% | 63.8% | 70.8% | 64.1% | 52.6% | 60.5% | 52.5% | 100.0% |
| Much more likely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Somewhat more likely | 16.3% | 5.9% | 7.3% | 20.0% | 19.3% | 18.4% | 23.6% | 13.8% | 16.7% | 14.3% | 23.7% | 11.8% | 23.7% | |
| No impact | 4.8% | 5.9% | 5.5% | 8.0% | 5.3% | 1.0% | 7.7% | 7.5% | | 2.8% | 2.6% | 11.8% | 8.5% | |
| Somewhat less likely | 4.5% | | 3.6% | 4.0% | 5.3% | 5.8% | 7.7% | 2.5% | 4.2% | 5.6% | 2.6% | 2.0% | 3.4% | |
| Much less likely | 12.3% | 23.5% | 7.3% | 8.0% | 14.0% | 17.5% | 5.1% | 12.5% | 4.2% | 12.4% | 13.2% | 13.7% | 10.5% | |
| Not sure | 1.3% | | | 4.0% | 1.8% | 1.0% | 2.6% | | 4.2% | 8% | 5.3% | | 1.7% | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

Ja Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Q31-34: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | Q4c. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| | | William area | West area | Davies Lake area | Good Falls area | Range area | Ironstone area | Blairmont area | Dickinson area | City | Medium town | Small town | Farther or Not |
| Q31. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion went to charities? | Much more likely | 52.9% | 52.7% | 56.0% | 42.1% | 41.7% | 46.2% | 51.3% | 70.8% | 47.8% | 57.9% | 52.9% | 42.4% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 11.8% | 21.8% | 16.0% | 26.3% | 30.1% | 25.6% | 22.5% | 20.8% | 25.1% | 21.1% | 15.7% | 30.9% |
| | No impact | 5.9% | 9.1% | 12.0% | 7.0% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 4.4% | 2.6% | 11.8% | 8.5% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.5% | 3.6% | | 5.3% | 2.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 3.4% |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 10.9% | 12.0% | 17.5% | 21.4% | 10.3% | 13.8% | 4.2% | 17.1% | 13.2% | 13.7% | 10.2% |
| Q32. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for public schools? | Not sure | 2.5% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 1.8% | | 7.7% | 3.8% | | 1.6% | 5.3% | 2.8% | 5.1% |
| | Much more likely | 58.3% | 72.7% | 64.0% | 45.6% | 60.2% | 46.2% | 58.3% | 66.7% | 61.4% | 57.9% | 62.7% | 42.4% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.8% | 10.9% | 16.0% | 21.1% | 17.5% | 23.1% | 16.3% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 18.4% | 11.8% | 25.4% |
| | No impact | 4.3% | 5.5% | 8.0% | 5.3% | 1.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 2.0% | 2.8% | 9.8% | 10.2% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.0% | 1.8% | | 5.3% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 2.9% | | 2.8% | | 2.0% | 6.8% |
| Q33. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for services for senior citizens? | Much less likely | 14.8% | 7.3% | 8.0% | 21.1% | 16.5% | 12.8% | 16.3% | 8.3% | 15.9% | 15.8% | 11.8% | 11.9% |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 1.8% | | 7.7% | 2.5% | | 1.2% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 3.4% |
| | Much more likely | 50.3% | 49.1% | 52.0% | 45.6% | 51.5% | 38.5% | 51.3% | 70.8% | 52.2% | 55.3% | 49.0% | 39.0% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 23.3% | 30.9% | 32.0% | 17.5% | 22.3% | 28.2% | 21.3% | 20.8% | 21.5% | 23.7% | 23.5% | 30.5% |
| | No impact | 5.8% | 7.3% | 8.0% | 8.3% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 4.4% | 2.6% | 9.8% | 10.2% |
| Q34. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for more gaming addiction treatment? | Somewhat less likely | 4.0% | 1.8% | | 7.0% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 5.2% | | 3.9% | 1.7% |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 10.9% | 4.0% | 19.3% | 17.5% | 15.4% | 17.5% | 4.2% | 15.9% | 15.8% | 13.7% | 13.6% |
| | Not sure | 1.5% | | 4.0% | 1.8% | | 7.7% | 1.3% | | .8% | 2.6% | | 5.1% |
| | Much more likely | 38.3% | 52.7% | 44.0% | 19.3% | 43.7% | 33.3% | 38.8% | 45.8% | 41.8% | 34.2% | 33.3% | 30.5% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 25.3% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 29.8% | 22.3% | 30.8% | 26.3% | 25.0% | 21.9% | 31.6% | 21.6% | 39.0% |
| Total Responses | No impact | 7.0% | 3.6% | 8.0% | 10.5% | 8.7% | 7.7% | 3.8% | | 6.4% | 5.3% | 11.8% | 6.8% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 8.3% | 7.3% | 8.0% | 12.3% | 8.7% | 7.7% | 5.0% | 16.7% | 9.6% | 7.9% | 5.9% | 5.1% |
| | Much less likely | 18.0% | 16.4% | 12.0% | 22.8% | 16.5% | 10.3% | 25.0% | 8.3% | 18.3% | 13.2% | 23.5% | 13.6% |
| | | 3.3% | 11.8% | 8.0% | 5.3% | | 10.3% | 1.3% | 4.2% | 2.0% | 7.9% | 3.9% | 5.1% |
| | | 400 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 39 |
| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

Operator's Signature La Costa Rickford

Date 10/3/03

Q35: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| Q35: Reasons why some NDs may favor increasing revenues that children receive by expanding charitable giving? | Total | Q3: Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q4: Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| | | William area | Minot area | Davids Lake area | Grand Forks area | Raygo area | Jennison area | Blanchard area | Dickinson area | City | Medina town | Beck town | Rock Lake | Not sure |
| Worley came \$ for children, hard to raise funds | 3.8% | | 5.5% | 12.0% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 4.8% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 1.7% | |
| Helps people, needs increasing | 20.8% | 17.6% | 16.4% | 16.0% | 28.1% | 26.2% | 20.5% | 13.8% | 20.8% | 21.1% | 21.1% | 23.5% | 16.9% | |
| Helps education | 4.5% | | 1.8% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 10.7% | 2.6% | 1.3% | 8.3% | 5.6% | 2.6% | | 5.1% | |
| Helps fund govt programs, reduces costs | 3.3% | | | | 3.5% | 5.8% | 2.6% | 5.0% | | 3.6% | | 2.0% | 5.1% | |
| Can accept gambling if for charity | 1.0% | | | | | 1.9% | | 1.3% | 4.2% | 1.6% | | | | |
| Keep \$ in state | .5% | | | | | 1.0% | | 1.3% | | .4% | 2.6% | | | |
| Like gambling, enjoyable entertainment | 14.3% | 11.8% | 14.5% | 8.0% | 19.3% | 14.6% | 12.8% | 10.0% | 25.0% | 15.1% | 10.5% | 13.7% | 13.6% | |
| Neighboring states have it | 8.3% | 11.8% | 5.5% | 20.0% | 8.8% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 10.0% | 16.7% | 8.8% | 5.3% | 7.8% | 8.5% | |
| Help economy, create jobs | .8% | | | | | | 2.6% | 1.3% | 4.2% | .8% | | 2.0% | | |
| \$ for state, economy, budget shortfalls | 3.8% | | 3.6% | 12.0% | 1.8% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 4.0% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 3.4% | |
| Keep taxes down, from increasing | 6.8% | 5.9% | 9.1% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 7.8% | | 11.3% | 4.2% | 6.8% | 7.9% | 5.9% | 6.8% | |
| Step toward better, more cautious | 3.5% | | 3.6% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 2.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 5.3% | | 3.4% | |
| Help more than Native Americans | .3% | | | | | | 2.6% | | | | | 2.0% | | |
| Help more than Native Americans | 2.0% | | 5.5% | | 5.3% | 1.0% | | 1.3% | | 1.6% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 1.7% | |
| Good | .8% | | | 4.0% | | 1.0% | | 1.3% | | .4% | 5.3% | | | |
| Min. offer | 2.5% | 5.9% | 1.8% | | 3.5% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 4.2% | 3.6% | | 2.0% | | |
| Not sure | 36.3% | 47.1% | 41.8% | 32.0% | 35.1% | 30.1% | 41.0% | 40.0% | 29.2% | 33.1% | 36.8% | 43.1% | 42.4% | 100.0% |
| No 2nd response | 89.0% | 100.0% | 90.9% | 88.0% | 86.0% | 86.4% | 94.9% | 91.3% | 79.2% | 87.6% | 89.5% | 92.2% | 91.5% | 100.0% |
| No 3rd response | 98.3% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 96.0% | 98.2% | 99.0% | 100.0% | 96.3% | 95.8% | 97.2% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 39 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

Operator's Signature La Costa Rickford

Date 10/2/03

Q36: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| Q34. Reasons why some NDAs may oppose increasing revenues that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming? | Total | Q3. Reasons of residence? | | | | | | | | Q46. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|-------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| | | William area | Marion area | Dorville Lake area | Central area | Range area | Lawrence area | Blount area | Dickinson area | Q | North area | Small town | Large town | Not sure |
| Moral reasons | 12.3% | 17.6% | 7.3% | | 10.5% | 13.6% | 12.8% | 15.0% | 20.5% | 12.7% | 10.5% | 9.8% | | 13.6% |
| Oppose gaming in general | 11.5% | | 20.0% | 24.0% | 10.5% | 8.7% | 15.4% | 7.5% | 8.3% | 9.2% | 15.8% | 15.7% | | 15.3% |
| Addition, gaming problems | 29.8% | 35.3% | 30.9% | 20.0% | 19.3% | 37.9% | 30.8% | 31.3% | 16.7% | 29.1% | 23.7% | 33.3% | | 33.9% |
| Other problems related to gaming in general | 1.5% | 5.9% | 5.5% | | 1.8% | 1.0% | | | | 2.0% | | 2.0% | | |
| Easy to gamble, increases gaming | 3.0% | | | 8.0% | 1.8% | 1.0% | 5.1% | 6.3% | 4.2% | 2.4% | 5.3% | 5.9% | | 1.7% |
| Many root of evil, greed, cheating, crime | 3.3% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 8.0% | 1.8% | 3.9% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 2.6% | 2.0% | | 1.7% |
| Conservative, resist change | 7.8% | 5.9% | 10.9% | | 5.3% | 5.8% | 12.8% | 12.3% | | 9.6% | | 7.8% | | 3.6% |
| Problems affect poor the most | 6.8% | | 7.3% | 4.0% | 10.9% | 7.8% | 5.1% | 6.3% | 4.2% | 8.0% | 2.6% | 7.8% | | 3.4% |
| Waste of time, money | 1.3% | 5.9% | 3.6% | | 1.8% | 1.0% | | | | 1.2% | | 2.0% | | 1.7% |
| Fear \$ won't be spent wisely, give them too much money | 5.0% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 8.8% | 4.9% | 10.3% | 3.8% | | 4.0% | 7.9% | 7.8% | | 5.1% |
| Cost will exceed benefits, no real benefits | 1.8% | | | | 5.3% | 1.9% | | 2.5% | | 2.4% | | 2.0% | | |
| \$ go to charity versus other needs, better use | 1.0% | | 1.8% | | 1.8% | 1.9% | | | | 1.2% | | | | 1.7% |
| Depends on where \$ goes | .8% | 5.9% | | 4.0% | | 1.0% | | | | .4% | | 2.0% | | 1.7% |
| Have enough gaming | 2.0% | | 3.6% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 1.3% | | .8% | | 2.0% | | 8.9% |
| Won't help economy, \$ will go out-of-state | 1.0% | | 1.8% | 4.0% | | 1.9% | | | | 1.2% | 2.6% | | | |
| Take \$ from Native Americans | 1.3% | | 1.8% | | 1.8% | 1.9% | | 1.3% | | 1.6% | 2.6% | | | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:12 AM

| | | Total | | Q3. Reason of refusal? | | | | | | | | | | Q4. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------|--------|------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | Wilmington area | Delmar area | Delaware Lake area | Grand Forks area | Range area | Lawrenceville area | Blacksburg area | Dickinson area | City | Midland town | Small town | Rural or ranch | Not sure | | |
| Q3. Reasons why some NOs may oppose increasing charitable receive by expanding charitable giving | Don't rule, guess not fair | 8% | | | | | 3.3% | | | 1.3% | | 1.2% | | | | | | |
| | Better ways to raise \$ | 1.3% | 5.9% | | | | | 1.0% | 2.0% | 2.3% | | 1.0% | | 2.0% | | | | |
| | Misc. other | 2.8% | | | 1.8% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 4.9% | | 2.5% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 5.3% | | 1.7% | | | |
| | Not sure | 23.8% | 29.4% | | 21.8% | 28.0% | 22.8% | 18.4% | 15.4% | 26.3% | 50.0% | 24.3% | 34.2% | 21.5% | 15.3% | | | |
| | No 2nd response | 84.3% | 76.5% | | 78.2% | 88.0% | 91.2% | 83.5% | 89.7% | 81.3% | 87.5% | 82.3% | 89.5% | 80.4% | 91.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | No 3rd response | 97.5% | 100.0% | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 98.2% | 96.1% | 94.9% | 96.3% | 100.0% | 97.0% | 97.4% | 94.1% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 | | | |

includes all respondents

10/2/02 11:06:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

4-2-1 Baktand 10/3/03

Ya Costa Rickford
Operator's signature

10/3/03
Date

Q37-40: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q46. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------|
| | | Urban area | Minor area | Dry Lake area | Grand area | Range area | Mountain area | Desert area | Suburban area | Q | Mountain area | Suburban area | Desert area | Not sure |
| Q37. How likely to vote for candidate who supports charitable giving and operating electronic gaming? | Much more likely | 29.4% | 27.3% | 32.0% | 15.8% | 29.1% | 28.2% | 33.8% | 30.0% | 27.9% | 28.9% | 33.3% | 30.5% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 5.9% | 25.5% | 8.0% | 21.1% | 24.3% | 7.7% | 17.5% | 20.8% | 21.1% | 18.4% | 17.6% | 11.9% | |
| | No impact | 22.0% | 20.0% | 28.0% | 24.0% | 24.3% | 20.5% | 23.8% | 8.3% | 22.7% | 26.3% | 15.7% | 22.0% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 6.0% | 3.6% | 12.0% | 10.5% | 3.9% | 7.7% | 2.5% | 12.5% | 5.2% | 2.6% | 9.8% | 8.5% | |
| | Much less likely | 19.5% | 35.3% | 8.0% | 21.1% | 16.5% | 28.2% | 21.3% | 8.3% | 19.5% | 15.8% | 19.6% | 22.0% | |
| Q38. How likely to vote for candidate who supports a multi-state lottery? | Not sure | 4.3% | 11.8% | 12.0% | 7.0% | 1.9% | 7.7% | 1.3% | | 3.6% | 7.9% | 3.9% | 5.1% | |
| | Much more likely | 41.3% | 49.1% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 38.8% | 35.9% | 43.8% | 54.2% | 42.6% | 39.9% | 45.1% | 33.9% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.5% | 9.1% | 8.0% | 21.1% | 26.2% | 10.3% | 16.3% | 16.7% | 20.3% | 7.9% | 9.8% | 16.9% | 100.0% |
| | No impact | 17.5% | 20.0% | 24.0% | 19.3% | 15.5% | 20.5% | 16.3% | 12.5% | 15.1% | 26.3% | 17.6% | 22.0% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 7.3% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 2.5% | 12.5% | 3.6% | 2.6% | 7.8% | 8.5% | |
| Q39. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming and to offer more casino games? | Much more likely | 23.5% | 12.7% | 4.0% | 19.3% | 12.6% | 23.1% | 20.0% | 4.2% | 16.3% | 10.5% | 15.7% | 15.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 3.9% | 1.8% | 20.0% | 3.5% | 1.9% | 5.1% | 1.3% | | 2.0% | 13.2% | 3.9% | 3.4% | |
| | No impact | 26.0% | 27.3% | 32.0% | 10.5% | 26.2% | 20.5% | 30.0% | 50.0% | 27.5% | 26.3% | 27.5% | 18.6% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 17.3% | 16.4% | 8.0% | 22.8% | 18.4% | 15.4% | 17.5% | 12.5% | 18.3% | 10.5% | 19.6% | 13.6% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 20.5% | 21.8% | 20.0% | 19.3% | 22.3% | 25.0% | 18.8% | 16.7% | 19.9% | 28.9% | 15.7% | 22.0% | |
| Q40. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming and to offer all casino games? | Much more likely | 10.3% | 5.9% | 8.0% | 15.8% | 12.6% | 12.8% | 7.5% | 12.5% | 10.0% | 5.9% | 9.8% | 15.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 22.3% | 25.5% | 20.0% | 26.3% | 18.4% | 23.1% | 25.0% | 4.2% | 21.5% | 21.1% | 21.6% | 27.1% | |
| | No impact | 3.8% | 3.6% | 12.0% | 5.3% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 1.3% | 4.2% | 2.8% | 7.5% | 5.9% | 3.4% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 26.8% | 23.6% | 36.0% | 15.8% | 24.3% | 17.9% | 33.8% | 50.0% | 26.3% | 23.7% | 33.3% | 23.7% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 16.5% | 18.2% | 4.0% | 19.3% | 17.5% | 25.0% | 15.0% | 8.3% | 17.1% | 18.4% | 15.7% | 13.6% | |
| Total Responses | | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

Salvatore Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q41-44: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q44. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| | | Winnipeg area | Manitoba area | Devils Lake area | Grand Forks area | Range area | Interlaken area | Blanchet area | Decision area | City | Neighborhood | Public housing | Private housing | No answer |
| Q41. How did you vote on the previous measure to allow a lottery in ND? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Always voted in favor of | 40.5% | 35.3% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 35.1% | 35.0% | 33.3% | 51.3% | 58.3% | 42.2% | 31.6% | 47.1% | 32.2% | 100.0% |
| Usually voted in favor of | 7.3% | 5.9% | 7.3% | 12.0% | 3.5% | 12.6% | 7.7% | | 12.5% | 6.8% | 13.2% | 3.9% | 8.5% | |
| Equally both ways | .8% | | | | | | 7.7% | | | .8% | 2.6% | | | |
| Usually voted against | 5.5% | 5.9% | | | 8.8% | 10.7% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 4.4% | 5.3% | 3.9% | 11.9% | |
| Always voted against | 20.5% | 35.3% | 18.2% | 32.0% | 22.8% | 17.5% | 28.2% | 17.5% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 28.9% | 25.5% | 27.1% | |
| Never voted | 16.8% | 5.9% | 25.5% | 8.0% | 17.5% | 19.4% | 10.3% | 17.5% | 8.3% | 20.7% | 10.5% | 11.5% | 8.5% | |
| Not sure | 8.8% | 11.8% | 9.1% | 8.0% | 12.3% | 4.9% | 7.7% | 10.0% | 12.5% | 8.4% | 7.9% | 7.8% | 11.9% | |
| Definitely vote for | 55.3% | 47.1% | 63.6% | 44.0% | 50.9% | 55.3% | 51.3% | 57.5% | 62.5% | 56.2% | 50.0% | 62.7% | 49.2% | |
| Possibly vote for | 14.5% | 5.9% | 12.7% | 16.0% | 17.5% | 19.4% | 10.3% | 10.0% | 16.7% | 15.9% | 23.7% | | 15.3% | |
| Possibly vote against | 3.5% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 7.0% | 2.9% | 5.1% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.4% | | 5.9% | 6.8% | 100.0% |
| Definitely vote against | 21.8% | 29.4% | 16.4% | 28.0% | 22.8% | 17.5% | 28.2% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 21.1% | 18.4% | 25.5% | 23.7% | |
| No opinion | 2.0% | 5.9% | 1.8% | | | 3.9% | 2.6% | 1.3% | | 1.6% | 2.6% | 3.9% | 1.7% | |
| Not sure | 3.0% | 5.9% | 3.6% | 8.0% | 1.8% | 1.0% | 2.6% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 2.8% | 5.3% | 2.0% | 3.4% | |
| Definitely vote for | 37.0% | 29.4% | 36.4% | 44.0% | 19.3% | 38.6% | 28.2% | 42.5% | 66.7% | 38.6% | 23.7% | 40.0% | 28.8% | |
| Possibly vote for | 15.0% | 5.9% | 14.5% | | 21.1% | 19.4% | 15.4% | 15.0% | 4.2% | 17.5% | 21.1% | 2.0% | 11.9% | |
| Possibly vote against | 7.8% | 5.9% | 5.5% | 4.0% | 8.8% | 9.7% | 12.8% | 6.3% | 4.2% | 7.6% | 7.9% | 5.9% | 10.2% | |
| Definitely vote against | 28.3% | 35.3% | 34.5% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 22.3% | 30.8% | 26.3% | 12.5% | 25.1% | 34.2% | 29.4% | 35.6% | 100.0% |
| No opinion | 5.3% | 11.8% | 3.6% | 4.0% | 8.8% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 5.3% | 9.8% | 6.8% | |
| Not sure | 6.8% | 11.8% | 5.3% | 8.0% | 8.8% | 4.9% | 7.7% | 6.3% | 8.3% | 7.2% | 7.9% | 3.9% | 6.8% | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q41-44: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q46. Where do you live? | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|
| | | Williamston area | Minot area | Davids Lake area | Grand Forks area | Range area | Lamont area | Blount area | Dickinson area | City | North Dakota | South Dakota | Nebraska | Not here |
| Q44. If asked to vote on measures that offered charitable grants, how would you vote? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definitely vote for | 36.3% | 35.3% | 36.4% | 36.0% | 26.3% | 36.9% | 28.2% | 41.3% | 54.2% | 36.3% | 18.4% | 49.0% | 37.3% | |
| Possibly vote for | 14.0% | | 12.7% | | 21.1% | 18.4% | 7.7% | 16.3% | 8.3% | 16.3% | 23.7% | 2.0% | 8.5% | |
| Possibly vote against | 6.3% | 5.9% | 5.5% | | 1.8% | 9.7% | 12.8% | 3.8% | 8.3% | 6.8% | 7.9% | 2.0% | 6.8% | |
| Definitely vote against | 37.9% | 41.2% | 38.2% | 48.0% | 36.8% | 22.3% | 41.0% | 33.8% | 12.5% | 29.5% | 31.6% | 39.2% | 39.8% | 100.0% |
| No opinion | 3.8% | 5.9% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 5.3% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 1.3% | 4.2% | 3.6% | 5.3% | 3.9% | 3.4% | |
| Not sure | 7.3% | 11.8% | 5.3% | 12.0% | 8.8% | 7.8% | 5.1% | 3.8% | 12.5% | 7.6% | 13.2% | 3.9% | 5.1% | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/6/02 11:06:12 AM

La Costa Rickford
Operator's signature

10/3/03
Date

Demographics: By Region & Area of Residence Size

| | Total | Q3. Region of residence? | | | | | | | | Q46. Where do you live? | | | | |
|--|-------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | William area | Black area | Dorville Lake area | Central area | Range area | Timberline area | Timberline area | Black area | Black area | Black area | Black area | Black area | Black area |
| Q1. Gender? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 49.0% | 47.1% | 49.1% | 48.0% | 49.1% | 49.5% | 46.2% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 44.7% | 49.0% | 44.1% | 100.0% |
| Female | 51.0% | 52.9% | 50.9% | 52.0% | 50.9% | 50.5% | 53.8% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 55.3% | 51.0% | 55.9% | |
| Q45. Age? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21-24 | 2.3% | 5.9% | 1.8% | | 1.8% | 3.9% | | 2.5% | | | 3.6% | | | |
| 25-34 | 10.5% | 5.9% | 12.7% | 4.0% | 8.8% | 12.6% | 5.1% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 12.7% | 9.8% | 5.1% | |
| 35-44 | 18.5% | 17.6% | 18.2% | 8.0% | 10.5% | 23.3% | 12.8% | 26.3% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 13.2% | 19.6% | 18.6% | |
| 45-54 | 22.5% | 23.5% | 30.9% | 24.0% | 22.8% | 24.3% | 7.7% | 18.8% | 29.2% | 20.7% | 26.3% | 31.4% | 20.3% | |
| 55-64 | 19.8% | 5.9% | 21.8% | 44.0% | 17.5% | 18.4% | 23.1% | 18.8% | 8.3% | 17.9% | 28.9% | 19.6% | 20.3% | 100.0% |
| 65+ | 26.0% | 41.2% | 14.5% | 20.0% | 36.8% | 16.5% | 51.3% | 21.3% | 37.5% | 25.1% | 26.3% | 19.6% | 35.6% | |
| Choose not to answer | 5% | | | | 1.8% | 1.0% | | | | 8% | | | | |
| Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <\$20K | 7.5% | 17.6% | 1.8% | 8.0% | 10.5% | 5.8% | 5.1% | 7.5% | 16.7% | 8.0% | 7.9% | 5.9% | 6.8% | |
| \$20K-\$34K | 20.3% | 5.9% | 25.5% | 28.0% | 10.5% | 18.4% | 35.9% | 17.5% | 25.0% | 21.9% | 15.8% | 23.5% | 13.6% | |
| \$35K-\$49K | 18.3% | 17.6% | 18.2% | 16.0% | 21.1% | 17.5% | 15.4% | 20.0% | 20.8% | 17.1% | 13.2% | 27.5% | 20.3% | |
| \$50K-\$74K | 13.3% | 5.9% | 10.9% | 8.0% | 15.8% | 17.5% | 5.1% | 15.0% | 12.5% | 14.7% | 10.5% | 15.7% | 6.8% | |
| \$75K+ | 14.0% | | 10.9% | 4.0% | 17.5% | 19.4% | 7.7% | 20.0% | | 15.9% | 13.2% | 5.9% | 15.3% | |
| Choose not to answer | 26.5% | 52.9% | 32.7% | 36.0% | 24.6% | 21.4% | 30.8% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 22.7% | 39.5% | 21.6% | 37.3% | 100.0% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 17 | 55 | 25 | 57 | 103 | 39 | 80 | 24 | 251 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:06:12 AM

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Q4-5: By Gender, Age & Income

| | Q1. Gender? | | Q4. Age? | | | | | | | Q4. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | Choose not to answer | Census not in universe |
|--|------------------|--------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | <\$20K | \$20K- \$30K | \$30K- \$40K | \$40K- \$50K | \$50K- \$75K+ | | |
| Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 79.5% | 78.9% | 33.3% | 61.9% | 79.7% | 81.1% | 84.8% | 85.6% | 50.0% | 76.7% | 75.3% | 74.3% | 79.2% | 85.7% | 84.0% | |
| | 14.8% | 14.2% | 55.6% | 19.0% | 13.9% | 13.3% | 13.9% | 12.9% | | 23.3% | 16.0% | 17.6% | 15.1% | 12.5% | 10.4% | |
| | 3.8% | 3.9% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 6.8% | 4.4% | | 1.0% | | | 7.6% | 4.1% | 5.7% | | 2.8% | |
| Q5. How recently have you registered to vote or changed your name or place of residence? | Not sure | 2.9% | | 9.5% | | 1.1% | 1.3% | 1.0% | 50.0% | | 1.2% | 4.1% | | 1.8% | 2.8% | |
| | Past week | 16.0% | 22.2% | 11.9% | 13.5% | 16.7% | 25.3% | 11.5% | | 13.3% | 14.8% | 18.9% | 18.9% | 19.0% | 12.3% | |
| | Past month | 17.8% | 22.2% | 19.0% | 20.3% | 18.9% | 11.4% | 19.2% | | 13.3% | 14.8% | 24.3% | 15.1% | 23.2% | 15.1% | |
| | Past year | 23.8% | 33.3% | 31.0% | 23.0% | 26.7% | 23.3% | 16.3% | 50.0% | 13.3% | 19.8% | 27.0% | 20.8% | 30.4% | 25.3% | |
| | More than a year | 22.3% | 11.1% | 26.2% | 20.3% | 22.2% | 21.5% | 24.0% | | 16.7% | 27.2% | 18.9% | 26.4% | 17.9% | 25.3% | |
| | Never | 20.0% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 21.6% | 15.6% | 16.5% | 22.8% | 50.0% | 43.3% | 23.5% | 10.8% | 17.0% | 14.3% | 21.7% | |
| Not sure | | .5% | | | 1.4% | | | | | | | | | 1.9% | | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 196 | 204 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:19 AM

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q6-10: By Gender, Age & Income

| Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q43. Age? | | | | | | Choose not to answer | | | | | | |
| | | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$10K | \$10K- \$14K | \$15K- \$19K | \$20K- \$24K | \$25K+ | | |
| Q6. How recently played charitable games in ND? | Total | 12.5% | 7.4% | 17.9% | 12.3% | 16.2% | 10.5% | 10.5% | 16.7% | 10.8% | 25.5% | 12.9% | 12.9% | 16.7% | 6.3% | 13.8% |
| | Past week | 15.4% | 16.6% | 14.1% | 25.0% | 21.6% | 14.0% | 14.9% | 12.1% | 16.2% | 35.3% | 12.9% | 12.9% | 12.1% | 22.9% | 10.8% |
| | Past month | 21.0% | 22.7% | 19.2% | 37.5% | 21.6% | 22.8% | 30.3% | 19.7% | 9.5% | 5.9% | 14.9% | 30.3% | 30.3% | 25.0% | 20.5% |
| | Past year | 26.0% | 27.0% | 25.0% | 27.0% | 31.6% | 23.7% | 23.7% | 27.3% | 23.0% | 17.6% | 29.0% | 21.2% | 27.9% | 16.7% | 33.7% |
| | More than a year | 25.1% | 26.4% | 23.7% | 13.5% | 21.1% | 21.1% | 21.1% | 24.2% | 40.5% | 100.0% | 30.6% | 19.7% | 25.6% | 29.2% | 24.1% |
| Q7. How recently been to racetrack casino in ND? | Never | 8.5% | 8.0% | 9.0% | | 5.4% | 5.3% | 5.3% | 21.2% | 5.4% | 5.9% | 12.9% | 10.6% | 4.7% | 6.3% | 7.2% |
| | Past week | 14.7% | 13.5% | 16.0% | 12.5% | 5.4% | 8.8% | 17.1% | 15.2% | 21.6% | 17.6% | 14.5% | 16.7% | 18.6% | 14.6% | 10.8% |
| | Past month | 29.2% | 28.2% | 30.1% | 37.5% | 32.4% | 31.6% | 26.3% | 28.8% | 28.4% | 29.4% | 32.3% | 33.3% | 25.6% | 29.2% | 25.3% |
| | Past year | 21.6% | 27.0% | 16.0% | | 35.1% | 19.3% | 28.9% | 15.2% | 17.6% | 17.6% | 25.3% | 18.2% | 27.9% | 20.8% | 19.3% |
| | More than a year | 25.7% | 22.7% | 28.8% | 50.0% | 21.6% | 35.1% | 21.1% | 19.7% | 27.0% | 29.4% | 14.5% | 21.2% | 23.3% | 29.2% | 36.1% |
| Not sure | | 3% | 6% | | | | | 1.3% | | | | | | | | 1.2% |
| Q8. How recently been to casinos in another state? | Past week | 1.9% | 6% | 3.2% | | 2.7% | 1.8% | 1.3% | 3.0% | 1.4% | | 3.2% | 1.5% | 2.3% | 2.1% | 1.2% |
| | Past month | 7.2% | 6.7% | 7.7% | | | 5.3% | 5.3% | 13.6% | 9.5% | | 11.3% | 4.5% | 7.0% | 6.3% | 8.4% |
| | Past year | 19.4% | 18.4% | 20.5% | 50.0% | 24.3% | 24.6% | 18.4% | 16.7% | 13.9% | 11.8% | 11.3% | 21.2% | 18.6% | 29.2% | 20.5% |
| | More than a year | 33.5% | 36.8% | 30.1% | 25.0% | 32.4% | 31.6% | 34.2% | 34.8% | 35.1% | 11.8% | 32.3% | 36.4% | 46.9% | 29.2% | 32.5% |
| | Never | 37.9% | 37.4% | 38.5% | 25.0% | 40.3% | 36.8% | 40.8% | 31.8% | 40.9% | 76.5% | 41.9% | 36.4% | 25.6% | 33.3% | 37.3% |
| Q9. How recently played slot machines in SD or video poker in MT? | Past week | 5% | 1.8% | | | 2.7% | 1.8% | | 1.9% | | | 1.9% | 1.9% | | 2.1% | |
| | Past month | 3.4% | 3.1% | 3.8% | | | 3.9% | 6.6% | 4.9% | 1.4% | 5.9% | | 3.0% | 4.7% | 2.1% | 6.0% |
| | Past year | 9.7% | 10.4% | 9.0% | 12.5% | 2.7% | 10.5% | 10.5% | 10.6% | 10.8% | | 9.7% | 16.7% | 16.3% | 4.2% | 6.0% |
| | More than a year | 15.7% | 17.2% | 14.1% | | 18.9% | 14.0% | 14.5% | 15.2% | 18.9% | 11.8% | 17.7% | 19.7% | 16.3% | 12.5% | 13.3% |
| | Never | 70.2% | 67.5% | 73.1% | 87.5% | 75.7% | 70.2% | 68.4% | 68.2% | 68.9% | 82.4% | 71.0% | 59.1% | 62.8% | 79.2% | 74.7% |
| Q10. How recently have you bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state? | Past week | 14.4% | 12.9% | 16.0% | | 10.8% | 12.3% | 19.7% | 22.7% | 6.8% | 5.9% | 11.3% | 13.6% | 18.6% | 27.2% | 9.6% |
| | Past month | 11.0% | 13.5% | 8.3% | 25.0% | 5.4% | 10.5% | 13.2% | 7.6% | 13.9% | | 11.3% | 12.1% | 9.3% | 10.9% | 13.3% |
| | Past year | 20.4% | 22.1% | 18.6% | | 27.0% | 28.1% | 19.7% | 21.2% | 12.2% | 17.6% | 11.3% | 24.2% | 30.2% | 16.7% | 21.7% |
| | More than a year | 16.9% | 19.0% | 14.7% | 12.5% | 10.8% | 28.1% | 17.1% | 12.1% | 16.2% | 23.5% | 19.4% | 15.2% | 16.3% | 18.8% | 14.5% |
| | Never | 37.0% | 31.9% | 42.3% | 62.5% | 45.9% | 21.1% | 30.3% | 36.4% | 50.0% | 52.9% | 46.8% | 33.3% | 25.6% | 27.1% | 41.0% |
| Not sure | | 3% | 6% | | | | | | | 1.4% | | | 1.9% | | | |
| Total Responses | | 319 | 163 | 156 | 8 | 37 | 57 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 1 | 17 | 62 | 43 | 48 | 83 |

Includes all respondents who have ever gambled

10/8/02 11:08:18 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/13/03
Date

Q11a-b: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Chosen not to answer |
|--|-----------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K-\$24K | \$25K-\$29K | \$30K-\$34K | \$35K-\$39K | \$40K-\$44K | \$75K+ |
| Q11a. How rate ND charitable games in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 10.0% | 8.3% | 11.8% | | 12.5% | 4.4% | 13.3% | 8.0% | 13.6% | 28.0% | 7.5% | 9.4% | 11.8% | 4.8% | |
| | Good | 43.5% | 43.3% | 43.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 53.3% | 33.3% | 44.0% | 40.9% | 35.7% | 49.1% | 31.3% | 50.0% | 39.7% | |
| | Fair | 31.0% | 31.7% | 30.3% | 50.0% | 21.9% | 37.8% | 40.0% | 22.0% | 25.0% | 21.4% | 30.2% | 46.9% | 32.4% | 33.3% | |
| | Poor | 5.4% | 7.5% | 3.4% | | 3.1% | 4.4% | 3.3% | 10.0% | 6.8% | 7.1% | 5.7% | 6.3% | 2.9% | 7.9% | |
| | Very poor | 1.7% | .8% | 2.5% | | | | | | 2.3% | | 4.7% | | | 2.9% | 1.6% |
| Q11b. How rate ND charitable games in giving you reasonable chance to win? | Not sure | 8.4% | 8.3% | 8.4% | | 12.5% | | 6.7% | 14.0% | 11.4% | 7.1% | 7.5% | 6.3% | | 12.7% | |
| | Excellent | 5.9% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 6.7% | 3.3% | 6.0% | 4.5% | 21.4% | 3.8% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 4.8% | |
| | Good | 28.9% | 30.8% | 26.9% | 25.0% | 40.6% | 42.2% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 22.7% | 14.3% | 25.0% | 32.1% | 29.4% | 28.6% | |
| | Fair | 31.4% | 35.8% | 26.9% | 37.5% | 31.3% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 24.0% | 27.3% | 35.7% | 23.5% | 32.1% | 34.4% | 50.0% | 23.8% |
| | Poor | 16.3% | 10.8% | 21.8% | 25.0% | 6.3% | 4.4% | 21.7% | 20.0% | 22.7% | 14.3% | 23.3% | 17.0% | 12.5% | 8.8% | 17.5% |
| Total Responses | Very poor | 8.8% | 8.3% | 9.2% | | 3.1% | 4.4% | 10.0% | 16.0% | 9.1% | | 11.3% | 6.3% | 5.9% | 14.3% | |
| | Not sure | 8.8% | 8.3% | 9.2% | | 9.4% | 2.2% | 6.7% | 14.0% | 13.6% | 14.3% | 3.8% | 9.4% | 2.9% | 11.1% | |
| | | 239 | 120 | 119 | 8 | 32 | 45 | 60 | 50 | 44 | 14 | 43 | 33 | 32 | 34 | 63 |

Includes all respondents who ever played charitable games

Q12a-b: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Chosen not to answer | |
|---|-----------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|----------------------|--|
| | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K- \$34K | \$35K- \$49K | \$50K- \$74K | \$75K+ \$99K+ | | | |
| Q12a. How rate ND reservation casino in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 13.6% | 10.4% | 17.1% | 25.0% | 6.9% | 21.6% | 13.2% | 14.8% | 25.0% | 17.0% | 9.6% | 9.1% | 14.7% | 13.9% | | |
| | Good | 37.7% | 40.8% | 34.2% | 50.0% | 31.0% | 35.1% | 40.7% | 33.8% | 40.7% | 41.5% | 38.5% | 36.4% | 41.2% | 36.5% | | |
| | Fair | 30.1% | 26.4% | 34.2% | 25.0% | 48.3% | 27.0% | 37.2% | 26.4% | 24.1% | 41.7% | 20.8% | 36.5% | 26.5% | 28.8% | | |
| | Poor | 9.3% | 12.8% | 5.4% | | 13.8% | 8.1% | 10.2% | 7.5% | 9.3% | | 9.4% | 7.7% | 14.7% | 7.7% | | |
| | Very poor | 2.5% | 2.4% | 2.7% | | | 2.7% | 3.4% | 5.7% | | | 1.9% | 3.8% | | 5.8% | | |
| Q12b. How rate ND reservation casino in giving you reasonable chance to win? | Not sure | 6.8% | 7.2% | 6.3% | | | 5.4% | 11.3% | 11.1% | 16.7% | 9.4% | 3.8% | 6.1% | 2.9% | 7.7% | | |
| | Excellent | 4.7% | 2.4% | 7.2% | 25.0% | 6.9% | 8.1% | 3.8% | | | 7.5% | 7.7% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 1.9% | | |
| | Good | 21.6% | 23.2% | 19.8% | 50.0% | 17.2% | 27.0% | 20.8% | 18.5% | 8.3% | 28.3% | 15.4% | 18.2% | 23.5% | 25.0% | | |
| | Fair | 39.4% | 40.0% | 38.7% | 25.0% | 51.7% | 37.8% | 42.4% | 34.0% | 37.0% | 41.7% | 34.0% | 36.5% | 44.1% | 32.7% | | |
| | Poor | 19.5% | 16.0% | 23.4% | | 24.1% | 16.2% | 11.9% | 24.5% | 24.1% | 16.7% | 15.1% | 25.0% | 12.1% | 14.7% | 26.9% | |
| Total Responses | Very poor | 8.9% | 11.2% | 6.3% | | | 5.4% | 15.3% | 7.5% | 8.3% | 7.5% | 11.5% | 3.0% | 8.8% | 11.9% | | |
| | Not sure | 5.9% | 7.2% | 4.5% | | | 5.4% | 3.4% | 9.4% | 25.0% | 7.5% | 3.8% | 6.1% | 5.9% | 1.9% | | |
| | | 236 | 125 | 111 | 4 | 29 | 37 | 59 | 53 | 54 | 12 | 53 | 52 | 33 | 34 | 52 | |

Includes all respondents who have ever been to a ND reservation casino

10/8/02 11:08:16 AM

Q13a-b: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Choose not to answer |
|--|-----------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------------|
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K- \$30K | \$30K- \$40K | \$40K- \$50K | \$50K- \$75K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer |
| Q13a. How rate out-of-state Powerball or lottery games in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 9.0% | 8.2% | 10.0% | 33.3% | 5.0% | 11.1% | 13.2% | 4.8% | 5.6% | 12.5% | 6.1% | 11.6% | 6.3% | 14.3% | 6.1% | |
| | Good | 33.0% | 31.8% | 34.4% | | 51.0% | 28.9% | 28.3% | 35.7% | 30.6% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 34.9% | 37.5% | 31.4% | 30.6% | |
| | Fair | 33.0% | 33.6% | 32.2% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 42.2% | 35.8% | 23.8% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 33.3% | 27.9% | 34.4% | 37.1% | 36.7% | |
| | Poor | 12.5% | 15.5% | 8.9% | 33.3% | 10.0% | 17.8% | 9.4% | 14.3% | 8.3% | | 9.1% | 14.0% | 15.6% | 11.4% | 14.3% | |
| | Very poor | 3.5% | 2.7% | 4.4% | | | | 3.8% | 4.8% | 8.3% | 12.5% | 3.0% | 4.7% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 2.0% | |
| Not sure | | 9.0% | 8.2% | 10.3% | | 5.0% | | 9.4% | 16.7% | 13.9% | 37.5% | 15.2% | 7.0% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 10.2% | |
| Q13b. How rate out-of-state Powerball or lottery games in giving you reasonable chances to win? | Excellent | 3.5% | 3.6% | 3.3% | | 5.0% | 8.9% | | 2.4% | 2.8% | 12.5% | 6.1% | 2.3% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 4.1% | |
| | Good | 19.0% | 16.4% | 22.2% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 15.6% | 32.1% | 9.5% | 11.1% | | 15.2% | 27.9% | 18.8% | 25.7% | 12.2% | |
| | Fair | 31.5% | 36.4% | 25.6% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 44.4% | 22.6% | 26.2% | 38.9% | 25.0% | 45.5% | 18.6% | 43.8% | 22.9% | 32.7% | |
| | Poor | 24.0% | 20.0% | 28.9% | 33.3% | 35.0% | 22.2% | 26.4% | 31.0% | 5.6% | 12.5% | 9.1% | 25.6% | 28.1% | 28.6% | 28.6% | |
| | Very poor | 15.5% | 17.3% | 13.3% | | 10.0% | 8.9% | 11.5% | 16.7% | 33.3% | | 12.5% | 23.3% | 9.4% | 17.1% | 14.3% | |
| Not sure | | 6.5% | 6.4% | 6.7% | | | | 7.5% | 14.3% | 8.3% | 37.5% | 12.1% | 2.3% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 8.2% | |
| Total Responses | | 200 | 110 | 90 | 3 | 20 | 45 | 53 | 42 | 35 | 8 | 33 | 43 | 32 | 35 | 49 | |

Includes all respondents who have ever played out-of-state lottery games

Q14: By Gender, Age & Income

| Q14. What direction should the legislature take with laws that control the charitable games allowed? | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|----------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|
| | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | <\$20K | \$20K-\$30K | \$30K-\$40K | \$40K-\$50K | \$50K+ | Choose not to answer |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All casino games | 34.8% | 37.2% | 32.4% | 33.3% | 42.9% | 33.8% | 35.6% | 36.7% | 30.8% | | 30.0% | 34.6% | 39.2% | 43.4% | 32.1% | 30.2% |
| Most casino games | 11.8% | 14.3% | 9.3% | 22.2% | 21.4% | 14.9% | 8.9% | 12.7% | 5.7% | | 13.3% | 6.2% | 21.6% | 9.4% | 14.3% | 8.9% |
| Only current charitable games | 36.5% | 32.7% | 40.2% | 33.3% | 23.8% | 41.9% | 42.2% | 38.0% | 31.7% | 50.0% | 30.0% | 43.2% | 31.1% | 37.7% | 37.5% | 35.8% |
| Opposed to gambling | 5.8% | 6.1% | 5.4% | | | 4.1% | 5.6% | 5.3% | 9.6% | | 10.0% | 6.2% | 4.1% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 9.4% |
| Allow lottery tickets | .8% | 1.0% | .5% | | | | 2.2% | | 1.0% | | | 1.2% | | 1.9% | | .9% |
| Should be state operated | .5% | .5% | .5% | | | | | 1.3% | 1.0% | | | | | | 1.8% | .9% |
| Misc. other | .8% | .5% | 1.0% | | | 1.4% | | 1.3% | 1.0% | | | | | 1.9% | | 1.9% |
| Not sure | 9.3% | 7.7% | 10.8% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 4.1% | 5.6% | 3.8% | 18.3% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 8.0% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 12.9% | 12.3% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q15a-f: By Gender, Age & Income

| | Q1. Gender? | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|---|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | <\$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer | |
| Q15a. Allow machines in charitable gaming area? | Yes | 61.5% | 62.2% | 60.8% | 88.9% | 83.3% | 64.9% | 62.2% | 62.0% | 48.1% | | 56.7% | 63.4% | 60.8% | 66.0% | 71.4% | 52.8% | Choose not to answer |
| | No | 33.8% | 34.7% | 32.8% | 11.1% | 14.3% | 33.8% | 35.0% | 34.2% | 40.4% | | 40.0% | 25.9% | 36.5% | 32.1% | 25.0% | 41.5% | |
| | Not sure | 4.8% | 3.1% | 6.4% | | 2.4% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 11.5% | | 3.3% | 8.0% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 3.0% | 5.7% | |
| Q15b. Allow machines in bars or clubs that have liquor? | Yes | 59.8% | 63.8% | 53.9% | 66.7% | 64.3% | 66.2% | 55.6% | 63.8% | 52.9% | | 50.0% | 63.0% | 66.2% | 62.3% | 53.6% | 57.5% | |
| | No | 37.0% | 32.7% | 41.2% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.8% | 38.9% | 31.6% | 42.3% | | 43.3% | 34.6% | 29.7% | 35.8% | 42.9% | 39.6% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 1.5% | 4.9% | | 2.4% | | 5.0% | 2.9% | 4.8% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 4.1% | 1.9% | 3.0% | 2.8% | |
| Q15c. Allow machines in restaurants that serve liquor? | Yes | 38.8% | 40.8% | 36.8% | 44.4% | 42.9% | 39.2% | 38.9% | 43.0% | 33.7% | | 33.3% | 43.2% | 37.8% | 39.6% | 39.3% | 36.8% | |
| | No | 59.3% | 58.7% | 59.8% | 55.6% | 57.1% | 60.8% | 60.0% | 54.4% | 61.5% | | 63.3% | 54.3% | 62.2% | 60.4% | 58.9% | 59.4% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | .5% | 3.4% | | | | 1.1% | 2.9% | 4.8% | | 3.3% | 2.5% | | | 1.8% | 3.8% | |
| Q15d. Allow machines in convenience stores? | Yes | 24.5% | 24.0% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 23.8% | 24.3% | 23.3% | 24.1% | 25.0% | | 30.0% | 27.2% | 25.7% | 24.5% | 17.9% | 23.6% | |
| | No | 73.8% | 74.5% | 73.0% | 66.7% | 76.2% | 74.5% | 76.7% | 74.7% | 70.2% | | 66.7% | 72.8% | 73.0% | 75.5% | 80.4% | 71.6% | |
| | Not sure | 1.8% | 1.5% | 2.0% | | | 1.4% | | 1.3% | 4.8% | | 3.3% | | 1.4% | | 1.8% | 3.8% | |
| Q15e. Allow machines in grocery stores? | Yes | 17.8% | 16.3% | 19.1% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 18.9% | 20.0% | 17.7% | 17.3% | | 26.7% | 16.0% | 20.3% | 13.2% | 16.1% | 17.9% | |
| | No | 81.0% | 82.1% | 79.9% | 88.9% | 88.1% | 79.7% | 80.0% | 82.3% | 81.8% | | 70.0% | 82.7% | 78.4% | 86.8% | 82.1% | 81.1% | |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | 1.5% | 1.0% | | | 1.4% | | | 3.8% | | 3.3% | 1.2% | 1.4% | | 1.8% | .9% | |
| Q15f. Allow machines in any private business? | Yes | 22.5% | 21.9% | 23.0% | 44.4% | 21.4% | 23.0% | 22.2% | 22.8% | 21.2% | | 30.0% | 22.2% | 29.7% | 13.2% | 28.6% | 17.0% | |
| | No | 74.5% | 76.0% | 73.0% | 55.6% | 76.2% | 73.0% | 74.4% | 75.9% | 75.0% | | 66.7% | 76.5% | 64.9% | 86.8% | 64.3% | 81.1% | |
| | Not sure | 3.0% | 2.0% | 3.9% | | 2.4% | 4.1% | 3.3% | 1.3% | 3.8% | | 3.3% | 1.2% | 5.4% | | 7.1% | 1.9% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

Q16: By Gender, Age & Income

| | Q16. FND allowed slot machines and video poker machines similar to those in SD & MT, how often would you play them? | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-----|----------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|
| | | Total | Male | | Female | | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | <\$20K | \$20K- \$34K | \$35K- \$49K | \$50K- \$74K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1+ per week | | 9.3% | 10.2% | 8.3% | 22.2% | 2.4% | 9.9% | 8.9% | 13.9% | 7.7% | | | 6.7% | 8.6% | 16.2% | 11.3% | 1.8% | 8.5% | |
| 1+ per month | | 21.3% | 26.0% | 16.7% | 11.1% | 26.2% | 28.4% | 24.4% | 20.3% | 13.5% | | | 10.0% | 18.5% | 31.1% | 22.6% | 25.0% | 17.0% | |
| 1+ per year | | 21.8% | 21.9% | 21.6% | 22.2% | 38.1% | 16.2% | 24.4% | 16.5% | 20.2% | | | 26.7% | 23.3% | 20.3% | 18.9% | 25.0% | 19.8% | |
| <1 per year | | 11.0% | 10.2% | 11.8% | 22.2% | 14.3% | 6.8% | 12.2% | 12.7% | 9.6% | | | 3.3% | 9.9% | 6.8% | 11.3% | 17.9% | 13.2% | |
| Never | | 35.5% | 29.6% | 41.2% | 22.2% | 19.0% | 37.8% | 28.9% | 34.2% | 48.1% | | | 53.3% | 39.5% | 25.7% | 35.8% | 30.4% | 36.8% | |
| Not sure | | 1.3% | 2.0% | .5% | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 2.5% | 1.0% | | | | | | | | 4.7% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

10/20/02 11:09:19 AM

Q17a-f: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|--|
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | < \$20K | \$20K- \$34K | \$35K- \$49K | \$50K- \$74K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer | |
| Q17a. Buy lottery tickets in charitable gaming areas? | Yes | 33.3% | 38.3% | 28.4% | 33.3% | 40.5% | 31.1% | 28.9% | 32.9% | 36.5% | | 43.3% | 38.3% | 29.7% | 39.6% | 28.6% | 28.3% | |
| | No | 63.5% | 60.2% | 66.7% | 66.7% | 57.1% | 68.9% | 67.8% | 63.3% | 57.7% | 100.0% | 43.3% | 59.3% | 66.2% | 60.4% | 71.4% | 67.9% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 1.5% | 4.9% | | 2.4% | | 3.3% | 3.8% | 5.8% | | 13.3% | 2.5% | 4.1% | | | 3.8% | |
| Q17b. Buy lottery tickets in all bars or clubs that have liquor? | Yes | 61.5% | 62.8% | 60.3% | 77.8% | 69.0% | 62.2% | 67.8% | 59.5% | 53.8% | | 63.3% | 64.2% | 63.5% | 60.4% | 64.3% | 56.6% | |
| | No | 34.8% | 35.2% | 34.3% | 22.2% | 28.6% | 36.5% | 30.0% | 36.7% | 38.5% | 100.0% | 30.0% | 33.3% | 33.8% | 39.6% | 30.4% | 37.7% | |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 2.0% | 5.4% | | 2.4% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 7.7% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 2.7% | | 5.4% | 5.7% | |
| Q17c. Buy lottery tickets in restaurants that have a liquor license? | Yes | 56.0% | 62.2% | 50.0% | 77.8% | 61.9% | 59.5% | 63.3% | 55.7% | 44.2% | | 60.0% | 53.1% | 59.5% | 54.7% | 62.5% | 51.9% | |
| | No | 41.3% | 35.7% | 46.6% | 22.2% | 38.1% | 39.2% | 35.6% | 40.5% | 50.0% | 100.0% | 33.3% | 45.7% | 39.2% | 43.4% | 33.9% | 44.3% | |
| | Not sure | 2.8% | 2.0% | 3.4% | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 3.8% | 5.8% | | 6.7% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | 3.6% | 3.8% | |
| Q17d. Buy lottery tickets in convenience stores? | Yes | 74.5% | 81.1% | 68.1% | 88.9% | 85.7% | 75.7% | 77.8% | 74.7% | 65.4% | 50.0% | 76.7% | 67.9% | 79.7% | 75.9% | 80.4% | 71.7% | |
| | No | 24.5% | 18.4% | 30.4% | 11.1% | 14.3% | 24.3% | 21.1% | 25.3% | 31.7% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 32.1% | 18.9% | 24.5% | 19.6% | 26.4% | |
| | Not sure | 1.0% | .5% | 1.5% | | | | 1.1% | | 2.9% | | 3.3% | | 1.4% | | | 1.9% | |
| Q17e. Buy lottery tickets in grocery stores? | Yes | 63.3% | 68.9% | 57.8% | 44.4% | 73.8% | 64.9% | 71.1% | 64.6% | 51.9% | 50.0% | 53.3% | 55.6% | 74.3% | 60.4% | 76.8% | 58.5% | |
| | No | 35.3% | 29.6% | 40.7% | 55.6% | 26.2% | 33.8% | 27.8% | 34.2% | 45.2% | 50.0% | 43.3% | 44.4% | 24.3% | 37.7% | 23.2% | 38.7% | |
| | Not sure | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 1.3% | 2.9% | | 3.3% | | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 2.8% | |
| Q17f. Buy lottery tickets in any private business? | Yes | 45.0% | 51.5% | 38.7% | 55.6% | 52.4% | 47.3% | 52.2% | 40.5% | 37.5% | | 46.7% | 43.2% | 48.6% | 43.4% | 57.1% | 37.7% | |
| | No | 51.3% | 45.4% | 56.9% | 44.4% | 45.2% | 51.4% | 45.6% | 53.2% | 56.7% | 100.0% | 46.7% | 55.6% | 48.6% | 54.7% | 42.9% | 53.8% | |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 3.1% | 4.4% | | 2.4% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 6.3% | 5.8% | | 6.7% | 1.2% | 2.7% | 1.9% | | 8.5% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

Q18: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Total | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Choose not to answer | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Choose not to answer |
|---|--------------|-------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|----------------------------|
| | | | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | <\$20K | \$20K- \$34K | \$35K- \$49K | \$50K- \$74K | \$75K+ | | |
| Q18. IFND participated in multi-state lottery like Powerball, how often would you buy lottery tickets? | 1+ per week | 29.8% | 30.1% | 29.4% | 22.2% | 31.0% | 35.1% | 33.3% | 35.4% | 19.2% | | 23.3% | 25.9% | 40.5% | 32.1% | 30.4% | 25.9% | |
| | 1+ per month | 26.8% | 30.1% | 23.5% | 33.3% | 35.7% | 21.6% | 31.1% | 31.6% | 19.2% | | 16.7% | 27.2% | 31.1% | 22.6% | 32.1% | 25.9% | |
| | 1+ per year | 12.8% | 12.8% | 12.7% | 22.2% | 11.9% | 14.9% | 10.0% | 8.9% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 13.6% | 6.8% | 15.1% | 16.1% | 11.3% | |
| | < 1 per year | 5.0% | 5.6% | 4.4% | | 4.8% | 8.1% | 5.6% | 1.3% | 5.8% | | 3.3% | 4.9% | 2.7% | 7.5% | 3.6% | 6.6% | |
| | Never | 25.0% | 19.9% | 29.9% | 22.2% | 16.7% | 18.9% | 18.9% | 22.8% | 39.4% | 50.0% | 36.7% | 27.2% | 18.9% | 22.6% | 17.9% | 29.2% | |
| | Not sure | .8% | 1.5% | | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | | 1.0% | | | 1.2% | | | | 1.9% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Deborah Rickard

Date

10/3/02

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q19-20: By Gender, Age & Income

| | Q1: Gender? | | Q45: Age? | | | | | | Q47: Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | Choose not to answer | Choose not to answer |
|---|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K- \$24K | \$24K- \$28K | \$28K- \$32K | \$32K+ | | |
| Q19: May I play out-of-state slot machines, play out-of-state video poker machines, or buy out-of-state lottery tickets? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly agree | 61.8% | 62.7% | 44.4% | 64.3% | 56.8% | 48.9% | 68.6% | 53.8% | 53.3% | 59.3% | 71.6% | 68.4% | 62.5% | 59.4% | |
| Slightly agree | 20.0% | 21.4% | 44.4% | 33.3% | 24.3% | 17.8% | 12.7% | 17.3% | 23.3% | 21.8% | 14.9% | 26.4% | 19.8% | 18.9% | |
| No reaction | 3.3% | 3.6% | | | 4.1% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 4.8% | | 2.5% | | 3.8% | 3.8% | 6.8% | |
| Slightly disagree | 5.8% | 6.6% | | | 6.8% | 2.2% | 7.6% | 9.6% | 13.3% | 7.4% | 1.4% | 5.7% | 5.4% | 5.7% | |
| Strongly disagree | 5.0% | 4.1% | | 2.4% | 4.1% | 6.7% | 1.3% | 7.7% | 3.3% | 6.2% | 10.8% | | 3.6% | 3.8% | |
| Not sure | 4.3% | 3.6% | 11.1% | | 4.1% | 2.2% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 3.7% | 1.4% | 3.8% | 5.4% | 5.7% | |
| Q20: One state and residents would benefit if the money that the money that NDans spend playing out-of-state slot machines, video poker machines, or lottery tickets was used for other purposes? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly agree | 61.3% | 58.3% | 44.4% | 59.9% | 62.3% | 66.7% | 68.4% | 53.8% | 63.3% | 59.3% | 73.0% | 56.8% | 62.5% | 56.8% | |
| Slightly agree | 16.5% | 17.3% | 44.4% | 28.6% | 16.3% | 17.8% | 8.9% | 16.4% | 10.8% | 14.8% | 10.8% | 28.3% | 21.4% | 15.1% | |
| No reaction | 2.0% | 1.9% | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 2.9% | 3.8% | 3.3% | 4.9% | | | 1.8% | 1.9% | |
| Slightly disagree | 4.3% | 4.1% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 5.8% | 3.3% | 6.2% | 2.7% | 5.7% | | 5.7% | |
| Strongly disagree | 11.3% | 10.2% | | 2.4% | 17.6% | 8.9% | 11.4% | 12.5% | 10.0% | 11.1% | 12.2% | 7.5% | 12.5% | 12.3% | |
| Not sure | 4.3% | 2.0% | | | 1.4% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 9.6% | 10.0% | 3.7% | 1.4% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 8.3% | |
| Total Responses | 400 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

Q21-24: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|
| | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | <\$20K | \$20K-\$30K | \$30K-\$40K | \$40K-\$50K | \$50K+ | Choose not to answer |
| Q21. Reaction to allowing charities to operate slot machines, video poker, or other forms of electronic gaming? | Strongly favor | 35.0% | 38.8% | 31.4% | 55.6% | 42.9% | 37.8% | 36.7% | 35.4% | 26.0% | 36.7% | 32.1% | 45.9% | 35.8% | 39.3% | 26.4% |
| | Slightly favor | 21.5% | 24.0% | 19.1% | 44.4% | 26.2% | 23.0% | 26.7% | 19.0% | 14.4% | 13.3% | 18.5% | 21.0% | 26.4% | 26.8% | 20.8% |
| | No reaction | 6.8% | 5.1% | 8.3% | | 7.1% | 4.1% | 6.7% | 10.1% | 6.7% | 10.0% | 6.2% | 1.4% | 7.5% | 3.6% | 11.3% |
| | Slightly oppose | 8.0% | 8.7% | 7.4% | | 9.5% | 8.1% | 4.4% | 6.3% | 12.9% | 6.7% | 11.1% | 6.8% | 15.1% | 1.8% | 6.0% |
| | Strongly oppose | 25.3% | 22.4% | 27.9% | | 9.5% | 24.3% | 23.3% | 26.0% | 34.0% | 30.0% | 27.2% | 24.3% | 15.1% | 26.8% | 21.4% |
| | Not sure | 3.9% | 1.0% | 5.9% | | 4.8% | 2.7% | 2.2% | 2.9% | 5.8% | | 3.3% | 4.9% | | 1.8% | 7.5% |
| Q22. Reaction to allowing charities to operate casinos that provide all of the games currently offered? | Strongly favor | 37.3% | 39.3% | 35.3% | 55.6% | 42.9% | 41.9% | 38.9% | 35.4% | 30.8% | 33.3% | 37.0% | 45.9% | 43.4% | 35.7% | 30.2% |
| | Slightly favor | 17.8% | 16.3% | 19.1% | 22.2% | 21.4% | 20.3% | 16.7% | 17.7% | 15.4% | 10.0% | 17.3% | 17.0% | 17.0% | 26.8% | 16.0% |
| | No reaction | 6.0% | 5.1% | 6.9% | 22.2% | 4.8% | 8.1% | 5.6% | 5.1% | 4.8% | 16.7% | 1.2% | 4.1% | 5.7% | 3.6% | 9.4% |
| | Slightly oppose | 8.5% | 10.2% | 6.9% | | 16.7% | 6.8% | 11.1% | 5.1% | 7.7% | 10.0% | 12.3% | 5.4% | 13.2% | 5.4% | 6.0% |
| | Strongly oppose | 26.8% | 26.5% | 27.0% | | 9.5% | 21.6% | 26.7% | 32.9% | 34.6% | 26.7% | 27.2% | 24.3% | 17.0% | 28.6% | 32.1% |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 2.6% | 4.9% | | 4.8% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 3.8% | 6.7% | 3.3% | 4.9% | 2.7% | 3.8% | | 5.7% |
| Q23. Reaction to the state operating casinos that provide all of the games currently offered? | Strongly favor | 36.3% | 37.8% | 34.8% | 22.2% | 31.0% | 36.5% | 37.8% | 45.6% | 31.7% | 36.7% | 28.4% | 51.4% | 37.7% | 33.9% | 32.1% |
| | Slightly favor | 15.8% | 17.3% | 14.2% | 44.4% | 23.8% | 13.5% | 17.8% | 10.1% | 14.4% | 16.7% | 19.8% | 10.8% | 11.3% | 28.6% | 11.3% |
| | No reaction | 5.8% | 3.6% | 7.8% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 6.8% | 5.6% | 1.3% | 5.8% | 6.7% | 3.7% | 4.1% | 7.5% | 3.6% | 8.5% |
| | Slightly oppose | 9.8% | 11.7% | 7.8% | 11.1% | 16.7% | 10.8% | 8.9% | 8.9% | 7.7% | 10.0% | 12.3% | 4.1% | 15.1% | 7.1% | 10.4% |
| | Strongly oppose | 29.0% | 28.1% | 29.9% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 31.1% | 30.0% | 30.4% | 33.7% | 26.7% | 30.9% | 25.7% | 28.3% | 26.8% | 32.1% |
| | Not sure | 3.5% | 1.5% | 5.4% | | 7.1% | 1.4% | | 3.8% | 6.7% | 3.3% | 4.9% | 4.1% | | | 5.7% |
| Q24. Reaction to private businesses operating casinos that provide all of the games currently offered? | Strongly favor | 17.3% | 19.9% | 14.7% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 20.3% | 15.6% | 20.3% | 17.3% | 26.7% | 18.5% | 21.6% | 15.1% | 16.1% | 12.3% |
| | Slightly favor | 8.3% | 8.7% | 7.8% | 11.1% | 7.1% | 9.5% | 11.1% | 11.4% | 2.9% | | 7.4% | 6.8% | 7.5% | 10.7% | 11.3% |
| | No reaction | 6.0% | 4.6% | 7.4% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 6.8% | 7.8% | 5.1% | 4.8% | 10.0% | 3.7% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 5.4% | 11.3% |
| | Slightly oppose | 17.5% | 20.4% | 14.7% | 22.2% | 35.7% | 21.6% | 14.4% | 12.7% | 13.5% | 13.3% | 19.8% | 16.2% | 28.3% | 21.4% | 10.4% |
| | Strongly oppose | 46.8% | 44.4% | 49.0% | 44.4% | 38.1% | 40.5% | 48.9% | 48.1% | 51.9% | 43.3% | 46.9% | 50.0% | 47.2% | 42.9% | 47.2% |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 2.0% | 6.4% | | 4.8% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 2.5% | 9.6% | 6.7% | 3.7% | 2.7% | | 3.6% | 7.5% |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 106 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:19 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q25-26: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|
| | | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | <\$20K | \$20K- \$25K | \$25K- \$30K | \$30K- \$35K | \$35K- \$40K | \$40K+ | Chosen not to answer |
| Q25. If item changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from expanded printing? | Charities | 37.8% | 41.7% | 22.2% | 47.6% | 44.6% | 35.6% | 34.2% | 35.6% | | 50.6% | 35.8% | 37.8% | 34.8% | 32.1% | 40.6% | |
| | State gov't | 42.5% | 36.8% | 55.6% | 33.3% | 33.8% | 44.4% | 49.4% | 44.2% | | 30.6% | 40.7% | 40.3% | 41.3% | 55.6% | 42.3% | |
| | Private business | 4.8% | 2.9% | | 4.8% | 8.1% | 6.7% | 1.3% | 3.8% | | | 2.9% | 9.3% | 7.3% | 1.8% | 4.7% | |
| | Native Americans | 3.9% | 3.9% | 11.1% | | 1.4% | 5.6% | 1.3% | 4.8% | | | 6.2% | 1.4% | 7.3% | 3.6% | 1.9% | |
| | Not sure | 11.5% | 14.7% | 11.1% | 14.3% | 12.2% | 7.8% | 13.9% | 11.3% | | 20.0% | 14.8% | 10.8% | 9.4% | 7.1% | 10.4% | |
| Q26. If item changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from the expanded printing? | Charities | 3.0% | 2.9% | | | 1.4% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 3.3% | 3.7% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 1.8% | 1.9% | |
| | State gov't | 12.0% | 8.8% | 22.2% | 7.1% | 13.9% | 11.1% | 12.7% | 12.9% | | 13.3% | 16.0% | 12.2% | 11.3% | | 15.1% | |
| | Private business | 37.3% | 38.2% | 55.6% | 33.3% | 39.2% | 40.0% | 41.8% | 30.8% | | 16.7% | 37.0% | 44.6% | 39.6% | 48.2% | 31.1% | |
| | Native Americans | 30.3% | 28.9% | 11.1% | 42.9% | 31.1% | 36.7% | 25.3% | 25.0% | | 26.7% | 2.9% | 29.7% | 37.7% | 39.3% | 28.3% | |
| | Not sure | 17.5% | 21.6% | 11.1% | 16.7% | 14.9% | 8.9% | 15.2% | 27.9% | | 40.0% | 19.8% | 9.3% | 7.3% | 10.7% | 23.6% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:19 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q27-30: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | Chosen not to answer | Total Responses |
|--|----------------------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q27. How likely to support to support expanded gaming if it created new jobs? | Much more likely | 51.3% | 52.0% | 50.5% | 66.7% | 61.9% | 47.3% | 62.2% | 50.6% | 39.4% | 46.7% | 53.1% | 63.9% | 47.2% | 50.0% | 45.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 19.5% | 24.0% | 15.2% | 33.3% | 28.0% | 21.6% | 16.7% | 19.0% | 16.3% | 20.0% | 17.3% | 16.2% | 22.6% | 25.8% | 18.9% | |
| | No impact | 7.0% | 4.6% | 9.3% | | 2.4% | 9.5% | 4.4% | 7.6% | 9.6% | 13.3% | 8.6% | 1.4% | 9.4% | 5.4% | 7.5% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 5.1% | 4.4% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 7.7% | 6.7% | 2.9% | 4.1% | 7.9% | 5.4% | 4.7% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.8% | 14.3% | 19.1% | | 4.8% | 18.9% | 13.3% | 16.5% | 25.0% | 13.3% | 18.5% | 14.9% | 13.2% | 14.3% | 20.8% | |
| | Not sure | .8% | | 1.5% | | | | | 1.3% | 1.9% | | | | | | 2.8% | |
| Q28. How likely to support to support expanded gaming if it provided funding for services that would be cut due to shortfalls? | Much more likely | 50.8% | 49.0% | 52.5% | 77.8% | 54.8% | 51.4% | 57.8% | 48.1% | 42.3% | 43.3% | 54.3% | 64.9% | 43.4% | 53.6% | 42.5% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 18.3% | 21.4% | 15.2% | 11.1% | 33.3% | 13.5% | 14.4% | 22.8% | 16.3% | 13.3% | 14.8% | 12.2% | 22.6% | 21.4% | 22.6% | |
| | No impact | 6.8% | 6.1% | 7.4% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 8.1% | 5.6% | 5.1% | 9.6% | 16.7% | 8.6% | 4.1% | 7.5% | 3.6% | 5.7% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 5.6% | 3.9% | | 2.4% | 8.1% | 5.6% | 3.8% | 2.9% | 3.3% | 3.7% | 2.7% | 9.4% | 3.6% | 5.7% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.3% | 16.3% | 16.2% | | 4.8% | 17.6% | 14.4% | 16.5% | 23.1% | 20.0% | 18.5% | 12.2% | 13.2% | 16.1% | 17.9% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 1.5% | 4.9% | | 2.4% | 1.4% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 5.8% | 3.3% | | 4.1% | 3.8% | 1.8% | 5.7% | |
| Q29. How likely to support to support expanded gaming if it stimulated tourism and economic development? | Much more likely | 47.3% | 48.5% | 46.1% | 33.3% | 45.2% | 43.2% | 57.8% | 50.6% | 40.4% | 40.0% | 51.9% | 60.8% | 39.6% | 48.2% | 39.6% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 21.8% | 23.5% | 20.1% | 55.6% | 33.3% | 20.3% | 18.9% | 20.3% | 19.2% | 20.0% | 12.3% | 17.6% | 28.3% | 28.6% | 25.5% | |
| | No impact | 7.5% | 5.6% | 9.3% | | 4.8% | 12.2% | 5.6% | 6.3% | 8.7% | 16.7% | 4.9% | 2.7% | 11.3% | 7.1% | 8.5% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 5.5% | 6.0% | 4.4% | | 11.9% | 4.1% | 3.3% | 3.8% | 6.7% | 3.3% | 9.9% | 4.1% | 9.4% | 1.8% | 3.8% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.0% | 15.3% | 16.7% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 20.3% | 14.4% | 16.5% | 20.2% | 13.3% | 19.8% | 14.9% | 11.3% | 14.3% | 17.9% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | .5% | 3.4% | | 2.4% | | | 2.5% | 4.8% | 6.7% | 1.2% | | | | 4.7% | |
| Q30. How likely to support to support expanded gaming if it kept money in ND currently spent out-of-state? | Much more likely | 61.0% | 62.8% | 59.3% | 55.6% | 54.8% | 64.9% | 67.8% | 63.3% | 53.8% | 46.7% | 64.2% | 73.0% | 54.7% | 67.9% | 53.8% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 16.3% | 16.8% | 15.7% | 33.3% | 35.7% | 13.5% | 13.3% | 13.9% | 13.5% | 26.7% | 9.9% | 9.5% | 22.6% | 19.6% | 17.9% | |
| | No impact | 4.8% | 2.0% | 7.4% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 1.4% | 4.4% | 5.1% | 7.7% | 10.0% | 7.4% | 1.4% | 3.8% | 1.8% | 5.7% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.5% | 6.1% | 2.9% | | 7.1% | 4.1% | 1.1% | 3.8% | 6.7% | 3.3% | 7.4% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 1.8% | 4.7% | |
| | Much less likely | 12.3% | 11.7% | 12.7% | | | 16.2% | 11.1% | 12.7% | 16.3% | 13.3% | 11.1% | 10.8% | 13.2% | 8.9% | 15.1% | |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | .5% | 2.0% | | | | 2.2% | 1.3% | 1.9% | | | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 2.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:08:19 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Ja Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q31-34: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | | Q3. Age? | | | | | Q4. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | Chosen not to answer | |
|---|----------------------|-------------|---------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---|-------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| | Total | Males | Females | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | | Chosen not to answer | | | |
| Q31. How likely to support expanded spending if portion went to children? | Much more likely | 48.8% | 49.5% | 48.0% | 44.4% | 57.1% | 51.1% | 48.1% | 42.3% | 40.0% | 53.1% | 60.8% | 43.4% | 42.9% | 45.3% | | | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 24.3% | 26.0% | 22.5% | 33.3% | 20.3% | 23.3% | 25.3% | 21.2% | 30.0% | 19.8% | 23.0% | 30.2% | 32.1% | 19.8% | | | |
| | No impact | 5.8% | 4.6% | 6.9% | 7.1% | 4.1% | 6.7% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 13.3% | 7.4% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 7.1% | 3.8% | | | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.3% | 4.6% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 4.1% | 3.3% | 1.3% | 4.8% | | 6.2% | | 5.7% | 3.6% | 3.8% | | | |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 13.3% | 17.2% | | 16.2% | 14.4% | 19.0% | 19.2% | 13.3% | 11.1% | 12.2% | 17.0% | 12.5% | 21.7% | | | |
| Q32. How likely to support expanded spending if portion used for public schools? | Not sure | 2.9% | 2.0% | 2.9% | | 2.7% | 1.1% | 1.3% | 5.8% | 3.3% | 2.5% | | 1.8% | 5.7% | | | | |
| | Much more likely | 58.3% | 58.7% | 57.8% | 71.4% | 59.5% | 61.1% | 54.4% | 50.0% | 46.7% | 60.5% | 71.6% | 54.7% | 58.9% | 51.9% | | | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.8% | 20.4% | 15.2% | 21.4% | 14.9% | 20.0% | 20.3% | 15.4% | 26.7% | 16.0% | 10.8% | 24.9% | 21.4% | 16.0% | | | |
| | No impact | 4.3% | 2.0% | 6.4% | | 4.8% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 5.8% | 10.0% | 6.2% | 1.4% | 3.8% | 3.6% | 3.8% | | | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.0% | 3.1% | 2.9% | | 4.1% | 1.1% | 3.8% | 3.8% | | 3.7% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 4.7% | | | |
| Q33. How likely to support expanded spending if portion used for services for senior citizens? | Much less likely | 14.8% | 13.8% | 15.7% | | 17.6% | 12.2% | 15.2% | 21.2% | 16.7% | 13.6% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 18.7% | 18.9% | | | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | | 1.4% | 2.2% | 1.3% | 3.8% | | | | 1.9% | 3.6% | 4.7% | | | |
| | Much more likely | 50.3% | 49.5% | 51.0% | 44.4% | 47.3% | 55.6% | 51.9% | 44.2% | 46.7% | 48.1% | 66.2% | 35.8% | 55.4% | 46.2% | | | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 23.3% | 26.5% | 20.1% | 22.2% | 23.0% | 23.3% | 20.3% | 22.1% | 30.0% | 21.0% | 18.9% | 37.7% | 17.9% | 21.7% | | | |
| | No impact | 5.8% | 3.6% | 7.8% | | 5.4% | 5.6% | 3.8% | 5.8% | 13.3% | 8.6% | 1.4% | 7.3% | 3.6% | 4.7% | | | |
| Q34. How likely to support expanded spending if portion used for more gunning activities treatment? | Somewhat less likely | 4.0% | 5.1% | 2.9% | | 4.1% | 2.2% | 5.1% | 4.8% | | 3.7% | 1.4% | 5.7% | 3.6% | 6.6% | | | |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 14.3% | 16.2% | | 18.9% | 12.2% | 17.7% | 20.2% | 10.0% | 18.5% | 12.2% | 13.2% | 17.9% | 16.0% | | | |
| | Not sure | 1.9% | 1.0% | 2.0% | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 1.3% | 2.9% | | | | | 1.8% | 4.7% | | | |
| | Much more likely | 38.3% | 38.8% | 37.7% | 22.2% | 36.5% | 43.3% | 36.7% | 36.5% | 30.0% | 39.5% | 45.9% | 30.2% | 51.8% | 31.1% | | | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 25.3% | 27.0% | 23.5% | 55.6% | 21.2% | 31.1% | 29.1% | 17.3% | 16.7% | 23.5% | 29.7% | 28.3% | 26.8% | 23.6% | | | |
| Total Responses | No impact | 7.0% | 5.1% | 8.8% | | 4.1% | 2.2% | 7.6% | 10.6% | 16.7% | 8.6% | 4.1% | 9.4% | 1.8% | 6.6% | | | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 8.3% | 8.2% | 8.3% | 11.1% | 10.8% | 3.3% | 10.1% | 7.7% | 13.3% | 8.6% | 6.8% | 15.1% | 5.4% | 5.7% | | | |
| | Much less likely | 18.0% | 13.4% | 17.6% | 11.1% | 27.0% | 17.8% | 15.2% | 20.2% | 20.0% | 17.3% | 12.2% | 17.0% | 14.3% | 24.9% | | | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 2.6% | 3.9% | | 2.4% | 2.2% | 1.3% | 7.7% | 3.3% | 2.9% | 1.4% | | | 8.9% | | | |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q35: By Gender, Age & Income

| Q35: Reasons why some NDs may favor increasing revenues that charities receive by expanding charitable giving? | Q1: Gender? | | Q35: Age | | | | | | | | Q37: Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2012? | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Chosen not to answer | <\$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | Chosen not to answer |
| Worries cause \$ for charities, hard to raise funds | 3.8% | 4.6% | 2.9% | | 9.3% | | 3.3% | 3.8% | 4.8% | | 10.0% | 4.9% | 4.1% | 1.9% | 1.9% |
| Helps people, needs increasing | 20.8% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 44.0% | 28.0% | 23.0% | 26.7% | 12.7% | 15.4% | | 20.0% | 23.3% | 25.7% | 28.3% | 14.3% |
| Helps education | 4.3% | 7.1% | 2.0% | 22.2% | 2.4% | 5.4% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 10.0% | 6.2% | 5.4% | 1.9% | 2.3% |
| Helps fund gov't programs, reduces cost | 3.3% | 4.1% | 2.5% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 2.9% | | 6.7% | 1.2% | 2.7% | 3.8% | 1.9% |
| Can accept gambling if for charity | 1.0% | | 2.0% | | | 1.4% | 2.2% | 1.3% | | | | 1.2% | | | 5.4% |
| Keep \$ in state | 5% | 5% | 5% | | 2.4% | 1.4% | | | | | | | | | 1.8% |
| Like gambling, enjoyable entertainment | 14.3% | 14.8% | 13.7% | 11.1% | 14.3% | 13.5% | 12.2% | 20.3% | 12.5% | | 6.7% | 22.2% | 21.6% | 11.3% | 8.9% |
| Neighboring states have it | 8.3% | 7.7% | 8.8% | | 9.5% | 6.8% | 3.3% | 12.7% | 10.6% | | 3.3% | 13.6% | 9.5% | 7.5% | 1.8% |
| Help economy, create jobs | .8% | 1.0% | .5% | | | 1.4% | | | 1.9% | | | 1.2% | | | .9% |
| \$ for state, economy, budget shortfalls | 3.8% | 3.1% | 4.4% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 6.7% | 5.1% | 1.9% | | | 6.2% | 2.7% | 3.8% | 1.9% |
| Keep taxes down, from increasing | 6.8% | 7.1% | 6.4% | | | 8.1% | 13.3% | 7.6% | 2.9% | | | 9.9% | 8.1% | 3.8% | 4.7% |
| Step toward lottery, more casinos | 3.3% | 4.1% | 2.9% | | 4.8% | 5.4% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 2.9% | | | 2.5% | 4.1% | 11.3% | 1.9% |
| Help more than Native Americans | .3% | | .5% | | | 1.4% | | | | | | | 1.4% | | |
| Good | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 1.3% | 1.0% | | | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | 1.9% |
| Misc. other | .8% | 1.5% | 1.5% | | | | 2.2% | 1.3% | | | | | 2.7% | | 1.8% |
| Not sure | 2.9% | 2.6% | 2.9% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 4.4% | 1.3% | 1.9% | | | 2.5% | | 1.9% | 2.8% |
| No 2nd response | 36.3% | 30.6% | 41.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 36.5% | 26.7% | 36.7% | 44.2% | 100.0% | 53.3% | 72.2% | 25.7% | 34.0% | 30.0% |
| No 3rd response | 89.0% | 86.7% | 91.2% | 88.9% | 88.1% | 87.8% | 87.8% | 83.5% | 91.2% | 100.0% | 90.0% | 85.2% | 86.5% | 88.7% | 91.3% |
| Total Responses | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 106 |

Includes all respondents

Ja Costa Rickford
Operator's signature

10/3/03
Date

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q36: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Total | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Choose not to answer | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Choose not to answer |
|--|---|-------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------------------|
| | | | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | < \$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | | |
| Q36. Reasons why some NDens may oppose increasing revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming? | Moral reasons | 12.3% | 14.8% | 9.8% | | 7.1% | 6.8% | 12.2% | 7.6% | 22.1% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 11.1% | 12.2% | 9.4% | 7.1% | 16.0% | |
| | Oppose gambling in general | 11.5% | 14.8% | 8.3% | | 11.9% | 12.2% | 10.0% | 13.9% | 11.5% | | 6.7% | 12.3% | 13.5% | 11.3% | 14.3% | 9.4% | |
| | Addiction, gambling problems | 29.8% | 25.0% | 34.3% | 33.3% | 28.6% | 27.0% | 27.8% | 32.9% | 31.7% | | 16.7% | 27.2% | 35.1% | 32.1% | 28.6% | 31.1% | |
| | Other problems related to gambling in general | 1.5% | 1.0% | 2.0% | | 2.4% | | 2.2% | 1.3% | 1.9% | | 3.3% | | 2.7% | | 1.8% | 1.9% | |
| | Easy to gamble, increase gambling | 3.0% | 1.0% | 4.9% | | | 4.1% | 2.2% | 5.1% | 2.9% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 3.8% | |
| | Money root of evil, greed, cheating, crime | 3.3% | 3.6% | 2.9% | | | 5.4% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 1.9% | | 3.3% | 2.5% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 1.8% | 3.8% | |
| | Conservative, resist change | 7.8% | 9.2% | 6.4% | | 4.8% | 5.4% | 12.2% | 11.4% | 4.8% | | 3.3% | 6.2% | 9.5% | 3.8% | 14.3% | 7.5% | |
| | Problems affect poor the most | 6.8% | 8.7% | 4.9% | | 2.4% | 8.1% | 8.9% | 5.1% | 7.7% | | 6.7% | 11.1% | 5.4% | 7.5% | 5.4% | 4.7% | |
| | Waste of time, money | 1.3% | 1.5% | 1.0% | | 4.8% | 1.4% | | 1.3% | 1.0% | | | | | 3.8% | | 2.8% | |
| | Fear \$ won't be spent wisely, give them too much money | 5.0% | 3.6% | 6.4% | 22.2% | 4.8% | 10.8% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 2.9% | | | 3.7% | 4.1% | 7.5% | 8.9% | 4.7% | |
| | Cost will exceed benefits, no real benefits | 1.8% | 1.5% | 2.0% | | | | 2.2% | | 3.8% | 50.0% | 3.3% | 1.2% | 2.7% | | | 2.8% | |
| | \$ go to charity versus other needs, better uses | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 22.2% | | 1.4% | | 1.3% | | | | 3.7% | | | 1.8% | | |
| | Depends on where \$ goes | .8% | 1.5% | | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | | 1.0% | | 3.3% | 1.2% | | | | .9% | |
| | Have enough gambling | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 2.2% | 2.5% | 1.0% | | 3.3% | 1.2% | 4.1% | | 1.8% | 1.9% | |
| | Won't help economy, \$ will go out-of-state | 1.0% | 2.0% | | | 2.4% | | | 1.3% | 1.9% | | | 3.7% | | | 1.8% | | |
| | Takes \$ from Native Americans | 1.3% | 1.0% | 1.5% | | | 1.4% | 2.2% | 2.5% | | | | | 2.7% | | 3.6% | .9% | |
| | Don't win, games not fair | .8% | .5% | 1.0% | | | 1.4% | | 1.3% | 1.0% | | 3.3% | | | 1.9% | 1.8% | | |
| Better ways to raise \$ | 1.3% | 1.5% | 1.0% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 1.4% | | | 1.9% | | 3.3% | 1.2% | | | 1.8% | 1.9% | | |
| Misc. other | 2.8% | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 2.4% | 4.1% | 3.3% | 3.8% | 1.0% | | | 4.9% | | 5.7% | 3.6% | 1.9% | | |

Includes all respondents

10/9/02 11:09:19 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Deborah Rickard

10/9/02
Date

Q36: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|-------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | <\$20K | \$20K- \$24K | \$25K- \$29K | \$30K- \$34K | \$35K- \$39K | \$40K- \$44K | \$45K- \$49K | \$50K- \$54K | Choose not to answer | Choose not to answer |
| Q36. Reasons why some NDAs stay opposed | Not sure | 23.8% | 19.9% | 27.5% | 11.1% | 33.3% | 21.6% | 22.2% | 20.3% | 26.9% | 43.3% | 24.7% | 17.6% | 30.2% | 8.9% | 26.4% | 26.4% | 26.4% | 26.4% | 26.4% |
| | No 2nd response | 84.3% | 84.2% | 84.3% | 100.0% | 90.5% | 86.5% | 86.7% | 81.0% | 78.8% | 80.0% | 86.4% | 86.5% | 83.0% | 91.1% | 79.2% | 79.2% | 79.2% | 79.2% | 79.2% |
| | No 3rd response | 97.5% | 97.4% | 97.5% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 97.3% | 98.9% | 98.7% | 94.2% | 96.7% | 95.1% | 97.3% | 98.1% | 100.0% | 98.1% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 98.1% | 98.1% |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | | | | 106 |

Includes all respondents

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Sal Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q37-40: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Q1. Gender? | | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | < \$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer |
| Q37. How likely to vote for candidate who supports charitable gaming sites operating electronic gaming? | Much more likely | 29.3% | 33.7% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 31.0% | 28.4% | 32.2% | 34.2% | 23.1% | | 33.3% | 23.5% | 37.8% | 28.3% | 32.1% | 25.5% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 19.0% | 18.9% | 19.1% | 33.3% | 28.6% | 21.6% | 22.2% | 16.5% | 11.5% | | 13.3% | 21.0% | 20.3% | 22.6% | 21.4% | 15.1% |
| | No impact | 22.0% | 21.4% | 22.5% | 33.3% | 31.0% | 20.3% | 22.2% | 21.5% | 18.3% | 50.0% | 10.0% | 30.9% | 17.6% | 18.9% | 26.8% | 20.8% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 6.0% | 6.1% | 5.9% | | 2.4% | 5.4% | 5.6% | 7.6% | 6.7% | 50.0% | 10.0% | 2.5% | 5.4% | 13.2% | 1.8% | 6.6% |
| | Much less likely | 19.5% | 16.8% | 22.1% | | 4.8% | 24.3% | 15.6% | 17.7% | 28.8% | | 26.7% | 21.0% | 17.6% | 15.1% | 17.9% | 20.8% |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 3.1% | 5.4% | | 2.4% | | 2.2% | 2.5% | 11.5% | | 6.7% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 11.3% |
| Q38. How likely to vote for candidate who supports a multi-state lottery? | Much more likely | 41.3% | 41.4% | 37.3% | 11.1% | 42.9% | 48.6% | 50.0% | 45.6% | 27.9% | | 36.7% | 33.3% | 52.7% | 45.3% | 46.4% | 35.8% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.5% | 17.3% | 17.6% | 44.4% | 21.4% | 13.5% | 15.6% | 20.3% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 16.0% | 14.9% | 20.8% | 19.6% | 17.9% |
| | No impact | 17.5% | 16.8% | 18.1% | 11.1% | 21.4% | 14.9% | 16.7% | 22.8% | 15.4% | | 13.3% | 25.9% | 10.8% | 13.2% | 21.4% | 17.0% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 4.1% | 5.4% | 11.1% | 7.1% | 4.1% | 3.3% | 2.5% | 5.8% | 50.0% | 3.3% | 4.9% | 4.1% | 9.4% | | 5.7% |
| | Much less likely | 15.5% | 13.8% | 17.2% | 22.2% | 4.8% | 18.9% | 12.2% | 6.3% | 26.9% | | 23.3% | 18.5% | 16.2% | 9.4% | 12.5% | 15.1% |
| | Not sure | 3.5% | 2.6% | 4.4% | | 2.4% | | 2.2% | 2.5% | 8.7% | | 6.7% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 8.5% |
| Q39. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming sites to offer more casino games? | Much more likely | 26.0% | 29.1% | 23.0% | 55.6% | 23.8% | 24.3% | 31.1% | 31.6% | 17.3% | | 20.0% | 23.5% | 33.8% | 28.3% | 25.0% | 23.6% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.3% | 18.4% | 16.2% | 22.2% | 26.2% | 20.3% | 20.0% | 10.1% | 14.4% | | 20.0% | 17.3% | 21.6% | 15.1% | 16.1% | 15.1% |
| | No impact | 20.5% | 19.9% | 21.1% | 22.2% | 28.6% | 18.9% | 18.9% | 22.8% | 17.3% | 50.0% | 13.3% | 27.2% | 14.9% | 18.9% | 25.0% | 19.8% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 10.5% | 8.7% | 11.8% | | 11.9% | 10.8% | 6.7% | 6.3% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 11.1% | 6.8% | 24.5% | 5.4% | 5.7% |
| | Much less likely | 22.3% | 19.9% | 24.5% | | 7.1% | 25.7% | 20.0% | 24.1% | 28.8% | | 23.3% | 18.5% | 21.6% | 11.3% | 28.6% | 27.4% |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 4.1% | 3.4% | | 2.4% | | 3.3% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 8.5% |
| Q40. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming sites to offer all casino games? | Much more likely | 26.8% | 30.1% | 23.5% | 44.4% | 23.8% | 24.3% | 31.1% | 31.6% | 21.2% | | 23.3% | 22.2% | 31.1% | 26.4% | 28.6% | 27.4% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 16.5% | 16.3% | 16.7% | 22.2% | 21.4% | 20.3% | 18.9% | 13.9% | 11.5% | | 16.7% | 18.5% | 25.7% | 17.0% | 16.1% | 8.5% |
| | No impact | 19.5% | 20.4% | 18.6% | 22.2% | 31.0% | 20.3% | 17.8% | 21.5% | 13.5% | 50.0% | 13.3% | 27.2% | 13.5% | 15.1% | 25.0% | 18.9% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 8.5% | 7.1% | 9.8% | | 9.5% | 10.8% | 6.7% | 5.1% | 11.5% | | 13.3% | 8.6% | 5.4% | 20.8% | 5.4% | 4.7% |
| | Much less likely | 24.5% | 23.0% | 26.0% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 24.3% | 23.3% | 25.3% | 31.7% | 50.0% | 23.3% | 22.2% | 23.0% | 18.9% | 25.0% | 30.2% |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 3.1% | 5.4% | | 4.8% | | 2.2% | 2.5% | 10.6% | | 10.0% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | | 10.4% |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 |

Includes all respondents

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Date

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q41-44: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | | | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|--------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | Total | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | Choose not to answer | < \$20K | \$20K- \$34K | \$35K- \$49K | \$50K- \$74K | \$75K+ | Choose not to answer | | |
| Q41. How did you vote on previous measures to allow a lottery in ND? | Always voted in favor of | 40.5% | 46.4% | 34.8% | 22.2% | 21.4% | 41.9% | 51.1% | 49.4% | 33.7% | | 33.3% | 37.0% | 51.4% | 41.5% | 39.3% | 37.7% | | |
| | Usually voted in favor of | 7.3% | 7.1% | 7.4% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 6.8% | 8.9% | 7.6% | 4.8% | | 3.3% | 7.4% | 6.8% | 7.5% | 10.7% | 6.6% | | |
| | Equally both ways | .3% | 1.0% | .5% | | | | | 2.5% | 1.0% | | | 2.5% | | | | .9% | | |
| | Usually voted against | 5.5% | 5.1% | 5.9% | | | 2.7% | 3.3% | 10.1% | 8.7% | | 3.3% | 6.2% | 4.1% | 5.7% | 8.9% | 4.7% | | |
| | Always voted against | 20.5% | 18.9% | 22.1% | | 9.5% | 17.6% | 18.9% | 19.0% | 31.7% | | 33.3% | 18.5% | 18.9% | 18.9% | 16.1% | 22.6% | | |
| | Never voted | 16.8% | 14.3% | 19.1% | 44.4% | 45.2% | 21.6% | 10.0% | 6.3% | 11.5% | 100.0% | 13.3% | 21.0% | 12.2% | 20.8% | 14.3% | 17.0% | | |
| | Not sure | 8.8% | 7.1% | 10.3% | 22.2% | 14.3% | 9.5% | 7.8% | 5.1% | 8.7% | | 13.3% | 7.4% | 6.8% | 5.7% | 10.7% | 10.4% | | |
| Q42. If the election were held today, how would you vote on measure to participate in a multi-state lottery? | Definitely vote for | 55.3% | 57.7% | 52.9% | 44.4% | 64.3% | 58.1% | 61.1% | 59.5% | 42.3% | 50.0% | 40.0% | 53.1% | 68.9% | 56.6% | 57.1% | 50.0% | | |
| | Possibly vote for | 14.5% | 15.3% | 13.7% | 44.4% | 21.4% | 12.2% | 15.6% | 15.2% | 9.6% | | 13.3% | 12.3% | 6.8% | 17.0% | 25.0% | 15.1% | | |
| | Possibly vote against | 3.5% | 2.6% | 4.4% | | | 5.4% | 3.3% | 2.5% | 4.8% | | 6.7% | 3.7% | 4.1% | 5.7% | 1.8% | 1.9% | | |
| | Definitely vote against | 21.8% | 18.4% | 25.0% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 18.9% | 16.7% | 19.0% | 34.6% | 50.0% | 26.7% | 25.9% | 17.6% | 15.1% | 16.1% | 26.4% | | |
| | No opinion | 2.0% | 1.5% | 2.5% | | | 2.7% | 1.1% | 2.5% | 2.9% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 1.4% | | | 2.8% | | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 4.6% | 1.5% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 2.2% | 1.3% | 5.8% | | 6.7% | 2.5% | 1.4% | 5.7% | | 3.8% | | |
| Q43. If asked to vote on measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer more casino games, how would you vote? | Definitely vote for | 37.0% | 41.3% | 32.8% | 44.4% | 50.0% | 44.6% | 42.2% | 34.2% | 24.0% | | 30.0% | 38.3% | 47.3% | 45.3% | 39.3% | 25.5% | | |
| | Possibly vote for | 15.0% | 15.8% | 14.2% | 44.4% | 26.2% | 13.5% | 13.3% | 12.7% | 12.5% | | 6.7% | 16.0% | 14.9% | 15.1% | 21.4% | 13.2% | | |
| | Possibly vote against | 7.8% | 7.1% | 8.3% | | 2.4% | 8.1% | 8.9% | 11.4% | 6.7% | | 6.7% | 8.6% | 4.1% | 9.4% | 8.9% | 8.5% | | |
| | Definitely vote against | 28.3% | 26.5% | 29.9% | 11.1% | 5.5% | 25.7% | 25.6% | 31.6% | 38.5% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 25.9% | 23.0% | 24.5% | 28.6% | 34.0% | | |
| | No opinion | 5.3% | 4.1% | 6.4% | | 4.8% | 4.1% | 4.4% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 50.0% | 13.3% | 2.5% | 6.8% | | 1.8% | 8.5% | | |
| | Not sure | 6.8% | 5.1% | 8.3% | | 7.1% | 4.1% | 5.6% | 5.1% | 11.5% | | 10.0% | 8.6% | 4.1% | 5.7% | | 10.4% | | |
| Q44. If asked to vote on measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer all casino games, how would you vote? | Definitely vote for | 36.3% | 40.8% | 31.9% | 33.3% | 45.2% | 44.6% | 41.1% | 30.4% | 27.9% | | 26.7% | 39.5% | 51.4% | 41.5% | 35.7% | 23.6% | | |
| | Possibly vote for | 14.0% | 12.2% | 15.7% | 66.7% | 26.2% | 13.5% | 15.6% | 12.7% | 4.8% | | 13.3% | 9.9% | 14.9% | 9.4% | 23.2% | 14.2% | | |
| | Possibly vote against | 6.3% | 6.1% | 6.4% | | 2.4% | 6.8% | 6.7% | 6.3% | 7.7% | | 3.3% | 9.9% | 2.7% | 13.2% | 3.6% | 4.7% | | |
| | Definitely vote against | 32.5% | 31.1% | 33.8% | | 14.3% | 27.0% | 30.0% | 39.2% | 43.3% | 50.0% | 40.0% | 32.1% | 24.3% | 26.4% | 33.9% | 38.7% | | |
| | No opinion | 3.8% | 3.1% | 4.4% | | 4.8% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 5.1% | 3.8% | | 10.0% | 2.5% | 2.7% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 5.7% | | |
| | Not sure | 7.3% | 6.6% | 7.8% | | 7.1% | 5.4% | 3.3% | 6.3% | 12.5% | 50.0% | 6.7% | 6.2% | 4.1% | 7.5% | 1.8% | 13.2% | | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | | |

Includes all respondents

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Date

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Demographics: By Gender, Age & Income

| | | Total | Q1. Gender? | | Q45. Age? | | | | | | Choose not to answer | Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | | | | | | Choose not to answer |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------------------|
| | | | Male | Female | 21-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ | | < \$20K | \$20K-\$34K | \$35K-\$49K | \$50K-\$74K | \$75K+ | | |
| Q3. Region of residence? | Williston area | 4.3% | 1% | 4.4% | 11.1% | 2.4% | 4.1% | 4.4% | 1.3% | 6.7% | | 10.0% | 1.2% | 4.1% | 1.9% | 8.5% | | |
| | Minot area | 13.8% | 13.8% | 13.7% | 11.1% | 15.7% | 13.5% | 18.9% | 15.2% | 7.7% | | 3.3% | 17.3% | 13.5% | 11.3% | 17.0% | | |
| | Devils Lake area | 6.3% | 6.1% | 6.4% | | 2.4% | 2.7% | 6.7% | 13.9% | 4.8% | | 6.7% | 8.6% | 5.4% | 3.8% | 8.5% | | |
| | Grand Forks area | 14.3% | 14.3% | 14.2% | 11.1% | 11.9% | 8.1% | 14.4% | 12.7% | 20.2% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 7.4% | 16.2% | 17.0% | 17.9% | 13.2% | |
| | Fargo area | 25.8% | 26.0% | 25.5% | 44.4% | 31.0% | 32.4% | 27.8% | 24.1% | 16.3% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 23.5% | 24.3% | 34.0% | 35.7% | 20.8% | |
| | Jamestown area | 9.8% | 9.2% | 10.3% | | 4.8% | 6.8% | 3.3% | 11.4% | 19.2% | | 6.7% | 17.3% | 8.1% | 3.8% | 5.4% | 11.3% | |
| | Bismarck area | 20.0% | 20.4% | 19.6% | 22.2% | 23.8% | 28.4% | 16.7% | 19.0% | 16.3% | | 20.0% | 17.3% | 21.6% | 22.6% | 28.6% | 15.1% | |
| Dickinson area | 6.0% | 6.1% | 5.9% | | 7.1% | 4.1% | 7.8% | 2.5% | 8.7% | | 13.3% | 7.4% | 6.8% | 5.7% | | 5.7% | | |
| Q46. Where do you live? | City | 62.8% | 64.8% | 60.8% | 100.0% | 76.2% | 64.9% | 57.8% | 57.0% | 60.6% | 100.0% | 66.7% | 67.9% | 58.1% | 69.8% | 69.6% | 53.8% | |
| | Medium town | 9.5% | 8.7% | 10.3% | | 4.8% | 6.8% | 11.1% | 13.9% | 9.6% | | 10.0% | 7.4% | 6.8% | 7.5% | 8.9% | 14.2% | |
| | Small town | 12.8% | 12.9% | 12.7% | | 11.9% | 13.5% | 17.3% | 12.7% | 9.6% | | 10.0% | 14.8% | 18.9% | 15.1% | 5.4% | 10.4% | |
| | Farm or ranch | 14.8% | 13.3% | 16.2% | | 7.1% | 14.9% | 13.3% | 15.2% | 20.2% | | 13.3% | 9.9% | 16.2% | 7.5% | 16.1% | 20.8% | |
| | Not sure | .3% | .5% | | | | | | 1.3% | | | | | | | | .9% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 196 | 204 | 9 | 42 | 74 | 90 | 79 | 104 | 2 | 30 | 81 | 74 | 53 | 56 | 106 | |

Includes all respondents

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Augusta Richard

10/8/02
Date

10/8/02 11:09:19 AM

Q4: By How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q5: How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q4: How likely are you to vote in the November election? | Definitely vote | 79.5% | 81.3% | 71.8% | 80.0% | 82.0% | 81.3% | 100.0% |
| | Possibly vote | 14.8% | 12.5% | 19.7% | 17.9% | 11.2% | 12.5% | |
| | Will not vote | 3.8% | 4.7% | 7.0% | | 4.5% | 3.8% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 1.6% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 2.2% | 2.5% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 69 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

Q5: By Voting Intention

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure |
| Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | Past week | 16.0% | 16.4% | 13.6% | 20.0% | 12.5% |
| | Past month | 17.8% | 16.0% | 23.7% | 33.3% | 12.5% |
| | Past year | 23.8% | 23.9% | 28.8% | | 23.0% |
| | More than a year | 22.3% | 23.0% | 16.9% | 26.7% | 25.0% |
| | Never | 20.0% | 20.4% | 16.9% | 20.0% | 25.0% |
| | Not sure | .3% | .3% | | | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q6-10: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year |
| Q6. How recently played charitable games in ND? | Past week | 12.5% | 12.7% | 10.2% | 25.0% | | 45.3% | 11.3% | 3.2% | |
| | Past month | 15.4% | 12.3% | 26.5% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 7.8% | 47.9% | 8.4% | 2.2% |
| | Past year | 21.0% | 21.0% | 26.5% | 8.3% | | 15.6% | 15.5% | 41.1% | 7.9% |
| | More than a year | 26.0% | 27.0% | 20.4% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 4.2% | 20.0% | 39.6% |
| | Never | 25.1% | 27.0% | 16.3% | 8.3% | 50.0% | 18.8% | 21.1% | 27.4% | 30.3% |
| Q7. How recently been to reservation casino in ND? | Past week | 8.5% | 9.9% | 2.0% | 8.3% | | 31.3% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 1.1% |
| | Past month | 14.7% | 13.1% | 12.2% | 25.0% | | 12.5% | 47.9% | 4.2% | 1.1% |
| | Past year | 29.2% | 25.4% | 44.9% | 41.7% | 33.3% | 28.1% | 22.5% | 49.5% | 13.5% |
| | More than a year | 21.6% | 24.6% | 10.2% | 16.7% | | 7.8% | 8.5% | 23.2% | 40.4% |
| | Never | 25.7% | 24.6% | 30.6% | 8.3% | 66.7% | 20.3% | 16.9% | 20.0% | 42.7% |
| | Not sure | .3% | .4% | | | | | | | 1.1% |
| Q8. How recently been to casino in another state? | Past week | 1.9% | 2.0% | 2.0% | | | 9.4% | | | |
| | Past month | 7.2% | 8.3% | | 16.7% | | 7.8% | 22.5% | 2.1% | |
| | Past year | 19.4% | 20.2% | 16.3% | 25.0% | | 21.9% | 28.2% | 25.3% | 4.5% |
| | More than a year | 33.5% | 34.9% | 34.7% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 32.8% | 22.5% | 29.5% | 47.2% |
| | Never | 37.9% | 34.5% | 46.9% | 50.0% | 83.3% | 28.1% | 26.8% | 43.2% | 48.3% |
| Q9. How recently played slot machines in SD or video poker in MT? | Past week | .9% | 1.2% | | | | 3.1% | 1.4% | | |
| | Past month | 3.4% | 3.6% | | 16.7% | | 7.8% | 7.0% | 1.1% | |
| | Past year | 9.7% | 8.3% | 14.3% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 7.8% | 19.7% | 10.5% | 2.2% |
| | More than a year | 15.7% | 16.7% | 14.3% | 8.3% | | 17.2% | 11.3% | 16.8% | 16.9% |
| | Never | 70.2% | 70.2% | 71.4% | 58.3% | 83.3% | 64.1% | 60.6% | 71.6% | 80.9% |
| Q10. How recently have you bought Powerball or lottery tickets in another state? | Past week | 14.4% | 15.1% | 10.2% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 43.8% | 8.5% | 7.4% | 5.6% |
| | Past month | 11.0% | 11.1% | 8.2% | 25.0% | | 6.3% | 31.0% | 8.4% | 1.1% |
| | Past year | 20.4% | 22.2% | 12.2% | 8.3% | 33.3% | 15.6% | 19.7% | 28.4% | 15.7% |
| | More than a year | 16.9% | 18.7% | 14.3% | | | 10.9% | 12.7% | 14.7% | 27.0% |
| | Never | 37.0% | 32.5% | 55.1% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 23.4% | 26.8% | 41.1% | 50.6% |
| Not sure | | .3% | .4% | | | | | 1.4% | | |
| Total Responses | | 319 | 252 | 49 | 12 | 6 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 |

Includes all respondents who have ever gambled

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q11a-b: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year |
| Q11a. How rate ND charitable games in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 10.0% | 10.9% | 9.8% | | | 19.2% | 19.6% | 2.9% | 1.6% |
| | Good | 43.5% | 40.8% | 58.5% | 36.4% | 33.3% | 51.9% | 55.4% | 40.6% | 29.0% |
| | Fair | 31.0% | 32.1% | 19.5% | 45.5% | 66.7% | 23.1% | 17.9% | 40.6% | 38.7% |
| | Poor | 5.4% | 6.5% | 2.4% | | | 1.9% | 1.8% | 5.8% | 11.3% |
| | Very poor | 1.7% | 2.2% | | | | 1.9% | 1.8% | 1.4% | 1.6% |
| | Not sure | 8.4% | 7.6% | 9.8% | 18.2% | | 1.9% | 3.6% | 8.7% | 17.7% |
| Q11b. How rate ND charitable games in giving you reasonable chance to win? | Excellent | 5.9% | 4.9% | 7.3% | 18.2% | | 5.8% | 16.1% | 2.9% | |
| | Good | 28.9% | 29.9% | 26.8% | 18.2% | 33.3% | 38.5% | 28.6% | 27.5% | 22.6% |
| | Fair | 31.4% | 32.6% | 31.7% | 9.1% | 33.3% | 26.9% | 28.6% | 42.0% | 25.8% |
| | Poor | 16.3% | 15.2% | 19.5% | 18.2% | 33.3% | 17.3% | 10.7% | 14.5% | 22.6% |
| | Very poor | 8.8% | 9.8% | 2.4% | 18.2% | | 5.8% | 12.5% | 4.3% | 12.9% |
| | Not sure | 8.8% | 7.6% | 12.2% | 18.2% | | 5.8% | 3.6% | 8.7% | 16.1% |
| Total Responses | | 239 | 184 | 41 | 11 | 3 | 52 | 56 | 69 | 62 |

Includes all respondents who ever played charitable games

Q12a-b: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year |
| Q12a. How rate ND reservation casinos in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 13.6% | 13.2% | 14.7% | 18.2% | | 7.8% | 23.7% | 13.2% | 8.0% |
| | Good | 37.7% | 37.6% | 44.1% | 18.2% | 50.0% | 45.1% | 37.3% | 37.2% | 30.0% |
| | Fair | 30.1% | 29.1% | 29.4% | 45.5% | 50.0% | 31.4% | 25.4% | 30.3% | 34.0% |
| | Poor | 9.3% | 9.5% | 5.9% | 18.2% | | 5.9% | 8.5% | 9.2% | 14.0% |
| | Very poor | 2.5% | 3.2% | | | | 2.0% | 1.7% | 5.3% | |
| | Not sure | 6.8% | 7.4% | 5.9% | | | 7.8% | 3.4% | 3.9% | 14.0% |
| Q12b. How rate ND reservation casinos in giving you reasonable chance to win? | Excellent | 4.7% | 4.8% | 2.9% | 9.1% | | 5.9% | 8.5% | 2.6% | 2.0% |
| | Good | 21.6% | 20.6% | 23.5% | 27.3% | 50.0% | 19.6% | 22.0% | 25.0% | 18.0% |
| | Fair | 39.4% | 41.3% | 32.4% | 27.3% | 50.0% | 43.1% | 42.4% | 38.2% | 34.0% |
| | Poor | 19.5% | 16.9% | 29.4% | 36.4% | | 21.6% | 15.3% | 19.7% | 22.0% |
| | Very poor | 8.9% | 10.1% | 5.9% | | | 5.9% | 10.2% | 9.2% | 10.0% |
| | Not sure | 5.9% | 6.3% | 5.9% | | | 3.9% | 1.7% | 5.3% | 14.0% |
| Total Responses | | 236 | 189 | 34 | 11 | 2 | 51 | 59 | 76 | 50 |

Includes all respondents who have ever been to a ND reservation casino

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q1 a-b: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year |
| Q13a. How rate out-of-state Powerball or lottery games in being enjoyable form of entertainment? | Excellent | 9.0% | 10.1% | 4.5% | | | 12.2% | 17.6% | 3.6% | 2.3% |
| | Good | 33.0% | 32.0% | 27.3% | 66.7% | 66.7% | 42.9% | 31.4% | 35.7% | 20.5% |
| | Fair | 33.0% | 33.1% | 31.8% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 26.5% | 27.5% | 33.9% | 45.5% |
| | Poor | 12.5% | 12.4% | 18.2% | | | 6.1% | 9.8% | 21.4% | 11.4% |
| | Very poor | 3.5% | 3.6% | 4.5% | | | 2.0% | 3.9% | 1.8% | 4.5% |
| | Not sure | 9.0% | 8.9% | 13.6% | | | 10.2% | 7.8% | 3.6% | 15.9% |
| Q13b. How rate out-of-state Powerball or lottery games in giving you reasonable chance to win? | Excellent | 3.5% | 3.6% | | 16.7% | | 6.1% | 7.8% | | |
| | Good | 19.0% | 20.7% | 9.1% | 16.7% | | 24.5% | 15.7% | 21.4% | 13.6% |
| | Fair | 31.5% | 30.2% | 45.5% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 30.6% | 29.4% | 33.9% | 31.8% |
| | Poor | 24.0% | 23.1% | 22.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 22.4% | 23.5% | 30.4% | 18.2% |
| | Very poor | 15.5% | 16.6% | 9.1% | 16.7% | | 14.3% | 15.7% | 12.5% | 20.5% |
| | Not sure | 6.5% | 5.9% | 13.6% | | | 2.0% | 7.8% | 1.8% | 15.9% |
| Total Responses | | 200 | 169 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 49 | 51 | 56 | 44 |

Includes all respondents who have ever played out-of-state lottery games

Q14: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q14. What direction should the legislature take with laws that control the charitable games allowed? | All casino games | 34.8% | 35.8% | 25.4% | 53.3% | 25.0% | 45.3% | 42.3% | 37.9% | 37.1% | 13.8% | |
| | Most casino games | 11.8% | 11.9% | 13.6% | | 12.5% | 14.1% | 12.7% | 15.8% | 10.1% | 6.3% | |
| | Only current charitable games | 36.5% | 35.8% | 42.4% | 40.0% | 12.5% | 29.7% | 36.6% | 33.7% | 36.0% | 45.0% | 100.0% |
| | Opposed to gambling | 5.8% | 6.0% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | | 1.1% | 5.6% | 18.8% | |
| | Allow lottery tickets | .8% | .9% | | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | | | 1.3% | |
| | Should be state operated | .5% | .6% | | | | | | | | 2.5% | |
| | Misc. other | .8% | .9% | | | | | | 1.1% | 2.2% | | |
| | Not sure | 9.3% | 7.9% | 13.6% | | 50.0% | 6.3% | 7.6% | 10.5% | 9.0% | 12.5% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Sal Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q15a-f: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|----------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q15a. Allow machines in charitable gaming sites? | Yes | 61.5% | 62.6% | 57.6% | 53.3% | 67.5% | 50.0% | 60.6% | 72.6% | 71.9% | 46.3% | 100.0% |
| | No | 33.8% | 33.3% | 33.9% | 46.7% | 25.0% | 45.3% | 32.4% | 25.3% | 23.6% | 47.5% | |
| | Not sure | 4.8% | 4.1% | 8.5% | | 7.5% | 4.7% | 7.0% | 2.1% | 4.5% | 6.3% | |
| Q15b. Allow machines in bars or clubs that have liquor? | Yes | 59.8% | 59.7% | 55.9% | 73.3% | 62.5% | 68.8% | 63.4% | 69.5% | 56.2% | 41.3% | 100.0% |
| | No | 37.0% | 37.1% | 39.0% | 26.7% | 37.5% | 28.1% | 33.8% | 28.4% | 40.4% | 53.8% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 3.1% | 5.1% | | | 3.1% | 2.8% | 2.1% | 3.4% | 5.0% | |
| Q15c. Allow machines in restaurants that have liquor? | Yes | 38.8% | 38.4% | 42.4% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 54.7% | 43.7% | 43.2% | 32.6% | 23.8% | |
| | No | 59.3% | 59.7% | 54.2% | 60.0% | 75.0% | 45.3% | 53.5% | 55.8% | 65.2% | 72.5% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 1.9% | 3.4% | | | | 1.8% | 1.1% | 2.2% | 3.8% | |
| Q15d. Allow machines in convenience stores? | Yes | 24.5% | 24.8% | 20.3% | 40.0% | 12.5% | 39.1% | 25.4% | 23.2% | 22.5% | 16.3% | |
| | No | 73.8% | 73.6% | 76.3% | 60.0% | 87.5% | 60.9% | 73.2% | 73.7% | 77.5% | 80.0% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.8% | 1.6% | 3.4% | | | | 1.4% | 3.2% | | 3.8% | |
| Q15e. Allow machines in grocery stores? | Yes | 17.8% | 18.2% | 13.6% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 29.7% | 19.7% | 15.8% | 13.5% | 13.8% | |
| | No | 81.0% | 80.8% | 83.1% | 73.3% | 87.5% | 70.3% | 78.9% | 82.1% | 86.5% | 83.8% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | .9% | 3.4% | | | | 1.4% | 2.1% | | 2.5% | |
| Q15f. Allow machines in any private business? | Yes | 22.5% | 22.3% | 25.4% | 26.7% | | 31.3% | 29.6% | 23.2% | 16.9% | 15.0% | |
| | No | 74.5% | 74.8% | 69.5% | 73.3% | 100.0% | 67.2% | 67.6% | 73.7% | 79.8% | 81.3% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 3.0% | 2.8% | 5.1% | | | 1.6% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 3.4% | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

Q16: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q16. If ND allowed slot machines and video poker machines similar to those in SD & MT, how often would you play them? | 1+ per week | 9.3% | 8.8% | 11.9% | 13.3% | | 29.7% | 14.1% | 3.2% | 2.2% | 3.8% | |
| | 1+ per month | 21.3% | 21.7% | 18.6% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 28.1% | 39.4% | 29.5% | 10.1% | 2.5% | |
| | 1+ per year | 21.8% | 20.1% | 28.8% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 20.3% | 25.4% | 33.7% | 23.6% | 3.8% | |
| | < 1 per year | 11.0% | 10.4% | 15.3% | 13.3% | | 12.5% | 5.6% | 10.5% | 24.7% | | |
| | Never | 35.5% | 37.4% | 25.4% | 26.7% | 50.0% | 9.4% | 15.5% | 20.0% | 37.1% | 90.0% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | 1.6% | | | | | | 3.2% | 2.2% | | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Y. Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q17a-f: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q17a. Buy lottery tickets in charitable gaming sites? | Yes | 33.3% | 34.9% | 25.4% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 26.8% | 32.6% | 37.1% | 31.3% | 100.0% |
| | No | 63.5% | 61.6% | 72.9% | 66.7% | 62.5% | 60.9% | 73.2% | 65.3% | 59.6% | 60.0% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 3.5% | 1.7% | | 12.5% | 1.6% | | 2.1% | 3.4% | 8.8% | |
| Q17b. Buy lottery tickets in all bars or clubs that have liquor? | Yes | 61.5% | 62.3% | 57.6% | 66.7% | 50.0% | 65.6% | 64.8% | 73.7% | 61.8% | 40.0% | 100.0% |
| | No | 34.8% | 34.0% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 37.5% | 29.7% | 31.0% | 25.3% | 37.1% | 51.3% | |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 3.8% | 3.4% | | 12.5% | 4.7% | 4.2% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 8.8% | |
| Q17c. Buy lottery tickets in restaurants that have a liquor license? | Yes | 56.0% | 55.3% | 57.6% | 66.7% | 50.0% | 67.2% | 71.8% | 62.1% | 49.4% | 33.8% | |
| | No | 41.3% | 41.5% | 40.7% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 31.3% | 25.4% | 36.8% | 48.3% | 60.0% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 2.8% | 3.1% | 1.7% | | | 1.6% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 2.2% | 6.3% | |
| Q17d. Buy lottery tickets in convenience stores? | Yes | 74.5% | 73.0% | 81.4% | 73.3% | 87.5% | 87.5% | 87.3% | 85.3% | 70.8% | 45.0% | |
| | No | 24.5% | 25.8% | 18.6% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 11.3% | 13.7% | 29.2% | 52.5% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.0% | 1.3% | | | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | | 2.5% | |
| Q17e. Buy lottery tickets in grocery stores? | Yes | 63.3% | 62.3% | 69.5% | 46.7% | 87.5% | 78.1% | 80.3% | 73.7% | 52.8% | 36.3% | |
| | No | 35.3% | 35.8% | 30.5% | 53.3% | 12.5% | 20.3% | 18.3% | 25.3% | 47.2% | 60.0% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 1.5% | 1.9% | | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 1.1% | | 3.8% | |
| Q17f. Buy lottery tickets in any private business? | Yes | 45.0% | 45.9% | 42.4% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 57.7% | 47.4% | 41.6% | 31.3% | |
| | No | 51.3% | 49.7% | 55.9% | 66.7% | 50.0% | 46.9% | 40.8% | 46.3% | 55.1% | 65.0% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 4.4% | 1.7% | | | 3.1% | 1.4% | 6.3% | 3.4% | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

Q18: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q18. If ND participated in multi-state lottery like Powerball, how often would you buy lottery tickets? | 1+ per week | 29.8% | 29.9% | 28.8% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 57.8% | 50.7% | 28.4% | 13.5% | 8.8% | |
| | 1+ per month | 26.8% | 27.7% | 20.3% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 26.6% | 35.2% | 31.6% | 28.1% | 12.5% | |
| | 1+ per year | 12.8% | 12.6% | 16.9% | | 12.5% | 7.8% | 4.2% | 24.2% | 14.6% | 7.5% | 100.0% |
| | < 1 per year | 5.0% | 4.1% | 8.5% | 13.3% | | | 7.0% | 4.2% | 9.0% | 3.8% | |
| | Never | 25.0% | 24.8% | 25.4% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 6.3% | 2.8% | 11.6% | 32.6% | 67.5% | |
| | Not sure | .8% | .9% | | | | 1.6% | | | 2.3% | | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rick Ford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q19-20: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q19. Many NDans play out-of-state slot machines, play out-of-state video poker machines, or buy out-of-state lottery tickets? | Strongly agree | 61.8% | 65.1% | 50.8% | 40.0% | 50.0% | 68.8% | 67.6% | 68.4% | 65.2% | 40.0% | |
| | Slightly agree | 20.0% | 17.0% | 30.5% | 33.3% | 37.5% | 21.9% | 21.1% | 22.1% | 12.4% | 22.5% | 100.0% |
| | No reaction | 3.3% | 3.8% | 1.7% | | | | 1.4% | 5.3% | 3.4% | 5.0% | |
| | Slightly disagree | 5.8% | 4.7% | 10.2% | 13.3% | | 3.1% | 5.6% | 2.1% | 6.7% | 11.3% | |
| | Strongly disagree | 5.0% | 5.3% | 3.4% | 6.7% | | 1.6% | 2.8% | 2.1% | 6.7% | 11.3% | |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 4.1% | 3.4% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 4.7% | 1.4% | | 5.6% | 10.0% | |
| Q20. Our state and residents would benefit if the money that NDans spend playing out-of-state lottery machines | Strongly agree | 61.5% | 62.6% | 54.2% | 73.3% | 50.0% | 79.7% | 69.0% | 72.6% | 53.9% | 36.3% | |
| | Slightly agree | 16.5% | 14.8% | 23.7% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 15.5% | 15.8% | 19.1% | 17.5% | 100.0% |
| | No reaction | 2.0% | 1.9% | 3.4% | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 4.2% | | 2.5% | |
| | Slightly disagree | 4.3% | 4.1% | 5.1% | | 12.5% | 1.6% | 5.6% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 6.3% | |
| | Strongly disagree | 11.3% | 11.9% | 10.2% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | 5.6% | 3.2% | 15.7% | 27.5% | |
| | Not sure | 4.5% | 4.7% | 3.4% | | 12.5% | 1.6% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 6.7% | 10.0% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for micro imaging and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/13/03
Date

Q21-24: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q21. Reaction to allowing charitable gaming sites to operate slot machines, video poker, or other forms of electronic gaming? | Strongly favor | 35.0% | 34.9% | 28.8% | 53.3% | 50.0% | 53.1% | 45.1% | 41.1% | 29.2% | 11.3% | |
| | Slightly favor | 21.5% | 19.5% | 33.9% | 13.3% | 25.0% | 20.3% | 26.8% | 24.2% | 21.3% | 15.0% | |
| | No reaction | 6.8% | 7.5% | 5.1% | | | 1.6% | 7.0% | 7.4% | 11.2% | 5.0% | |
| | Slightly oppose | 8.0% | 7.9% | 10.2% | 6.7% | | 10.9% | 5.6% | 6.3% | 7.9% | 8.8% | 100.0% |
| | Strongly oppose | 25.3% | 26.7% | 16.9% | 26.7% | 25.0% | 10.9% | 12.7% | 17.9% | 27.0% | 55.0% | |
| | Not sure | 3.5% | 3.5% | 5.1% | | | 3.1% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 3.4% | 5.0% | |
| Q22. Reaction to allowing charitable organizations to operate casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at Q23. | Strongly favor | 37.3% | 37.1% | 32.2% | 73.3% | 12.5% | 43.8% | 50.7% | 43.2% | 31.5% | 20.0% | |
| | Slightly favor | 17.8% | 18.2% | 18.6% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 23.4% | 25.4% | 15.8% | 20.2% | 5.0% | 100.0% |
| | No reaction | 6.0% | 6.3% | 5.1% | | 12.5% | 6.3% | 2.8% | 7.1% | 6.7% | 6.3% | |
| | Slightly oppose | 8.5% | 7.2% | 15.3% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 5.6% | 8.4% | 10.1% | 11.3% | |
| | Strongly oppose | 26.8% | 27.7% | 23.7% | 13.3% | 37.5% | 18.8% | 12.7% | 21.1% | 27.0% | 52.5% | |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 3.5% | 5.1% | | 12.5% | 1.6% | 2.8% | 4.2% | 4.5% | 5.0% | |
| Q23. Reaction to the state operating casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at Q24. | Strongly favor | 36.3% | 36.5% | 28.8% | 60.0% | 37.5% | 46.9% | 54.9% | 36.8% | 29.2% | 18.8% | |
| | Slightly favor | 15.8% | 15.4% | 18.6% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 18.8% | 14.1% | 18.9% | 20.2% | 6.3% | |
| | No reaction | 5.8% | 5.3% | 6.8% | | 25.0% | 3.1% | 4.2% | 8.4% | 5.6% | 6.3% | |
| | Slightly oppose | 9.8% | 8.2% | 22.0% | | | 7.8% | 9.9% | 7.4% | 11.2% | 12.5% | |
| | Strongly oppose | 24.0% | 31.1% | 18.6% | 26.7% | 25.0% | 20.3% | 14.1% | 24.2% | 29.2% | 53.8% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 3.5% | 3.5% | 5.1% | | | 3.1% | 2.8% | 4.2% | 4.5% | 2.5% | |
| Q24. Reaction to private businesses operating casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed at Q23. | Strongly favor | 17.3% | 17.9% | 10.2% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 20.3% | 22.5% | 18.9% | 14.6% | 11.3% | |
| | Slightly favor | 8.3% | 8.8% | 6.8% | 6.7% | | 10.9% | 11.3% | 8.4% | 6.7% | 5.0% | |
| | No reaction | 6.0% | 6.0% | 6.8% | | 12.5% | 7.8% | 2.8% | 9.5% | 4.5% | 5.0% | |
| | Slightly oppose | 17.5% | 14.8% | 28.8% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 25.4% | 16.8% | 19.1% | 13.8% | |
| | Strongly oppose | 46.8% | 48.4% | 42.4% | 26.7% | 50.0% | 43.8% | 35.2% | 40.0% | 51.7% | 61.3% | 100.0% |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 4.1% | 5.1% | | 12.5% | 4.7% | 2.8% | 6.3% | 3.4% | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Lu Costa Rickford

Date

10/13/03

Q25-26: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q25. If laws changed, who would you most prefer to have operate and benefit from expanded gaming? | Charities | 37.8% | 38.7% | 33.9% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 39.1% | 31.0% | 43.2% | 36.0% | 38.8% | |
| | State gov't | 42.5% | 42.8% | 45.8% | 26.7% | 37.5% | 42.2% | 56.3% | 47.4% | 39.3% | 27.5% | 100.0% |
| | Private business | 4.8% | 4.1% | 5.1% | 20.0% | | 7.8% | 5.6% | 2.1% | 7.9% | 1.3% | |
| | Native Americans | 3.5% | 3.8% | 1.7% | 6.7% | | 6.3% | 2.8% | | 2.2% | 7.5% | |
| | Not sure | 11.5% | 10.7% | 13.6% | 6.7% | 37.5% | 4.7% | 4.2% | 7.4% | 14.6% | 25.0% | |
| Q26. If laws changed, who would you least prefer to have operate and benefit from the expanded gaming? | Charities | 3.0% | 2.8% | 3.4% | | 12.5% | 4.7% | 2.8% | 2.1% | 4.5% | 1.3% | |
| | State gov't | 12.0% | 12.6% | 10.2% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 18.8% | 8.5% | 10.5% | 10.1% | 13.8% | |
| | Private business | 37.3% | 37.1% | 42.4% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 39.1% | 36.6% | 38.9% | 41.6% | 28.8% | 100.0% |
| | Native Americans | 30.3% | 30.2% | 23.7% | 73.3% | | 25.0% | 42.3% | 34.7% | 22.5% | 27.5% | |
| | Not sure | 17.5% | 17.3% | 20.3% | | 37.5% | 12.5% | 9.9% | 13.7% | 21.3% | 28.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q27-30: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q27. How likely to support expanded gaming if it created new jobs? | Much more likely | 51.3% | 51.3% | 42.4% | 73.3% | 75.0% | 68.8% | 64.8% | 65.3% | 41.6% | 20.0% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 19.5% | 18.2% | 32.2% | 6.7% | | 17.2% | 21.1% | 17.9% | 22.5% | 17.5% | 100.0% |
| | No impact | 7.0% | 7.2% | 6.8% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | 4.2% | 7.4% | 6.7% | 12.5% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 5.0% | 5.1% | | | 4.7% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 3.4% | 10.0% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.8% | 17.9% | 10.2% | 13.3% | 25.0% | 4.7% | 5.6% | 7.4% | 24.7% | 38.8% | |
| | Not sure | .8% | .3% | 3.4% | | | 1.6% | | | 1.1% | 1.3% | |
| Q28. How likely to support expanded gaming if it provided funding for services that would be cut due to shortfall? | Much more likely | 50.8% | 50.9% | 44.1% | 66.7% | 62.5% | 56.3% | 71.8% | 62.1% | 42.7% | 22.5% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 18.3% | 15.7% | 35.6% | 13.3% | | 15.6% | 11.3% | 23.2% | 21.3% | 17.5% | |
| | No impact | 6.8% | 7.2% | 3.4% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 5.6% | 15.0% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 5.3% | 3.4% | | | 3.1% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 8.8% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.3% | 17.6% | 10.2% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 8.5% | 6.3% | 23.6% | 32.5% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 3.1% | 3.4% | | 12.5% | 9.4% | | 2.1% | 2.2% | 3.8% | |
| Q29. How likely to support expanded gaming if it stimulated tourism and tourism-related economic development? | Much more likely | 47.3% | 48.1% | 42.4% | 46.7% | 50.0% | 60.9% | 56.3% | 54.7% | 46.1% | 21.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 21.8% | 19.8% | 33.9% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 21.9% | 19.7% | 29.5% | 18.0% | 17.5% | 100.0% |
| | No impact | 7.5% | 8.2% | 3.4% | | 25.0% | 4.7% | 8.5% | 6.3% | 4.5% | 13.8% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 5.5% | 5.0% | 8.5% | 6.7% | | 1.6% | 5.6% | 3.2% | 6.7% | 10.0% | |
| | Much less likely | 16.0% | 17.0% | 8.5% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 8.5% | 6.3% | 20.2% | 35.0% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 1.9% | 3.4% | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | | 4.5% | 2.5% | |
| Q30. How likely to support expanded gaming if it kept money in ND currently spend out-of-state? | Much more likely | 61.0% | 61.3% | 54.2% | 73.3% | 75.0% | 73.4% | 80.3% | 69.5% | 56.2% | 30.0% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 16.3% | 15.1% | 25.4% | 13.3% | | 15.6% | 11.3% | 23.2% | 13.5% | 15.0% | 100.0% |
| | No impact | 4.8% | 5.0% | 3.4% | | 12.5% | 4.7% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 4.5% | 12.5% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.5% | 3.8% | 10.2% | | | 1.6% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 9.0% | 5.0% | |
| | Much less likely | 12.3% | 13.2% | 6.8% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 3.1% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 16.9% | 33.8% | |
| | Not sure | 1.3% | 1.6% | | | | 1.6% | | 1.1% | | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q31-34: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q31. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion went to charities? | Much more likely | 48.8% | 49.7% | 44.1% | 46.7% | 50.0% | 62.5% | 50.7% | 57.9% | 51.7% | 22.5% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 24.3% | 23.0% | 35.6% | 20.0% | | 20.3% | 31.0% | 34.7% | 14.6% | 18.8% | 100.0% |
| | No impact | 5.8% | 5.3% | 6.8% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 4.7% | 4.2% | 1.1% | 5.6% | 13.8% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.5% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 6.7% | | | 2.8% | 2.1% | 4.5% | 7.5% | |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 16.0% | 8.5% | 13.3% | 37.5% | 10.9% | 11.3% | 3.2% | 19.1% | 32.5% | |
| | Not sure | 2.5% | 2.5% | 1.7% | 6.7% | | 1.6% | | 1.1% | 4.5% | 5.0% | |
| Q32. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for public schools? | Much more likely | 58.3% | 58.2% | 57.6% | 60.0% | 62.5% | 70.3% | 66.2% | 70.5% | 53.9% | 31.3% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.8% | 15.7% | 28.8% | 26.7% | | 17.2% | 19.7% | 23.2% | 14.6% | 13.8% | |
| | No impact | 4.3% | 4.7% | 1.7% | | 12.5% | 1.6% | 4.2% | | 4.5% | 11.3% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 3.0% | 3.5% | 1.7% | | | | 2.8% | 3.2% | 3.4% | 5.0% | |
| | Much less likely | 14.8% | 15.7% | 8.5% | 13.3% | 25.0% | 9.4% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 21.3% | 36.3% | |
| | Not sure | 2.0% | 2.2% | 1.7% | | | 1.6% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 2.2% | 2.5% | |
| Q33. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for services for senior citizens? | Much more likely | 50.3% | 50.0% | 54.2% | 33.3% | 62.5% | 60.9% | 56.3% | 60.0% | 51.7% | 23.8% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 23.3% | 21.4% | 33.9% | 33.3% | | 21.9% | 28.2% | 28.4% | 16.9% | 21.3% | |
| | No impact | 5.8% | 6.0% | 3.4% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 4.7% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 11.3% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.0% | 4.4% | 1.7% | 6.7% | | | 2.8% | 2.1% | 9.0% | 5.0% | |
| | Much less likely | 15.3% | 16.4% | 6.8% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 10.9% | 7.0% | 4.2% | 18.0% | 36.3% | |
| | Not sure | 1.5% | 1.9% | | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 2.1% | | 2.5% | |
| Q34. How likely to support expanded gaming if portion used for more gambling addiction treatment? | Much more likely | 38.3% | 40.3% | 35.6% | 13.3% | 25.0% | 45.3% | 53.5% | 46.3% | 28.1% | 21.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 25.3% | 23.0% | 37.3% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 28.1% | 23.9% | 30.5% | 24.7% | 18.8% | |
| | No impact | 7.0% | 7.5% | 1.7% | 6.7% | 25.0% | 1.6% | 7.0% | 5.3% | 6.7% | 13.8% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 8.3% | 7.2% | 13.6% | 13.3% | | 7.8% | 8.5% | 7.4% | 10.1% | 6.3% | 100.0% |
| | Much less likely | 18.0% | 18.2% | 10.2% | 46.7% | 12.5% | 14.1% | 7.0% | 9.5% | 22.5% | 36.3% | |
| | Not sure | 3.3% | 3.8% | 1.7% | | | 3.1% | | 1.1% | 7.9% | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q35: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|--------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q35. Reasons why some NDans may favor increasing revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming? | Worthy cause | 3.8% | 3.8% | 3.4% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | 4.2% | 5.3% | 3.4% | 2.5% | |
| | \$ for charities, hard to raise funds | 20.8% | 20.1% | 22.0% | 26.7% | 25.0% | 28.1% | 21.1% | 16.8% | 19.1% | 21.3% | |
| | Helps people, needs increasing | 4.5% | 4.4% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 6.3% | 4.2% | 5.3% | 4.5% | 2.5% | |
| | Helps education | 3.3% | 2.8% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 3.4% | 2.5% | 100.0% |
| | Helps fund gov't programs, reduces cuts | 1.0% | 1.3% | | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 1.1% | | |
| | Can accept gambling if for charity | .5% | .6% | | | | 1.6% | | 1.1% | | | |
| | Keep \$ in state | 14.3% | 16.0% | 8.5% | | 12.5% | 21.9% | 11.3% | 15.8% | 15.7% | 7.5% | |
| | Like gambling, enjoyable entertainment | 8.3% | 7.2% | 13.6% | 13.3% | | 6.3% | 8.5% | 9.5% | 12.4% | 3.8% | |
| | Neighboring states have it | .8% | .9% | | | | | 1.4% | | 1.1% | 1.3% | |
| | Help economy, create jobs | 3.8% | 4.1% | 3.4% | | | 6.3% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 3.4% | 3.8% | |
| | \$ for state, economy, budget shortfalls | 6.8% | 7.5% | 5.1% | | | 4.7% | 4.2% | 10.5% | 6.7% | 6.3% | |
| | Keep taxes down, from increasing | 3.5% | 3.8% | 1.7% | 6.7% | | 4.7% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 3.4% | 6.3% | |
| | Step toward lottery, more casinos | .3% | .3% | | | | | | | | 1.3% | |
| | Help more than Native Americans | 2.0% | 2.2% | | 6.7% | | 4.7% | 1.4% | 3.2% | 1.1% | | |
| | Greed | .8% | .9% | | | | | | | 1.1% | 2.5% | |
| | Misc. other | 2.5% | 2.8% | | 6.7% | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 3.2% | 1.1% | 5.0% | |
| | Not sure | 36.3% | 34.6% | 42.4% | 33.3% | 62.5% | 32.8% | 38.0% | 35.8% | 31.5% | 43.8% | |
| | No 2nd response | 89.0% | 88.1% | 93.2% | 86.7% | 100.0% | 79.7% | 93.0% | 88.4% | 92.1% | 90.0% | 100.0% |
| | No 3rd response | 98.3% | 98.4% | 96.6% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 93.8% | 98.6% | 98.9% | 98.9% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q36: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q36. Reasons why some NDans may oppose increasing revenue that charities receive by expanding charitable gaming? | Moral reasons | 12.3% | 12.3% | 8.5% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 7.8% | 14.1% | 12.6% | 13.5% | 12.5% | |
| | Oppose gambling in general | 11.5% | 13.2% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 18.8% | 7.0% | 12.6% | 7.9% | 12.5% | |
| | Addiction, gambling problems | 29.8% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 6.7% | 25.0% | 23.4% | 26.8% | 32.6% | 33.7% | 30.0% | |
| | Other problems related to gambling in general | 1.5% | 1.6% | 1.7% | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 2.5% | |
| | Easy to gamble, increase gambling | 3.0% | 2.5% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 4.7% | 2.8% | | 3.4% | 5.0% | |
| | Money root of evil, greed, cheating, crime | 3.3% | 3.5% | 3.4% | | | 3.1% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 4.5% | 5.0% | |
| | Conservative, resist change | 7.8% | 8.5% | 3.4% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 7.0% | 8.4% | 9.0% | 5.0% | |
| | Problems affect poor the most | 6.8% | 6.9% | 6.8% | | 12.5% | 3.1% | 9.9% | 6.3% | 7.9% | 6.3% | |
| | Waste of time, money | 1.3% | 1.3% | | | 12.5% | | 1.4% | | 1.1% | 3.8% | |
| | Fear \$ won't be spent wisely, give them too much money | 5.0% | 5.3% | 5.1% | | | 9.4% | 8.5% | 1.1% | 2.2% | 6.3% | |
| | Cost will exceed benefits, no real benefits | 1.8% | 1.9% | 1.7% | | | | 1.4% | | 1.1% | 6.3% | |
| | \$ go to charity versus other needs, better uses | 1.0% | .3% | 3.4% | 6.7% | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | | 2.5% | |
| | Depends on where \$ goes | .8% | .9% | | | | | | | 2.2% | 1.3% | |
| | Have enough gambling | 2.0% | 1.9% | 3.4% | | | | 2.8% | 4.2% | 1.1% | 1.3% | |
| | Won't help economy, \$ will go out-of-state | 1.0% | .9% | 1.7% | | | | 2.8% | | 1.1% | 1.3% | |
| | Takes \$ from Native Americans | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.7% | | | 3.1% | 2.8% | 1.1% | | | |
| | Don't win, games not fair | .8% | .6% | 1.7% | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | | 1.1% | | |
| | Better ways to raise \$ | 1.3% | 1.6% | | | | | 1.4% | 1.1% | 2.2% | 1.3% | |
| | Misc. other | 2.8% | 2.2% | 6.8% | | | 4.7% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 2.2% | 1.3% | |
| | Not sure | 23.8% | 22.6% | 25.4% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 21.1% | 25.3% | 25.8% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| | No 2nd response | 84.3% | 81.4% | 93.2% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 87.5% | 84.5% | 88.4% | 82.0% | 78.8% | 100.0% |
| | No 3rd response | 97.5% | 97.2% | 98.3% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 96.9% | 97.2% | 98.9% | 96.6% | 97.5% | 100.0% |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q37-40: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q37. How likely to vote for candidate who supports charitable gaming sites operating electronic gaming? | Much more likely | 29.3% | 29.9% | 23.7% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 36.6% | 31.6% | 21.3% | 12.5% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 19.0% | 17.6% | 22.0% | 26.7% | 37.5% | 15.6% | 25.4% | 21.1% | 19.1% | 13.8% | |
| | No impact | 22.0% | 22.0% | 25.4% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 15.6% | 22.5% | 30.5% | 25.8% | 12.5% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 6.0% | 5.3% | 11.9% | | | 4.7% | 1.4% | 6.3% | 5.6% | 10.0% | 100.0% |
| | Much less likely | 19.5% | 21.1% | 10.2% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 9.4% | 11.3% | 7.4% | 21.3% | 47.5% | |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 4.1% | 6.8% | | | 4.7% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 6.7% | 3.8% | |
| Q38. How likely to vote for candidate who supports a multi-state lottery? | Much more likely | 41.3% | 42.5% | 32.2% | 53.3% | 37.5% | 62.5% | 52.1% | 43.2% | 33.7% | 21.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.5% | 17.0% | 16.9% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 15.6% | 22.5% | 17.9% | 18.0% | 13.8% | |
| | No impact | 17.5% | 17.6% | 23.7% | | | 10.9% | 15.5% | 25.3% | 19.1% | 13.8% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 4.8% | 3.1% | 13.6% | 6.7% | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 4.2% | 6.7% | 7.5% | 100.0% |
| | Much less likely | 15.5% | 16.4% | 8.5% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 4.7% | 7.0% | 7.4% | 18.0% | 38.8% | |
| | Not sure | 3.5% | 3.5% | 5.1% | | | 4.7% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 4.5% | 5.0% | |
| Q39. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming sites to offer more casino games? | Much more likely | 26.0% | 25.2% | 22.0% | 53.3% | 37.5% | 39.1% | 35.2% | 24.2% | 24.7% | 11.3% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 17.3% | 17.9% | 16.9% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 20.3% | 19.7% | 20.0% | 16.9% | 10.0% | |
| | No impact | 20.5% | 19.5% | 27.1% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 14.1% | 18.3% | 30.5% | 21.3% | 15.0% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 10.3% | 8.8% | 20.3% | 6.7% | | 6.3% | 11.3% | 6.3% | 9.0% | 17.5% | 100.0% |
| | Much less likely | 22.3% | 24.8% | 8.5% | 13.3% | 37.5% | 17.2% | 14.1% | 14.7% | 22.5% | 42.5% | |
| | Not sure | 3.8% | 3.8% | 5.1% | | | 3.1% | 1.4% | 4.2% | 5.6% | 3.8% | |
| Q40. How likely to vote for candidate who supports allowing charitable gaming sites to offer all casino games? | Much more likely | 26.8% | 26.4% | 22.0% | 53.3% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 35.2% | 25.3% | 27.0% | 12.5% | |
| | Somewhat more likely | 16.5% | 16.7% | 18.6% | | 25.0% | 14.1% | 25.4% | 17.9% | 18.0% | 7.5% | |
| | No impact | 19.5% | 19.2% | 23.7% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 15.5% | 30.5% | 19.1% | 16.3% | |
| | Somewhat less likely | 8.5% | 6.6% | 16.9% | 20.0% | | 9.4% | 9.9% | 5.3% | 3.4% | 15.0% | 100.0% |
| | Much less likely | 24.5% | 27.4% | 10.2% | 13.3% | 37.5% | 21.9% | 12.7% | 17.9% | 24.7% | 45.0% | |
| | Not sure | 4.3% | 3.8% | 8.5% | | | 4.7% | 1.4% | 3.2% | 7.9% | 3.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Q41-44: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q41. How did you vote on previous measures to allow a lottery in ND? | Always voted in favor of | 40.5% | 43.7% | 25.4% | 33.3% | 37.5% | 56.3% | 59.2% | 40.0% | 36.0% | 17.5% | |
| | Usually voted in favor of | 7.3% | 7.9% | 5.1% | 6.7% | | 9.4% | 5.6% | 8.4% | 10.1% | 2.5% | |
| | Equally both ways | .8% | .6% | 1.7% | | | 1.6% | | 2.1% | | | |
| | Usually voted against | 5.5% | 6.0% | 5.1% | | | 4.7% | 4.2% | 5.3% | 7.9% | 5.0% | |
| | Always voted against | 20.5% | 22.6% | 13.6% | 13.3% | | 4.7% | 9.9% | 11.6% | 22.5% | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| | Never voted | 16.8% | 11.0% | 35.6% | 46.7% | 50.0% | 15.6% | 15.5% | 20.0% | 14.6% | 17.5% | |
| | Not sure | 8.8% | 8.2% | 13.6% | | 12.5% | 7.8% | 5.6% | 12.6% | 9.0% | 7.5% | |
| Q42. If the election were held today, how would you vote on measure to participate in a multi-state lottery? | Definitely vote for | 55.3% | 58.5% | 39.0% | 53.3% | 50.0% | 75.0% | 69.0% | 63.2% | 47.2% | 27.5% | |
| | Possibly vote for | 14.5% | 11.0% | 32.2% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 15.6% | 14.1% | 17.9% | 14.6% | 10.0% | |
| | Possibly vote against | 3.5% | 4.4% | | | | 1.6% | 1.4% | 4.2% | 5.6% | 2.5% | 100.0% |
| | Definitely vote against | 21.8% | 22.6% | 18.6% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 4.7% | 14.1% | 10.5% | 24.7% | 52.5% | |
| | No opinion | 2.0% | .9% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 12.5% | | | 2.1% | 1.1% | 6.3% | |
| | Not sure | 3.0% | 2.5% | 5.1% | | 12.5% | 3.1% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 6.7% | 1.3% | |
| Q43. If asked to vote on measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer more casino games, how would you vote? | Definitely vote for | 37.0% | 38.1% | 30.5% | 46.7% | 25.0% | 48.4% | 47.9% | 40.0% | 37.1% | 15.0% | |
| | Possibly vote for | 15.0% | 13.8% | 20.3% | 13.3% | 25.0% | 21.9% | 14.1% | 15.8% | 13.5% | 11.3% | |
| | Possibly vote against | 7.8% | 7.2% | 13.6% | | | 3.1% | 8.5% | 13.7% | 4.5% | 7.5% | |
| | Definitely vote against | 28.3% | 30.2% | 18.6% | 26.7% | 25.0% | 17.2% | 22.5% | 20.0% | 25.8% | 53.8% | 100.0% |
| | No opinion | 5.3% | 4.4% | 6.8% | 6.7% | 25.0% | 3.1% | 4.2% | 4.2% | 5.6% | 8.8% | |
| | Not sure | 6.8% | 6.3% | 10.2% | 6.7% | | 6.3% | 2.8% | 6.3% | 1.5% | 3.8% | |
| Q44. If asked to vote on measure that allowed charitable gaming sites to offer all casino games, how would you vote? | Definitely vote for | 36.3% | 36.2% | 33.9% | 46.7% | 37.5% | 42.2% | 56.3% | 34.7% | 37.1% | 15.0% | |
| | Possibly vote for | 14.0% | 12.9% | 20.3% | 13.3% | 12.5% | 21.9% | 11.3% | 17.9% | 12.4% | 7.5% | |
| | Possibly vote against | 6.3% | 6.9% | 5.1% | | | 3.1% | 1.4% | 11.6% | 5.6% | 7.5% | |
| | Definitely vote against | 32.5% | 34.0% | 27.1% | 26.7% | 25.0% | 21.9% | 26.8% | 28.4% | 25.8% | 57.5% | 100.0% |
| | No opinion | 3.8% | 3.1% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 3.1% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 5.6% | 7.5% | |
| | Not sure | 7.3% | 6.9% | 8.5% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 7.8% | 2.8% | 6.3% | 13.5% | 5.0% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 39 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Lu Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Demographics: By Voting Intention & How Recently Gambled

| | | Total | Q4. How likely are you to vote in the November election? | | | | Q5. How recently have you wagered money on games of chance? | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|--|---------------|---------------|----------|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | | | Definitely vote | Possibly vote | Will not vote | Not sure | Past week | Past month | Past year | More than a year | Never | Not sure |
| Q3. Region of residence? | Williston area | 4.3% | 4.7% | 3.4% | | | 1.6% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 7.9% | 5.0% | |
| | Minot area | 13.8% | 13.8% | 15.3% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 19.7% | 14.7% | 11.2% | 11.3% | |
| | Devils Lake area | 6.3% | 6.3% | 6.8% | 6.7% | | 4.7% | 5.6% | 6.3% | 7.9% | 6.3% | |
| | Grand Forks area | 14.3% | 14.5% | 15.3% | | 25.0% | 21.9% | 11.3% | 11.6% | 14.6% | 12.5% | 100.0% |
| | Fargo area | 25.8% | 25.2% | 25.4% | 33.3% | 37.5% | 29.7% | 23.9% | 25.3% | 23.6% | 27.5% | |
| | Jamestown area | 9.8% | 10.7% | 6.8% | 6.7% | | 6.3% | 7.0% | 11.6% | 10.1% | 12.5% | |
| | Bismarck area | 20.0% | 18.9% | 22.0% | 40.0% | 12.5% | 17.2% | 19.7% | 23.2% | 18.0% | 21.3% | |
| | Dickinson area | 6.0% | 6.0% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 8.5% | 5.3% | 6.7% | 3.8% | |
| Q1. Gender? | Male | 49.0% | 49.4% | 50.8% | 46.7% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 54.9% | 55.8% | 52.8% | 41.3% | |
| | Female | 51.0% | 50.6% | 49.2% | 53.3% | 75.0% | 62.5% | 45.1% | 44.2% | 47.2% | 58.8% | 100.0% |
| Q45. Age? | 21-24 | 2.3% | .9% | 8.5% | 6.7% | | 3.1% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 1.1% | 1.3% | |
| | 25-34 | 10.5% | 8.2% | 13.6% | 26.7% | 50.0% | 7.8% | 11.3% | 13.7% | 12.4% | 6.3% | |
| | 35-44 | 18.5% | 18.6% | 16.9% | 33.3% | | 15.6% | 21.1% | 17.9% | 16.9% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| | 45-54 | 22.5% | 23.0% | 20.3% | 26.7% | 12.5% | 23.4% | 23.9% | 25.3% | 22.5% | 17.5% | |
| | 55-64 | 19.8% | 21.1% | 18.6% | | 12.5% | 31.3% | 12.7% | 21.1% | 19.1% | 16.3% | |
| | 65+ | 26.0% | 28.0% | 22.0% | 6.7% | 12.5% | 18.8% | 28.2% | 17.9% | 28.1% | 37.5% | |
| | Choose not to answer | .5% | .3% | | | 12.5% | | | 1.1% | | 1.3% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q46. Where do you live? | City | 62.8% | 61.9% | 67.8% | 53.3% | 75.0% | 56.3% | 73.2% | 63.2% | 61.8% | 58.8% | 100.0% |
| | Medium town | 9.5% | 10.1% | 6.8% | 13.3% | | 17.2% | 1.4% | 7.4% | 12.4% | 10.0% | |
| | Small town | 12.8% | 12.6% | 8.5% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 15.6% | 14.1% | 7.4% | 13.5% | 15.0% | |
| | Farm or ranch | 14.8% | 15.1% | 16.9% | | 12.5% | 10.9% | 11.3% | 21.1% | 12.4% | 16.3% | |
| | Not sure | .3% | .3% | | | | | | 1.1% | | | |
| Q47. Household's gross or total income before taxes for the year 2001? | < \$20K | 7.5% | 7.2% | 11.9% | | | 6.3% | 5.6% | 4.2% | 5.6% | 16.3% | |
| | \$20K-\$34K | 20.3% | 19.2% | 22.0% | 40.0% | 12.5% | 18.8% | 16.9% | 16.8% | 24.7% | 23.8% | |
| | \$35K-\$49K | 18.5% | 17.3% | 22.0% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 21.9% | 25.4% | 21.1% | 15.7% | 10.0% | |
| | \$50K-\$74K | 13.3% | 13.2% | 13.6% | 20.0% | | 15.6% | 11.3% | 11.6% | 15.7% | 11.3% | 100.0% |
| | \$75K+ | 14.0% | 15.1% | 11.9% | | 12.5% | 17.2% | 18.3% | 17.9% | 7.9% | 10.0% | |
| | Choose not to answer | 26.5% | 28.0% | 18.6% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 20.3% | 22.5% | 28.4% | 30.3% | 28.8% | |
| Total Responses | | 400 | 318 | 59 | 15 | 8 | 64 | 71 | 95 | 89 | 80 | 1 |

Includes all respondents

10/8/02 11:16:12 AM

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

La Costa Rick Gould

Date

10/3/03

1495 +
1074

HIGHLIGHTS OF CROSS-TABS WITH THE GAMING ISSUES SURVEY OF OCTOBER 2002

SECTION 5 of CGAND's Gaming Issues Survey contains contingency tables on all of the questions in the survey. These tables, more commonly referred to as "Cross-tabs", contain specific data as to the responses by region and area.

Some responses that may be of particular interest are noted below:

- | | | |
|-----------|--------|--|
| Page 3 | Q11 | The perceived value of charitable gaming experiences. |
| Page 4 | Q12 | The perceived value with reference to Tribal Casinos. |
| Page 6 | Q14 | The direction people believe the legislature should take with charitable gaming |
| Page 12 | Q22 | Level of support or opposition to charitable organizations operating casinos that provide all of the games currently allowed on reservations |
| Page 7 | Q15a | Location that machine gaming sites be allowed |
| Page 9-10 | Q17-18 | Some lottery poll questions. |
| Page 12 | Q21 | Opinions about charities operating slots, video poker, and other electronic gaming. |
| Page 13 | Q25-26 | If gaming were expanded, who should benefit. |
| Page 19 | Q37 | Support of a candidate who supports charities having slot machines, video poker, or electronic games. |

AH #3

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
Gaming Division
Eligible Use Contributions for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2000

| Charitable Uses: | Amount | Percent to Grand Total |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Abused | \$ 54,714 | 0.31 |
| Alcohol and Drug Abuse | 148,118 | 0.85 |
| Animal Protection | 308,446 | 1.77 |
| Blind | 14,141 | 0.08 |
| Cancer | 49,383 | 0.28 |
| Cystic Fibrosis | 128,657 | 0.74 |
| Disabled | 1,208,856 | 6.92 |
| Heart Disease | 13,922 | 0.08 |
| Learning Disabilities | 3,340 | 0.02 |
| Mental Health | 200,795 | 1.15 |
| Multiple Sclerosis | 142,725 | 0.82 |
| Needy | 112,823 | 0.65 |
| Paralysis | 600 | 0.00 |
| Developmentally Disabled Citizens | 928,616 | 5.31 |
| Senior Citizens | 148,124 | 0.85 |
| Terminally Ill | 30,673 | 0.18 |
| Wildlife | 182,215 | 1.04 |
| Youth Activities | 1,989,738 | 11.39 |
| Adult Activities | 168,314 | 0.96 |
| Head Injuries | 3,420 | 0.02 |
| Home on the Range | 33,494 | 0.19 |
| March of Dimes | 4,779 | 0.03 |
| Meals on Wheels | 17,381 | 0.10 |
| Medical Facilities (Nonprofit) | 110,151 | 0.63 |
| Memorial Funds | 15,725 | 0.09 |
| Nursing Homes (Nonprofit) | 30,225 | 0.17 |
| Ronald McDonald House | 7,375 | 0.04 |
| Salvation Army | 9,600 | 0.05 |
| Special Olympics | 371,114 | 2.12 |
| United Fund/United Way | 7,225 | 0.04 |
| YMCA/YWCA | 6,850 | 0.04 |
| Volunteer Services | 17,903 | 0.10 |
| Gambling Addiction | 7,900 | 0.05 |
| Other | 109,028 | 0.62 |
| Total | \$ 6,586,370 | 37.69 |

| Religious Uses: | Amount | Percent to Grand Total |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Religious uses | 234,185 | 1.34 |
| Total | \$ 234,185 | 1.34 |

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Educational Uses:

| | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------|
| Agriculture | \$ 61,583 | 0.35 |
| Arts | 2,095,541 | 11.99 |
| Educational Public Services | 963,025 | 5.51 |
| Safety | 93,007 | 0.53 |
| Educational Institutions and Activities | 716,031 | 4.10 |
| Preservation of Cultural Heritage | 349,935 | 2.00 |
| Scholarships | 732,682 | 4.19 |
| Vocational Workshops | 7,655 | 0.04 |
| Other | 93,905 | 0.54 |
| Total | \$ 5,113,364 | 29.26 |

Fraternal Uses:

| | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| Camp Grassick | \$ 33,199 | 0.19 |
| Fraternal Foundations | 22,272 | 0.13 |
| Legion Baseball | 400,355 | 2.29 |
| Disabled or Injured Veteran's Assistance | 43,200 | 0.25 |
| Other | 42,317 | 0.24 |
| Total | \$ 541,343 | 3.10 |

Patriotic Uses:

| | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| Scouting Activities and Boys or Girls State | \$ 95,874 | 0.55 |
| Community Bands, Color and Honor Guards, Flags, and Patriotic Celebrations | 236,044 | 1.35 |
| Other | 50,530 | 0.29 |
| Total | \$ 382,448 | 2.19 |

Uses for Erection or Maintenance of Public Buildings or Works:

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Uses described above | 145,047 | 0.83 |
| Total | \$ 145,047 | 0.83 |

| Uses Lessening the Burden of Government: | Amount | Percent to Grand Total |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Community Emergency Services such as Ambulance and Fire Departments | \$ 485,677 | 2.78 |
| Disbursements Directly to a City, County, State, or U.S. Government | 350,678 | 2.01 |
| Improvement of Public Areas | 187,718 | 1.07 |
| Parks and Recreation | 1,604,100 | 9.18 |
| Law Enforcement | 18,432 | 0.11 |
| Other | 14,115 | 0.08 |
| Total | \$ 2,660,720 | 15.23 |

Uses Benefiting a Definite Number of Persons Who are the Victims of Loss of Home or Household Possessions Through Explosion, Fire, Flood, or Storm and the losses are Uncompensated by Insurance:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|------|
| Uses described above | \$ 21,435 | 0.12 |
|----------------------|-----------|------|

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

Uses Benefiting a Definite Number of Persons Suffering from a Seriously Disabling Disease or Injury Causing Severe Loss of Income or Incurring Extraordinary Medical Expense Which is Uncompensated by Insurance:

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|--------|
| Uses described above | \$ 729,749 | 4.18 |
| Community Uses: | | |
| Economic Development | \$ 301,447 | 1.73 |
| Tourism | 639,851 | 3.66 |
| Other | 118,889 | 0.68 |
| Total | \$ 1,060,187 | 6.07 |
| Grand Total | \$ 17,474,848 | 100.00 |

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

PH # 4

March 19, 2003

Chrm. Traynor and members of the Senate Judiciary Com.

My name is Warren DeKrey, Chrm. Of the ND Council of Gambling Problems.

I appear in opposition to HB 1274

Prior to 1975, Many fraternal organizations allowed Poker games, usually not where the public would readily see them. It was always illegal in ND but the law was seldom if ever enforced. There were no limits & large stakes were often involved. I recall seeing a quarter of land being transferred after one of the all-night games. Poker has always had a bad connotation. That's probably why ND made it illegal.

In May of 1975, Attorney General Allen Olson decided to enforce the State law. Poker was illegal as it always had been and the law was enforced. Following this there was a move on to make some gambling legal if the proceeds went to charities.

A constitutional amendment allowing Charitable Gambling was passed by the voters in 1976 and in 1977 the Legislature passed a bill allowing 4 games: Punch boards, Pull tabs, Raffles & Bingo. The Legislature has approved several additional games over the years as shown by the following summery.

North Dakota Gambling History

- 1977 Charitable Gambling approved
Punchboards, pull-tabs, raffles, & Bingo**
- 1979 Sports pools**
- 1981 Twenty-one**
- 1983 Increased allowable expenses for gaming operators**
- 1987 Poker, horse racing, raised allowable gaming expenses**
- 1989 Slot machines at casinos, off track betting, calcuttas
Further increase in allowable gaming expenses, increase
betting limits on Twenty-One**
- 1992 Indian gaming compacts signed by Governor**
- 1999 New Indian gaming compact signed by Governor**
- 2001 Increase in allowable expenses for gaming operators
Increased betting limits on Black Jack**
- 2002 Voters approved State operated Lottery**

In 1987 the Legislature passed a bill which again allowed Poker. The bill keeps it a small friendly tournament game which may be conducted on not more than two occasions per year. Raises are \$1 each and allows only 3 raises.

In 2001 an amended bill was introduced to raise the wagers and to allow exotic games to be played at any time during the year. The bill passed the House but was defeated in the Senate 6 to 42.

Today we have before us a re-write of the previous bill with the exception that the word non-tournament has been inserted. Wagers have been increased from \$1 to \$25 and the word non-tournament allows any and all kinds of Poked to be played. In addition Poked can be played at any or at all times, but not restricted to 2 occasions a year.

This present bill essentially takes us back to the Poker games that took place prior to 1975. The question needs to be asked, why is it now good for the people of the State? It is a definite expansion of gambling.

What is happening is that the various Charitable Games are competing with each other for the gamblers dollars and as one raises its stakes the next one wants to do the same. The charities begin cannibalizing each other. Especially since there is only so many dollars out there. It becomes more about the games than about the charities. The losers in all this are the people of ND. Gambling is reverse economic development.

The charities have already lost funds to operating expenses of the games. Originally only 33% of income could be kept for expenses. Now up to 53% can be kept for expenses. Obviously it's more about gambling than charity, and again it is reverse economics.

SP

The March 5, 2003 Bismarck Tribune editorial quoted information from the 9th Federal District in depth study on the effects of gambling in the 9th District. This particular study showed that we wagered \$900 for every man, woman and child in ND in 2000, the latest information available. Ten years ago this figure was \$458 about one half.

HB 1274 will only increase this amount. We don't need an expansion of gambling.

Please vote no on HB 1274

Are there any questions?

ATT #5

North Dakota State Senate

March 19, 2003
House Bill No. 1274

Rev. Warren L. Wenzel, Pastor Linton United Methodist Church
Linton, North Dakota 701-254-0166

Chairman Traynor and members of the committee:


I am here representing myself and I ask you to defeat House Bill 1274. It is another expansion of gambling. We are already one of the highest per person gambling states in the nation. The Bismarck Tribune of March 4, 2003 reported on a front page story that North Dakotans gambles less than our neighbors. The story did not have the facts and was very misleading because just the opposite true. The article said that North Dakotans spend about \$180 per person per year gambling. Charity Gaming in North America 2001 annual Report shows however that North Dakotans spent \$246,516,772 on Charitable gambling alone. That does not include the amounts spent in reservation Casinos. That's over \$410.00 per person. We are second only to Alaska. And no other state is even close to the two leaders, North Dakota and Alaska. The American Legion magazine of June 2002 has a good study entitled, "Gambling's Dark Side". A May 7, 2001, Business Week magazine, article quotes Kip Peterson, a consultant at Transnational Market Development Inc., describing the turning to more and different kind of games by the gambling industry as, "It's a self-destructive cycle". Gambling's appetite never ends. This measure is a threat to the well-being of our communities. Society pays a high price for gambling problems and any increase in gambling opportunities increases the problems.

A young man from West Fargo was here testifying in favor of the lottery bill two weeks ago. He said and quoted figures that showed gambling really was not a problem. That gambling hurts the poor he said is a myth. That addiction is a growing problem is a myth he said. He was quite persuasive but he did not have the facts. Gambling does hurt the poor more than any other segment of society. Those who have less education gamble more than those with more education. The research is clear. And gambling addiction is a growing problem. Dave Palermo, contributing editor of INTERNATIONAL GAMING AND WAGERING BUSINESS, a principal journal of the gambling industry, wrote in their June, 2002 issue: "But the industry remains in denial. It defies any study linking gambling with bankruptcy, suicide and other social problems. And it steadfastly refutes any claim by critics that the spread of legal casino gambling in this country increases the prevalence of problem and pathological gambling. That position defies logic. In fact, it's insulting. The caseload for specialists in addiction treatment has skyrocketed." This bill would turn nearly every bar in North Dakota into a casino.

The proponents of a state lottery said all they wanted was the opportunity to buy Power-ball Lottery tickets in North Dakota. They said it would not hurt the charitable gambling. That too was not the truth and this bill is proof that. The lottery will hurt the charities. What we have in North Dakota is not charitable gambling but a gambling industry that is using charities as a front. You must stop the expansion of gambling by voting against this bill. Martin Dyckman said, "It is easier to excuse desperate people who bet money they don't have than to excuse public officials who seduce them."



The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.


Operator's Signature

10/2/03
Date

North Dakotans gamble less than neighbors

BISMARCK TRIBUNE • TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2003

*Only \$180 per person
in the state compared to
South Dakota's \$400*

By TONY SPILDE
Bismarck Tribune

Under the B, nine
B-9.

A recent study shows gambling activity in North Dakota is relatively benign compared to that in neighboring states.

Though they have plenty of opportunity, North Dakotans spend less money gambling than residents in Montana, South Dakota and Minnesota. According to fedgazette, a business and economics publication of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, about \$180 per person was spent on gambling here in 2000.

That was \$42 less than the national average, and well below the estimated \$400 spent per individual in South Dakota. Montanans gambled \$341 per person, and \$262 was spent for each Minnesota resident, according to the

report.

The study indicated charitable gambling was popular in North Dakota, and indeed an estimated 930 such sites exist in the state. But Indian casino business in the state is small compared to that of its neighbors, and North Dakota doesn't offer video gambling, scratch-off tickets or a lottery.

North Dakota voters approved their state's entry in a multi-state lottery in November, but it has yet to join.

Karen Larson, state director of mental health and substance abuse, said a smaller number of gambling opportunities than in other states might be why North Dakota spends less.

Another reason might be more awareness of gambling problems.

Allan Stenehjerm, director of the Mental Health Association in North Dakota, said the increased availability of gambling help could be a cause for a drop in the number of gamblers in the state.

According to a state Human Services study, the number of North Dakotans who gamble once a week or more dropped from 12 percent in 1992 to 4

percent in 2000. Figures from the state Tax Department show gaming tax collections have decreased steadily since 1994, lending to the notion that less is being spent on pull tabs, bingo, blackjack and other charitable games.

"We've seen gambling revenues go down the last couple years," Stenehjerm said. "But since we do spend less on gambling, we also spend less on gambling addiction."

The state provides about \$150,000 every two years for gambling addiction programs. The North Dakota Indian Gaming Association recently donated \$103,000 to Stenehjerm's organization, which provides a gambling help line. And the state Legislature is considering using part of the profits from the lottery to fund treatment programs for gamblers.

"Treatment is very successful, but people need to recognize that it's available," Stenehjerm said.

The fedgazette report is available online at www.minneapolisfed.org/pubs/fedgaz/03-03/.

(Reach Tony Spilde at 250-8260 or tspilde@ndonline.com.)

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

Roberta Rickard

10/2/03
Date

National Association of Fundraising Ticket Manufacturers

CHARITY GAMING IN NORTH AMERICA 2001 ANNUAL REPORT



The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Sal Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/2/02
Date

RECEIPTS BY GAMES

| STATE/ PROVINCE | BINGO GROSS | PULLTAB GROSS | RAFFLES GROSS | OTHER GROSS | TOTAL GROSS RECEIPTS | TOTAL NET PROCEEDS | % NET PROCEEDS GROSS RECEIPTS |
|--------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alaska | \$64,713,324 | \$236,056,802 | \$8,000,492 | \$2,111,962 | \$310,882,580 | \$29,120,262 | 9.37% |
| Arizona | \$5,397,551 | | | | \$5,397,551 | Not Tracked | N/A |
| Colorado | \$65,559,744 | \$122,869,394 | \$7,195,508 | | \$195,624,646 | \$27,218,401 | 13.91% |
| Connecticut | \$29,421,633 | \$8,798,418 | \$12,145,188 | \$1,066,766 | \$51,432,005 | \$17,279,230 | 33.60% |
| Iowa | \$23,920,542 | | \$6,810,487 | | \$30,731,029 | Not Tracked | N/A |
| Idaho | \$4,984,759 | \$5,179,972 | | | \$10,164,731 | \$5,651,553 | 55.60% |
| Illinois | \$94,724,345 | \$145,789,720 | | \$3,807,733 | \$244,321,798 | Not Tracked | N/A |
| Indiana | \$494,542,821 | \$54,423,839 | \$12,696,192 | \$14,475,207 | \$576,138,059 | \$67,487,370 | 11.71% |
| Kansas | \$24,000,000 | \$14,300,000 | | | \$38,300,000 | Not Tracked | N/A |
| Kentucky | \$116,778,108 | \$475,720,045 | \$5,370,954 | \$9,179,771 | \$607,048,878 | \$48,217,868 | 7.94% |
| Louisiana | \$118,785,200 | \$73,313,700 | \$2,902,600 | \$1,493,700 | \$196,495,200 | \$21,580,900 | 10.98% |
| Massachusetts | \$101,935,825 | \$41,542,924 | \$16,774,861 | \$852,278 | \$161,105,888 | \$27,152,744 | 16.85% |
| Maine | \$29,800,717 | \$60,520,653 | | | \$90,321,370 | \$17,462,120 | 19.33% |
| Michigan | \$148,509,441 | \$188,031,365 | \$59,110,769 | \$4,084,634 | \$399,736,209 | \$74,273,973 | 18.58% |
| Minnesota | \$69,982,000 | \$1,329,382,000 | \$4,390,000 | \$21,146,000 | \$1,424,900,000 | \$127,439,000 | 8.94% |
| Missouri | | | | | \$151,200,000 | \$16,994,537 | 11.24% |
| Mississippi | \$97,520,855 | \$8,979,862 | | \$26,203,069 | \$132,703,786 | \$17,546,976 | 13.22% |
| Nebraska | \$17,641,173 | \$71,391,519 | \$4,238,281 | \$166,051,868 | \$259,322,841 | \$26,151,720 | 10.08% |
| New Hampshire | \$34,100,000 | \$49,100,000 | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | \$83,200,000 | \$10,900,000 | 13.10% |
| New Mexico | \$20,305,390 | \$9,857,682 | \$99,389 | \$138,822 | \$30,401,283 | \$3,108,307 | 10.22% |
| New York | \$179,490,194 | \$324,251,879 | \$5,666,761 | \$1,844,187 | \$511,253,021 | \$91,147,750 | 17.83% |
| North Carolina | \$31,098,397 | | Not Tracked | | \$31,098,397 | \$4,070,302 | 13.09% |
| North Dakota | \$48,037,570 | \$160,634,211 | \$2,780,383 | \$35,064,608 | \$246,516,772 | \$15,747,911 | 6.39% |
| Ohio | \$191,339,236 | \$557,042,613 | | | \$748,381,849 | \$82,718,945 | 11.05% |
| Oklahoma | \$97,059,748 | \$4,594,693 | | | \$101,654,441 | \$4,820,783 | 4.74% |
| Oregon | \$65,547,400 | | \$5,399,698 | \$259,687 | \$71,206,785 | \$12,026,180 | 16.89% |
| Pennsylvania | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | N/A |
| South Carolina | \$109,615,868 | | | | \$109,615,868 | \$5,914,731 | 5.40% |
| South Dakota | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | Not Tracked | N/A |
| Texas | \$477,493,280 | \$84,975,689 | | | \$562,468,969 | \$34,557,924 | 6.14% |
| Virginia | \$229,232,104 | \$69,215,210 | \$5,191,580 | \$42,102,905 | \$345,741,799 | \$43,102,843 | 12.47% |
| Washington | \$146,363,504 | \$500,195,462 | \$6,318,017 | \$248,748,909 | \$901,625,892 | \$109,291,919 | 12.12% |
| West Virginia | \$36,057,218 | | \$133,800,494 | | \$169,857,712 | \$14,112,289 | 8.31% |
| Wisconsin | \$22,258,973 | | \$51,446,916 | | \$73,705,889 | \$34,492,568 | 46.80% |
| Totals: | | | | | \$8,872,555,248 | \$989,587,106 | |
| Alberta | \$282,271,000 | \$40,931,000 | \$77,909,000 | \$611,273,000 | \$1,012,384,000 | \$183,136,000 | 18.09% |
| British Columbia | \$215,900,000 | | \$48,600,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$266,000,000 | \$90,400,000 | 33.98% |
| Manitoba | \$79,700,000 | \$11,100,000 | \$12,700,000 | \$100,000 | \$103,600,000 | \$16,500,000 | 15.93% |
| New Brunswick | \$58,757,654 | \$250,861 | \$8,327,935 | \$82,666 | \$67,419,116 | \$14,222,133 | 21.10% |
| Newfoundland | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | N/A |
| Nova Scotia | \$85,534,000 | | \$11,396,000 | \$90,211,000 | \$187,141,000 | \$24,067,000 | 12.86% |
| Prince Edward Is. | \$14,646,868 | | | | \$14,646,868 | \$3,922,674 | 26.78% |
| Saskatchewan | \$115,058,606 | \$44,756,575 | \$24,149,867 | | \$183,965,048 | \$38,213,130 | 20.77% |
| Totals: | | | | | \$1,835,156,032 | \$370,460,937 | |

This table will provide the reader with a breakdown on how much is wagered by state or province in bingo, pulltabs, raffles and other games sponsored by charities ("gross receipts"). It will also identify the amount of money ("net proceeds") charities will have derived from the play of those games during the 2001 fiscal year for that jurisdiction, and which they may use for their programs. Finally, a calculation is made to show the percentage of net proceeds to gross receipts so the reader may make comparisons among the reporting jurisdictions.

Bismarck Tribune - April 6, 1998

Alcohol, drugs on run, now it's gambling

There is a new addiction growing in Indian country. The addiction is gambling.

In his novel, "The Gambler," Fyodor Dostoevsky wrote: "At that point I ought to have gone away, but a strange sensation rose up in me, a sort of defiance of fate, a desire to challenge it, to put out my tongue at it. I laid down the largest stake allowed — four thousand gulden — and lost it.

"Then, getting hot, I pulled out all I had left, staked it on the same number, and lost again, after which I walked away from the table as though I were stunned. I could not even grasp what had happened to me."

These days, I am hearing tales of Indian men and women reacting in a like fashion. One man, an employee of the BIA, and his wife, who works for the tribal government — middle-class Americans, for all intents and purposes — find themselves over their head in debt because of their frequent trips to their tribe's casino. They have reached the point where they are beginning to sell off some of their possessions in order to get back into the game.

Any Indian nation with a casino has among their customers those on welfare who have become addicted to gambling. They take what little they have and make a try for the pot of gold they hope to find at the slot machines or "21" tables.

We are just beginning to understand the havoc that gambling-addicted people are bringing to their families. Just as many Indian tribes are beginning to win the battle against alcohol and drugs, this new addiction is pushing many families into deep poverty.

Perhaps there is not the physical violence and the abuse associated with drinking, but the separation of mother and father from their children and the poverty brought about by the loss of money to the casino is creating many problems — teen-age suicide, for one.

John Lauerman, contributing editor of Harvard Magazine, writes: "Although we're not exactly sure what defines problem gambling in individuals, its impact on the nervous system is undeniable. In many ways, problem gambling is like any other addiction. It appears to act as a stimulant, one to which frequent risk-takers can become inured. Research shows that problem gamblers exhibit patterns of brain activity familiar to experts on drug and alcohol addiction."

This is an issue several tribal governments are just now beginning to address. Just as so many Indian nations declared war on alcohol and drug addiction among their own people, they must now declare war on this new addiction.

— Tim Giago, Indian Country Today,
Rapid City, S.D.

La Costa Rickford
Operator's Signature

10/3/03
Date

HOW TO BUILD A CHURCH WITHOUT BINGO

by Father William J. Witt, M.A., M. Div.

It was the last Tuesday of May 1963. Six months previously on November 2 I had arrived as Pastor to this 100 years old small river-town parish of O. L. of the Holy Rosary, in Lowellville, Ohio. The church was small, 50' x 50' and in desperate need of replacement.

A small Bingo game had been going on for many weeks, months and years before I arrived. It served as the excuse many used to not contribute to the Sunday collection. At the end of the weekly game on the last Tuesday of May 1963 I took the microphone and announced:

"My dear friends. I am sick and disgusted with your complaints about not getting enough money in the prizes. You are getting more than half the take. As I see it you are here for one of three reasons.

(1) You are here because you love God and want to help His Church, and you think by playing Bingo you are helping the Church. If that is the reason you are here, you are welcome.

(2) Or you are here because you love your neighbor and want to spend a few hours in their company. If that's the reason you are here, you are welcome.

(3) Or you are here because you love money, and you hope by playing Bingo you will get more. If that's the reason you are here, we don't want you because we are contributing to your greed for money and that is not exactly the reason Jesus Christ started His Church. In fact we are working against the teachings of Jesus if we are encouraging greed or your lust for money.

"If you are here because you love money, all the money remaining from tonight's game is on the table here. Come up and take as much as you want home with you for tonight is the last Bingo as long as I am pastor here." The people were frozen. Total silence!

The next morning it was like a bomb had fallen on the village. Many said: "This crazy priest we have, how does he think he can run a parish or build a new church without Bingo?"

The next Sunday I got up in the pulpit and announced: My dear parishioners, we have no gold mines, we have no oil wells and we have no Bingo. The only money we have to run this parish and to build a new church is what you from your love of God take out of your pocket and put in the collection basket. God gives you everything you have. Now in thanksgiving to the good Lord for all His blessings, I am asking you to return 10% from the 100% He has given you.

We began a tithing program. The collection doubled, tripled and then went up to 500% of what it had been. We were able to build an education center immediately and then a new church in four years. While the church was going up the building fund campaign was conducted and over subscribed by \$50,000. In all the years since with major facilities' expansion and a rebuilding after a fire there has been no pandering to greed by introducing Bingo. The parishioners brag: "Not only do we have the most beautiful church in the diocese, but we have no Bingo."