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## The Commissioners



## Robert L. Wolfson, Chairman

Robert L. Wolfson is Chairman of the Board for Wolfson Capital Venture, serves on the Mark Twain Chairman's Board, is a member of the Board of Trustees for Brandeis University and is on the Board of Trustees of Jewish Hospital in St. Louis. He is the co-founder of the St. Louis Blues of the National Hockey League and served as Vice-President and Treasurer of the St. Louis Blues. Mr. Wolfson has a long history as a successful businessman, having owned and managed many successful retail and commercial ventures. Additionally, Mr. Wolfson is the recipient of many awards from civic organizations and is well known for his philanthropic endeavors.


## Robert M. Clayton II, Vice-Chairman

Mr. Clayton is a senior partner of Clayton \& Clayton law firm. He has served on the Board of Directors of Roosevelt Bank and has also served as a member of the Compensation and Stock Option Committee. He serves on the Mark Twain Home Board. Mr. Clayton is former President of the Missouri Bar and is the Treasurer of the Missouri Bar Plan Mutual Insurance Company, a member of its Executive Committee and Chairman of the Bar's Underwriting and Finance Committee. Mr. Clayton also serves as a member and Director of the Bar Plan Foundation.


## William J. Quinn

Mr. Quinn is a retired, 23 year veteran of the FBI where he served as supervisor of the agency's Organized Crime and Racketeering unit in Kansas City. He also served as National Chairman of the Former Agents of the FBI Foundation. He is a veteran of the United States Navy and holds a BBA degree from Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts. In addition, Mr. Quinn has owned and operated a private security company.


## Dr. Jenice Prather, Secretary

Dr. Jenice J. Prather is a CPA and accounting professor at the University of Missouri-Columbia. She has published over twenty articles in national and international academic accounting journals. She has received numerous honors and awards for her research and teaching including a two year Research Associateship from Washington University and a KPMG Peat Marwick Intemational Accounting Research Fellowship. She holds leadership positions in the American Accounting Association, the National Association of Black Accountants, the American Institute of CPAs, the Institute of Management Accountants and the Missouri Society of CPAs. She was on the Price Waterhouse, National Advisory Board and currently is on the MIZZOU Credit Union and the Board of Trustees of Second Missionary Baptist Church.


## Avis Tucker

Avis Tucker is the President of Star-Journal Publishing Co. and serves as Editor and Publisher of The Daily Star-Journal in Warrensburg, Missouri. She also serves as President of Johnson County Broadcasters, Inc. Additionally Mrs. Tucker serves on the Missouri Commission on the
Organization of the Judicial Department; the Whiteman Air Force Base Community Council; the Warrensburg Chamber of Commerce; and the Children's Mercy Hospital Public Affairs Committee. Mrs. Tucker has received number of awards for her professional accomplishments and her public service work, most recently the Chancellor's Award from UMKC.

## Introduction

The Missouri Gaming Commission was established in 1993 to regulate riverboat gambling in Missouri. In addition, the Commission assumed the responsibility for regulating charitable bingo games on July 1, 1994.

The five member Commission is charged with maintaining public confidence in legalized gambling and ensuring that no criminal elements are allowed to infiltrate licensed gaming operations. It is important that the Commission do its job well so that public confidence in the gaming industry is established, thereby allowing the industry to reach its goals of economic development, job creation and the promotion of Missouri as a major tourist attraction.

As a state regulatory agency, the Commission and its staff hold themselves to the highest ethical and professional standards and strive to conduct all business in a manner which maintains the public trust. Pursuant to statute, a strict Code of Ethics has been adopted prohibiting conflicts of interest and ex parte communications.

## The key regulatory responsibilities of the Commission are as follows:

- to conduct thorough background investigations on all key persons involved in the gaming operation including substantial owners, management personnel, key operational employees and suppliers;
- to thoroughly investigate the finances of applicants and their key persons to determine if they have the financial resources and responsibility to meet their proposed obligations;
- to screen all occupational licensees including dealers, slot attendants, food and beverage servers, security and surveillance personnel and all other employees who have access to the gaming area and investigate the background of each to ensure that the personnel operating the casino are of sufficient character to maintain the integrity of Missouri gaming;
- to photograph and fingerprint each employee so as to maintain a complete and accurate database of boat personnel;
- to assign appropriate staff to each gaming operation to be present at all times when gaming is conducted. Enforcement agents are charged with
ensuring that gaming is conducted in accordance with the Missouri gaming statute, the rules and regulations of the commission and the operator's own internal controls;
- to ensure that the safety of the passengers is guarded, to conduct investigations of suspected wrongdoing and to receive complaints from customers;
- to review and audit the finances of the gaming operation through the combined use of Commission staff and independent public accounting firms that are retained by the licensee and approved by the Commission; and
to monitor the financial integrity of gaming operators to ensure that Missouri's financial interests are protected.

Pursuant to statute, the Commission has entered in to a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri State Highway Patrol to perform background investigations and provide enforcement personnel on the boats. Under the terms of this agreement, the Patrol also provides enforcement personnel for the Division of Bingo.

The Commission also has a Memorandum of Understanding with the IRS to assist with the financial portion of the background investigation and to provide ongoing expertise with regard to the internal control procedures and the reporting and payment of taxes.

At the end of 1996, ten riverboat casinos were operational at eight different developments in Missouri. Summaries of the operator's financial reports, that are required by the Commission, are contained in Appendix C. Harrah's Maryland Heights, Inc. and Players Maryland Heights Corporation are in the process of being investigated.

The Commission is also responsible for approximately 870 bingo licensees and has successfully implemented the new requirement of licensing hall providers. In addition, the commission has successfully executed the difficult task of implementing the new supplier-based bingo tax that took effect January 1, 1995.

## The Effect of the $\$ 500$ Loss Limit on Competitiveness

For the past two years the commission has reported that the $\$ 500$ loss limit imposed by statute places Missouri riverboat gaming operations at a competitive disadvantage as opposed to similar operations in the adjoining states of Illinois and Iowa. We opined at that time that the $\$ 500$ loss limit contributes to a large decrease in state revenue.

The commission's comments in prior years have been tempered by our knowledge that the riverboat gaming industry in Missouri was in its formative years, and that little data was available to study. After more than two years of Missouri operating history, there is now adequate data from Missouri and its adjoining competitive states to expand our comments on the loss limits, and state our findings with more precision.

## Negative Impact on Customer Satisfaction

The most frequent complaints to Commission staff and regulatory personnel in their contacts with the public are those dealing with the loss limit and the boarding restrictions. The restriction on boarding is a method to enforce the loss limit.

In addition, the loss limit continues to be difficult to enforce. Although the commission uses its best efforts to enforce the limit, the customer's desire to circumvent it consumes a tremendous amount of manpower. Enforcement agents spend a signiticant amount of time dealing with violations and customer disputes. Gaming boat sergeants regularly testify that their most difficult problem was enforcing the $\$ 500$ loss limit.

## The Loss Limit and the Problem Gambler

The loss limit has been described as a measure intended to deal with problem gaming. However, the success of the loss limit in addressing the problem of compulsive gambling remains undetermined.

The primary argurnent for the $\$ 500$ loss limit is that it helps deter the problem gambler. If the loss limit controlled the behavior of the problem gambler, it would be a laudable requirement.

Mental health professionals have told the commission that, left untreated, the problem gambler will find a way to gamble. Whether it is by reboarding another cruise, using some other person's loss limit card, by crossing the river into another jurisdiction where there is no loss limit, or gambling illegally, the problem gambler will find a way to exercise the compulsion.

The commission, in relying on the treatment professionals, has focused its battle against problem gambling on education, prevention and treatment. Missouri has been one of the most aggressive states in combating problem gambling. Missouri is the first jurisdiction to create a system whereby problem gamblers can exclude themselves from casinos under threat of arrest for trespassing. In addition, the commission has required operators to adopt programs to educate problem gamblers and has arranged funding for the recruitment and training of treatment counselors who must be certified by the Missouri department of mental health.

## The Loss Limit and the Typical Consumer

While treatment professionals tell the commission that loss limits do not inhibit the compulsive gambler, Wall Street analysts who study the industry report that the loss limit has a negative impact on the normal consumer looking
for an entertainment experience.' Gaming is an entertainment industry. In the entertainment industry, the consumers demand a product that they can enjoy during their leisure time on their own terms.

In Missouri, there are consumers that indicate they dislike the product which they are being offered. Many of these consumers will go out of their way, even travel to another state, to find a product that is more user friendly. A cursory survey of the license plates in the parking lot of the Casino Queen in East St. Louis, Illinois, adequately demonstrates this point.

Many Missouri gaming customers complain that the loss limit is inconvenient, intrusive and that it detracts from the entertainment experience they seek at Missouri riverboats. To have to "account" for ones spending during what is supposed to be a leisure activity strikes many as a personal encroachment. The fact that this requirement is imposed and enforced by the government further aggravates this perception.

Many Missouri consumers react to this restriction by taking their leisure time and tax dollars across the border to Illinois, Iowa, or Kansas, where there are no limits. Furthermore, it is apparent that the loss limit severely restricts Missouri riverboat operators from drawing tourist customers from other states. Consumers' choice as to how to spend their discretionary leisure dollars is evident in the competitive gaming arena.

The Missouri gaming law was adopted by the people for its potential to generate economic development, its ability to raise needed revenue for education and because it is a leisure activity that many want to pursue. The loss limit detracts from all of these goals. While Missouri is currently the beneficiary of a significant amount of capital investment and new job creation, the continuing negative impact of the loss limit renders our economic future in this area uncertain. Because of the loss limit, Missouri riverboat operators are less competitive, the state is losing money to its neighboring states, there is a reduction in the number of available jobs and the number of riverboats that can successfully operate in Missouri is restricted.

## How does the Loss Limit Work?

Pursuant to $\S 313.805$, RSMo, the commission is required to regulate the wagering structure to include a maximum loss of five hundred dollars per individual player per gambling excursion. In order to enforce this provision the commission requires the following procedure:

1. In order to board an excursion gambling boat a customer most stand in line to obtain a purchase authorization coupon (scrip). This scrip must be signed by the customer in the presence of a licensed riverboat employee.
2. After the customer receives the scrip he/she must get in another line to board the riverboat. The scrip also serves as the customer's boarding pass.
3. The scrip, which is time and date stamped, must be printed with bokes of denominations, of which the total of all boxes shall not exceed $\$ 500$. These boxes shall be canceled by permanent black marker at the time the patron presents the scrip in the riverboat casino. If the scrip is not signed at the time of presentment, or the date and time are not valid, the scrip shall be confiscated from the customer. If the scrip is valid and there are sufficient available boxes, the cashier shall cancel the appropriate number of boxes with a permanent black marker and complete the transaction.
4. In a situation where a customer wishes to buy chips at a table, the procedure is the same except that the dealer stops the game to execute the transaction. On many occasions the use of the serip to convert cash to chips will slow up the game. This is another example of customer dissatisfaction arising out of the process.

Tax revenues from gaming have benefited education. While tax revenues from gaming are still growing, after only two years Missouri has seen
1 Transcript, Missouri gaming commission meeting, November 25, 1996, pages 8, 11 and 16-17 (Bruce Tumer, Salomon Brothers); pages 44-46 (Joe Coccimiglio, Prudential Securities); pages 57-58, (Tom Ryan, Bankers Trust); pages 65-68, (Larry Klatzkin, Donaldson, Lufkin \& Jenrette); pages 84-90, (Richard Byrne, Merrill Lynch);

those revenues fall short of predictions. Analysts from Wall Street tell the commission that we are exporting our tax dollars to other states. In a recent commission meeting regarding market size, a well respected gaming analyst opined that while Missouri supplies 73\% of the gaming market in the St. Louis area, it captures only $50 \%$ of the revenue. ${ }^{2}$

Finally, the gaming experience of consumers who do visit Missouri gaming operators is less desirable than the experience offered by competitive states. Missouri is offering a more cumbersome and less enjoyable product. The commission believes that the gaming policy for Missouri should retain the Missouri dollars in Missouri and attract dollars from other states. Our current policy has the exact opposite result.

## The Costs of Competitive Inferiority

Limiting the ability of Missouri operators to offer a competitive entertainment product has direct economic costs which are easily illustrated. Missouri gaming riverboats are larger, more luxurious and offer more non-gaming amenities ${ }^{3}$ than competitors in neighboring states. Yet they fail to compete in economic terms, even though the bulk of the population seeking the entertainment product lives in Missouri.

For example, the Casino Queen in East St. Louis, Illinois and the Alton Belle in Alton, Illinois combined have less capital investment than St. Charles Riverfront Station, which has consistently expanded and reinvested since it opened in May, 1994. In addition, these Illinois gaming facilities consist primarily of parking facilities and the gaming casino. They offer no non-gaming amenities other than limited restaurant facilities.

In spite of these negative competitive factors, the two Illinois facilities regularly outperform SCRS in spending per customer. Similarly, Illinois riverboats in the St . Louis area fare significantly better in gaming revenue per square foot, gaming revenue per position and admissions per square foot. One must question why Missouri residents will drive a longer distance to an inferior facility to spend their entertainment dollar. The answer is to spend their money on the product which they consider superior.

One must question why Missouri residents will drive a longer distance to an inferior facility to spend their entertainment dollar. The answer is to spend their money on the product which they consider superior.
pages 104-106, (John Maxwell, Standard \& Poor's) and pages 115-118, (Steve Schneider, Stifel Nicolaus). See also, Minutes of Missouri gaming commission meeting, May 24, 1995.

Missouri Gaming Commission minutes, November 25, 1996, page 27 quoting Jason Ader, Bear Sterns gaming analyst.
Examples of some of the non-gaming amenities included in Missouri projects include themed restaurants, movie theaters, hotels, meeting space, retail shopping, child care centers, micro breweries, an 18th century railroad car restored to its original luxury, fountain displays and theaters for live entertainment.
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## The Problem is Clear - How does Missouri Address the Problem?

Missouri statutes require the commission to report annually to the Governor and the General Assembly on the competitive state of the gaming industry in Missouri. For two years, the commission has advised the General Assembly that we believe that there could be a problem with the structure of the gaming industry, but that the data is incomplete. However, we now find the data to be clear and compelling. A problem exists in the Missouri gaming industry -- the gaming product is not competitive with our neighboring states. This will create negative economic results and lower tax revenues.

Due to navigational safety constraints, most Missouri riverboats do not cruise. It has been suggested by gaming analysts and by legislation filed in prior years that the elimination of the boarding time restrictions will help Missouri gaming operators economically and be more consumer friendly. The commission believes that the current boarding time restrictions are detrimental to the consumer, and make little sense since the riverboats are not leaving the dock. They are an artificial barrier to entry and participation. Yet the boarding times are essential to enforcing the loss limit. A change in the statutes which
eliminates the boarding times but maintains the loss limit would make the enforcement of the loss limit impossible.

## Findings

Current Missouri statutes are not competitive with our adjoining states. Consequently, Missouri is at a competitive disadvantage. Repealing the loss limit would make the Missouri operators more competitive. Without this change, the Missouri gaming industry will continue to be at a competitive disadvantage, and over time, will decline rather than prosper.

## Conclusion

Section 313.837, RSMo, requires the commission to report annually to the general assembly on the effects of the loss limit on the competitiveness of the gaming industry in Missouri. The findings above are intended to satisfy this statutory mandate. The enactment of any changes in policy as a result of these findings are obviously the purview of the General Assembly and the Governor.
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## Effect of Tax Rate on Competitiveness

The Missouri tax rate currently mirrors that of its principle competitor, the State of Illinois. The Missouri/Illinois tax rate consists of a $20 \%$ base tax on adjusted gross receipts (AGR). In Missouri, $10 \%$ of that tax (or $2 \%$ of AGR) is a local tax, imposed by state statute. The funds collected from this local tax are allocated to the home dock city or county for services necessary for the safety of the public visiting the excursion gambling boat. The remaining tax on AGR ( $18 \%$ of gross receipts) is placed in the "Gaming Proceeds for Education Fund" and may be spent only for public elementary, secondary and higher education.

Iowa has a graduated tax that caps out at $20 \%$ for adjusted gross receipts over $\$ 3$ million. Because the graduated rate reaches its cap at the relatively low ceiling of $\$ 3$ million, lowa's effective tax rate is not significantly different from that of Missouri and Illinois.

Licensees are also responsible for a $\$ 2$ admission fee for each person who participates in a gaming excursion. One dollar of this fee is remitted to the home dock city or county. The remaining dollar is used to fund the regulatory activities of the Commission. No general revenue is used for any activity of the Commission. In addition to the $\$ 2$ admission fee, the gaming boat is billed monthly for the full cost of the enforcement agents assigned to the boat. Either through fees or direct billing, the gaming operators pay for the full cost of their own regulation.

The State of Mississippi assesses a tax of $12 \%$ on AGR. Unlike Illinois, who is limited to licensing 10 gaming operations, Mississippi has not limited the number of casinos licensed, but has licensed all applicants that have been found suitable. The Missouri law does not specifically limit the number of licenses that may be issued, but places this responsibility in the hands of the Commission through a "best interests of Missouri" standard.

The state of Kansas has recently allowed casinos operated by native American Indians. These casinos are not taxed.

For your future reference, a table is contained in Appendix B setting forth the tax rate in each gaming jurisdiction and the regulatory restrictions that are imposed. The chart below is a generalization of the tax rates in the various gaming jurisdictions. Because of the subtleties of each states tax law, it is difficult to precisely chart the rates. For a definitive explanation of the tax rates, refer to the aforementioned chart in Appendix $B$.

The Commission does not feel that the $20 \%$ tax rate currently places our licensees at a competitive disadvantage. The commission will continue to monitor the performance of all licensees and report developments as they occur.
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# Missouri Gaming Commission <br> Contributions to Education 

Fiscal Year 1995

| Gaming Proceeds for Education | $\$ 56,616,282.04$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bingo Tax Proceeds for Education | $\$ \mathbf{6 , 2 5 3 , 7 0 3 . 9 6}$ |
| FY'95 Tax Revenue from Gaming | $\$ 62,869,986.00$ |

## Fiscal Year 1996

Gaming Proceeds for Education
$\$ 99,730,320.67$
Bingo Tax Proceeds for Education
$\$ 4,684,178.52$
FY'96 Tax Revenue from Gaming
$\$ 104.414,499.19$
Total Tax Revenue from Gaming
$\$ 167,284,485.19$

## Does the Gambling Money Really Go to Fund Education?

This may be the question most frequently asked of public officials. The simple answer is, "yes, it does". Pursuant to a constitutional amendment passed by the General Assembly as S.J.R. 20 in 1992 and approved by the voters in a subsequent general election, all state tax money derived from the proceeds of gambling is spent on education.

The text of this constitutional provision, contained in Article III, Section 39(d), reads as follows:

All state revenues derived from the conduct of all gaming activities as are now or hereafter authorized by this constitution or by law, unless otherwise provided by law on the effective date of this section, shall be appropriated beginning July 1, 1993, solely for the public institutions of elementary, secondary and higher education and shall not be included within the definition of "total state revenues" in section 17 of article $X$ of this constitution.

The tax revenues derived from the proceeds of gambling for fiscal year 1998 are estimated to be $\$ 155$ million. In addition to the gambling money, traditional state general revenue funding for public schools has increased every year since riverboat gambling was enacted. The total state budget for education, which represents approximately $50 \%$ of the average local school budget, is $\$ 2.965$ billion. The gambling money was designed to supplement not replace the primary sources of public school funding. The funds derived from gambling have been used for the Outstanding Schools Trust Fund, the School District Bond Fund, for maintenance and capital expenditures for public colleges and universities and to supplement the school foundation formula.
for an entertainment experience.' Gaming is an entertainment industry. In the entertainment industry, the consumers demand a product that they can enjoy during their leisure time on their own terms.
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those revenues fall short of predictions. Analysts from Wall Street tell the commission that we are exporting our tax dollars to other states. In a recent commission meeting regarding market size, a well respected gaming analyst opined that while Missouri supplies 73\% of the gaming market in the St. Louis area, it captures only $50 \%$ of the revenue. ${ }^{2}$
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The text of this constitutional provision, contained in Article III, Section 39(d), reads as follows:

All state revenues derived from the conduct of all gaming activities as are now or hereafter authorized by this constitution or by law, unless otherwise provided by law on the effective date of this section, shall be appropriated beginning July 1, 1993, solely for the public institutions of elementary, secondary and higher education and shall not be included within the definition of "total state revenues" in section 17 of article $X$ of this constitution.

The tax revenues derived from the proceeds of gambling for fiscal year 1998 are estimated to be $\$ 155$ million. In addition to the gambling money, traditional state general revenue funding for public schools has increased every year since riverboat gambling was enacted. The total state budget for education, which represents approximately $50 \%$ of the average local school budget, is $\$ 2.965$ billion. The gambling money was designed to supplement not replace the primary sources of public school funding. The funds derived from gambling have been used for the Outstanding Schools Trust Fund, the School District Bond Fund, for maintenance and capital expenditures for public colleges and universities and to supplement the school foundation formula.

## Where <br> Does All the Gaming Tax Money Go?



## Organizational Structure

## OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Thomas J. Irwin was named Executive Director by the Commission on October 27, 1993. Mr. Irwin came to the Commission after serving 3 years as Executive Assistant to St. Louis County Executive, Buzz Westfall. Mr. Irwin is a graduate of Harvard University where he earned his masters degree from the Kennedy School of Government. He has served as the Chief Budget Officer for the Boston Police Department and was the Executive Assistant for Intergovernmental Affairs for St. Louis mayor Vince Schoemehl from 1982 to 1988. Mr. Irwin is a veteran of the United States Marine Corps, having served in Vietnam in 1968.

Mr. Irwin is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Commission. He supervises all staff activities and reports to the Commission. Among the staff positions reporting to the Director is Public Information Officer, Harold Bailey. Mr. Bailey is responsible for organizing and distributing all public documents and reports.

In addition, there are six primary functions of the Commission that have been divided into sections that report directly to Mr. Irwin, including: Administration, Audit, Bingo, Corporate Securities, Enforcement \& Investigations, and Legal \& Legislative Affairs.

## ADMINISTRATION

The administration section, headed by Deputy Director Deborah A. Ferguson, provides a range of administrative, financial and technical services to help the Commission accomplish its goals. The administrative services can be divided into the following functions: accounts payable, accounts receivable, purchasing, data processing, budget, facility leasing, and human resources. Accomplishments of the administration section would not have come to pass without the assistance of Chief Accountant Denny Hodges, Personnel Officer Vicki Glenn, Records Administrator Michael Shellman, and Data Processing Manager John Bluma. The administration staff benefited from the addition of Tena Smith, Diane Riddle, and Mike Brizendine.

The administration section continues to be a focal point of activity with the continued growth of the gaming industry. The highlight of this past year was the relocation of the Jefferson City office. Planning and design for the Jefferson City office began in 1995 and culminated with the move in September, 1996. Highlights of the new building include a hearing room to conduct Commission meetings, adequate file space to house the Commission
records that will be relocated from the St. Louis office, and the merging of the Bingo and Gaming staff into one facility to enhance coordination of daily activities.

More specifically, the duties of this section are as follows:

- Billing licensees for the processing and annual licenses issued to Level One and level Two Occupational employees that work for each riverboat. To date there are approximately 9,000 licensed employees.
- Billing licensed operators for the full cost of the enforcement agents assigned to each boat.
- Maintaining all Commission financial and personnel records which includes the monthly reconciliation of the Gaming Commission fund balance and processing all payments made by the Commission.
- Preparation, and implementation of the Commission's annual budget to ensure compliance with legislative intent.
- Handling all personnel matters and employee training and establishing and implementing written office policies for Commission staff.
$>$ Preparation of fiscal notes to provide estimates to proposed legislation.


## Data Processing

The Data Processing section, headed by John Bluma, had a busy year in 1996 which included major systems developments as well as the daunting task of moving the Jefferson City office to a new location. Some of the accomplishments of this important section include:

- Opening new commission offices for its agents at licensed premises.

Moving the Jefferson City offices of the Riverboat Gaming and the Bingo workgroups to the new location. This involved moving all computer workstations, servers, communications processors, and printers to the new
building. The two separate networks were consolidated into one large network that provides email between all members of the two sections for the first time and allows sharing of peripheral equipment, such as laser printers.

- Final testing and implementation of a billing system for enforcement billing to reimburse the state for expenses related to regulating the casino gaming industry.
- Automation of annual MULES checks required of the 9,000 plus gaming occupational license holders, eliminating hundreds of hours of data entry time.

2 Upgrade of the physical inventory system to provide more complete reports and to track add-on costs to major inventory items.

Design and development of an occupational license history tracking system to provide a complete picture of license payments, changes in license status, duplicate badges issued, and changes in employment status.

- Enhancing existing systems to meet new statutes and rules and regulations.


## AUDIT

The audit section is responsible for the critical function of ensuring that the operators pay their taxes promptly and accurately. This section, headed by John Davis, former Internal Revenue Service Manager, developed the Commission's tax remittal system that allows the Commission to capture tax remittance data on a daily basis. The operator's returns are audited by compliance audit staff headed up by senior accountant Kara Hardaway.

The audit section also develops audit programs, reviews and approves each boat's system of internal controls, conducts on-site performance audits, reviews the quarterly CPA audits of Adjusted Gross Receipts Tax and Admission Tax and reviews all internal audit reports prepared by the casino's internal audit staff.

During 1996, the audit section revised Minimum Internal Control Standards that all operators must meet. These standards were developed by the
audit staff after a lengthy review process that involved input from the IRS, enforcement officers and industry experts.

The audit section also implemented a system for tracking and depositing all non-tax revenue received from applicants such as application fees from applicants and reimbursements for Commission services.

A summary of some of the audit section's programs and objectives is contained on page 22.

## BINGO

The Bingo Division is comprised of three separate sections which include the Administration/Licensing, Audit and Enforcement. The Bingo Division Supervisor is Ron Pleus. The Audit Section Supervisor is Randall Cahill and the Enforcement Section Supervisor is Sergeant Dwight Franklin. The bingo statutes have been revised significantly in recent years requiring many administrative changes to occur within the Division. Among the more daunting projects were the establishment of a new licensing category for hall providers and the implementation of a new, supplier-based, tax. Specific duties within the three sections of the Bingo Division and the recent statutory changes are briefly outlined below.

Administrative/Licensing Section - This section is responsible for the processing of all correspondence and the licensing and maintenance of over 1,500 operator licensees which include all regular and special event bingo operators licenses and 200 hall providers annually. This section deposits and records all tax and license receipts received on a daily basis. This unit maintains a data base of over 31,000 records of individuals that are involved in the management, conduct and/or operation of bingo games and 3,000 records of individuals involved as owners and officers of licensed Hall Providers. Currently, this staff consist of three employees, Jane Bax, Pam Murphy and Tina Freese. In conjunction with the data processing staff, the administrative section has developed an automated renewal application system which became fully operational January 1996. This system simplifies the renewal process for the licensee and eliminates wasted steps and duplicate information. The system has proven to be a tremendous time saver for the not-for-profit volunteer organizations who are required to file renewals and also helps to reduce the staffing cost and other administrative cost for the Division.

Audit Section - This section is responsible for the timely audit of all Bingo Product Manufacturers and Suppliers and assisting the Enforcement Section with on-site inspections of bingo operators. The audit staff has developed a comprehensive Manufacturer and Supplier audit procedure manual and has developed procedures for the inspection of bingo operators. The procedures for the inspection of bingo operators are used by both the Enforcement and Audit Staffs. The audit section has audited all of the licensed Manufacturers and Suppliers during fiscal year 1996. These audits resulted in over $\$ 320,000.00$ in unreported taxes and penalties. The auditors also assisted enforcement with inspections and investigations of unlicensed suppliers and operators. The section conducts on-site inspections of formerly licensed suppliers to determine if the products in inventory were being disposed of in accordance with the statutes. The audit staff also assists the administrative staff in auditing the operator's quarterly reports.

Enforcement Section - This section is headed by Sgt. Dwight Franklin, a 17 year veteran of the Missouri Highway Patrol. Sgt. Franklin has six (6) officers assigned to the enforcement section. Their duties include background investigations of all Manufacturers and Suppliers, to include all the key persomel in those companies. These investigations include criminal checks, financial checks, past employment history and all litigation involving the applicant. In addition, the enforcement section is responsible for investigating complaints on the licensed bingo organizations. The complaints range from minor rule violations, to thefts of large sums of money. Complaints are received on a daily basis and are investigated on the basis of severity, location and available manpower. An additional duty of the Enforcement Section is to complete background investigations on all new potential employees of the Gaming Commission.

## CORPORATE SECURITIES AND FINANCE

The Commission has established a Section of Corporate Securities and Finance to address the challenge of regulating the complex financial, corporate structuring and contractual transactions involving publicly traded and privately held gaming companies. This section is comprised of staff trained in legal, accounting and business matters to perform examinations of these transactions.

The suitability issues examined by the Corporate Securities and Finance Section include complex financial and legal suitability issues such as financial soundness, corporate control, legal compliance and procedural licensing issues.

The section's examinations are coordinated closely with the Enforcement Division for background investigations and disciplinary matters.

Typical transactions that are examined by the section include mergers and acquisitions, public debt and equity issuances, and private financings, such as bank loans and credit facilities. The goal of this new section is to provide the Commission with more thorough and sophisticated investigations and analysis of the suitability of gaming companies and with a uniform system for providing this analysis on corporate securities and fimance issues. Through this section, the Commission hopes to identify suitability problems of applicants and licensees earlier and more efficiently and to identify, plan for and possibly even avoid potential business closures of licensees due to financial matters.

The Corporate Securities and Finance Section is headed by the Commission's General Counsel, Greg Omer, who reports directly to the Executive Director on corporate securities and finance matters. The section also includes a Chief Financial Analyst position to be filled soon, which will oversee the work of the financial staff examining the corporate securities and finance transactions.

The Commission's Financial Manager, Pam Brown, has handled the financial analysis of the reported transactions up to now and will continue to perform many of the more complex transaction examinations and oversee the work of an accountant, Pam Wheelis, and a financial analyst (planned to be added next year), who are also assigned to the section.

## ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement for the Missouri Gaming Commission is provided by officers of the Missouri State Highway Patrol and agents of the Internal Revenue Service by way of Memorandums of Understanding which set forth the responsibilities of each entity.

The enforcement section is headed by Mel Fisher, former Superintendent of the Highway Patrol. The Gaming Division of the Highway Patrol is headed by Captain Dwight Hartung. There are seventy-seven officers assigned to the Gaming Division and an additional six officers assigned to the Bingo Enforcement Unit.

Some of the advantages of using Highway Patrol Officers as gaming agents include:

- the staff assigned are trained specialists in law enforcement and investigations, thus saving the Commission the time, effort and expense of recruitment and training;
- because the agents are licensed law enforcement officers, they command immediate respect when interacting with licensees and customers aboard a riverboat as well as when they are in a foreign jurisdiction conducting an investigation;
- the Commission feels that it is important to rotate enforcement staff aboard the various boats. this process is much easier with seasoned law enforcement officers who are used to being rotated between assignments as well as in and out of the gaming division;
provides the ability to access sensitive law enforcement information from other jurisdictions;
- their experience in conducting investigations and handling emergency situations has proven invaluable.

The Commission's background investigation units consist of three Highway Patrol Officers and one IRS agent. The background investigations conducted by the Missouri Gaming Commission are thorough and take approximately four months to complete if no unusual complications or delays emerge. The Commission not only investigates the finances and activities of the company and all its key people, but traces the source of all their funds to ensure that no criminal elements are funding the operation from behind the scene. An outline that provides a sketch of a typical background investigation is contained on page 20.

## LEGAL \& LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

The legal \& legislative affairs section is responsible for all legal matters presented to the commission prior to litigation. Any litigation involving the commission is handled by the Attorney General's office. In addition, this section, which is headed by Deputy Director, Kevin Mullally, develops and drafts legislation endorsed by the commission as well as all rules and regulations. Moreover, the legal section manages an administrative appeals docket where Mullally serves as Hearing Officer.

Greg Omer serves as the commission's general counsel and works closely with the enforcement staff reviewing incident reports, investigative issues and possible disciplinary actions. In addition, Mr. Omer heads the Corporate Securities section.

## Some of the other responsibilities of the legal section include:

- Drafting all resolutions for all commission actions; and
- preparing disciplinary complaints and denial orders for proposed action against licensees; and
- conducting quasi-legislative hearings on issues such as continuous docking and boat design; and
providing legal research services; and
- organizing and maintaining records of all official commission actions and commission policies; and
- handling inquiries from legislators, constituents and other state regulatory agencies.

The commission's legal staff is supported by paralegal, Heather Grefrath and legal secretary Susan Sundermeyer. This support staff is critical to daily operations of the legal section and is particularly valuable in the section's role in preparing and managing the rules and regulations, all documents necessary for commission meetings and all documents declaring commission policy.

In 1997, the legal section will be augmented with the addition of staff attomey, Robert Little.

## PENDING LITIGATION

The Missouri Gaming commission denied one occupational license in 1994, thirteen occupational licenses in 1995, and thirty-five occupational licenses in 1996. Each aplicant is presumed unsuitable and has the burden of proof to prove his or her suitability to the Commssion. An individual may request a hearing to attempt to prove suitability to the Commission by serving
such a request on the commission's Executive Director. The following is a list of pending litigation:

| Petitioner |  | Venue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bingo Systems \& Supply |  | AHC |
| Cape Girardeau Elks Lodge 639 |  | AHC |
| Cape Girardeau VFW Post 3838 |  | AHC |
| Edwin Pete Rhodes |  | AHC |
| Ideal Bingo Supplies, Inc. |  | AHC |
| Mary Cracchiolo |  | AIIC |
| Maureen L. Scott |  | AHC |
| Meramec-Arnold Eagles Auxiliary |  | AHC |
| Myron B. Carter, Sr. |  | AHC |
| Pan-Education Institute |  | AHC |
| Raymond J. Drury |  | AHC |
| Raytown Women of Today |  | AHC |
| Sandra Termini |  | AHC |
| Stanley L. Turner | AHC |  |
| Missouri Gaming Co-Disc. Action |  | MGC |
| Harrah's -Disciplinary Action |  | MGC |
| Boyd Kansas City, Inc. -Disc. Action | tion | MGC |
| Jeffery Koester -Denied License |  | MGC |
| Gary Franklin -Denied License |  | MGC |
| Mark Zwolle -Disciplinary Action |  | MGC |
| Anthony Civella -Exclusion |  | MGC |
| Peter Simone-Exclusion |  | MGC |
| Yolanda Nettles |  | MGC |
| Tracy Anderson |  | MGC |
| Carrie Gentry |  | MGC |
| Jimmie B. Carsey | MGC |  |
| Cape Girardeau Elks \& VFW C | Circuit Court o | Cape Girardeau County |
| MGC v. Veteran's Commission, St. Louis Public Schools | Misso | i Supreme Court |
| W. Todd Akin v. MGC | Misso | i Supreme Court |
| William D. Cammisano, Jr. Miss | Missouri Court of | ppeals-Western District |
| Pen-Yan Investment, Inc. Miss | Missouri Court of | ppeals-Western District |

## SUMMARY OF PENDING LITIGATION

There are fourteen bingo cases pending in the Administrative Hearing Commission.

There are three disciplinary cases at the Commission level against gaming licensees pending the outcome of Pen-Yan Investment, Inc. v. Boyd Kansas City, Inc. and MGC.

Pen-Yan Investment, Inc. v. Boyd Kansas City. Inc., MGC is pending in the Missouri Court of Appeals, Western District regarding disciplinary action taken against Boyd for associating in business affairs with a person who has a felony police record. The Commission imposed a fine against Boyd and prohibited Boyd from collecting or distributing any funds from the machines under its service agreement with Pen-Yan.

MGC v. Missouri Veterans Commission, St. Louis Public Schools is pending in the Missouri Supreme Court regarding funds received from fines imposed by the Commission.

In W. Todd Akin et. al. v. MGC, the Circuit Court of Cole County ruled in favor of the commission on summary judgment. The suit challenges the Commission's authority to grant or deny Harrah's Maryland Heights Corp. and Players Maryland Heights, L.P. a license for a continuously docked excursion gambling boat within a man-made basin filled by water from the Mississippi River. The petitioners have appealed and the matter is now before the Missouri Supreme Court.

Cape Girardeau Elks Lodge, et. al. v. MGC is pending in the Circuit Court of Cape Girardeau County regarding the Commission's decision to suspend the Cape Girardeau Elks Lodge bingo license.

In the Matter of William D. Cammisano, Jr. there is an appeal pending in the Missouri Court of Appeals, Westem District regarding the Commission's decision to place Mr. Cammisano on its List of Excluded Persons.

## MISSOURI GAMING COMMISSION'S EXCLUSION LIST

The Missouri Gaming Commission placed two individuals in 1994, two individuals in 1995, and two individuals in 1996 on the commission's Exclusion List. Placement of these individuals on the Exclusion List has been based on prior convictions.

As a result of placement on the Exclusion List, each individual shall not be permitted entry into any portion of a riverboat gaming operation within the state of Missouri and shall be ejected if discovered on such premises. Furthermore, Excluded Persons shall be prohibited from contact of any kind with Missouri riverboat gaming operations. Persons placed on the List may file a written petition with the Commission to request a hearing to have their name
removed from the Exclusion List. Currently, one individual has appealed to the Western District of Missouri and two others are pending hearings by the Missouri Gaming Commission.

## MISSOURI GAMING COMMISSION'S DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

 AGAINST OCCUPATIONAL LICENSEESThe Missouri Gaming Commission has taken disciplinary action against twenty-eight occupational licensees as of September 30, 1996. Preliminary

Orders for Disciplinary Action set forth statements of fact that support the proposed disciplinary action and the regulatory and statutory sections involved. Individuals may request a hearing by serving such a request on the Commission's Executive Director. Currently, four individuals have sought hearings before the Commission one of which is still pending.


## Voluntary Exclusions

On December 30, 1996, after six months of research and consultation, the commission established a unique program to combat problem gambling. The List of Disassociated Persons is the result of many months of consultation with treatment professionals that help problem gamblers. The program allows problem gamblers to exclude themselves from Missouri riverboat casinos under the threat of arrest for trespassing.

In exchange for agreeing not to patronize Missouri riverboat casinos, the problem gambler is removed from all casino mailing lists and direct marketing promotions. In addition, the operators are required to deny persons on the List check cashing privileges and must take away their VIP or "player's club" card.

Treatment professionals have advised the commission that the only way for a problem gambler to get help is to admit that he/she has a problem and to accept personal responsibility for that problem by seeking treatment.

The Disassociated Persons program is a valuable tool in addressing problem gambling because it requires the individual to admit to having a gambling problem, to agree to seek treatment and stay away from gambling casinos. Furthermore, it includes severe consequences if the problem gambler succumbs to the temptation to gamble. Moreover, it offers some protection to the problem gambler from the marketing promotions that encourage people to visit the casino properties.

The program operates in the following manner:

- The problem gambler must obtain an application for placement on the List of Disassociated Persons from the commission;
$>$ the application contains various information about the individual, an admission that the person is a problem gambler and agrees to stay off Missouri riverboats and seek treatment, an authorization to release this information to riverboat operators as well as a Waiver releasing the commission and the licensee from any liability associated with enforcing the rules of the program;
-the application must be personally presented to a commission agent at which time the information is verified and the rules of the program are explained;
$>$ the application is a closed record and its contents may only be disclosed to necessary commission and riverboat personnel;
- the commission considers all applications in closed session;
- once a person is placed on the List, he/she cannot petition for removal. After consulting with treatment professionals, the commission concluded that problem gambling requires lifetime treatment and therefore, there is no procedure for removal from the List.

Missouri is the first jurisdiction in the world to propose a program such as this. We will continue to monitor and refine the program and look forward to reporting to you on its impact in next year's annual report.

## Brief Timeline of Riverboat Gaming in Missouri

- May 13, 1991 - General Assembly passes House Bill 149 which authorized referendum to be submitted to the voters in the November 1992 election to determine whether the State Tourism Commission shall have the power to issue riverboat gambling licenses.

November 3, 1992 - Missouri voters pass referendum allowing riverboat gaming with a majority of nearly $63 \%$.

- January 1993 -- Governor Carnahan announces intentions to push legislation creating an independent Gaming Commission to oversee riverboat gambling.
- April 29, 1993 -- SBs 10 \& 11 creating the Missouri Gaming Commission are signed into law by Governor Carnahan and five Commissioners are appointed: Robert Wolfson, Chairman; Robert Clayton; William Quinn; Dr. Jenice Stewart and Avis Tucker.
- April 30, 1993-Troy Harris, et. al. v. The Missouri Gaming Commission, amended petition is filed. The petition challenges the constitutionality of Senate Bills 10 \& 11.
$>$ May 17, 1993 -- The Missouri Gaming Commission holds its first meeting.
- September 1, 1993 - Proposed Rules and Emergency Rules are adopted.
- September 20, 1993 -- 19 riverboat gaming license applications are filed with the commission.
$>$ September 20, 1993 - Clarence E. "Mel" Fisher hired as Deputy Director for Enforcement.
$>$ September 24, 1993 - Commission contracts with the Internal Revenue Service to perform financial investigations for the commission. Four IRS agents are assigned to the commission.
- September 28, 1993 - Commissions enters into and inter-agency agreement with the Missouri State Highway Patrol to provide enforcement services for the commission.

October 1, 1993 -- Debbie Ferguson joins the commission as Deputy Director for Administration.
$>$ November 3, 1993 - Commission hires Tom Irwin as Executive Director and Kevin Mullally as Deputy Director for Legal \& Legislative Affairs.

- November 30, 1993 - Commission announces that it will begin background investigations on the following companies: President Riverboat Casino-Missouri; St. Charles Riverfront Station, Inc.; St. Joseph Riverboat Partners; The Missouri Gaming Company; GDC (Supplier); IGT (Supplier); Casino Tokens (Supplier); Paul-Son Dice \& Card Company (Supplier).
$>$ December 22, 1993 - Governor Carnahan signs Executive Order 93-50 designating the enforcement section of the Missouri Gaming Commission as a criminal justice agency.


## 1994

- January 25, 1994 -- Missouri Supreme Court, in Troy Harris v. Missouri Gaming Commission, strikes down games of chance including slot machines. The court ruled that the Commission did have the authority to issue licenses to riverboat where games of skill are played. Specifically mentioned as games of skill are poker and blackjack. The Court remanded six games to lower court for determination as to whether they are games of skill or chance: baccarat, craps, roulette wheel, klondike table, faro layout and video games of chance.
- February 1, 1994 - Rules and Regulations become effective.
- February 7, 1994 - Legislature passes resolution to place constitutional amendment on the ballot which would allow the legislature to approve games of chance (slot machines) on riverboats and floating facilities on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.
- April 5, 1994 -- Voters defeat constitutional amendment allowing games of chance (slot machines) by an unofficial count of 1263 votes.
- April 29, 1994 - Finding of Preliminary Suitability issued to President Riverboat Casino, St. Charles Riverfront Station, St. Joseph Riverboat Partners and The Missouri Gaming Company.
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- May 20, 1994 -- Governor signs into law SB 740 which defines games of chance and enacts more stringent ethics provisions. The bill also allows the commission to license a barge in an artificial basin as an excursion gambling boat if it can be demonstrated that safety concerns prevent an operator from cruising from that location.
$>$ May 27, 1994 -- Commission authorizes as games of skill the following: Blackjack, Caribbean Stud Poker, Poker, Double Down Stud Poker, Pia Gow Poker, Poker, Texas Hold 'Em, the video representations of these games, and Craps.
- May 27, 1994 -- Commission authorizes President Riverboat Casino-Missouri to operate the Admiral as a continuously docked excursion gambling boat because cruising would cause danger to the boat's passengers.
- May 27, 1994 - Gaming Commission issues first two excursion gambling boat licenses to President Riverboat Casino in St. Louis and St. Charles Riverfront Station in St. Charles.
- May 27, 1994 -- Initiative petition that would allow voters to approve games of chance is submitted to the Secretary of State for approval of the form of the petition.
- June 6, 1994-- Secretary of State notifies referendum petitioners that the Attomey General has approved the form of their petition. The Secretary of State prepared the following petition title that was approved by the Attorney General:

Shall the General Assembly be authorized to permit only upon the Mississippi River and the Missouri River lotteries, gift enterprises, and games of chance to be conducted on excursion gambling boats and floating facilities?

- June 9, 1994 -- Commission prioritizes Aztar Missouri Corporation, Boyd Kansas City, Inc. and Harrah's North Kansas City as companies to be investigated for licensure pursuant to 11 CSR 45-4.060.
- June 22, 1994 -- Gaming Commission issues licenses to St. Joseph Riverboat Partners in St. Joseph and The Missouri Gaming Company in Riverside.
- September 20, 1994 - Commission issues a finding of preliminary suitability to Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation.
-September 20, 1994 -- Commission authorizes Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation and St. Charles Riverfront Station ${ }^{1}$ to operate excursion gambling boats as continuously docked vessels. In both cases the commission found that operating a cruising vessel from the proposed site would cause danger to the boat's passengers and the project will generate permanent job creation and land-based development.
- September 22, 1994 -- Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation is issued an excursion gambling boat license.
-September 28, 1994 - Public hearing regarding Capitol Queen and Casino, Inc's application for an excursion gambling boat license results in the commission denying CQC's license and prohibiting them from reapplying for two years.
$>$ October 7, 1994 -- Commission places William D. Cammisano, Jr. and John Termini on its list of excluded persons.
- November 8, 1994 -- Voters approve games of chance.
- December 9, 1994 -- Games of chance are allowed on riverboats.
- December 27, 1994 - St. Charles Riverfront Station is issued a license to operate the St. Charles 11 as an excursion gambling boat. This marks the first time the commission has licensed a second excursion gambling boat for a single development.

1 The approval was for St. Charles Riverfront Station's second boat. The first boat continued to cruise until April 16, 1996
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## 1995

- February 22, 1995 -- Commission announces it will begin background investigation on Hilton Kansas City Corporation for an excursion gambling boat license.
$>$ March 30, 1995-- State Auditor releases final audit report of the Missouri Gaming Commission. No major deficiencies are noted.
- April 20, 1995 - Commission repays $\$ 3$ million start-up loan to state general revenue fund.
- April 25, 1995 - Commission approves continuous docking petitions for Boyd Kansas City, Inc. and Hilton Kansas City Corporation.
- April 25, 1995 - The commission issues a finding of preliminary suitability to Aztar Missouri Gaming Corporation.
$>$ April 26, 1995-The commission issues an excursion gambling boat license to Aztar Missouri Gaming Corporation in Caruthersville, Missouri.
$>$ May 24, 1995 - The commission anmounces it will begin background investigations on the following companies: Harrah's Maryland Heights Corporation; Kansas City Station, Inc.; Players Maryland Heights, Inc.
- August 28, 1995 -- Pursuant to House Bill 574, the duties of the Missouri Horse Racing Commission are transferred to the Gaming Commission.
- September 12, 1995 - The commission issues a finding of preliminary suitability to Boyd Kansas City, Inc.
- September 13, 1995 - The commission grants the petition of Harrah's Maryland Heights Corporation and Players Maryland Heights, Inc. to operate continuously docked excursion gambling boats at their joint venture in Maryland Heights.
- September 13, 1995 - The commission issues an excursion gambling boat license to Boyd Kansas City, Inc.
- November 16, 1995 - The commission fines the following companies for associating with, either socially or in business affairs, persons with felony police records or persons with a notorious or unsavory reputation: Boyd Kansas City, Inc.; Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation; The Missouri Gaming Company.


## 1996

February 15,1996 - The commission grants continuous docking rights to Aztar Missouri Gaming Corporation for a second boat in Caruthersville, Harrah's North Kansas City for a second boat, and Kansas City Station Corporation for two boats in Kansas City.

- April 16, 1996 - The commission grants continuous docking rights to Argosy in Riverside, Missouri; St. Joseph Riverboat Partners; and St. Charles Riverfront Station.
$>$ May 15, 1996 -- The commission issues a license to Harrah's North Kansas City for the Lucky Star. This is the second boat at the Harrah's North Kansas City facility. Included in the project is a 200 -room hotel, expanded parking and meeting space.
- June 19, 1996 -- The commission places William Cammisano, Jr. on Exclusion List.
- June 27, 1996 - The commission places Peter Simone and Anthony T. Civella on Exclusion List.
- August 28, 1996-The commission takes disciplinary action against Boyd Kansas City, Inc. for periodic failure to take and report turnstile readings.
$>$ October 11, 1996 - The commission issues a finding of preliminary suitability to Hilton Kansas City Corporation and Flamingo Hilton Riverboat Casino, L.P.


## October 18, 1996 - The commission issues a Class B riverboat gambling license to Hilton Kansas City Corporation and a Class A riverboat gambling license to Flamingo Hilton Riverboat Casino, L.P.

## Outline of a Background Investigation

## Review Application for Completeness

* Establish number of key people;
- Check disclosure forms for completeness;
$=$ Check tax release forms;


## City Selection Process

$>$ Contact city to determine how the gaming operator was selected;

- Interview Mayor and City Council members;
- If a steering committee was used, interview members of that committee;

2. Determine if any city officials own stock in the selected gaming company;

- Obtain minutes of council meetings that pertain to riverboat issues: (a)selection, (b) resolution, and (c) ordinance;
- Contact city attorney who handled negotiations with gaming company and obtain correspondence between city and gaming company;

Contact City Economic Development Director (if applicable)

## Docksite

- Land selected for gaming operation;
$\checkmark$ Who was it purchased from (how long have they owned the property);
$\checkmark$ Price (copy of contract);
$\checkmark$ Copy of plat map and legal description;
$\checkmark$ Determine if any of city officials or selection committee members have ownership interest in docksite;
- Corps of Engineers Permit
$\checkmark$ Status;
$\checkmark$ Any concerns by Corps;
$\checkmark$ Wetlands involved;
$>$ Contact D.N.R. for any known concerns in area;
$>$ Check with city for any known dumpsites with possible hazardous material

Developmental agreement between city and gaming operator (obtain copy from city);
$\Rightarrow$ Determine if development is feasible;
$\checkmark$ Is support facility land based or floating;
$\checkmark$ Projected number of jobs, economic aid to area;
$\checkmark$ Traffic flow to area - what improvements are needed -- who will pay for improvements

## Riverboat

- Locate boat and obtain all information about boat (cruise schedule, liability canier);
- Establish design of riverboat;

Determine emergency medical plan for boat;
$>$ Determine if Coast Guard and other safety requirements have been met;

## Ganing Operator (Public Corporation, Partnership, Private

 Company)- Establish contact person with operator;
$\checkmark$ Determine attorney of record for gaming company;
$\checkmark$ Any missing items from application, advise contact person;
- Establish home office (Financial Headquarters)
$\checkmark$ Determine a good date and location where all key people can be contacted for a personal interview;
$\checkmark$ Where can financial record be located;


## Outline of a Background Investigation

$\checkmark$ Breakdown of management (corporate, Board of Directors, major stockholders);
$\checkmark$ Establish flow chart of key people and companies owned by gaming operator;

- Investigation of Key People will include but not be limited to the following:
$\checkmark$ Check previous employment work records;
$\checkmark$ Check state, local and federal intelligence files;
$\sqrt{ }$ Check for other gaming licenses, if applicable (check with appropriate regulators);
$\checkmark$ Check state, federal and local courts for any civil litigation;
$\checkmark$ Check for any arrest record;
$\sqrt{ }$ Check personal and business credit;
$\checkmark$ Check state and local tax status, IRS will handle federal taxes;
$>$ Other locations of gaming operations (currently operating and pending locations);
$\checkmark$ Contact garning regulators for respective locations;
$\checkmark$ Travel to sites to view operations
Establish a file for all key people investigated with summaries; establish a file for financial records with summary of financial viability of company and ability to complete obligations to the city and State of Missouri. Establish a file for other locations of licensure along with summary.


## Associated Investigations

$>$ All allegations of Any nature must be investigated and a file established with a written summary;

- Associated investigations must be done in a complete and thorough manner and all reports written accurately;
$>$ Upon completion of all investigations, complete reports and summaries, a separate press releasable summary must be written. This summary must be approved by Gaming Commission legal staff.

Missouri Gaming Commission Compliance Audit Objectives for Licensees

| Audit Area |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ticket/Turnstile | To ensure accuracy of ticket and turnstile counts reported to MGC including comps/VIPs, stayovers and promotions |
| Table Games | To ensure accuracy of AGR for table games reported to MGC |
| Electronic Games | To ensure accuracy of AGR for electronic games reported to MGC |
| Cage Accountability | To ensure accuracy of cage accountability forms and compliance with internal controls and tax reporting regulations |
| Observations: <br> Cage, Main Bank, Pit Area, <br> Slot Area, Turnstile, Ticketing |  |
| Purchase/Redemptions | To determine that cashiers are complying with internal controls for chips, tokens, gaming scrip and cash |
| $\$ 500$ Loss Limit | To determine compliance with MO statutes and internal controls |
| Stayover Procedures | To determine compliance with MGC regulations and internal controls |
| Manual Jackpot Payouts | To ensure that manual jackpot payouts are properly handled and the required tax forms are completed |
| Hopper Fills | To ensure that hopper fills are properly handled and comply with internal controls |
| Table Fills | To ensure that table fills are properly handled and comply with internal controls |
| Table Credits | To ensure that table credits are properly handled and comply with internal controls |
| Patron Tracking/Currency | To ensure that tracking procedures comply with internal controls and the currency transactions are properly completed |
| Transaction Reporting |  |
| Imprest Bank Balancing | To ensure that proper balancing and accountability is performed during a shift change |
| Coin Vault | To ensure proper maintenance of coin, chip and token inventory |
| Satellite Cages/Slot Booths | To ensure compliance with internal controls and consistency with main cage procedures |
| Tips/Gratuities | To ensure compliance with MGC regulations and internal controls |
| Cage Access/Security | To ensure compliance with internal controls |
| Turnstile | To ensure accuracy of turnstile count for admissions tax calculation |
| Ticketing | To ensure compliance with internal controls and proper handling of stubs, voids and issuance |
| Miscellaneous/Other |  |
| Surveillance Tapes | To review activity for hard, soft and tip counts and drops to verify compliance with internal controls |
| Workpaper Preparation and | To establish standardized procedures for MGC audit workpapers and audit reports |
| Audit Reports |  |

## Missouri Gaming Commission

Semi-Annual Financial Audit Objectives for Licensees

| Audit Area | Objective |
| :---: | :---: |
| Monthly Financial Statement Review | To perform a preliminary review of monthly financial statement information for proper completion of financial statement templates, verification of adjusted gross receipts to MGC reports, and to detect any unusual items which justify further review when conducting on-site audit. |
| Engagement Letters | To give advance notification to each boat of the date and scope of audit being performed. |
| Financial Statement Verification | To determine consistency of monthly financial statement information submitted to MGC with boat's general ledger system. |
| Balance Sheet Accounts |  |
| Cash/Cash Reserve Balance | To determine the existence, consistency and fair presentation of the cash balance on the monthly financial statements. |
| Cash Receipts | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the cash balance on the monthly financial statements and the source of large cash receipts other than gaming revenue. |
| Cash Disbursements | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the cash balance on the monthly financial statements and to trace the outflow of large cash disbursements. |
| Accounts/N Notes Receivable | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the accounts receivable and/or notes receivable balance in the monthly financial statements. |
| Accrued Admission and Gaming Tax Liability | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the accrued admission/gaming tax liability balance in the monthly financial statements. |
| Chip and Token Liability | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the chip and token liability balance in the monthly financial statements |
| Progressive Jackpot Liability | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the progressive jackpot liability balance in the monthly financial statements. |
| Tips and Gratuities (Accrued Liability) | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the accrued tips and gratuities liability in the monthly financial statements. |
| Customer Deposit Liability | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of the customer deposit liabilities in the monthly fiscal statements. |
| Accounts Payable | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of accounts payable balance in the monthly financial statements. |
| Income Statement Accounts |  |
| Revenue - Table Games | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of table games revenue as reported to MGC daily and in the monthly financial statements. |
| Revenue - Electronic Games | To determine the consistency and fair presentation of electronic games revenue as reported to MGC daily and in the monthly financial statements. |
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|  | Missouri Gaming Conmission <br> Semi-Annual Financial Audit Objectives for Licensees |
| :--- | :--- |
| Revenue - Admissions To determine the consistency and fair presentation of admissions revenue as reported to MGC daily and in the <br> monthly financial statements. <br> Promotional Expense To determine that comps are properly recorded as expenses and not deducted from revenue in accordance with <br> GAAP. <br> Pre-Opening Costs To determine whether certain pre-opening and licensing costs are properly expensed or amortized over future <br> periods in accordance with GAAP <br> Workpaper Preparation and Audit Reports To establish standardized procedures for MGC audit workpapers and audit reports. <br>   <br>   |  |

## Appendix A




## AROGSY RIVERSIDE CASINO

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY
Fiscal year ended June 30, 1995

| MONITH | TOTAL AGR | TABLE | TABLE \% OF | SLOT, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT \% OFF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS | MDINPER, | DAILY WIN PERTABLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILYWIN } \\ & \text { PER SLOT } \end{aligned}$ | DAILY WIN PERPOSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALLY WIN } \\ & \text { PER SQ FOOT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aug-94 | 5,366,862 | 3,737,992 | 69.65\% | 1,628,870 | 30.35\% | 181,963 | 29.49 | 1,586.58 | 124.81 | 216.68 | 5.77 |
| Sep-94 | 5,569,796 | 3,952,937 | 70.97\% | 1,616,860 | 29.03\% | 177,635 | 31.36 | 1,733.74 | 128.02 | 232.37 | 6.19 |
| Oct-94 | 4,340,064 | 3,155,461 | 72.71\% | 1,184,603 | 27.29\% | 136,613 | 31.77 | 1,339.33 | 90.77 | 175.22 | 4.67 |
| Nov-94 | 4,019,051 | 2,896,091 | 72.06\% | 1,122,960 | 27.94\% | 133,330 | 30.14 | 1,270.22 | 88.91 | 167.67 | 4.47 |
| **Dec-94 | 5,072,086 | 2,842,929 | 56.05\% | 2,229,157 | 43.95\% | 184,526 | 27.49 | 1,554.36 | 83.32 | 148.47 | 5.45 |
| Jan-95 | 6,646,054 | 3,131,076 | 47.11\% | 3,514,978 | 52.89\% | 226,934 | 29.29 | 1,711.91 | 129.73 | 192.80 | 7.15 |
| Feb-95 | 7,060,288 | 3,054,165 | 43.26\% | 4,006,123 | 56.74\% | 244,881 | 28.83 | 1,848.77 | 162.96 | 226.15 | 8.41 |
| Mar-95 | 7,277,275 | 2,868,629 | 39.42\% | 4,408,645 | 60.58\% | 253,449 | 28.71 | 1,568.41 | 159.97 | 208.67 | 7.83 |
| Apr-95 | 7,484,955 | 2,924,611 | 39.07\% | 4,560,343 | 60.93\% | 239,045 | 31.31 | 1,652.32 | 170.99 | 221.78 | 8.32 |
| May-95 | 7,370,780 | 2,743,438 | 37.22\% | 4,627,342 | 62.78\% | 259,045 | 28.45 | 1,499.97 | 166.41 | 210.04 | 7.93 |
| Jun-95. | 6,979,363 | 2,552,304 | 36.57\% | 4,427,058 | 63.43\% | 244,216 | 28.58 | 1,492.58 | 165.44 | 208.09 | 7.75 |
| TOTALS: | 67.186.573 | 33,859,633 | 50.40\% | 33,326,940 | 49.60\% | 2281,637 | 29.45 |  |  |  |  |

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| RONTH | TOTAL, | TABLE, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE \% OF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | SLOT, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT \% OF } \\ & \text { IOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS. | WDINPER, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILYWIY } \\ & \text { PERTABLE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATEYWTN } \\ & \text { PERESLOT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WIN, } \\ & \text { PERPOSITION } \end{aligned}$ | DAIEYWIN PERSAFOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul-95 | 7,517,957 | 2,473,575 | 32.90\% | 5,044,382 | 67.10\% | 279,960 | 26.85 | 1,399.87 | 174.97 | 210.52 | 8.08 |
| Aug-95 | 7,813,226 | 2,580,067 | 33.02\% | 5,233,159 | 66.98\% | 290,728 | 26.87 | 1,460.14 | 181.32 | 218.59 | 8.40 |
| Sep-95 | 7,401,526 | 2,447,319 | 33.07\% | 4.954.206 | 66.93\% | 265,662 | 27.86 | 1,431.18 | 177.38 | 213.98 | 8.22 |
| Oct-95 | 7,192,284 | 2,405,716 | 33.45\% | 4,786,568 | 66.55\% | 251,129 | 28.64 | 1,361.47 | 165.85 | 201.22 | 7.73 |
| Nov-95 | 6,771,690 | 2,222,842 | 32.83\% | 4,548,848 | 67.17\% | 246,819 | 27.44 | 1,277.50 | 162.87 | 194.92 | 7.52 |
| Dec-95 | 6,912,444 | 2,317,863 | 33.53\% | 4,594,581 | 66.47\% | 258,089 | 26.78 | 1,289.13 | 156.51 | 190.26 | 7.43 |
| Jan-96 | 6,453,260 | 2,005,465 | 31.08\% | 4,447,795 | 68.92\% | 256,948 | 25.12 | 1,115.39 | 150.24 | 176.41 | 6.94 |
| Feb-96 | 7,389,019 | 2,376,581 | 32.16\% | 5,012,438 | 67.84\% | 325,003 | 22.74 | 1,412.95 | 187.45 | 223.64 | 8.80 |
| Mar-96 | 8,363,429 | 2,623,687 | 31.37\% | 5,739,743 | 68.63\% | 357,892 | 23.37 | 1,459.23 | 193.88 | 228.63 | 8.99 |
| Apr-96 | 8,044,985 | 2,585,832 | 32.14\% | 5,459,154 | 67.86\% | 330,099 | 24.37 | 1,486.11 | 190.55 | 227.26 | 8.94 |
| May-96 | 7,246,960 | 2,254,593 | 31.11\% | 4,992,367 | 68.89\% | 306,290 | 23.66 | 1,212.15 | 168.63 | 196.45 | 7.79 |
| Jun-96 | 6,598,201 | 1,983,280 | 30.06\% | 4,614,921 | 69.94\% | 279,050 | 23.65 | 1,101.82 | 161.08 | 184.82 | 7.33 |
| TOTALSE23. | 87,704983 | 28,276,820 | 32.24\% | 59,428,462 | 67.76\% | 3,447.669 | 2. 25.44 |  |  | T\% |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)


## GRAND

TOTALS:
** December 1994 figures refiect the first month of operations with legalized slot machines

CASINO AZTAR
PERFORMANCE SUMMARY
Fiscal year ended June 30, 1995


Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| ONTH | TATAL $\quad$ ACR | TABLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE \% OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | SLOT ACR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT } \% \text { OF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | Abilissions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WMPER } \\ & \text { ADMSSION } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALYMN } \\ & \text { PERTABLE } \end{aligned}$ | DAILY WIN PERSLOT: | DAIIYWH PER POSITION | DAILY WIN, PERSQEOOT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Juil95 | 2,060,334 | 756,858 | 36.73\% | 1,303,476 | 63.27\% | 68,636 | 30.02 | 871.96 | 83.76 | 110.40 | 6.39 |
| Aug-95 | 2,053,105 | 662,744 | 32.28\% | 1,390,362 | 67.72\% | 75,053 | 27.36 | 763.53 | 89.88 | 110.57 | 6.37 |
| Sep-95 | 2,052,035 | 742,378 | 36.18\% | 1,309,657 | 63.82\% | 73,274 | 28.00 | 883.78 | 88.01 | 114.77 | 6.58 |
| Oct-95 | 1,865,419 | 610,572 | 32.73\% | 1,254,848 | 67.27\% | 62,972 | 29.62 | 703.42 | 81.61 | 100.96 | 5.98 |
| Nov-95 | 1,739,459 | 646,056 | 37.14\% | 1,093,403 | 62.86\% | 54,194 | 32.10 | 769.11 | 74.08 | 97.78 | 5.58 |
| Dec-95 | 1,845,824 | 668,943 | 36.24\% | 1,176,882 | 63.76\% | 56,293 | 32.78 | 770.67 | 84.55 | 109.45 | 5.73 |
| Jan-96 | 1,594,982 | 599,874 | 37.61\% | 995,108 | 62.39\% | 54,630 | 29.20 | 716.70 | 72.14 | 93.38 | 4.95 |
| Feb-96 | 2,032,111 | 647,506 | 31.86\% | 1,384,605 | 68.14\% | 65,620 | 30.97 | 858.76 | 107.29 | 129.52 | 6.74 |
| Mar-96 | 2,532,115 | 721,792 | 28.51\% | 1,810,324 | 71.49\% | 92,559 | 27.36 | 862.36 | 133.02 | 149.87 | 7.85 |
| Apr-96 | 2,060,136 | 594,712 | 28.87\% | 1,465,424 | 71.13\% | 68,763 | 29.96 | 734.21 | 111.27 | 126.00 | 6.39 |
| May-96 | 2,048,919 | 673,295 | 32.86\% | 1,375,624 | 67.14\% | 63,269 | 32.38 | 804.41 | 102.25 | 122.17 | 6.36 |
| Jun-96 | 1,907,848 | 533,178 | 27.95\% | 1,374,670 | 72.05\% | 62,287 | 30.63 | 658.24 | 105.58 | 117.55 | 6.11 |
| TOTALS* | 473.792.297 | 2, 7,857,906 | 6ern 33 | 15.934.381 | 66.97\% | 797.650 | 29.83 | $\underline{3}$ |  |  |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)

| MOMTH | WTOTALS | WTABEE | TABLE \% OF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLQT } \\ & \text { AGR } \end{aligned}$ | SLOT \% OF TOTALAGR | ADMISSIONS | WMPER, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WM } \\ & \text { PERTARLE } \end{aligned}$ | DALLY WIN PERGLOT | DAILY WIN PERPOSITION | DAILY WIN PERSA FOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul-96 | 2,017,722 | 565,454 | 28.02\% | 1,452,268 | 71.98\% | 70,311 | 28.70 | 698.09 | 111.54 | 124.32 | 6.47 |
| Aug-96 | 2,017,133 | 538,343 | 26.69\% | 1,478,790 | 73.31\% | 74,559 | 27.05 | 664.62 | 113.58 | 124.28 | 6.47 |
| Sep-96 | 1,850,635 | 573,535 | 29.40\% | 1,377,100 | 70.60\% | 62,406 | 31.26 | 708.07 | 105.77 | 120.19 | 6.25 |
| Oct-96 | 1,718,084 | 446,936 | 26.01\% | 1,271,148 | 73.99\% | 59,085 | 29.08 | 551.77 | 97.63 | 105.86 | 5.51 |
| Nov-96 | 1,885,674 | 528,036 | 28.00\% | 1,357,638 | 72.00\% | 62,033 | 30.40 | 651.90 | 104.27 | 116.18 | 6.04 |
| Dec-96 | 1,687,889 | 504,577 | 29.89\% | 1,183,312 | 70.11\% | 60,329 | 27.98 | 622.93 | 90.88 | 104.00 | 5.41 |
| TOTALSEM | 11,277, 36 | 3156881 | 27.99\% | 8,120.265 | 72.01\% | 388.723 | 29.01 | 422 |  | $\underline{ }$ | Mrem |

GRAND


[^0]

| - | , ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | + + | +5.3. | W | 4, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2 3 3 | 23 | , | + ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4 4 | + |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



[^1]HARRAHS NORTH KANSAS CITY

## PERFORMANGE SUMMARY

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1995

|  | WTOTAG, | WABLE | TABLE\% GFF TOTALAGR | SLOT, ACH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT of OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS | ADNPER ADSION | DAIYYMN PERTABLE | DAILYMIN PERSLOT. | DALY WINY, PERPOSITIOH | DAILYMN PER SOFOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *Sep-94 | 1.126,040 | 492,716 | 43.76\% | 633,324 | 56.24\% | 40,845 | 27.57 | 582.41 | 87.20 | 101.23 | 3.96 |
| Oct-94 | 5,388,329 | 3,330,347 | 61.81\% | 2,057,983 | 38.19\% | 183,842 | 29.31 | 1,142.88 | 82.26 | 140.63 | 5.50 |
| Nov-94 | $6.480,151$ | 4,340,856 | 66.99\% | 2,139,295 | 33.01\% | 236,233 | 27.43 | 1,539.31 | 88.36 | 174.76 | 6.62 |
| **Dec-94 | 8,151,618 | 4,524,567 | 55.51\% | 3.627,051 | 44.49\% | 318,614 | 25.58 | 1,801.90 | 127.73 | 207.21 | 8.32 |
| Jan-95 | 9,742,487 | 4,774,337 | 49.01\% | 4,968,150 | 50.98\% | 365,433 | 26.66 | 1,878.18 | 174.20 | 245.91 | 9.95 |
| Feb-95 | 9,673,001 | 4,346,806 | 44.94\% | 5,326,194 | 55.06\% | 342,466 | 28.25 | 1,805.15 | 205.42 | 265.13 | 10.93 |
| Mar-95 | 11,214,361 | 4,687,797 | 41.80\% | 6,526,564 | 58.20\% | 386,215 | 29.04 | 1,758.36 | 233.93 | 276.78 | 11.45 |
| Apr-95 | 11,512,912 | 4,527,022 | 39.32\% | 6,985,889 | 60.68\% | 398,085 | 28.92 | 1,754.66 | 251.47 | 294.52 | 12.14 |
| May-95 | 11,608,026 | 4,217,210 | 36.33\% | 7,390,816 | 63.67\% | 418,495 | 27.74 | 1,581.85 | 257.47 | 287.38 | 11.85 |
| Jun-95 | 11,156,513 | 4,121,676 | 36.94\% | 7,034, 838 | 63.06\% | 413,673 | 26.97 | 1,717.36 | 242.25 | 302.10 | 11.77 |
| HotaEsi | 36.0533437 | 29393963.334 |  | 46.590103 | Hex 54.26\% | 34,103,9011 | 27,72 |  |  |  |  |

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| WONTH | TOTAE AGR | WMABLE, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE\%GF } \\ & \text { TOTALACR } \end{aligned}$ | SHLOT $A$ SR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOTA GF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADUISSIONS: | WITPER ADMISSION | DAILYME | DALY WIN RERSLOT, | DAILYWIN PERPOSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALYYWNY } \\ & \text { PERSQFOOT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jut-95 | 12,627,258 | 4,575,856 | 36.24\% | 8,051,402 | 63.76\% | 461,737 | 27.35 | 1,845.10 | 277.25 | 321.06 | 12.89 |
| Aug-95 | 12,848,930 | 4,497,963 | 35.56\% | 8,150,967 | 64.44\% | 466,772 | 27.10 | 1,813.69 | 271.35 | 311.00 | 12.91 |
| Sep-95 | 11,631,477 | 3,959,481 | 34.04\% | 7,671,996 | 65.96\% | 403,642 | 28.82 | 1,649.78 | 263.91 | 295.52 | 12.27 |
| Oct-95 | 11,541,331 | 3,998,771 | 34.65\% | 7,542,560 | 65.35\% | 401,155 | 28.77 | 1,573.08 | 251.09 | 283.77 | 11.78 |
| Nov-95 | 10,998,088 | 4,152,864 | 37.76\% | 6,845,224 | 62.24\% | 371,682 | 29.59 | 1.730 .36 | 235.47 | 279.42 | 11.60 |
| Dec-95 | 10,682,578 | 3,805,706 | 35.63\% | 6,876,871 | 64.37\% | 371,500 | 28.76 | 1,534.56 | 228.93 | 262.65 | 10.91 |
| Jan-96 | 10,426,800 | 3,795,468 | 36.40\% | 6,631,332 | 63.60\% | 354,003 | 29.45 | 1,530.43 | 220.76 | 256.36 | 10.64 |
| Feb-96 | 11,258,825 | 3,713,909 | 32.98\% | 7,544,916 | 67.01\% | 390,226 | 28.85 | 1,600.82 | 268.49 | 295.91 | 12.29 |
| Mar-96 | 11,665,383 | 3,738,962 | 32.05\% | 7,926,421 | 67.95\% | 430,581 | 27.09 | 1,723.02 | 253.41 | 289.91 | 11.91 |
| Apr-96 | 10,647,073 | 3,159,818 | 29.68\% | 7,487,255 | 70.32\% | 395,103 | 26.95 | $1,504.68$ | 247.35 | 273.42 | 11.23 |
| **May-96 | 13,549,089 | 4,401,740 | 32.49\% | 9,147,349 | 67.51\% | 578,214 | 23.43 | 1,302.68 | 156.12 | 189.53 | 7.10 |
| Jun-96 | 13,815,785 | 4,472,145 | 32.37\% | 9,343,640 | 67.63\% | 622,371 | 22.20 | 1,367.63 | 164.79 | 199.71 | 7.48 |
| Totalises | 5hatituchen |  |  | 33.21993 | \% $26588 \%$ | 5.246889 | 36978 | +2, ${ }^{2}$ | 4. | \% |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)

|  |  | WYTAELE | TAELE \%OF TOTALACR | MESIOT, AGR | SLOTXOF | ADIUSSIOHS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MIMPER } \\ & \text { ADISSION } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OMISYME } \\ & \text { PERTABLE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY MIN } \\ & \text { PERSLOTR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALYYINY } \\ & \text { PERPOSITOH: } \end{aligned}$ | DALYMIK PERSOFOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jui-96 | 14,401,267 | 4,529,406 | 31.45\% | 9,871,861 | 68.55\% | 660,064 | 21.82 | 1,385.14 | 174.11 | 208.17 | 7.79 |
| Aug-86 | 15,354,410 | 4,901,636 | 31.92\% | 10,452,774 | 68.08\% | 702,912 | 21.84 | 1,498.97 | 184.35 | 221.95 | 8.31 |
| Sep-96 | 14,306,766 | 4,364,506 | 30.51\% | 9,942,260 | 69.49\% | 648,977 | 22.05 | 1,334.71 | 175.35 | 206.80 | 7.74 |
| Oct-96 | 14,096,377 | 4,276,089 | 30.33\% | 9,820,288 | 69.67\% | 635,979 | 22.16 | 1,307.67 | 173.20 | 203.76 | 7.63 |
| Nov-96 | 13,883,177 | 4,481,854 | 32.26\% | 9,411,324 | 67.74\% | 612,125 | 22.70 | 1,370.60 | 165.98 | 200.83 | 7.52 |
| Dec-96 | 14,088,145 | 4,447,340 | 31.57\% | 9,640,805 | 68.43\% | 641.845 | 21.95 | 1,360.04 | 170.03 | 203.64 | 7.62 |
| MOTASR3\% | W等86416143 | 27.0008831 | W2xy $31.35 \%$ | 59189.312 | 4\% $6896 \%$ | 3,901902 | 32.08. |  |  |  |  |

GRAND


* Harrahs Morth Kanasas City bogan operations, September 22, 1994
** Second dockside casino began operations, May 15, 1996

| WOMTH | OTAL <br> AGR | TABLE AGR | TABLE \% OF TOTALAGR | SLOT AGR | SLOT \% OF TOTAL AGR | ADMISSIONS | WINPER ADMISSION | DAILY WIN PERTABLE | DAILY WIN PERSLOT | DALY WIN PERPOSITION | DAILYWIN PERESOEOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aug-94 | 2,831,841 | 1,985,969 | 70.13\% | 845,872 | 29.87\% | 174,976 | 16.18 | 736.36 | 60.50 | 102.52 | 1.30 |
| Sep-94 | 3,217,222 | 2,244,590 | 69.77\% | 972,632 | 30.23\% | 183,987 | 17.49 | 860.00 | 71.89 | 120.36 | 1.53 |
| Oct-94 | 3,284,483 | 2,320,233 | 70.64\% | 964,250 | 29.36\% | 182,234 | 18.02 | 860.30 | 68.97 | 118.91 | 1.51 |
| Nov-94 | 3,108,966 | 2,203,269 | 70.87\% | 905,697 | 29.13\% | 168.980 | 18.40 | 844.16 | 66.94 | 116.31 | 1.48 |
| **Dec-94 | 6,912,438 | 2,761,847 | 39.95\% | 4,150,591 | 60.05\% | 357,481 | 19.34 | 1,254.81 | 93.11 | 132.41 | 3.29 |
| Jan-95 | 6,578,473 | 2,380,536 | 36.19\% | 4,197,938 | 63.81\% | 333,385 | 19.73 | 1,081.57 | 94.17 | 126.01 | 3.13 |
| Feb-95 | 6,686,708 | 2,465,671 | 36.87\% | 4,221,037 | 63.13\% | 327,301 | 20.43 | 1,240.28 | 104.83 | 128.09 | 3.41 |
| Mar-95 | 6,959,047 | 2,554,585 | 36.71\% | 4,404,462 | 63.29\% | 368,055 | 18.91 | 1,160.65 | 107.15 | 141.81 | 3.31 |
| Apr-95 | 6,542,134 | 2,081,183 | 31.81\% | 4,460,952 | 68.19\% | 350,754 | 18.65 | 977.08 | 103.91 | 130.04 | 3.12 |
| ***May-95 | 1,962.729 | 685,944 | 34.95\% | 1,276,785 | 65.05\% | 98,899 | 19.85 | 966.12 | 89.22 | 117.04 | 2.80 |
| **Jun-95 | 2,298,535 | 707,369 | 30.77\% | 1,591,166 | 69.23\% | 114,214 | 20.12 | 996.29 | 120.00 | 145.20 | 3.28 |
| TOTAES | 50, 3182576 | 2. 22.381 .194 | 4444\% | $527.991,381$ | 55,56\% | 2.660 .265 | 18.94 | Exame |  | Qumatarm | Wam, ${ }^{2}$ |

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| MONTH | $\qquad$ | TABLE | TAQLEFOF TOTALAER | SLOT | SLOT \%OF | ADMISSIONS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WIN PER } \\ & \text { ADMISSION } \end{aligned}$ | DALY YIN PERTABLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WN } \\ & \text { PER SLOK } \end{aligned}$ | DAILY WIN RER POSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WIN } \\ & \text { PER SQROOI } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jut-95 | 6,655,736 | 2,036,677 | 30.60\% | 4,619,059 | 69.40\% | 359,315 | 18.52 | 925.34 | 109.88 | 133.35 | 3.07 |
| Aug-95 | 6,902,419 | 2,248,331 | 32.57\% | 4,654,088 | 67.43\% | 354,493 | 19.47 | 1,021.50 | 110.47 | 138.04 | 3.18 |
| Sep-95 | 6,465,755 | 1,937,487 | 29.97\% | 4,528,269 | 70.03\% | 332,730 | 19.43 | 909.62 | 111.15 | 133.70 | 3.08 |
| Oct-95 | 6,293,618 | 1,927,209 | 30.62\% | 4,366,409 | 69.38\% | 310,350 | 20.28 | 863.44 | 99.19 | 121.35 | 2.90 |
| Nov-95 | 5,679,370 | 1,733,302 | 30.52\% | 3,946,068 | 69.48\% | 279,353 | 20.33 | 802.45 | 96.72 | 117.29 | 2.70 |
| Dec-95 | 5,728,799 | 1,749,022 | 30.53\% | 3,979,777 | 69.47\% | 290,000 | 19.75 | 783.61 | 90.79 | 111.12 | 2.64 |
| Jan-96 | 5,265,155 | 1,546,791 | 29.38\% | 3,718,364 | 70.62\% | 263,177 | 20.01 | 693.01 | 84.83 | 102.13 | 2.51 |
| Feb-96 | 6,046,134 | 1,683,484 | 27.84\% | 4,362,650 | 72.16\% | 306,771 | 19.71 | 806.27 | 110.19 | 125.37 | 2.98 |
| Mar-96 | 6,948,426 | 1,844,709 | 26.55\% | 5,103,718 | 73.45\% | 350,550 | 19.82 | 826.48 | 116.43 | 134.78 | 3.20 |
| Apr-96 | 6,000,213 | 1,735.343 | 28.92\% | 4,264,871 | 71.08\% | 298,476 | 20.10 | 850.66 | 124.92 | 138.85 | 3.45 |
| ***May-96 | 4,444,151 | 1,184,350 | 26.65\% | 3,259,802 | 73.35\% | 232,081 | 19.15 | 561.84 | 95.57 | 102.91 | 2.47 |
| *****un-96 | 3,606,348 | 935,605 | 25.94\% | 2,670,743 | 74.06\% | 206,335 | 17.48 | 458.63 | 78.30 | 86.30 | 2.07 |
| TOTALS: | 70.036.124 | 20.562307 | 29.36\% | 49.473 .816 | - 70.64\% | 3,583,631 |  |  | +5>4 |  | 4 |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)

| WEDN1H. | TOTAL AGR | TABLE AGR. | TABLE TOTALAGR | ALOT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT \% OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WNPER } \\ & \text { ADMISSION } \end{aligned}$ | DAILY WIN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALY WIN } \\ & \text { RERSLOT. } \end{aligned}$ | DAILYWIN PER POSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WIN/ } \\ & \text { PER SQ FOOT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul-96 | 5,241,039 | 1,275,485 | 24.34\% | 3,965,554 | 75.66\% | 282,886 | 18.53 | 625.24 | 16.26 | 125.41 | - 3.01 |
| Aug-96 | 5,627,312 | 1,501,803 | 26.69\% | 4,125,509 | 73.31\% | 310,645 | 18.11 | 736.18 | 120.95 | 134.66 | 3.23 |
| Sep-96 | 5,353,045 | 1,314,607 | 24.56\% | 4,038,438 | 75.44\% | 314,457 | 17.02 | 644.42 | 118.39 | 128.09 | 3.08 |
| Oct-96 | 5,658,075 | 1,460,882 | 25.82\% | 4,197,193 | 74.18\% | 300,722 | 18.81 | 716.12 | 123.05 | 135.39 | 3.25 |
| Nov-96 | 5,557,438 | 1,447,383 | 26.04\% | 4,110,056 | 73.96\% | 390,317 | 14.24 | 709.50 | 120.49 | 132.98 | 3.19 |
| Dec-96 | 5,412,788 | 1,356,779 | 25.07\% | 4,056,009 | 74.93\% | 279,892 | 19.34 | 665.09 | 118.91 | 129.52 | 3.11 |
| TOTALSE | 32.84, 696 | 8,356.937 | 25,49\% | 24.692759 | - $74.56 \%$ | 1,878,919 | 17,48 |  |  |  |  |

GRAND
TOTALS:

18.87.

* December 1994 figures reflect the first month of operations with legalized siot machines
**** Operations were shut down May 16 and 31, 1996 and June 1 thru 7, 1996 due to flooding on the Mississippl River

ST. CHARLES RIVERFRONT STATION
PERFORMANCE SUMMARY
Fiscal year endad June 30, 1995

| MONTH | TTOTAL, | TABLE AGR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE } \% \text { OF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | SLOT, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT \%OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS | WINPER: ADMISSION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAICY WIN } \\ & \text { PERTABLE } \end{aligned}$ | DAILYWIN PERSLOT | DALY WIK: PERPOSIION | DAILYWIN PERSQEOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aug-94 | 2,532,013 | 1,553,910 | 61.37\% | 978,103 | 38.63\% | 101,583 | 24.93 | 737.15 | 48.99 | 85.08 | 3.40 |
| Sep-94 | 2,952,462 | 1,741,073 | 58.97\% | 1,211,389 | 41.03\% | 124,559 | 23.70 | 853.47 | 60.68 | 102.52 | 4.10 |
| Oct-94 | 3,544,576 | 2,105,013 | 59.39\% | 1,439,563 | 40.61\% | 159,403 | 22.24 | 998.58 | 72.11 | 119.11 | 4.76 |
| Nov-94 | 4,015,547 | 2,493,408 | 62.09\% | 1,522,139 | 37.91\% | 189,796 | 21.16 | 1,222.28 | 76.24 | 139.43 | 5.58 |
| ${ }^{*}$ Dec-94 | 7,180,927 | 2,981,408 | 41.52\% | 4,199,519 | 58.48\% | 322,567 | 22.26 | 1,414.33 | 141.11 | 241.29 | 9.65 |
| Jan-95 | 9,776,943 | 3,776,549 | 38.63\% | 6,000,394 | 61.37\% | 460,944 | 21.21 | 1,282.36 | 115.56 | 154.07 | 6.71 |
| Feb-95 | 8,763,184 | 3,648,031 | 37.37\% | 6,115,153 | 62.63\% | 433,639 | 22.51 | 1,302.87 | 136.07 | 173.56 | 7.42 |
| Mar-95 | 10,304,905 | 3,803,675 | 36.91\% | 6,501,230 | 63.09\% | 438,813 | 23.48 | 1,226.99 | 130.66 | 183.19 | 7.07 |
| Apr-95 | 11,107,235 | 3,913,418 | 35.23\% | 7,193,817 | 64.77\% | 457,914 | 24.26 | 1,254.30 | 117.20 | 175.04 | 7.88 |
| **May-95 | 6,025,098 | 2,103,138 | 34.91\% | 3,921,960 | 65.09\% | 245,870 | 24.51 | 1,348.17 | 155.63 | 191.55 | 8.55 |
| *-Jun-95 | 7,727,469 | 2,849,776 | 36.88\% | 4,877,693 | 63.12\% | 321,584 | 24.03 | 1,304.84 | 139.00 | 176.23 | 7.83 |
| TOTALS: | 74,930.359 | 30.969 .399 | 4133\% | 43,960.950 | 58.67\% | 3,2566.672 | 299\% 23.01 |  |  | . |  |

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| NOMTH | $\qquad$ | TMELE | TABLEFOF TOTAL AGR | SLOT AGR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT GOF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISSIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { WMPER } \\ \text { ADMISSION } \end{gathered}$ | DAILYWIN PERTABLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WIN } \\ & \text { PER SLOT } \end{aligned}$ | DAILY WIN EERPOSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILYMIN } \\ & \text { PERSQ FOOT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul95 | 9,730,086 | 3,384,155 | 34.78\% | 6,345,931 | 65.22\% | 440,462 | 22.09 | 1,049.68 | 123.62 | 220.43 | 6.68 |
| Aug-85 | 10,330,991 | 3,441,696 | 33.31\% | 6,889,295 | 66.69\% | 467,024 | 22.12 | 1,067.52 | 131.66 | 158.39 | 7.09 |
| Sep-95 | 11,102,935 | 3,688,246 | 33.22\% | 7,414,689 | 66.78\% | 500,288 | 22.18 | 1,182.13 | 146.42 | 175.90 | 7.87 |
| Oct-95 | 10,869,615 | 3,743.484 | 34.44\% | 7,126,131 | 65.56\% | 454,503 | 23.92 | 1,161.13 | 136.10 | 166.57 | 7.46 |
| Nov-95 | 11,066,912 | 3,926,339 | 35.46\% | 7,140,573 | 64.52\% | 451,897 | 24.49 | 1,258.44 | 139.36 | 173.84 | 7.85 |
| Dec-95 | 11,215,389 | 3,986,831 | 35.55\% | 7,228,558 | 64.45\% | 456,191 | 24.58 | 1,236.61 | 136.36 | 170.33 | 7.70 |
| Jan-96 | 10,430,817 | 3,446,978 | 33.05\% | 6,983,839 | 66.95\% | 428,435 | 24.35 | 1,069.16 | 131.75 | 158.42 | 7.16 |
| Feb-96 | 11,466, 121 | 3,356,023 | 29.27\% | 8,110,098 | 70.73\% | 478,862 | 23.94 | 1,112.74 | 162.50 | 185.28 | 8.41 |
| Mar-96 | 12,419,412 | 3,675,089 | 29.59\% | 8,744.323 | 70.41\% | 526,589 | 23.58 | 1,139.92 | 163.90 | 187.73 | 8.52 |
| Apr-96 | 11,326,274 | 3,411,602 | 30.12\% | 7,914,672 | 69.88\% | 479,712 | 23.61 | 1,093.46 | 153.30 | 176.92 | 8.03 |
| May-96 | 12,138,328 | 3,569,995 | 29.41\% | 8,568,333 | 70.59\% | 522,070 | 23.25 | 1,107.32 | 160.42 | 183.31 | 8.33 |
| Jun-96 | 13,233,564 | 3,260,849 | 24.64\% | 9,972,715 | 75.36\% | 586,888 | 22.55 | 1,045.14 | 192.26 | 199.39 | 9.39 |
| TOTALS: | 135.330.444 | 42,891.287 | 31. $59 \%$ | 92,439.157 | 68.31\% | 5192.921 | 22,36 |  |  |  |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)

| MONTH | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { AGR } \end{gathered}$ | TABLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE } 60 F \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | SLOT, | SLOT \% OF TOTAL AGR | ADMISSIONS | WINPER ADMISSION | DALY MIN PERTABLE | DAILY WIM <br> PERSLOT | DAILYYIN: PERPOSITION | DAIKYWIN, PER SO FOOT: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul-96 | 13,010,409 | 3,425,884 | 26.33\% | 9,584.525 | 73.67\% | 574,468 | 22.65 | 1,098.04 | 184.78 | 196.03 | 9.23 |
| Aug-96 | 13,122,229 | 3,632,638 | 27.68\% | 9,489,591 | 72.32\% | 576,197 | 22.77 | 1,164.31 | 182.95 | 197.71 | 9.31 |
| Sep-96 | 11,895,764 | 3,150,053 | 26.48\% | 8,745,711 | 73.52\% | 520,291 | 22.86 | 1,009.63 | 168.61 | 179.23 | 8.44 |
| Oct-96 | 11,473,610 | 3,189,672 | 27.80\% | 8,283,938 | 72.20\% | 526,219 | 21.80 | 1,022.33 | 159.71 | 172.87 | 8.14 |
| Nov-96 | 12,049,098 | 3,440,662 | 28.56\% | 8,608,436 | 71.44\% | 535,578 | 22.50 | 1.102.78 | 165.96 | 181.54 | 8.55 |
| Dec-96 | 11,804,706 | 3,182,469 | 26.96\% | 8,622,237 | 73.04\% | 537,787 | 21.95 | 1,020.02 | 166.23 | 177.86 | 8.37 |
| TOTALS | 73,355,816 | 20.021378 | 27.29\% | 53.334438 | 72.71\% | 3.270 .50 | 22.43 |  |  | 2" |  |

GRAND
TOTALS:


- December 1994 figures reflect the first month of operations with legalized slot machines
* Operations were shut down May 18 thru May 31, 1995 and June 1 thru 8 , 1895 due to flooding on the Mlssourl River


## ST. JO FRONTIER CASINO

## PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

## Fiscal year ended June 30, 1995

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL, } \\ & A G R, \end{aligned}$ | TAELE ACR | TABLE \% OF TOTALACR | SLDT, AGR | SLOT \% OF TOTAL AGR | ADMISSIOAS | WINPER ADMESION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WIN } \\ & \text { BERTABLE } \end{aligned}$ | DALLY WIN RERSLOT | DAITY WHN PER POSITION | RDAILYWIN PERSQEOOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aug-94 | 1,351,236 | 767,746 | 56.82\% | 583,490 | 43.18\% | 61,349 | 22.03 | 1,031.92 | 78.43 | 125.98 | 4.53 |
| Sep-94 | 1,305,770 | 690,217 | 52.86\% | 615,553 | 47.14\% | 56,438 | 23.14 | 958.63 | 85.49 | 125.80 | 4.52 |
| Oct-94 | 1,239,298 | 748,955 | 60.43\% | 490,344 | 39.57\% | 50,893 | 24.35 | 1,006.66 | 65.91 | 115.54 | 4.16 |
| Nov-94 | 1,035,940 | 643,498 | 62.12\% | 392,442 | 37.88\% | 44,836 | 23.11 | 893.75 | 54.51 | 99.80 | 3.59 |
| *Dec-94 | 1,677,395 | 744,593 | 44.39\% | 932,802 | 55.61\% | 65,162 | 25.74 | 1,091.78 | 93.74 | 131.02 | 5.62 |
| Jan-95 | 1,642,390 | 647,718 | 39.44\% | 994,671 | 60.56\% | 66,449 | 24.72 | 949.73 | 99.96 | 128.28 | 5.51 |
| Feb-95 | 1,711,035 | 641,008 | 37.46\% | 1,070,027 | 62.54\% | 67,242 | 25.45 | 1,040.60 | 119.05 | 147.96 | 6.35 |
| Mar-95 | 1,956,960 | 793,170 | 40.53\% | 1,163,790 | 59.47\% | 72,399 | 27.03 | 1,163.01 | 116.95 | 152.85 | 6.56 |
| Apr-95 | 1,951,345 | 709,015 | 36.33\% | 1,242,330 | 63.67\% | 72,180 | 27.03 | 1,181.69 | 124.36 | 157.11 | 6.76 |
| May-95 | 1,969,610 | 612,030 | 31.07\% | 1,357.580 | 68.93\% | 74,819 | 26.32 | 987.14 | 135.89 | 158.58 | 6.60 |
| Jun-95 | 1,750,908 | 510,285 | 29.14\% | 1,240,623 | 70.86\% | 69,275 | 25.27 | 850.48 | 121.27 | 140.30 | 6.07 |
| Totals. | 17,591887 | 7,508,234 | 4268\% | 10,083653. | , . $57.32 \%$ | W2. 701.042 | W, [2-25.09 | - | , \% | \% | \%res |

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1996

| RONTH | TOTAL $A G R$ | TABLE ACR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE \% OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL AGR } \end{aligned}$ | AGRT, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SLOT\% OF } \\ & \text { TOTALAGR } \end{aligned}$ | ADMISEIONS | MNPER ADMISSION | DAIEY WIN PERTARLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DALYYWI } \\ & \text { PER SLOT } \end{aligned}$ | DAILYWIN PERROSITION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAILY WINE } \\ & \text { PERSP FOOT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul-95 | 1,965,365 | 550,747 | 28.02\% | 1,414,617 | 71.98\% | 79,070 | 24.86 | 935.06 | 130.75 | 151.31 | 6.59 |
| Aug-95 | 2,068,104 | 602,677 | 29.14\% | 1,465,427 | 70.86\% | 77,652 | 26.63 | 1,023.22 | 135.45 | 159.22 | 6.93 |
| Sep-95 | 1,960,137 | 562,600 | 28.70\% | 1,397,537 | 71.30\% | 73,864 | 26.54 | 987.02 | 133.48 | 155.94 | 6.79 |
| Oct-95 | 1,830,524 | 543,398 | 29.69\% | 1,287,126 | 70.31\% | 66.296 | 27.61 | 973.83 | 118.97 | 142.63 | 6.14 |
| Nov-95 | 1,800,448 | 617,730 | 34.31\% | 1,182,718 | 65.69\% | 64,298 | 28.00 | 1,143.94 | 112.96 | 144.96 | 6.24 |
| Dec-95 | 1,852,255 | 557,290 | 30.09\% | 1,294,966 | 69.91\% | 67,772 | 27.33 | 998.73 | 119.69 | 144.32 | 6.21 |
| Jan-96 | 1,633,473 | 547,436 | 33.51\% | 1,086,038 | 66.48\% | 61,017 | 26.77 | 981.07 | 100.38 | 127.28 | 5.48 |
| Feb-96 | 1,776,841 | 474,307 | 26.69\% | 1,302,534 | 73.31\% | 71,060 | 25.00 | 908.63 | 128.70 | 148.00 | 6.37 |
| Mar-96 | 2,082,362 | 611,353 | 29.36\% | 1,471.010 | 70.64\% | 78,313 | 26.59 | 1,095.61 | 135.97 | 162.25 | 6.98 |
| Apr-96 | 1,837,256 | 483,278 | 26.30\% | 1,353,978 | 73.70\% | 67,913 | 27.05 | 894.96 | 129.32 | 147.93 | 6.37 |
| May-96 | 1,838,296 | 493,741 | 26.86\% | 1,344,556 | 73.14\% | 70,746 | 25.98 | 884.84 | 124.28 | 143.24 | 6.16 |
| Jun-96 | 1,541,847 | 377,745 | 24.50\% | 1,164,102 | 75.50\% | 62,752 | 24.57 | 699.53 | 111.18 | 124.14 | 5.34 |
| Totals | 23,186,908 | -6.4.422300 | 28.95\% | 15.764.608 | 71.05\% | 840.753 | T-26 26.39 | - | $4 \times 13$ |  |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December 1996)

| HONTH | TOTAL ACR | TABLE AGR | TABLE\%OF, TOTAL AGR. | SLOT, | SLOT \% OF, TOTAL AGR, | ADIISSIONS | ADINPER, | DAILYMIN PERTARLE | DAILYMI | PDALY MINE PER POSITAN | DAILY MNY, PER SOEOOT, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jui-96 | 1,608,044 | 433,179 | 26.94\% | 1,174,865 | 73.06\% | 67,391 | 23.86 | 802.18 | 112.21 | 129.47 | 5.57 |
| Aug-96 | 1,644,434 | 411,765 | 25.04\% | 1,232,669 | 74.96\% | 70,073 | 23.47 | 762.53 | 117.73 | 132.40 | 5.70 |
| Sep-96 | 1,671,597 | 444,675 | 26.60\% | 1,226,922 | 73.40\% | 66,247 | 25.23 | 823.47 | 117.18 | 134.59 | 5.79 |
| Oct-96 | 1,573,945 | 329,489 | 20.93\% | 1,244,456 | 79.07\% | 67,537 | 23.30 | 610.17 | 118.86 | 126.73 | 5.45 |
| Nov-96 | 1,501,775 | 398,194 | 26.51\% | 1,103,582 | 73.49\% | 61,427 | 24.45 | 737.40 | 105.40 | 120.92 | 5.20 |
| Dec-96 | 1,543,255 | 413,620 | 26.80\% | 1,129,635 | 73.20\% | 61,959 | 24.91 | 765.96 | 107.89 | 124.26 | 5.35 |
| TOTALS: | 9,543,050 | $2,430,921$ | $25.47 \%$ | 7,112,129 | 2.74.53\% | 3 394;634 | $\times 24.18$ | - $\square^{2}$, |  |  | L3.3 |

GRAMD


* December 1994 figures reflect the first month of operations with legallzed slot machines


## SAMS TOWN KANSAS CITY

## PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1996

|  | $\qquad$ | WTAELE ${ }^{\text {What }}$ | TABLEGOFS | What, | SLOT\%OF | ADIISSIONS | I AOMISER | PAIVYMIN | DAIGYTN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *Sep-95 | 3,932,981 | 1,131,170 | 28.76\% | 2,801,810 | 71.24\% | 161,426 | 24.36 | 1,122.19 | 162.65 | 182.08 | 7.80 |
| Oct-95 | 5,847,163 | 1,990,066 | 34.03\% | 3,657,097 | 65.97\% | 294,213 | 19.87 | 1,126.24 | 124.42 | 152.73 | 6.74 |
| Nov-95 | 5,211,425 | 1,959,245 | 37.60\% | 3,252,181 | 62.40\% | 207,776 | 25.08 | 989.52 | 108.73 | 135.40 | 6.20 |
| Dec-95 | 4,987,002 | 1,796,034 | 36.01\% | 3,190,969 | 63.99\% | 227,438 | 21.93 | 827.67 | 111.76 | 130.90 | 5.75 |
| Jan-96 | 4,967,984 | 1,754,743 | 35.32\% | 3,213,241 | 64.68\% | 213,537 | 23.27 | 808.64 | 112.67 | 130.50 | 5.72 |
| Feb-96 | 6,685,796 | 1,903,623 | 28.47\% | 4,782,174 | 71.53\% | 338,927 | 19.73 | 937.75 | 169.13 | 180.39 | 8.23 |
| Mar-96 | 7,370,796 | 2,343,721 | 31.80\% | 5,027,075 | 68.20\% | 388,316 | 18.98 | 1,095.71 | 165.81 | 187.22 | 8.49 |
| Apr-96 | 6,214,532 | 2,001,387 | 32.20\% | 4,213,145 | 67.80\% | 333,820 | 18.62 | 1,026.35 | 138.91 | 161.84 | 7.40 |
| May-96 | 6,004,127 | 1,718,824 | 28.63\% | 4,285,303 | 71.37\% | 329,676 | 18.21 | 853.01 | 135.92 | 150.72 | 6.92 |
| Jun-96 | 5,618,826 | 1,562,401 | 27.81\% | 4,056,425 | 72.19\% | 354,425 | 15.85 | 801.23 | 136.44 | 148.41 | 6.69 |
| TOTALS | W 56810.463 | V 48161213 | 510 $31.95 \%$ | 3, 38.674419 |  | 2 2.849554 | 4 ${ }^{2} 19.5$ | 1+3 | W |  |  |

Fiscal Year 1997 (July thru December)
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## Appendix B



## US GAMING AT A GLANCE

|  | Charitable bingo | $\begin{gathered} \text { Charitable } \\ \text { games } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Card } \\ \text { rooms } \end{gathered}$ | Casimos | Gaming devices | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Sports } \\ \text { wagering } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Video } \\ \text { lottery } \\ \text { terminals }\end{array}$ | Keno | Instant <br> \& pulitab <br> games | Lotto | Numbers | Passives | Grey. hound | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jai } \\ \text { alai } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Harness | Quarter horse | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thorough- } \\ \text { bred } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Interstate <br> Inter-tack <br> wagering | Intrastate <br> Inter-track wagering | $\begin{gathered} \text { Off- } \\ \text { track } \\ \text { betting } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Telephone } \\ \text { betting } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALabama | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Alaska | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Arkansas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  |
| California | $\omega$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | * | 0 | 0 | Q | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | © | $\bigcirc$ | ¢ | $\bigcirc$ | $\omega$ |  |
| Colorado | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | * | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| Connecticut | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | - | 9 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |
| Florida | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | © | $\bullet$ | 0 | $\omega$ | 6 |  |  |
| Ceorgia | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hawaii |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| Illinois | ¢ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 9 |  |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Indiana | 0 | 6 |  | - | - |  |  |  | 6 | 6 | $\sigma$ |  |  |  | 6 | $\bigcirc$ | 6 | 6 | - | 0 |  |
| lowa | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| Kansas | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Kentucky | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\theta$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | E |
| Louisiana | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Maine | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | 0 |  | - | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Maryland | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | 0 |  | - | 9 | 0 | $\omega$ | $\bullet$ |
| Massachusetts | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | - | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 3 |  |  |
| Michigan | 0 | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  |
| Mississippi | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri | 0 | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |  |
| Montana | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Nebraska | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| Nevada | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\theta$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| New Jersey | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\sigma$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| New Mexico | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | $\theta$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | © | $\bigcirc$ | 9 | 0 |  |  |
| New York | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | © | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | 0 | + | © | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| North Carolina | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Dakota | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\sigma$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |
| Oklahoma | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |
| Oregon | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |
| Pennsylvania | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bullet$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{1}{4}$ |  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | 0 |  |  |  |

## US GAMING AT A GLANCE

|  | Charitable bingo | Charitable games | $\begin{gathered} \text { Card } \\ \text { rooms } \end{gathered}$ | Casinos | Gaming devices | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Sports } \\ \text { wagerine } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Video lottery terminals | Keno | Instant <br> \& pulltah <br> games | Lotto | Numbers | Passives | Greyhound | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{r} \text { Jai } \\ \text { alai } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Hamess | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quarter } \\ & \text { horse } \end{aligned}$ | Thoroughbred | Intersiate <br> Inter-track <br> wagering | Intrastate Inter-track wagering | $\begin{gathered} \text { OIf- } \\ \text { track } \\ \text { betting } \end{gathered}$ | Telephone betting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Carolina | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  | * |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| Tennessee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\omega$ | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Texas | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |
| Utah |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | * |  |  |  |  |  |
| Verrnont | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | - | - |  | 0 |  | 1 | - |  |  |  |
| Virginia | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - | 1 | - | - | - |  |
| Washington | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | - | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Washington, D.C | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Virginia | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | $\bullet$ | - | 0 | - |  |  |
| Wyoming | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\omega$ | 0 | 0 | - | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Puerto Rico | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Virgin Islands |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |
| Legend |  | Authorized <br> Permitted b | but not | yet imple | mented |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Legal a } \\ & \text { Implem } \end{aligned}$ | and operati ented sinc | ce June | $\text { e } 1995$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \end{aligned}$ |  | Operative Previousl | but no pa |  | wagering not permitte |  |  |  |

MISSOURI GAMING COMMISSION

## SURVEY OF GAMING TAXES, REVENUES AND REGULATIONS

| durtadietion | Casino Type | No. of Ltcentes | CrmingTax Rta, | Other Taxes 4 Fees | Admlssion Fee | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lovs } \\ & \text { Llomits } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Gaming Lintis | T996 Calendar Yeat GamfinRevenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nevada | Landbased | Current: 416 unrestricted; 1,879 restricted/Unlimited | Monthly on gross gaming revenue: 3\% for first $\$ 50 \mathrm{~K} ; 4 \%$ of the next $\$ 84 \mathrm{~K}$; $6.25 \%$ exceeding $134 \mathrm{~K} /$ effective tax rate to unrestricted licensees $7.25 \%$ | Slot license fee of \$250 per year |  |  |  | \$7,368,580,000 |
| New Jersey | Landbased | Current 13/̈nlimited | 8\% on gross gaming revenue | \$500 per year per slot machine; investment alternative tax, $1.25 \%$ of est gross revenues |  |  |  | \$3,748,576,000 |
| Louisiana | Cruise/Landbased | 14 Riverboat \& 1 Landbased/Limit 15 riverboals | $18.5 \%$ of net gaming proceeds or $\$ 100,000$ per year whichever is greater |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \$ 2.50-\$ 3.50 \\ \text { per admission } \\ \text { optional in local } \\ \text { jurisdictions } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | . | \$340,899,209 |
| Mississippi | Dockside | Current 29/Unlimited | 8\% state tax; 4\% tax split between city and county where gaming is legal | Application Fee, $\$ 5,000$; Gaming Device tax $\$ 100,000 / y r$ |  |  |  | \$1,724,301,405 |
| lowa | Cruise/Dockside* | Current 12 ( 9 paramutual-siots only, 9 riverboats)/No limit | Annually on AGR: 5\% for first \$1MM; $10 \%$ of the next $\$ 2 \mathrm{MM}$; 20\% exceeding $\$ 3 \mathrm{MM}$ | Enforcement Cost @ $95 \%+$ Commission costs divided equally between boats on a weekly basis; Application fee $\$ 40,000$; Annual fee $\$ 5$ per passenger to capacity; Annual license fee $\$ 1,000$; occupational license \& fingerprinting fees |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Removed } \\ \text { in } 1994 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | \$455,935,892 |
| Illinois | Cruise | Current 10/Limit 10 | 20\% of AGR | Various licensee and application fees ranging from $\$ 50$ to $\$ 50,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2 \text { per } \\ \text { admission fee. } \end{gathered}$ |  | No Poker Allowed | \$1,178,311,827 |
| Missour | Simulated Cruise** | Current 7/Unlimited*** | 20\% of AGR | Boat to pay for full cost of enforcement. Avg. \$50,000 per month; various license and applications fees | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2 \text { per } \\ \text { admission fee. } \end{gathered}$ | Loss limit of $\$ 500$ per 2 hour cruise |  | \$467,577,788 |
| Indiana | Cruise/Simulated Cruise on Lake Michigan | Current 4/Limit 11 | 20\% of AGR |  | $\$ 3$ per person per cruise admission fee. |  |  | \$6,400,000 |
| Colorado | Limited Stakes/Landbased | Current 61/Unlimited | Annually on AGR: 2\% for first \$2MM; $\mathbf{8 \%}$ for next $\$ 2 \mathrm{MM} ; 15 \%$ for next $\$ 1$ MM; 18\% above \$5MM | State fee of $\$ 75$ per device, per year. Local fee of $\$ 750-\$ 1,265$ per device per year. |  |  | Bet limit of $\$ 5$ on slots, blackjack and poker only | \$348,342,946 |
| South Dakota | Limited Stakes/Landbased | Current 116/Unlimited | 8\% of AGR | A $\$ 2,000$ per device, per year fee; various license, application and investigation fees |  |  | Bet limit of \$5 | \$48,535,113 |

[^3]
## Appendix C



| Gaming Commission Fund Balance Report Fiscal Year 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AMOUNT | SUBTOTAL | Total |  | AMOUNT | SUBTOTAL | TOTAL |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fees: |  |  |  | EXPENDITUREGAMING (com) |  |  |  |
| A\&B Application | \$942,117.72 |  |  | Office \& Comm. Equip. Purchase | \$66,062.00 |  |  |
| Level 1 Occup. Application | \$50,700.00 |  |  | Communications Expense | \$102,357.00 |  |  |
| Level II Occup. Application | \$558,180.85 |  |  | Inst. \& Phys. Plant Expense | \$187,366.00 |  |  |
| Supplier Application | \$155,739.66 |  |  | Inst. \& Phys. Plant Equip. Purchase |  |  |  |
| Level II Occup. Annual Fee | \$367,982.01 |  |  |  | \$49,221.00 |  |  |
| Supplier Annual Fee | \$20,000.00 |  |  | Data Processing Exp. \& Equip. | \$160,263.00 |  |  |
| Penalties | \$225,000.00 |  |  | Professional Services | \$347,662.00 |  |  |
| Level II Supplier Application | \$2,925.00 |  |  | Other Expense | \$155,444.00 |  |  |
| Level II Supplier Annual Fee | \$1,100.00 |  |  | Refund Appropriation | \$9,315.00 |  |  |
| Admissions | \$12,608,260.00 | \$14,932,005.24 |  | Debt Retirement | \$3,000,000.00 |  |  |
| Licenses: |  |  |  | Rounding Adjustment | \$2.00 | \$4,319,525.00 |  |
| A\&B Annual | \$175,000.00 |  |  | Total Gaming |  |  | \$8,797,724.52 |
| Liquor License | \$4,000.00 | \$179,000.00 |  | EXPENDITURE-OTHER |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  | Personal Services: |  |  |  |
| Administrative Income | \$796,296.41 |  |  | DOR Salaries | \$14,025.22 | \$14,025.22 |  |
| Interest | \$260,240.42 | \$1,056,536.83 |  | Expense \& Equipment: |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  | \$16,167,542.07 | MSHP Gasoline | \$102,059.24 |  |  |
| EXPENDITURE-GAMING |  |  |  | MSHP Auto Maintenance \& Repair | \$55,246.88 |  |  |
| Personal Service: |  |  |  | MSHP Automobiles | \$500,935.26 |  |  |
| Gaming Salaries | \$779,505.57 |  |  | Transfer to General Revenue (UPC) | \$13,471.00 | \$671,712.38 |  |
| MSHP Salaries | \$2,254,137.40 |  |  | Total Other |  |  | \$685,737.60 |
| MSHP Fringe Benefit | \$1,080,716.37 |  |  | FUND BALANCE |  |  | 9,208,142.28 |
| Gaming Fringe Benefit | \$363,840.18 | \$4,478,199.52 |  | Penalty Reserve | \$225,000.00 |  |  |
| Expense \& Equipment |  |  |  | Interest Through | \$8,098.24 | \$233,098.24 | \$233,098.24 |
| Travel \& Vehicle Exp. | \$172,879.00 |  |  | FUND BALANCE |  |  |  |
| Office Equipment | \$68,954.00 |  |  | W/LITIGATION |  |  | \$8,975,044.04 |


| Gaming Commission Fund Balance Report Fiscal Year 1996-As of 08-31-96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGINNING BALANCE 71/95 | AMOUNT | SUBTOTAL | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \boldsymbol{\$ 9 , 2 0 8 , 1 4 2 . 2 8} \end{gathered}$ |  | AMOUNT | SUBTOTAL | TOTAL |
| REVENUE |  |  |  | Office Equipment | \$53,708.54 |  |  |
| Fees: |  |  |  | Office \& Comm. Equip. Pur. | \$82,105.21 |  |  |
| A\&B Application | \$1,073,907.66 |  |  | Communications Expense | \$103,873.84 |  |  |
| Level I Occup. Application | \$91,200.00 |  |  | Inst. \& Phys. Plant Expense | \$46,567.50 |  |  |
| Level II Occup. Application | \$526,650.00 |  |  | Inst. \& Phys. Plant Equip. Pur. | \$10,512.62 |  |  |
| Supplier Application | \$88,007.49 |  |  | Data Processing Exp \& Equip. | \$115,001.21 |  |  |
| Level I Occup. Annual Fee | \$1,000.00 |  |  | Professional Services | \$613,952.32 |  |  |
| Level II Occup. Annual Fee | \$652,623.99 |  |  | Other Expense | \$19,015.62 |  |  |
| Supplier Annual Fee | \$40,000.00 |  |  | Refund Appropriation | \$314.50 |  |  |
| Penalties | \$7,349.60 |  |  | Lease Payment | \$168,941.04 | \$1,373,551.52 |  |
| Level II Supplier Application | \$1,800.00 |  |  | Total Gaming |  |  | \$34,142,183.55 |
| Level II Supplier Annual Fee | \$1,036.86 |  |  | EXPENDITURE-OTHER |  |  |  |
| Admissions | \$22,297,394.00 | \$24,780,069.60 |  | Personal Services: |  |  |  |
| Licenses: |  |  |  | DOR Salaries | \$21,876.00 |  |  |
| A\&B Annual | \$225,000.00 |  |  | Attorney General Salaries | \$31,200.00 |  |  |
| Liquor License | \$5,500.00 | \$230,500.00 |  | Auditor's Office Salaries | \$28,850.97 | \$81,926.97 |  |
| Other: |  |  |  | Expense \& Equipment: |  |  |  |
| Administrative Income | \$305,257.74 |  |  | MSHP Gasoline | \$116,133.00 |  |  |
| Enforcement Reimbursements | \$6,155,156.78 |  |  | MSHP Auto Maintenance \& Repair | \$84,188.72 |  |  |
| Interest | \$899,042.28 |  |  | MSHP Vehicle Purchase | \$508,249.00 |  |  |
| Outlawed Check | \$9,999.00 | \$7,369,455.80 |  | Auditors Office Expenses | \$2,221.42 |  |  |
| Total |  |  | \$41,589,067.68 | Div. of Youth Services | \$491,855.28 |  |  |
| EXPENDITURE-GAMING |  |  |  | Miscellaneous Transfers | \$8,421,958.97 | \$9,624,606.39 |  |
| Personal Service: |  |  |  | Total Other |  |  | \$9,706,533.36 |
| Gaming Salaries | \$1,039,779.95 |  |  | FUND BALANCE |  |  | \$24,435,650.19 |
| MSHP Salaries | \$3,075,756.33* |  |  | Penalty Reserve - From FY 96 | \$7,349.60 |  |  |
| MSHP Fringe Benefit | \$1,448,504.05 |  |  | Interest Through 6-30-96 Est. | \$431.00 |  |  |
| Gaming Fringe Benefit | \$509,292.28 | \$6,073,332.61 |  | Penalty Reserve - From FY95 | \$225,000.00 |  |  |
| Expense \& Equipment |  |  |  | Interest Through 6-30-95 Est. | \$15,302.00 | \$248,082.60 |  |
| Travel \& Vehicle Exp. | \$159,559.12 |  |  | FUND BALANCEW/LITIGATION |  |  | \$24,187,567.59 |

Appendix D


## Aztar Missouri Corporation



## Boyd Gaming Company "Sam's Town"




## Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation




## Hilton Kansas City Corporation



## Quick Facts:

License Date: October 18, 1996
Total Gaming Positions. 1,223
Gambling Space 30,000
Employees: 941
Flamingo Casino
1800 E. Front Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64120
Tel: (816) 855-7777
Local Government:
City of Kansas City
Quick Stats:
Due to licensure date of this casino, complete data is not yct available.

## Kansas City Station Corporation



## Quick Facts:

License Date: January 18, 1997 Total Gaming Positions 3,876 Gambling Space $140,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft Employees: 3,216

Station Casino Kansas City 7777 NE Bimingham Road Kansas City, Missouri 64161
Tel (816) $414-7000$
Local Government
City of Kansas City

## Quick Stats:

Due to licensure date of this casino, complete data is not yet available.

## Missouri Gaming Company "Argosy"



## Quick Facts:

License Date June 22, 1994
Total Gaming Positions: 1,190
Gambling Space: 30,000
Employees: 1,144
Argosy Riverside Casino 777 N.W. Argosy Parkway Riverside, Missouri 64150 Tel: (816) 746-3100

Local Govemment: City of Riverside

## Quick Stats:

## Admissions

3,447,669
Admissions Fees $\quad \begin{array}{r}\$ 6,895,338\end{array}$
Admission Fees
State \& Local Portion $\$ 3,447,669$ Adjusted Gross Receipts $\$ 87,704,983$ Gaming Tax $\$ 17,540,997$
Estimated Project Cost $\$ 92,597,042$
Gaming Tax
Local Portion $\quad \$ 1,754,100$
State Portion $\quad \$ \quad \$ 15,786,897$
Table Games
Slot Machines

## President Riverboat Casino - Missouri, Inc.



## Quick Facts.

License Date: May 27, 1994
Total Gaming Positions: 1,393
Gambling Space: 58,000
Employees: 1,115
President Riverboat Casino--Missouri, Inc on the Admiral
600 North Leonor K. Sullivan Blvd.
St Louis, Missouri 63102
Tel: (314) 8622-3000
Local Government:
City of St. Louis
Quick Stats:

Admissions $\quad 3,583,631$
Admissions Fees $\$ 7,167,262$
Admission Fees
State \& Local Portion $\quad \$ 3,583,631$ Adjusted Gross Receipts $\$ 70,036,124$
Gaming Tax $\$ 14,007,225$
Estimated Project Cost $\quad \$ 60,204,248$
Gaming Tax
Local Portion $\$ 1,400,722$
State Portion Table Games
Slot Machines

## St. Charles Riverfront Station



| Quick Facts: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| License Dates: |  |
| Casino St. Charles: May 27, 1994 |  |
| Dockside facility: December 28, 1994 |  |
| Total Gaming Positions: 2,141 |  |
| Gambling Space: 47,000 |  |
| Employees: 1,859 |  |
| Casino St. Charles |  |
| 1260 S. Main |  |
| St. Charles, Missouri 63302 |  |
| Tel: (314) 940-4300 |  |
| Local Government: |  |
| City of St. Charles |  |
| Quick Stats: |  |
| Admissions | 5,792,921 |
| Admissions Fees | \$11,585,842 |
| Admission Fees |  |
| State \& Local Portion | \$5,792,921 |
| Adjusted Gross Receipts | \$135,330,444 |
| Gaming Tax | \$27,066,089 |
| Estimated Project Cost | \$153,969,488 |
| Gaming Tax |  |
| Local Portion | \$2,706,609 |
| State Portion | \$24,359,480 |
| Table Games | 104 |
| Slot Machines | 1,729 |

## St. Joseph Riverboat Partners




[^0]:    * Casino Axtar began operations, April 27, 1995

[^1]:    TM.

[^2]:    * Sams Town - Kansas Clty began operations, September 13, 1995

[^3]:    *Requined to cruise one cruise a day for 100 days during April - October
    -" Presumption that boats crisise, but allows procedure for dockside if necessary to ensure safety of passengers. Al boats dockside except Adtar in Caruthersville.
    $\cdots$ While there is no limit on ilicensing, legistation was unsuccessfully introduced in 1995 to limit the number of riverboats to nine.

    - The gaming lax serves as a credit against state income tax

