

TABLE 1C. KEY DETERMINANTS OF GAMBLING IMPACTS

Study	Study Area	Substitution Effect	Recapture	Profile of Patrons ^a
Leven (1998)	Missouri	75% substitution rate ^b	53%	higher inc, better educ, older
WEFA (1997)	Connecticut	75% substitution rate ^b	--	higher inc, white
Gazel (1995)	Illinois	83% of patrons residents	--	more retired, poor, minority
	Las Vegas	15% of patrons residents	--	--
	Atlantic City	<15% of patrons residents	--	--
Blois (1995)	Connecticut	100% substitution rate ^b	--	--
Deloitte (1995)	Michigan	100% substitution rate ^b	45%	--
KPMG (1995)	Windsor, ONT	21% of patrons residents	--	--
MD DFS (95)	Maryland	-- ^c	25%	representative tourists
Andersen (1995)	Maryland	70% substitution rate ^d	30%	lower income, younger ^c
Hunter (1995)	Maryland	35% substitution rate ^d	24%	--
Deloitte (1992)	Chicago	58% of patrons residents	--	--
MN Gaming (1993)	Minnesota	80% of patrons residents	--	--
Thompson (1995)	Wisconsin	85% of patrons residents ^e	--	lower income, elderly, female
Murray (1993)	Wisconsin	83% of patrons residents	--	--
Gazel (1996)	Wisconsin	--	50%	--
Univ. Assocs. (1992)	Michigan	37% of patrons residents	--	--
Thompson (1996)	Illinois	--	30%	--
Nat'l Comm'n (76)	U.S.	--	--	higher inc, better educ, male
Harrah's (1996)	U.S.	--	--	higher income, better educated
Chicago BGA (96)	Illinois	--	--	higher income, better educated

^aIn comparison to residents unless otherwise noted.

^bMeasured in terms of a shift in resident spending in terms of existing regional goods and services.

^cErroneously measured only in terms of tourists in general rather than base population.

^dMeasured in terms of percentage of total spending by casino customers.

^eAlso 30% of patrons said casino gambling changed their spending on other types of leisure activities.