

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES

1985-1986

86/2

4384

SSTA

HB 284 - HB 338

1263

1 time.

2 Sec. 15.25.043. DETERMINATION OF RESIDENCY OF A CANDIDATE. In
3 determining the residence within an election district of a qualified
4 voter for the purposes of compliance with art. II, sec. 2 of the
5 Alaska Constitution, the director shall apply the rules established in
6 AS 15.05.020 together with the following rules:

7 (1) a person establishes residence within an election
8 district

9 (A) by actual physical presence at a specific location
10 within the district; and

11 (B) by maintaining a habitation at the specific
12 location;

13 (2) a person may maintain a place of residence at a specif-
14 ic location within a district while away from the location for pur-
15 poses of employment, education, military service, or vacation if the
16 person does not establish residency at another location; and

17 (3) a qualified voter loses residence by voting in another
18 election district or in another state's elections.

19 * Sec. 27. AS 15.25.050(a) is amended to read:

20 (a) At the time the declaration is filed, each candidate shall
21 pay a nonrefundable filing fee to the director. The filing fee for
22 candidates for office of governor, lieutenant governor, United States
23 senator, and United States representative is \$100. The filing fee for
24 candidates for office of state senator and state representative is
25 \$30. [SUBJECT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION, THE DIRECTOR SHALL PAY
26 THE FILING FEE COLLECTED FROM A CANDIDATE UNDER THIS SECTION TO THE
27 CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE POLITICAL PARTY OF THAT CANDIDATE.]

28 * Sec. 28. AS 15.25.160 is amended to read:

29 Sec. 15.25.160. REQUIRED NUMBER OF SIGNATURES FOR STATEWIDE
H

1 OFFICE. Petitions for the nomination of candidates for the office of
2 governor, lieutenant governor, United States senator and United States
3 representative shall be signed by qualified voters of the state equal
4 in number to at least one [THREE] percent of the number of voters who
5 cast ballots [VOTES CAST] in the preceding general election. Candi-
6 dates for the office of governor and lieutenant governor shall file
7 jointly.

8 * Sec. 29. AS 15.25.170 is amended to read:

9 Sec. 15.25.170. REQUIRED NUMBER OF SIGNATURES FOR DISTRICT-WIDE
10 OFFICE. Petitions for the nomination of candidates for the office of
11 state senator or state representative shall be signed by qualified
12 voters of the election or senate district in which the proposed nomi-
13 nee desires to be a candidate equal in number to at least one [THREE]
14 percent of the number of voters who cast ballots [VOTES CAST] in the
15 proposed nominee's [HIS] respective election or senate district in the
16 preceding general election. A [, PROVIDED THAT NO] nominating peti-
17 tion [NEED CONTAIN MORE THAN 200 SIGNATURES NOR] may not [IT] contain
18 less than 50 signatures for any district.

19 * Sec. 30. AS 15.30.025(a) is amended to read:

20 (a) A limited political party may be organized for the purpose
21 of selecting candidates for electors of President and Vice President
22 of the United States by filing [A PETITION] with the director at least
23 90 days before a presidential general election a petition signed by
24 qualified voters of the [THIS] state equaling in number at least one
25 [THREE] percent of the number of voters who cast ballots [ALASKA'S
26 TOTAL VOTE] for President at the last presidential election. The
27 petition shall state that the signers intend to organize a limited
28 political party, that they intend to select candidates for electors of
29 President and Vice-President of the United States at the next
H

1 succeeding presidential election, and the name of the limited politi-
2 cal party.

3 * Sec. 31. AS 15.30.025(c) is amended to read:

4 (c) A limited political party organized under this section
5 ceases [SHALL CEASE] to be a limited political party if [WHENEVER] its
6 presidential candidate fails to receive at least three [10] percent of
7 the number of voters who cast ballots [TOTAL ALASKAN VOTE CAST] for
8 the office of President at a presidential election.

9 * Sec. 32. AS 15.35.040 is amended to read:

10 Sec. 15.35.040. FILING DECLARATION BY SUPREME COURT JUSTICE.
11 Each justice seeking retention in office shall file with the director
12 a declaration of candidacy for retention no later than August 1 before
13 [NOT LESS THAN 90 DAYS BEFORE THE DATE OF] the general election at
14 which approval or rejection is requisite.

15 * Sec. 33. AS 15.35.055 is amended to read:

16 Sec. 15.35.055. FILING DECLARATION BY JUDGE OF THE COURT OF
17 APPEALS. Each judge of the court of appeals seeking retention in
18 office shall file with the director a declaration of candidacy for
19 retention no later than August 1 before [NOT LESS THAN 90 DAYS BEFORE
20 THE DATE OF] the general election at which approval or rejection is
21 requisite.

22 * Sec. 34. AS 15.35.070 is amended to read:

23 Sec. 15.35.070. FILING DECLARATION BY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE.
24 Each judge seeking retention in office shall file with the director a
25 declaration of candidacy for retention no later than August 1 before
26 [NOT LESS THAN 90 DAYS BEFORE THE DATE FIXED FOR] the general election
27 at which approval or rejection is requisite.

28 * Sec. 35. AS 15.35.110 is amended to read:

29 Sec. 15.35.110. FILING DECLARATION BY DISTRICT JUDGE. Each
H

1 district judge seeking retention in office shall file with the direc-
2 tor a declaration of candidacy for retention no later than August 1
3 before [NOT LESS THAN 90 DAYS BEFORE THE DATE FIXED FOR] the general
4 election at which approval or rejection is requisite.

5 * Sec. 36. AS 15.40.100 is amended to read:

6 Sec. 15.40.100. REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION FOR NO-PARTY CANDI-
7 DATES. Petitions for the nomination of candidates not representing a
8 political party shall be signed by qualified voters of the state equal
9 in number to at least one [THREE] percent of the number of voters who
10 cast ballots [NUMBERS OF VOTES CAST] in the preceding general elec-
11 tion, and shall state in substance that which is required in petitions
12 for nomination for general elections provided in AS 15.25.180.

13 * Sec. 37. AS 15.40.190 is amended to read:

14 Sec. 15.40.190. REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION FOR [OF] NO-PARTY
15 CANDIDATES. Petitions for the nomination of candidates not represent-
16 ing a political party shall be signed by qualified voters of the state
17 equal in number to at least one [THREE] percent of the number of
18 voters who cast ballots [VOTES CAST] in the preceding general election
19 and shall state in substance that which is required for nomination
20 petitions by AS 15.25.180.

21 * Sec. 38. AS 15.40.280 is amended to read:

22 Sec. 15.40.280. REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION FOR [OF] NO-PARTY
23 CANDIDATES. Petitions for the nomination of candidates not represent-
24 ing a political party shall be signed by qualified voters of the state
25 equal in number to at least one [THREE] percent of the number of
26 voters who cast ballots [VOTES CAST] in the preceding general elec-
27 tion, shall include nominees for the office of governor and lieutenant
28 governor, and shall state in substance that which is required for
29 nomination petitions by AS 15.25.180.
H

1 * Sec. 39. AS 15.40.440 is amended to read:

2 Sec. 15.40.440. REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION FOR NO-PARTY CANDI-
3 DATES. Petitions for the nomination of candidates not representing a
4 political party shall be signed by qualified voters equal in number to
5 at least one [THREE] percent of the number of voters who cast ballots
6 [VOTES CAST] in the proposed nominee's [HIS] respective election or
7 senate district in the preceding general election. A [, PROVIDED THAT
8 NO] nominating petition [NEED CONTAIN MORE THAN 200 SIGNATURES NOR]
9 may not [IT] contain less than 50 signatures for any district, and
10 shall state in substance that which is required in petitions for
11 nomination for general elections provided in AS 15.25.180.

12 * Sec. 40. AS 15.58.010 is amended to read:

13 Sec. 15.58.010. ELECTION PAMPHLET. Before each state general
14 election, the lieutenant governor shall prepare, publish and mail at
15 least one [AN] election pamphlet to each household identified from the
16 official registration list [EVERY REGISTERED VOTER]. The pamphlet
17 shall be prepared on a regional basis as determined by the lieutenant
18 governor.

19 * Sec. 41. AS 15.58.030(a) is amended to read:

20 (a) No later than July 15 of a presidential election year [75
21 DAYS BEFORE THE STATE GENERAL ELECTION], candidates for the offices of
22 the United States President and Vice-President may file with the
23 lieutenant governor photographs and statements advocating their candi-
24 dacy.

25 * Sec. 42. AS 15.58.030(b) is amended to read:

26 (b) No later than July 15 of a year in which a [75 DAYS BEFORE
27 THE] state general election will be held, a candidate for the office
28 of United States senator, United States representative, governor,
29 lieutenant governor, [JUSTICE OR JUDGE,] state senator, or state
H

1 representative may file with the lieutenant governor a photograph and
2 a statement advocating the [HIS] candidacy.

3 * Sec. 43. AS 15.58.030 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

4 (g) No later than August 7 of the year in which the state gener-
5 al election will be held, a person seeking retention in office as a
6 justice or judge may file with the lieutenant governor a photograph
7 and a statement advocating the candidacy.

8 * Sec. 44. AS 15.58.040(a) is amended to read:

9 (a) No later than July 15 of a year in which a [75 DAYS BEFORE
10 THE] state general election will be held, a political party may file
11 with the lieutenant governor a maximum of two pages of material.

12 * Sec. 45. AS 15.58.050 is amended to read:

13 Sec. 15.58.050. INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON JUDICIAL
14 OFFICERS. No later than August 7 of the year in which [75 DAYS BE-
15 FORE] the state general election will be held, the judicial council
16 shall file with the lieutenant governor a statement including informa-
17 tion about each supreme court justice, court of appeals judge, superi-
18 or court judge, and district court judge who will be subject to a
19 retention election. The statement shall reflect the evaluation of
20 each justice or judge conducted by the judicial council according to
21 law. A statement may not exceed 600 words.

22 * Sec. 46. AS 15.60.010(20) is amended to read:

23 (20) "political party" means an organized [A] group of
24 [ORGANIZED] voters that [WHICH] represents a political program and
25 that [WHICH] nominated a candidate for governor who received at least
26 three [10] percent of the total votes [VOTE] cast at the preceding
27 general election for governor;

28 * Sec. 47. AS 43.23.015 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

29 (i) The commissioner shall design the application form prepared
H

1 in conformity with (b) of this section so that an individual applying
2 for a permanent fund dividend may register to vote, update an existing
3 voter registration, and request the cancellation of a voter registra-
4 tion in another state. The commissioner shall promptly provide the
5 director of elections with the information obtained under this sub-
6 section. The commissioner may not use information obtained under this
7 subsection for any purpose except to assist a resident of the state to
8 complete or update voter registration.

9 * Sec. 48. AS 15.13.070(f) and (g); AS 15.20.201(d), 15.20.220(b); and
10 AS 15.25.180(10) are repealed.

11 * Sec. 49. Sections 1 - 24, 26 - 31, 36 - 42, 44 and 46 - 48 of this
12 Act take effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.070(c).

13 * Sec. 50. Sections 25, 32 - 35, 43 and 45 of this Act take effect
14 January 1, 1987.



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

11/24/89
Date

H B

2 8 8

COMMITTEE REPORT
SENATE

FURTHER: RESOURCES
JUDICIARY

5/6/85

Date FEBRUARY 4, 1986

Mr. President

The Committee on STATE AFFAIRS considered CSHB 288(Jud) am

taking of fish and game for subsistence and personal use; efd.

and (a majority of the committee) (the committee) reports it back with the following recommendations:

- do pass
- do pass with attached amendment(s)
- replace with/or adopt s CS for CS HBN288 (SA)
- new title
- same title and recommends _____
- and attached a "LETTER OF INTENT" NEW FISCAL NOTE
- reports it back without recommendation
- recommends referral to RESOURCES Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING
DO PASS

MEMBERS HAVING
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

John W. ...
Tim ...
W. Fischer NR
Bill Ray DO NOT PASS
UNLESS AMENDED / SLOTT
WORKMANSHIP

Michael ...
Chairman
James ...
Chairman recommendation

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION E HUB
1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON DC 20036 10AM

Western Union Mailgram®



4-0431655130 05/10/85 ICS IPWMTZZ CSP MGA
2028296375 WGB TDMT WASHINGTON DC 100 05-10 0353P EST

NRA
M

HONORABLE MITCH ABOOD, CHAIRMAN
ALASKA SENATE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
ROOM 423C
ALASKA STATE CAPITOL BLDG
JUNEAU AK 99801

DEAR SENATOR,

AS THE ALASKA LEGISLATIVE SESSION COMES TO A CLOSE, THE NRA WOULD
LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT OF THE SPORTSMEN IN YOUR STATE.

WE ARE ESPECIALLY GRATEFUL FOR YOUR RESOLVE IN SEEKING LONG-TERM
SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS CREATED BY HOUSE BILL 288. SUCH PROBLEMS
DESERVE CAREFUL STUDY, AND IN-PUT FROM SPORTSMEN IS ESSENTIAL IN
ORDER TO DEVELOP THE APPROPRIATE LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.

NRA STANDS READY TO ASSIST IN THESE EFFORTS.

SINCERELY,
MICHAEL J LASHBROOK, DIRECTOR STATE AND LOCAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

1555 EST

NO/COMP NO



Official Business

COMMITTEE:

DATE:

SIGN-IN

Subject of meeting:

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE	REPRESENTING	DO YOU WANT TO TESTIFY?
Woody Morrison Jr.	1736 Davis - Juneau	780-4963	self	yes ✓
Martz Jensen	2630 Embury Lane Juneau	789-7853	Self	yes ✓
Robert Rausch	P.O. Box 2602 Juneau	789-3764	Self	yes ✓
Susan Arthur	Box 2662 Juneau	789-3764	Self	yes ✓
Peter Armentrout	Juneau	9-3450	AK. Outdoor Council	yes ✓
Dennis Kelso	P.O. Box 3-2000 Juneau AK 99802	465-4100	Department of Fish and Game	yes ✓
Larri Spangler	Pouch K, Juneau	465-3600	Department of Law	yes ✓
Rep Goll	Pouch V Juneau 99811	465-4975	Self	yes ✓
Bob Blake	314 Seward Juneau	586-7870	United Fishermen of Alaska	yes ✓
Carl McQueen	P.O. Box 3-2000 Juneau, AK 99802	465-4147	Dept of Fish & Game	-

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

REPLY TO:

1031 W 4th AVENUE
SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
PHONE: (907) 276-3550

1st NATIONAL CENTER
100 CUSHMAN ST.
SUITE 400
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701
PHONE: (907) 452-1568

POUCH K - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-3600

May 10, 1985

The Honorable Mitchell Abood
Chairman
Senate State Affairs Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, AK 99811

Re: CS HB 288(Jud) am -- sub-
sistence and personal use
Our file nos. 366-375-85
and 377-176-85

Dear Senator Abood:

There appears to be some confusion about my testimony and the testimony of Dennis Kelso, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Fish and Game, on CS HB 288(Jud) am, relating to subsistence and personal use, to the Senate State Affairs Committee. The Department of Law and the Department of Fish and Game support CS HB 288 (Jud) am, because the bill would provide the statutory authority that will solve both the ANILCA and management problems which resulted from Madison v. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, ___ P.2d ___, Op. No. 2911, (Alaska Feb. 22, 1985). In addition, the definition of "subsistence uses" contained in the bill would be defensible against an equal protection challenge.

If you have any questions about this, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

NORMAN C. GORSUCH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: *Larri Irene Spengler*
Larri Irene Spengler
Assistant Attorney General

Honorable Mitchell Abood
366-375-85 and
377-176-85

May 10, 1985
Page 2

LIS:dln

cc: Commissioner Collinsworth
Deputy Commissioner Kelso
Honorable Norman C. Gorsuch

JUNEAU TLINGIT & HAIDA COMMUNITY COUNCIL
3235 HOSPITAL DRIVE
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

May 9, 1985

Re: SB 231

Senator Mitch Abood
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Abood:

My name is Cyril R. Manamaker. I am the President of the Juneau Tlingit & Haida Community Council. I represent the approximately 5000 urban members of the Alaska Native Community who live in Juneau.

We are urging you to support and help to Pass SB 231. We urge your support because SB 231 responsibly satisfies the need for a subsistence law for Alaska.

This bill will provide the Boards of Fish and Game the right to make decisions and allocate resources. It will create a personal use fishery for non-rural residents. It defines rural communities so that it allows for the responsible management of the resources and it will put Alaska back in compliance with ANILCA.

In light of these important attributes we think SB 231 should be passed.

Sincerely,

Cyril R. Manamaker

Cyril R. Manamaker
President, JTHCC

I would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 231. It is quite distressing to see such a flawed piece of legislation even considered for passage. Not only does this bill create an unreasonable and arbitrary classification of its residents but it favors special interest groups that derive a cash livelihood from a public resource. This public resource is reserved by the State constitution for use by all of the people for common benefit. When those needs have been met other uses in support of commerce and industry are provided for.

The haste with which this bill is being hustled makes me wonder if any of those persons favoring it have taken the time to analyze what they are doing. Having no other definition for the word "rural", and it seems that this one word is their panacea, than Webster's New World dictionary: I see that this bill will exclude all persons living in towns or cities, all persons not engaged in agricultural type pursuits, in essence all persons not living in the country. This encompasses all people in Haines, Hoonah, Juneau, Sitka, Angoon, Kake, Petersburg, Ketchikan, Wrangell, etc. Who does it leave? Those few individuals not living in any of the towns, villages, or cities.

As our population continues to grow, and our industries expand our fish and game resources must not only recieve the highest priority for habitat protection but the resultant reduced per capita allocation of fish and game resources must be equitable distributed to all residents of the State. Special interest users must take a second position to the peoples basic priority ownership of the resources.

Greg L. Young
GREG L. Young

May 8, 1985
Robert A. Rausch
P.O. Box 2662
Juneau, Alaska 99803

The issue before us, the 1978 subsistence statute, and the Governor's current effort to bandaid one of its many legal shortcomings, is one that I have testified on or spoken on almost annually. I expect that many more individuals will agonize over this ill-conceived and fatally flawed concept before it passes into history as one of the most wrong-minded attempts to categorize Alaskans in our recorded history.

Basically I have only one message--it is the same message that I gave to the legislature in 1976 and 1978 and subsequently to then candidate, Bill Sheffield in the summer of 1982. That message is THE ISSUE WILL NOT GO AWAY UNTIL ALL CITIZENS of Alaska are treated equally and fairly in the allocation of fish and game resources. The existing statute fails to do this and the "bandaid" proposal constitutes an even more flagrant violation of fairness.

at least by the Governor's proposal
The 1978 subsistence statute will never function satisfactorily because it is bad social and conservation law. It is bad because it is illogical. The law takes one of the many uses of fish and game resources, uses that presumably fall within the constitutionally mandated "beneficial uses," and accords it the highest priority of use for all time, in every case and in every situation, without regard for other beneficial uses so long as the resource isn't eliminated. Of course, other uses can continue so long as subsistence use is fully satisfied. But in the face of rapidly expanding human populations especially in some of our resource poor regions, the end of other beneficial uses is merely a matter of time.

I submit that the legislature should never have created an absolute use priority for any fish or game population, let alone for all of them.

Without a mandated priority of use the Board(s) of Fisheries and Game managed from 1959-1978 with far fewer altercations over resource use, fewer lawsuits and better rapport among users. Certainly the system was not without problems. But no system responsible for the welfare of Alaska's diverse fish and game populations and their uses will satisfy everyone. However, the current system is on the verge of alienating everyone.

A part of the problem stems from the rather abstruse terminology associated with the statute and its proposed successor. "Subsistence use" has never been satisfactorily defined in spite of the Boards' best efforts. Certainly they have come forth with definitions or characterizations of subsistence but all such efforts contain elements that are, in ^{all} probability, unconstitutional in that they almost invariably rely upon one's area (geography) of residence, past practices (length of residency) or other nebulous terminology. We may not like it but we can no longer draw lines on maps or calendars to determine your eligibility to be a fully participating citizen. Perhaps we need a constitutional amendment authorizing limited entry subsistence permits fully patterned after the fisheries limited entry system; certainly such an approach would stimulate our flagging economy. Finding a definition for the term "rural" is at least as problematic as defining "subsistence" and perhaps fraught with more legal pitfalls.

I wonder if it isn't time, once again, to step back and ponder what it is that we are trying to do? Is this merely an attempt to benefit "rural" people? Does it have anything to do with ethnicity? Is welfare (need) a part of the problem? Are some Alaskan citizens more equal than others? It seems to me that the purpose of the activity has become fuzzy. Are we really trying to perpetuate a life style and if so, is it necessary to gradually eliminate all other uses?

If it should be a life style that is at issue I suggest it has already largely disappeared. "Rural" hunting and fishing today is not a life sustaining activity. Yes, it is important, highly desirable, worthy of some protection, but not indefinitely sustainable given the high technology now employed in the taking of fish and wildlife---do we want to foster as the highest priority of use the taking of walrus from aircraft and from boats with the aid of radios when only the ivory is salvaged--do we wish to accord first priority to the pursuit of flightless waterfowl, caribou, and other game with the most modern all-terrain vehicles---can we perpetuate desirable cultural attributes while fostering multibillion dollar expenditures in the areas that clamor most for subsistence? Has the legislature taken the time and energy necessary to articulate a position that conveys the leadership required to assure the holders of various subsistence viewpoints that all have been considered fully and fairly?

1. The issue is too complex to resolve in the dying days of this session--please don't pass a "rural" bill and thereby force the citizens to once again sue to correct your mistake. Request the public involvement that the administration promised but has denied us.
2. Following extensive hearings throughout the state consider doing what you do best--pass a bill that treats all Alaskans equally and fairly and allow the Board(s) to implement the law. Laws that supplant the Boards' and Department's authority to allocate and manage fish and game rarely are successful because of the rapid fluctuation in animal population numbers and distribution.
3. Problems attendant to defining and administering subsistence will never go away until we build a coalition of supporters whose essential qualifications reek of fairness and equity. Perhaps the very term, subsistence, should be abandoned for a forward looking system that considers all beneficial uses of wild resources whenever allocations are made among the uses. Assigning by law the highest priority of use to subsistence was an error that staggers the imagination. Clearly there are higher uses over time and in certain places. Examples are legion and they change with time and circumstance. In my view a statute directing the Boards of Fisheries and Game to consider all designated beneficial uses whenever allocating fish and game resources comes much closer to the desired goals than does the existing or proposed legislation (the legislature, if it so desired, could spell out designated beneficial uses including subsistence uses, commercial uses, recreational uses, etc.)

Such an approach could also alleviate any potential clash with the federal government as subsistence would be considered with every regulatory action. Of course, it will be necessary to eventually alter federal law in order to lessen the likelihood of expensive suits against ANILCA by citizens. Suits that many legal scholars believe have merit.

TO Chairman and Committee,

May 9, 1980

I have been an Alaskan resident for the last 6 years and a commercial fisherman for the last 10 years.

I myself along with the rest of us here in Cordova support House Bill 288 as it now reads.

I feel the management plan by Fish and Game and the Alaskan Fisheries Board over the last 30 years has worked for the Alaskan Fisheries.

Limited entry enacted in the early 70's has now returned an abundance of fish to the streams, creeks, and Rivers of Alaska.

The historical subsistence catch on the upper upper rivers has worked out fairly in the past 50 years. If there is to be an increased catch of subsistence fish then there should be an income level to define a subsistence user.

I have no problem with a resident catching subsistence needs as long as that person actually needs the fish or game to survive. I would really question the need of a urban resident that makes over \$35,000 a year and drives a Winnebago to catch fish and game to survive.

Anyone in the state of Alaska that is a resident can get a low interest loan and become a Commercial Fisherman.

Don't give a priority basis to a user group that could be made up of the Total population of Alaska. (over)

All it takes is 30 days to become a
resident and once that is known a
lot more people will move to Alaska
to take advantage of the favorable
natural resources that ~~exists~~ ^(still) there.

Thank you

James F. Ryland

Box 1241

Cordova, AK. 99574

424-7115

4/25/85

BY

Halford

IN THE SENATE

A bill

For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the taking of fish and game for personal and subsistence uses; and providing for an effective date."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

Section 1. FINDINGS. The legislature finds that:

(1) Nonresidents visiting Alaska take fish stocks and game populations primarily for commercial, trophy, and recreational purposes. Alaska residents who take fish stocks and game populations for non-commercial purposes use such stocks and populations for food for personal and family consumption;

(2) because of its importance to the health, safety and general wellbeing of all Alaska residents, the taking of fish stocks and game populations by such residents for personal and family consumption is a priority use of stocks and populations;

(3) because of their local proximity to fish stocks and game populations, their dependence upon such stocks and populations as a mainstay of livelihood, and the lack of alternative food resources, the taking of fish stocks and game populations for personal and family consumption by Alaska residents in rural areas for personal and family consumption by reasonable economic means is essential to the health, safety, and general well being of such residents;

(4) the taking of fish stocks and game populations for commercial, recreational and other uses by both residents and nonresidents is also important to the economy of the State of Alaska and particularly to the economies of communities dependent upon commercial fishing; and

(5) commercial fishermen often use a portion of their catch for personal use.

*Section 2. AS 16.05.251 (b) is repealed and reenacted to read:

(b) Whenever it is necessary to restrict the taking of a fish population to assure the maintenance of such population on a sustained-yield basis, the taking of such population by Alaska residents for personal and family consumption, shall be the priority uses of the harvestable surplus of such population and the Board of Fisheries shall adopt regulations authorizing such taking in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62).

*Sec. 3. AS 16. 05. 251 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(c) If the harvestable surplus of a fish population is not large enough to provide a reasonable opportunity for the taking of such population by Alaska residents pursuant to regulations adopted pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Board of Fisheries shall adopt regulations in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) that afford the taking of such population for subsistence uses a priority over other consumptive uses of such population. Takings authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to reasonable regulations as to seasons, bag limits, and methods and means.

(d) If the harvestable surplus of such population is not large enough to provide a reasonable opportunity for the taking of such population for subsistence uses, the board shall adopt regulations that establish restrictions and limitations on the taking of such population for subsistence uses on the basis of the following criteria:

(1) customary and direct dependence upon the resource as the mainstay of one's livelihood;

(2) local residency; and

(3) availability of alternative resources.

Subsistence fishing authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to reasonable regulation as to seasons, bag limits, and methods and means.

(e) If the Board of Fisheries denies a petition or proposal to amend, adopt, or repeal a regulation, the board, upon receiving a written request from the sponsor of the petition or proposal, shall in addition to the requirements of AS 44.62.230 provide a written explanation for the denial to the sponsor not later than 30 days after the board has officially met and denied the sponsor's petition or

proposal, or 30 days after receiving the request for an explanation, whichever is later.

Sec. 4. AS 16.05.255 is repealed and reenacted to read:

(a) The Board of Game may adopt regulations it considers advisable in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) for

(1) setting apart game reserve areas, refuges and sanctuaries in the waters or on the lands of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the legislature;

(2) establishing open and closed seasons and area for the taking of game;

(3) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit, capture and transport of game;

(4) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, sex, age, and size limitation on the taking of game;

(5) classifying game as game birds, song birds, big game animals, fur bearing animals, predators or other categories;

(6) methods, means, and harvest levels necessary to control predation and competition among game in the state;

(7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management, conservation, protection, use, disposal, propagation and stocking of game;

(8) prohibiting the live capture, possession, transport, or release of native or exotic game or their eggs;

(9) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of game licenses, permits and registrations and the transfer of

permits and registrations between registration areas and game management units or subunits is allowed.

(b) Wherever it is necessary to restrict the taking of a game population to assure the maintenance of such population on a sustained-yield basis, the taking of such population by Alaska residents for personal and family consumption, shall be the priority uses of the harvestable surplus of such population and the Board of Game shall adopt regulations authorizing such taking in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62)

(c) If the harvestable surplus of a game population is not large enough to provide a reasonable opportunity for the taking of such population by Alaska residents pursuant to regulations adopted pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Board of Game shall adopt regulations in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) that afford the taking of such population for subsistence uses a priority over other consumptive uses of such population. Takings authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to reasonable regulations as to seasons, bag limits, and methods and means.

(d) If the harvestable surplus of such population is not large enough to provide a reasonable opportunity for the taking of such population for subsistence uses, the board shall adopt regulations that establish restrictions and limitations on the taking of such population for subsistence uses on the basis of the following criteria:

- (1) customary and direct dependence upon the resource as the mainstay of one's livelihood;
- (2) local residency; and
- (3) availability of alternative resources.

Takings authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to reasonable regulations as to seasons, bag limits, and methods and means.

(e) If the Board of Game denies a petition or proposal to amend, adopt, or repeal a regulation, the board, upon receiving a written request from the sponsor of the petition or proposal, shall in addition to the requirements of AS 44.62.230 provide a written explanation for the denial to the sponsor not later than 30 days after the board has officially met and denied the sponsor's petition or proposal, or 30 days after receiving the request for an explanation, whichever is later.

Sec. 4. AS 16.05.940 (23) is amended to read:

(23) "subsistence uses" means the customary and traditional taking and use by Alaska residents in rural areas of wild, renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation, for the making and selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible by-products of fish and wildlife resources taken for personal or family consumption, and for the noncommercial customary trade, barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption. Wild and renewable resources taken for subsistence uses must be used in the same area in which they are taken. For the purposes of this paragraph,

(a) "rural area" means a community or area in which the taking of fish stocks and game populations for personal and family consumption is a significant characteristic of the economy of the community or area;

(b) "family" means all persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, and any person living within the household on a permanent basis;

Sec. 5. AS 16.05.940 (21) is amended to read:

(21) "sport fishing" means the taking of or attempting to take for personal use or for personal or family consumption, and not for sale or barter, any fresh water, marine, or anadromous fish by hook and line held in the hand, or by hook and line with the line attached to a pole or rod which is held in the hand or closely attended, or by other means defined by the Board of Fisheries."

Sec. 6. AS 16.05.940.(28) is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(28) "resident net fishing" means the taking, fishing for, possession of finfish, shellfish, or other fishery resources, by Alaska residents for personal or family consumption and not for sale or barter, with gill or dip net, seine, pot, fish wheel, long line, or other similar means defined by the Board of Fisheries.

Sec. 7. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.070(c).



RECORDS CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James A. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

11/24/89
Date

H B

3 3 8

Alaska State Legislature

DISTRICT 27
AKHIOK
CHIGNIK
CHIGNIK LAGOON
CHIGNIK LAKE
CHINIAK
IVANOF BAY
KARLUK
KODIAK
LARSEN BAY
OLD HARBOR
OUZINKIE
PERRYVILLE
PORT LIONS
WOMENS BAY



Representative
Dave Thompson

P O BOX V
JUNEAU ALASKA 99811
(907) 465-2487
(907) 465-2498

P O BOX 75
KODIAK, ALASKA 99615
(HI) (907) 486-4899
(LIO) (907) 486-8116

DT: 4/24/86
TO: House Finance Committee
FR: Dave Thompson *DWT*
RE: HB 338, Lottery Fiscal Note

The following fiscal note and accompanying analysis give the costs for the initial three and one-half months (3/15/87 to 6/30/87), and the first fiscal year of operation for a lottery as permitted by CSSSHB 33E(Jud). The funding for FY 87 would provide for establishment of a board of directors and one months salary for an executive director and secretary to implement the corporation.

Figures for FY 88 are predicated on:

1. Gross sale of lottery products of \$35,485,300;
2. Prize payments of 50% of gross sales, or \$17,742,700;
3. Administration costs of 9% of gross sales, or \$3,280,100 (see fiscal note analysis).
4. Commissions to retail sales agents of 7% of gross sales, or \$2,484,000.

This results in a net profit of 34% of gross sales, or \$11,978,600 to the state general fund.

This gross sale figure is consistent with the low end estimate for probable profits which could be generated by an Alaska lottery, "Replacement Revenues - - a Position Paper in Support of an Alaskan Lottery," pages 27 & 28.

**STATE OF ALASKA 1985 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
FISCAL NOTE**

Revision Date : _____

REQUEST

FISCAL DETAIL

Bill/Resolution No. : CS SSHB 338
 Title : An Act establishing a state lottery, authorizing an advisory vote; & providing for an effective date.
 Sponsor : Thompson
 Requestor : _____
 Date of Request : _____

Agency Affected : Dept. of Revenue
 DRU : Division of Public Services
 Components : _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES		8.4	1054.9			
TRAVEL		13.8	99.7			
CONTRACTUAL		24.4	1377.5			
SUPPLIES		5	32.0			
EQUIPMENT			216.0			
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS			17742.7			
MISCELLANEOUS			2484.0			
TOTAL OPERATING		47.1	23006.8			

CAPITAL			500.0			
----------------	--	--	-------	--	--	--

REVENUE			35485.3			
----------------	--	--	---------	--	--	--

FUNDING : (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER			23006.8			
TOTAL			23006.8			

POSITIONS :

FULL-TIME			27			
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : Attach a separate page if necessary

Grants, Claims: Prize Obligation
 Miscellaneous: Retail Agent Compensation
 Funding: Operational Funds from Lottery Proceeds

Bill allows for program receipts

Prepared by: Bob D. Thomas Phone: _____
 Division: Representative Dave Thompson Date: _____

Approved by Commissioner: _____ Date: _____
 Agency: _____

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

LOTTERY CORPORATION
Fiscal Note Analysis

ASSUMPTION:

1. Instant ticket game with retail outlets in all communities of over 800 population. Communities between 250,000 and 5,000 to have 1 retail outlet for each 2,000 people. Communities between 5,000 and 2,000 to have 1 retail outlet for every 1,000 people. Communities between 2,000 and 800 to have 1 retail outlet for each 800 people. The cities of Ketchikan, Wrangell, Sitka, Juneau and Skagway would have 5 additional retail outlets each; Petersburg, Haines, Angoon, Cordova, Valdez, Seward and Whittier would have 2 additional retail outlets each to service tourist volume.
2. Weekly lotto game available through all retail outlets in communities of 250,000 - 2,000. Each fourth week lotto game available through all retail outlets in communities 250,000 - 800, retail agents in 75% of the communities between 800 - 100, and by request through the mail to the remainder of the population from lottery regional offices (Anchorage, Juneau and Fairbanks).
3. On-line lottery games would only be considered in the major marketing areas (containing 78.7% of the state's population; page 19 of position paper) of the state. This would be implemented after six months of operation.
4. Gaming computer equipment will be leased for a percentage of the gross sales. Current data line capacity owned by the state to be used for on-line application at no cost to the corporation.
5. A lottery corporation with three departments plus an Office of the Director.
 - (1) the office of the director
 - (2) a marketing department
 - (3) a security department
 - (4) an administration department

The lottery corporation board of directors would have overall authority over the state lottery.

LOTTERY CORPORATION

100 PERSONAL SERVICES

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

The lottery corporation would be headed by the director. The Director acts as Secretary and Executive Officer of the Board of Directors. The Director supervises and administers the operation of the lottery. A secretary would be employed in this office to provide administrative and secretarial support.

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>\$ PER MONTH</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
1 Director	6,135 (a)	6,135	73,620
1 Secretary	2,289 (a)	2,289	27,504

MARKETING DEPARTMENT

Manages statewide marketing activities including sales of lottery tickets and shares, program advertising and promotion, retailer network, marketing analysis, product and game design, and related activities. Nine field representatives, (Anchorage, 5; Juneau, 2; and Fairbanks, 2) would service retail sales agents for lottery products.

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>\$ PER MONTH</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
1 Marketing & Sales Manager	4,668 (b)	-0-	56,016
1 Publications Specialist	4,010 (b)	-0-	48,120
1 Economist/Research Analyst	4,339 (b)	-0-	39,552
1 Secretary/Clerk Typist	2,056 (b)	-0-	24,672
9 Sales Representatives	4,339 (c)	-0-	390,510

SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Develops and manages maintenance of systems and procedures to ensure security, integrity, honesty, and fairness of Lottery operations. Responsibilities include background investigation of staff, vendors, and contractors.

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>\$ PER MONTH</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
1 Investigator/Manager	4,379 (b)	-0-	52,548
2 Investigators	3,753 (b)	-0-	90,072
1 Secretary/Clerk Typist	2,056 (b)	-0-	24,672

ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Administers corporation operations relating to budgeting, accounting, data processing, contract administration, and administrative services including purchasing, facilities management, and records.

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>\$ PER MONTH</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
1 Accounting & Operations Mgr.	3,855 (b)	-0-	46,260
2 Accounting Technicians	2,886 (b)	-0-	69,264
1 Accounting Clerk	2,292 (b)	-0-	27,504
1 Secretary/Clerk Typist	2,056 (b)	-0-	24,672
1 Storekeeper	2,886 (c)	-0-	28,860

After 6 months of operation, on-line games would be implemented and the following staff added:

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>\$ PER MONTH</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
1 Accounting Technician	2,886 (d)	-0-	17,316
1 Accounting Clerk	2,292 (d)	-0-	13,752
TOTAL ANNUAL WAGES AND BENEFITS		8,424	1,054,914

FOOTNOTES

- (a) Beginning at day 45
- (b) Beginning at day 75
- (c) Beginning at day 105
- (d) Beginning at day 225

200 TRAVEL

This travel covers board of director's travel and monthly meetings, director's travel to other lottery states, conferences and monthly meetings. The accounting and operations manager, the marketing manager and the investigators would each be using out-of-state travel to attend training seminars and would bring the expertise back to their sections. The marketing manager would travel within Alaska to promote the lottery and the enforcement section investigators would travel within Alaska to conduct field investigations and to ensure the integrity of the lottery.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Commission trips	11,813	47,250
Director trips	2,000	16,000
Marketing trips	-0-	5,000
Accounting training trip	-0-	1,400
Investigator training/ Investigative trips	-0-	30,000
TOTAL TRAVEL	13,813	99,650

300 CONTRACTUAL

Contractual costs are listed in 3 separate categories: expenses related to the gaming equipment; expenses related to the setup of the corporation; expenses related to security checks for employees and agents.

Gaming Equipment

Computer data lines from the central office to the computer terminals at vendor's locations in communities of over 2,000 currently exist and could be used by the lottery at no cost to the state. Computer terminals would be leased from a gaming equipment company for a percentage of sales. Costs for installation of these terminals would be a one-time capital cost to upgrade the capacity at communication nodes to interface with lottery equipment

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Instant tickets	-0-	407,970
Data line connections from terminals to local nodes (6 mos.)	-0-	10,782
Interface	-0-	500,000

Corporation Setup

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Executive Search	20,000	-0-
Office communications	1,000	21,000
Copiers	500	12,000
Printing	500	35,000
Subscriptions	-0-	1,000
Postage	500	30,000
Messenger Service	-0-	2,000
Freight	500	3,000
Office Space	1,000	69,264
Miscellaneous	-0-	5,000
Advertisement	500	500,000

Security Checks

During the first 1-3 months of operation, prior to lottery product sales, contracted services will screen lottery employee (100) and agent licensing (900) applications.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Security checks	400	200,000
Vendor reports, marketing information and other information and statistics would be data-captured for analysis and reporting to the commission.		

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Equip. lease & maintenance	-0-	48,512
Programs	-0-	25,000
Program maintenance	-0-	<u>7,000</u>
TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	24,400	1,877,528

400 SUPPLIES

Office supplies costs are estimated at \$1.0 per employee.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Stationery and office supplies	500	25,000
Miscellaneous software	<u>-0-</u>	<u>7,000</u>
TOTAL SUPPLIES	500	32,000

500 EQUIPMENT

Office equipment and furniture includes desks, chairs, calculators, file cabinets, partitions, bookcases, credenzas, phones, conference tables and typewriters for central office and two regional offices. Purchase of central processing unit equipment, including one disk drive, a tape drive, a 5574 band printer and air and power conditions.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
Office equipment and furniture	-0-	125,000
Disk and tape drives	-0-	70,000
5574 printer	-0-	12,500
Air and power conditioners	<u>-0-</u>	<u>8,500</u>
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	-0-	216,000

	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 88</u>
TOTAL LOTTERY CORPORATION YEARLY OPERATING	\$ 47,137	\$ 3,280,092

The figure of \$47,137 represents start-up and operational costs for the first 3.5 months of the lottery. An appropriation in this amount will be needed for implementation and operation of the first 3.5 months.

The Fiscal Note provides figures based on the above assumptions and corporation structure, an annual per capita net income of \$26 (as described on page 28 of the position paper Replacement Revenues--a Position Paper in Support of an Alaskan Lottery), and a net profit estimate of 35% of total expenditures for lottery products.

R E P L A C E M E N T R E V E N U E S --

a Position Paper in Support of an

A L A S K A N L O T T E R Y

From the Office of:
Representative David W. Thompson
Alaska State Legislature

Prepared by:
Bob D. Thomas

November 1985

SUMMARY

As the state of Alaska faces the very real prospect of long-term declining revenues from its number one revenue source while the demand for state government services continues to increase, exploration of new revenue generation sources is necessary. The notion of lotteries, specifically state operated lotteries, is far from a new idea, and although over one-half of the U.S. population lives in states operating lotteries, misinformation abounds regarding them. Lotteries offer state governments a proven method for enhancing their total level of revenue receipts. Lotteries are not designed to solve all the financial woes of any state but can help diversify a total package of revenue generation programs.

Government sponsored lotteries have been around from the birth of this nation and have become an integral part of 22 state government's financial support system. Lotteries provide state governments with an acceptable, predictable, voluntary form of revenue generation. Projections for revenue generation in Alaska conservatively range from \$15 million to \$20 million per year.

Lotteries do not prevail on the "poor" or the "less educated" ... every study conducted to date concludes that the above average income and higher than average educated segments of the populations, in states operating lotteries, buy the lions share of lottery products. Lotteries do not increase the incidence of compulsive gambling and do not disrupt the lives of large prize winners. An Alaska lottery would not negatively affect the economies of the states 262 rural communities.

While a politically conservative approach to drafting legislation for authorization of an Alaska lottery is recommended, the experience of states with successful lottery histories and advice of directors of those lotteries should be utilized to maximize the profit potential for this state. The broadest possible latitude must be given the state agency, and board or commission, for operation of the lottery to allow for the flexibility to operate within and adjust to everchanging market conditions.

Recent surveys conclude that the broad cross-section of Alaskan residents would favor the implementation of a state sponsored lottery by two to one margin.

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Part I: LOTTERY BASICS.....	5
Nutshell History of Lotteries.....	5
Types of Lottery Games.....	5
Questions and Answers about Lotteries.....	7
Part II: ALASKA LOTTERY INCOME.....	11
Alaska Compared to Current Lottery States.....	11
Alaska Compared to Colorado.....	27
Projections of Lottery Income for Alaska.....	27
Part III: SOCIAL IMPACT OF LOTTERIES.....	29
What Affect do Lotteries Have on the "Poor?".....	29
What Affect do Lotteries Have on the "Less Educated?".....	29
How do Lotteries Affect the Incidence of Compulsive Gambling?.....	35
Does Winning Disrupt the Lives of Winners of Large Cash Prizes.....	37
Do Lotteries Cause an Economic Drain on Rural Communities....	38
Part IV: IMPLEMENTING AND OPERATING A STATE LOTTERY.....	43
Enabling Legislation.....	43
Interim Funding of a Lottery Agency.....	45
Operation of a State Lottery.....	47
Part V: ALASKA LOTTERY OPINION.....	49
Survey Methodology.....	49
Survey Findings.....	50
Table 1-II: STATES LOTTERY INCOME.....	12
Table 2-II: LOTTERY STATE DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARISON REGARDING POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS FOR OPERATION OF A PROFITABLE LOTTERY.....	15
Table 3-II: INCOME CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATIONS IN LOTTERY STATES AND ALASKA.....	16
Table 4-II: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATIONS IN LOTTERY STATES AND ALASKA.....	17
Table 5-II: WESTERN LOTTERY STATES MARKETING AREAS COMPARISONS...	19
Table 1-III: INDEXED HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION FOR NEW YORK...	33
Table 2-III: 1984 ALASKA POPULATION ESTIMATES BY COMMUNITY SIZE...	39
Table 3-III: 1984 ALASKA POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR COMMUNITIES OVER 2000.....	40

INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to provide the reader with general information regarding state operated lotteries. Types of customary lottery games are described and the most common questions about lotteries are answered based on validated research completed by numerous state governments and lottery industry organizations over the past twenty years.

Revenue generation in states currently operating lotteries is examined and comparisons are presented to assist the reader analyze those factors affecting projection of revenue that could be expected from an Alaskan lottery. Among those factors examined are the economic and physical characteristics of the population of our state, marketing area configurations, and tourist impact on Alaska. A projection of probable profits from a lottery is presented based upon most current population figures, tourist influences and conservative expectations of per capita expenditures on lottery products.

State responsibility for the social affects of government sponsored activities must be of paramount concern to all involved in effecting legislation establishing authority for these activities. The social impact from the operation of a state lottery is discussed and the most current research available is presented.

A brief discussion on implementation and operation of a state lottery is presented from recommendations by several recognized authorities with many years of experience in directing state lotteries.

The conclusions of a November 1985 state-wide opinion poll conducted in Alaska are presented for the readers examination.

Part I: LOTTERY BASICS

Nutshell History of Lotteries

Lottery, according to Webster, is "a drawing of lots in which prizes are distributed to the winners among persons buying a chance." The lottery is not an invention of conventional America. Lotteries have been used by kings, emperors and representative governments throughout history to finance building projects or to increase revenues. The first reported government lottery was instituted by Ceasar Augustus to rebuild Rome. In 1612, King James authorized a lottery to help finance the "colonial settlement" which paid the cost of settling Virginia. In 1751 and 1754 Benjamin Franklin helped sponsor a series of "Academic Lotteries" and helped fund the University of Pennsylvania. The Congress of 1776 provided a National Lottery strongly supported by Thomas Jefferson and others of the nation's founding fathers. Some 70 acts were passed by Congress before 1820 authorizing lotteries for the building of schools and roads and other public projects. Lotteries helped erect Harvard, Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, Columbia, Princeton, William and Mary and many of the nations other prestigious academic institutions. Today over 112 countries around the world sponsor government lotteries, including most of Western Europe, Canada, Mexico, and many Central and South American nations. The modern U.S. lottery started in 1964 in New Hampshire.

Thomas Jefferson once said that "Lotteries are a wonderful thing; they tax only the willing." Indeed many states have turned to state-operated lotteries as a means of raising revenue "painlessly." Lotteries are currently legal in the District of Columbia and 22 states - Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia; (Puerto Rico and Guam also have lotteries). Well over 50% of the population of the U.S. lives in lottery states.

Types of Lottery Games

Lottery games can be divided into two category - "active" and "passive." Active games are those in which the player participates in the bet by choosing a number or set of numbers. The winning numbers are drawn completely at random, so the player's choice has no bearing on the outcome of the game. However, many players enjoy active games because they can choose numbers that have some significance to them which gives an added dimension of entertainment and interest. Active games currently offered by the U.S. lottery states include three and four digit numbers games and lotto.

Passive games are those in which the player takes no action to determine whether he has won or lost; a ticket is purchased and the outcome is then revealed. Passive games offered in the U.S. include instant

games, traditional "draw" type lottery games and some subscription games.

The games mentioned above are all easy to play, and none involve any skill. Features of the various games can be described as follows.

1. Draw Lotteries

Though rare in the U.S., this was the original lottery game, and remains the main game in overseas lotteries. Players purchase pre-numbered tickets and wait for a weekly drawing, similar to a raffle. Payouts vary among games, but generally start at around \$5 and cap off at either \$50,000 or in some cases into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and more.

2. The Instant Game

Instant lottery games involve a fixed price for a ticket, usually \$1. The ticket normally has a scratch-off spot to reveal whether or not it is a winner. The advantage of this game is no waiting: the player knows immediately whether or not he has won.

Prizes range anywhere from a free ticket up to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Most lotteries hold some type of grand prize drawing for winners of some lower-tier prizes, the winner of that drawing receiving a prize sometimes as high as \$1 million or \$1,000 a week for life. Most lotteries offer several instant games per year, and grand prize drawings are generally held when a specific game is sold out or otherwise ended.

3. Lotto

A traditional European lottery game in which the player selects four, five or six numbers from a field ranging from 30 to 49, depending on the size of the population of the state.

Payout is parimutuel; i.e. the jackpot is created from money wagered, and the more that people bet, the larger the prize becomes. If no one selects the winning six numbers in any order, the jackpot "rolls over" to the next drawing. If there no winners for a number of weeks the jackpot can become enormous. Prizes can be divided when more than one bet is placed on the same numbers, and many states offer smaller prizes if one chooses most of the correct numbers.

4. Subscription Games

Many lotteries offer subscriptions to their lotto games, allowing the player to select certain numbers, pay a bulk rate, and automatically be issued a ticket for each drawing. The same concept is applied to many draw-type games, and many lotteries offer a stand-alone subscription game that doubles as a weekly draw lottery.

5. Numbers Games

Numbers games have been one of the traditional games of state lotteries since the 1970's. The player selects a three- or four-digit number and places a bet on it, normally starting at \$.50.

The winning number is drawn at a preset time, and the drawing is usually broadcast on television and/or radio. Drawings are held daily for three-digit games, and anywhere from once a week to daily for four-digit games. All but one numbers game in the U.S. offer a

fixed payout for winning numbers, i.e. the payout ratio does not change when more people bet money. Several options for betting combinations are available to play at a variety of predetermined odds and pay-off formulas. Payouts are determined by the amounts bet.

Questions and Answers about a State Lottery

Are lotteries a good method of raising state revenues?

Not as effective as taxes ... taxation is the most effective way of raising revenues. No responsible person in the industry has ever claimed that lotteries replace broad based taxes. Lotteries are best described as a supplemental revenue source only. Lotteries were never designed to solve tax revenue collection problems - only to assist.

How much revenue will a state lottery produce?

Fiscal year 1985 statistics indicate that total gross lottery sales in the U.S. exceeded \$8.8 billion. This means the average annual state lottery gross revenue was about \$90.00 per capita. A simplified means of predicting a state's likely gross lottery sales is to multiply this number by a state's total population. On the average, about 35 - 40% of gross lottery sales goes to the state as profits from the lottery. (see Pt. II for complete discussion of revenue projections for Alaska)

Is a state-run lottery the answer to the economic problems currently facing Alaska?

Certainly a state-run lottery is not the answer to all the financial needs of the state. At the same time, in many states the lottery has stabilized some of their problems. Connecticut raised \$148,000,000 from its lottery; Pennsylvania, \$572,600,000; Michigan, \$320,000,000; and little old Rhode Island \$18,600,000 in FY 85. All of this revenue is raised voluntarily. Needless to say, there are people who oppose lotteries or gambling in any form. These people are free not to buy tickets.

Are lotteries popular?

Yes. More people participate in state-run lotteries than in any other form of legalized gaming. In present lottery states, 75% of the residents of those states favor the lottery programs. At one time or another 60% of the residents of a lottery state will buy lottery tickets. Recent ballots in four states (California, Oregon, West Virginia, and Missouri) showed an overwhelming acceptance vote (over 60%). Alaskans support the concept of a state operated lottery by a margin of two to one according to a poll completed in November, 1985 by the Dittman Research Corporation of Anchorage (see Pt. V for

complete Dittman Research Corporation report). A survey of voters in AK House District 1 A-B by Rep. Robin Taylor, also completed in November '85, concluded the same level of support for a lottery; 66% of the respondents (from a total of 328) would support a "tightly regulated state operated Lottery Program" in Alaska. Polls taken in other non-lottery states such as Nebraska, Missouri, Florida indicate overwhelming support (two or three to one) for state-run lotteries.

Has any lottery in modern times ever failed ... or failed to show a profit? How are sales doing?

No lottery has ever failed ... or failed to show a profit. Sales are soaring! In 1982 lottery ticket sales exceeded \$4.2 billion .. with lottery profits exceeding \$1.5 billion. In calendar year 1983, sales exceeded \$6.0 billion with profits exceeding \$2.4 billion. In 1984, sales hit \$6.9 billion, generating \$2.8 billion in profits; and in FY 85 gross sales were \$8.8 billion providing an estimated \$3.8 billion in profits for those states with lotteries.

What do states do with their lottery profits?

Most states put their lottery profits into their general funds. However, some states earmark lottery profits for specific purposes. California, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York and New Jersey use their profits to aid education ... Pennsylvania donates its profits for senior citizen programs ... Massachusetts shares its profits with all the towns and cities in the state ... Colorado earmarks some of its profits for parks and recreation.

What happens to the lottery dollar and how does a lottery affect the economy of the state?

Generally, 45¢ to 50¢ of every dollar is returned to ticket buyers in the form of prizes ... 5¢ to 7¢ of every dollar is paid to local merchants as commissions for selling tickets ... about 5¢ to 10¢ of every dollar is used to pay state lottery employees, rent and utility bills for office and warehouse space, to purchase lottery products from established and experienced vendors, to establish a computer system, and promote the lottery ... and the balance, about 35¢, ends up as the profit for the state. Almost all lottery dollars stay in the state.

Are lotteries difficult to administer?

Absolutely not! Modern-day lotteries have been in existence for 20 years (since 1964) and there certainly isn't any "mystery" concerning their operations. Present lottery states are only too happy to share their experiences and their techniques with new entrants into the lottery field. Most states have lottery commissions overseeing their operation. All lotteries have full-time Directors or Executive

Secretaries ... people with extensive backgrounds in lottery operations. Few problems have arisen in the lottery industry during the past twenty years. When problems have arisen the industry has been quick to react. Recent studies indicate that a majority of ticket buyers believe that lotteries are well run and honest. Lottery staff can run from 50 to 150 depending on the size of the state. (see Pt. IV for additional discussion regarding lottery operations)

Where are lottery tickets sold?

Most states license retail establishments that are easily accessible to the public such as drug stores, supermarkets, convenience stores, newsstands and package stores. As a rule of thumb one license is granted for each 1,000 of population. As stated previously, these agents usually receive 5% to 7% of their sales as commissions for selling lottery tickets. In granting licenses lottery agencies will investigate each prospective licensee as to past criminal records ... their financial condition ... their ability to serve the public ... and their general fitness to serve as agents.

Aren't lotteries, for the most part, supported by poor people?

Definitely not! Extensive studies of the state-run lotteries indicate that an overwhelming majority of ticket purchasers are in the middle income ranges. Whereas citizens in the low income ranges buy lottery tickets, they buy fewer tickets proportionately than their percentage of the population. (see Pt. III for complete discussion of social impacts of a lottery on Alaska)

Don't lotteries appeal to the under-educated?

Current demographic information obtained from actual prize claim forms filed with the Washington State Lottery (a perfect sampling of lottery ticket purchasers) show that 65.6% of players are high school graduates or better and that those with less than eight years of schooling play the lottery in far less proportion than they represent in the population. This study's conclusion repeats that of every study of lottery participation conducted in the U.S. over the last twenty years. (see Pt III for complete discussion of social impacts of a lottery on Alaska)

How much money does the average citizen spend on lottery tickets per year?

The "per capita" spending on lottery tickets in 1984 was about \$72.02. Since only about 60% of a state's population is expected to buy tickets, actual expenditures for tickets is about \$120, or about \$2 per week.

How about "organized crime" and lotteries?

There is absolutely no evidence of any state lottery being infiltrated by "organized crime." As a matter of fact some lottery Directors believe that state-run lotteries have taken customers away from illegally-run numbers games. A Connecticut study came to the conclusion that the state's legal games had, in fact, impacted illegal wagering in that state. A 1976 report of the National Gambling Commission stated that 11% of all Americans wager illegally. In lottery states that percentage drops to 6% ... almost a 50% decrease in illegal wagering. Modern day lotteries are run by state governments and there are no avenues available for illegal operators to ply their trade. There is no similarity between state-run lotteries and casino gambling or horse racing. The latter two are usually operated by private individuals or corporations that are licensed by the state. (see Pt. II for additional discussion)

What about the social implications of advocating a form of legalized gambling as a method of raising revenue?

People have been known to gamble for thousands of years and will continue to gamble. Most sociological studies (and there are many) have concluded that state-run lotteries are a "harmless" form of legalized gambling. A comprehensive, independent, state-commissioned study completed in 1981 concerning Connecticut's legalized gambling programs gave the state "a clean bill of health" ... "no increase in welfare cases, no increase in bankruptcies, no increase in compulsive gambling, and no increase in unemployment." Newsweek concluded an article on gambling in its March 3, 1980 issue by stating: "The only games that apparently pose no real threat of addiction are state lotteries. That is because they don't have enough action." (again, see Pt. II for further comment on social implications of lotteries)

PART II: ALASKA LOTTERY INCOME

Alaska Compared to Current Lottery States

Consideration of an Alaska state operated lottery always prompts the question of how much profit could the state generate on an annual basis. A responsible answer to this question is dependent on many factors and requires careful consideration. Because lotteries are businesses operated for a profit, they are dependent upon the same factors that affect other businesses. These basic marketing factors must be studied to determine if Alaska has those characteristics indicative of lottery success. To date there has been no in-depth analysis of the characteristics which are generally present in states currently operating successful lotteries and the degree to which these characteristics exist in Alaska. The following discussion provides, for the first time, this analysis.

Since every state lottery has always produced a profit, it could be said that all are successful. However, as Table 1 indicates, some states are more successful than others; that is some states produce both a higher net profit and a higher per capita profit from their lotteries. A review of the marketing conditions of the lottery states quickly reveals why some are more successful than others. These factors are:

1. The economic characteristics of the population of the state,
2. The physical characteristics of the population of the state (age, sex, education level, etc.),
3. The population concentration/dispersion patterns for the state.
4. Unique conditions usually affecting a particular state or region (neighboring state's lotteries, high volume of non-resident traffic, etc.)

Table 1-II lists the 18 states which have operated lotteries for over one year and the income generated for the years 1981-1985. Gross, net and per capita income has been presented from available sources. Because of the tremendous variation in the size of the population of the states listed a comparison of gross or net lottery income does little to help determine which states are successful and which are not. The key measure of just how successful a state has been in operation of its lottery is the per capita profit to the state. A sound per capita measure will also be of most help to project the possibilities for Alaska. As can be seen, Maryland is the most successful and Vermont is the least successful in per capita income of all 18 states.

Those top five states experiencing the most success with lotteries in 1983 thru 1985 were Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Colorado ('83), Wash. D.C. ('84 & '85), and Massachusetts ('85). Those states with the least successful record with regard to per capita income were Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, Ohio ('83), Colorado ('84) and Rhode Island ('85). Colorado ranked in the top five for 1983 and in the bottom five states in 1984 and 1985.

Table 1-II

STATES LOTTERY INCOME

State	1981 ^a		1982 ^b		1983 ^a				1984 ^a				1985 ^c	
	\$Mil Gross	\$Mil Gross	\$Mil Net	\$Mil Gross	\$Mil Net	\$ Per Capita	Rnk*	\$Mil Gross	\$Mil Net	\$ Per Capita	Rnk*	\$Mil Net	\$ Per Capita	Rnk*
AZ				75.0	30.0	11.04	15	60.0	18.0	6.62	15	22.0	8.09	14
CO				208.0	72.8	25.19	4	120.0	40.7	14.08	14	32.0	11.77	13
CT	515.1	169.8	71.0	188.0	75.2	24.20	5	254.4	105.4	33.92	5	148.8	47.88	6
DW	20.1	25.6	9.5	29.8	11.0	18.51	10	33.0	14.0	23.56	9	15.0	25.24	11
DC				54.1	14.2	22.25	7	68.2	21.7	34.00	4	29.7	49.97	3
IL	206.1	334.8	142.9	467.0	214.4	18.76	9	911.9	377.1	33.00	6	517.8	45.31	7
MN	6.4	9.7	2.4	13.7	3.3	2.93	17	16.0	4.5	4.00	17	4.4	3.91	17
MD	385.6	457.4	199.0	462.8	198.5	47.07	1	485.5	209.2	49.61	1	263.7	62.53	1
MA	224.0	279.8	92.5	352.0	97.3	16.33	11	506.1	169.1	29.48	7	284.0	49.50	4
MI	502.3	527.3	205.6	557.6	221.2	23.88	6	620.0	250.0	26.99	8	320.0	34.55	9
NH	11.0	12.4	3.6	13.6	3.7	4.02	16	18.7	5.7	6.19	16	4.3	4.67	15
NJ	417.0	517.8	220.3	690.1	295.0	40.06	2	847.8	359.7	48.84	2	388.0	52.68	2
NY	236.2	424.9	179.8	646.9	262.4	14.94	13	888.7	389.8	22.20	11	615.0	35.03	8
OH	295.9	363.9	144.0	397.7	144.8	13.41	14	603.0	250.0	23.15	10	338.0	31.30	10
PN	427.0	562.2	227.1	885.4	335.4	29.96	3	1,236.0	516.3	43.52	3	572.6	48.26	5
RI	36.2	38.0	13.7	44.0	15.0	15.84	12	52.9	18.4	19.43	12	18.6	4.42	16
VT	2.5	3.8	.9	4.6	1.1	2.15	18	5.1	1.3	2.54	18	1.2	2.35	18
WA				225.0	90.0	21.78	8	164.6	71.0	17.18	13	58.8	14.23	12
Mean	234.7	266.2	108.0	295.3	115.9	19.57		382.9	156.8	24.35		201.9	29.53	
Median	258.8	265.5	114.	445.0	168.3	24.61		620.6	258.8	26.08		286.9	27.52	

* Lottery states ranked by highest per capita income first (#1).

^a Lottery Journal; Vol. 1, No. 1.

^b Games and Wagering Business; May 1985.

^c "USA Today"; 9/12/85.

Table 2-II provides a comparison of Alaska to all states which have lotteries or are in the process of starting lotteries, with regard to income levels and physical characteristics of the populations within these states. These comparisons have been illustrated for those factors generally considered to be indicators of positive characteristics for the operation of a profitable lottery. States are ranked in descend order for each category of economic and physical characteristics of their population. Rankings for Table 2-II have been made from information contained in Tables 3-II and 4-II, for which specific values for rankings can be ascertained.

Columns A-G contain economic comparisons for the 21 states involved in this analysis. The ranking is straight-forward, the state with the highest income figure for each category is ranked first, for each of these columns except for columns D and E. Columns D and E are reversed, with the state with the lowest income figure for this category ranked first. For example, Alaska has the lowest percentage of its population in the \$0 to \$10,000 household income category. Since lottery participation by the lower income groups is less than their proportion to the population in general the state with the lowest percentage of its population in this group should be ranked first. The same reasoning has been applied to column E.

For all categories of income measures indicating ability to operate a profitable lottery, Alaska ranks first. In addition, those states with a record for operating the most successful lotteries (see Table 1-II) rank with Alaska in the top one-third of states compared in Table 2-II, (Pennsylvania an exception). Those least successful lottery states (see Table 1-II) fall at the opposite end of the spectrum from Alaska.

An analysis of personal, family and household income, comparing Alaska to other lottery states indicates that Alaska should expect to be able to operate a profitable lottery.

Column H compares Alaska and the current lottery states as to how urban their population is. History has shown that state operated lotteries generally are more successful in urban versus rural states. States rank from first, Washington D.C., with a 100% urban population, to last, Vermont, with a 33.8% urban population. The percentage of Alaska population living in urban areas is 64.3%; this is 35.7 percentage points below D.C. and 30.5 percentage points above Vermont.

The rank order in column H is less conclusive than the percentage point differences between the states. This is confirmed by the fact that each of the top five most successful lotteries are represented in the highest, middle and lowest one-third of the order. The closest state (with an income history) to Alaska in its percentage of urban population is the third most successful lottery state Pennsylvania, with 69.3%. Those least successful lottery states, Vermont, Maine and New Hampshire, have the most rural populations by far. Contrary to the belief of many, that we in Alaska live in remote areas, the large majority of our population lives in urban areas, and, according to the Alaska Department of Labor we are becoming more urban each year.

Alaska's population grew by 30% in the 2.25 years between 5/1/80 and 7/1/84 and 90% of that growth was in the Anchorage, Kenai Penn., Mat-Su, Fairbanks, and Juneau Boroughs.¹

Again, Alaska appears to be in a favorable situation for probable lottery success when considering its percentage of urban population.

Column I of Table 2-II illustrates the ranking of lottery states and Alaska for their population mix of males to females. Numerous studies of lottery players indicate that more males than females play lottery games. (see Part III) Alaska leads all states in the number of males to 100 females, with a total of 112 (Table 4-II). A significant point here is that all lottery states, except Washington D.C., have between 90 and 99 males for every 100 females. This large difference between Alaska and other lottery states is a factor in support of being able to implement a successful lottery.

Column J presents a ranking of the percentage of populations over eighteen years of age. Alaska's population is youngest compared to those in lottery states. However, information from Table 4 indicates that the percentage of population eighteen and older for lottery states (excluding DC at 77.5%) ranges from a high of 74.0% (RI) to a low of 70.3% (MI). Alaska's eighteen and older population makes up 67.5% of its total population. Two points need to be made here; first the difference between Alaska's percentage and that of the more normal lottery states is not significantly large; and Alaska, like Washington D.C., is subject to peculiar circumstances. Alaska has the lowest percentage of elderly population in the nation (2.8% compared to a U.S. average of 11.8%¹), this reduces our percentage of eighteen and older population. This second point is actually a positive characteristic for lottery success in Alaska since the elderly play lotteries in numbers less than their proportion to the total population. Although the total percentage of eighteen and older population is lower than other lottery states, the percentage of age levels that play lotteries the most, is higher than this 67.5% figure. This conclusion Washington D.C. has the highest percentage of female population in the nation due to occupational opportunities there.

Columns K and L of Table 2-II provide a comparison of Alaska and the lottery states regarding the education levels for their populations. Studies of lottery players indicate that the typical player has more education than the average for the total population. (see Part III) Again Alaska ranks first with the highest percentage of its population having more than 12 years of school, and third highest for the percentage of its population with 16 or more years of education.

Alaska's ranking in all of the categories examined in Table 2-II are high and indicate, that from the basis of this information, Alaska would be successful if it implemented a lottery. That is, Alaska could expect to generate for its general fund, a level of revenue per capita on a par with the most successful lotteries now in operation.

¹ Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, (Draft) Alaska Population Overview, 1985; Chapt. II.

TABLE 2-II

LOTTERY STATES DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS REGARDING POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS
FOR OPERATION OF PROFITABLE LOTTERY

Rank	A Personal Income/ Capita	B Median Family Income	C Median Hsehd Income	D % of Hsehd \$0-10K	E % of Hsehd \$10-20K	F % of Hsehd \$30-40K	G % of Hsehd \$40K +	H % Pop Urban Areas	I Male/ 100 Female	J % Pop over 18 Yrs Old	K % Pop w/ 12+ Yrs Sch	L % Pop .. / 16+ Yrs Sch
1	AK	AK	AK	AK	AK	AK	AK	DC	AK	DC	AK	DC
2	DC	CT	MD	MI	MD	MD	MD	CA	WA	RI	CO	CO
3	CT	MD	CT	CT	NJ	NJ	CT	NJ	CO	MA	WA	AK
4	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	IL	MI	NJ	RI	CA	PN	OR	CT
5	CA	IL	IL	IL	MO	CT	DC	NY	OR	CT	CA	MD
6	IL	MI	MI	CO	CT	IL	CA	AZ	AZ	NY	AZ	MA
7	NY	WA	WA	MI	CA	WA	IL	MA	MI	CA	NH	CA
8	MD	CA	CA	WA	WA	CA	MI	IL	NH	NJ	MA	WA
9	WA	CO	CO	CA	NY	CO	CO	CO	VT	OR	VT	VT
10	CO	MA	DW	NH	MA	OH	DW	MD	MN	WA	CT	NJ
11	MA	OH	OH	DW	DW	MA	NY	CT	IL	MD	MN	NH
12	DW	DW	MA	OH	DC	DW	RI	WA	MD	CO	DW	NY
13	MI	NY	NH	MA	OH	NY	WA	OH	OH	DW	MI	OR
14	PN	OR	PN	PN	CO	OR	MA	MI	CT	NH	MD	DW
15	OH	PN	OR	OR	OR	PN	OR	DW	DW	IL	NJ	AZ
16	RI	NH	NY	AZ	PN	AZ	OH	PN	NJ	VT	DC	IL
17	NH	RI	AZ	NY	RI	NH	AZ	OR	PN	MN	OH	RI
18	OR	DC	RI	DC	AZ	DC	PN	AK	RI	OH	IL	MN
19	AZ	AZ	VT	RI	NH	RI	NH	NH	MA	AZ	NY	MI
20	VT	VT	MN	VT	MN	VT	VT	MN	NY	MI	PN	OH
21	MN	MN	*	MN	VT	MN	MN	VT	DC	AK	RI	PN

* District of Columbia omitted from this column by source; not a state.

Source: TABLE 3-II, & TABLE 4-II.

Column Explanations:

A, B, & C. First ranked (#1) state has highest income for category; last ranked (#21) has lowest income for category of lottery states.

D & E. First ranked (#1) states have lowest percent of households in income category; last ranked (#21) states have highest percent of households in income category.

F & G. First ranked (#1) states have highest percent of households in income category; last ranked (#21) states have lowest percent of households in income category.

H. First ranked state has highest percent of population living in urban areas.

I. First ranked state has the highest number of males per 100 females.

J, K, & L. First ranked states have the highest percent of population in each category.

Table 3-II

INCOME CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATIONS IN LOTTERY STATES AND ALASKA

	Personal Income 1981				Money Income 1979										
	Total (Mil \$)	Per Capita (\$)	Trnsfr. Pymnts. (Mil \$)	Median Family Income (\$)	Household Income							Median (\$)	Rnk.	Per Capita (\$)	Pov. Level Fam. (%)
					Less than \$10K	\$10K to \$20K	\$20K to \$30K	\$30K to \$40K	\$40K to \$50K	\$50K and Over					
New England															
Maine	9,662.7	8,530	1,748.2	16,167	34.9	35.7	19.3	6.4	1.9	1.8	13,816	46	5,768	9.8	
New Hampshire	9,367.3	10,013	1,208.3	19,723	26.3	33.2	23.6	10.0	3.6	3.4	17,013	21	6,966	6.1	
Vermont	4,498.7	8,727	699.3	17,205	31.8	35.7	19.6	7.6	2.7	2.6	14,790	37	6,178	8.9	
Massachusetts	64,243.9	11,128	9,423.4	21,166	27.7	28.8	22.5	11.3	4.9	4.7	17,575	19	7,458	7.6	
Rhode Island	9,678.0	10,155	1,657.6	19,448	30.7	31.0	21.9	9.4	3.6	3.3	16,097	29	6,897	7.7	
Connecticut	40,131.1	12,805	4,410.6	23,149	22.2	27.6	24.1	13.1	6.0	7.0	20,077	4	8,511	6.2	
Middle Atlantic															
New York	201,707.2	11,460	30,386.4	20,180	30.4	28.4	20.8	10.6	4.7	5.2	16,647	26	7,498	10.8	
New Jersey	90,001.3	12,156	11,460.8	22,906	23.8	26.7	23.0	13.4	6.3	6.7	19,800	6	8,127	7.6	
Pennsylvania	123,056.8	10,366	20,583.8	19,995	28.6	30.6	22.9	10.2	4.0	3.7	16,880	22	7,077	7.8	
East North Central															
Ohio	111,186.4	10,313	15,978.2	20,909	26.9	29.5	24.0	11.4	4.4	3.8	17,754	15	7,285	8.0	
Illinois	132,638.0	11,572	17,003.6	22,746	25.0	26.7	23.5	13.1	5.8	5.9	19,321	7	8,066	8.4	
Michigan	99,016.6	10,758	14,244.3	22,107	25.6	26.4	23.5	13.3	5.9	5.3	19,223	8	7,688	8.2	
South Atlantic															
Deleware	6,643.5	11,102	836.1	20,817	26.5	29.3	22.7	11.2	5.1	5.1	17,846	13	7,449	8.9	
Maryland	48,821.9	11,452	6,332.6	23,112	22.1	27.1	23.1	14.0	6.8	6.9	20,281	3	8,293	7.5	
Wash. D.C.	8,522.8	13,509	1,916.2	19,099	30.5	29.4	17.6	9.6	5.2	7.7	16,211	X	8,960	15.1	
Mountain															
Colorado	33,257.4	11,216	3,680.6	21,279	25.4	29.9	23.0	11.6	5.1	5.1	18,056	12	7,998	7.4	
Arizona	27,285.8	9,765	4,008.1	19,017	28.8	31.3	21.8	10.1	4.1	4.0	16,448	27	7,041	9.5	
Pacific															
Washington	47,546.4	11,274	6,521.9	21,696	26.0	28.4	23.6	12.2	5.0	4.7	18,367	9	8,073	7.2	
Oregon	26,528.8	10,009	4,042.0	20,027	28.7	30.5	22.3	10.5	4.0	3.9	16,780	24	7,557	7.7	
California	289,583.8	11,968	38,308.8	21,537	26.3	28.1	21.5	12.1	5.7	6.4	18,243	10	8,295	8.7	
Alaska	5,660.7	13,749	500.2	28,395	18.3	21.2	18.4	15.1	11.3	15.7	25,414	1	10,193	8.6	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, County & City Data Book, 1983

Table 4-II

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATIONS IN LOTTERY STATES AND ALASKA

	1980									25 Years and Older	
	Land Area (Sq Mi)	Total Persons	Urban (%)	Males Per 100 Females	18 Yrs and Older	Median Age	Total House- holds	College Enroll- ment	Yrs of Sch		
									Total	12+ (%)	16+ (%)
New England											
Maine	30,995	1,124,660	47.5	94.4	803,273	30.4	395,814	45,764	661,840	68.7	14.4
New Hampshire	8,993	920,610	52.2	95.0	662,528	30.1	323,493	50,344	541,953	72.3	18.2
Vermont	9,273	511,465	33.8	94.9	366,138	29.4	178,325	29,703	295,051	71.0	19.0
Massachusetts	7,824	5,737,037	83.8	90.8	4,246,648	31.2	2,032,717	415,897	3,463,256	72.2	20.0
Rhode Island	1,055	947,154	87.0	91.0	704,303	31.8	338,590	64,128	575,243	61.1	15.4
Connecticut	4,872	3,107,576	78.8	93.1	2,284,657	32.0	1,093,678	177,255	1,900,164	70.3	20.7
Middle Atlantic											
New York	47,377	17,558,072	84.6	90.5	12,870,209	31.9	6,340,429	1,076,133	10,721,012	66.3	17.9
New Jersey	7,468	7,364,823	89.0	92.2	5,373,962	32.2	2,548,594	384,885	4,504,247	67.4	18.3
Pennsylvania	44,888	11,863,895	69.3	91.9	8,740,599	32.1	4,219,606	550,786	7,240,244	64.7	13.6
East North Cent.											
Ohio	41,004	10,797,630	73.3	93.5	7,703,310	29.9	3,833,828	514,105	6,291,667	67.0	13.7
Illinois	55,645	11,426,518	83.3	94.0	8,183,481	29.9	4,045,374	617,759	6,678,759	66.5	16.2
Michigan	56,954	9,262,078	70.7	95.2	6,510,092	28.8	3,195,213	531,671	5,254,040	68.0	14.3
South Atlantic											
Delaware	1,932	594,338	70.6	93.1	427,743	29.8	207,081	34,286	344,657	68.6	17.5
Maryland	9,837	4,216,975	80.3	94.0	3,049,445	30.3	1,460,865	256,872	2,499,096	67.4	20.4
Wash. D.C.	63	638,333	100.0	86.1	494,842	31.1	253,143	59,302	398,653	67.1	27.5
Mountain											
Colorado	103,595	2,889,964	80.6	98.5	2,081,151	28.6	1,061,249	179,073	1,663,891	78.6	23.0
Arizona	113,505	2,718,215	83.8	96.9	1,926,728	29.2	957,032	179,503	1,558,891	72.4	17.4
Pacific											
Washington	66,511	4,132,156	73.5	98.7	2,992,796	29.8	1,540,510	243,004	2,439,417	77.6	19.0
Oregon	96,184	2,633,105	67.9	97.0	1,910,048	30.2	991,593	149,400	1,579,841	75.6	17.9
California	156,299	23,667,902	91.3	97.2	17,278,944	29.9	8,629,866	1,720,087	14,043,986	73.5	19.6
Alaska	570,833	401,851	64.3	112.8	271,106	26.1	131,463	18,778	211,397	82.5	21.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census; County & City Data Book, 1983

So far we have only looked at the first two marketing conditions listed above; the economic and physical characteristics of the population of Alaska in relation to other lottery states. The third marketing condition needing examination is how the population of Alaska is concentrated and/or dispersed.

Alaska is unique in its vastness with over one-half million square miles of land, 3.7 times the area of the next largest lottery state, California, and 541 times the size of Rhode Island, the smallest lottery state (excluding DC). However, as we saw in Table 2-II, Alaska is quite urban; twice as urban as Vermont, and only 36% less urban than Wash. D.C. with 100% of its population living in urban areas. When we examine the degree to which the population in Alaska is concentrated we find that there exists similarities with some of the other lottery states. These states are the relatively large western states of Arizona, Colorado, Oregon and Washington. Table 5-II and maps of these states following Table 5-II illustrate this similarity in population concentration in marketing terms.

As Table 5-II illustrates, each of these states has one marketing area which contains approximately one-half of the states total population. This area has been identified as the primary marketing area for that state. In addition, each of these states has from one to three other major marketing areas within the state which, when combined with the primary marketing area, contain approximately 80% of the state's total population. The conclusion made from this comparison is that these states would be reasonable candidates for use as a comparative model to help predict possible revenue levels for an Alaskan lottery.


The three western states with lottery history at this time are Arizona, Colorado and Washington. Of these states the most similar to Alaska is Colorado, with the same pattern of population concentration (one primary marketing area and two additional major marketing areas). Colorado is also a very close match with its percentages of total population in these marketing areas very similar to Alaska's.

Also included is a map of Vermont, a state often used as an example to compare with Alaska for projections of lottery revenue because its total population size is similar to Alaska's. Three factors should be considered to illustrate why Vermont is not a reliable example for this comparison. Note that although Vermont's population is about the same as Alaska's, there is only one city, Burlington, with over 25,000 people. Also note that 66.2% of Vermont's total population lives in rural settings (Table 4-II); only 35.7% of Alaska's population lives in rural settings (Table 4-II). Vermont lacks the population concentration/s necessary for effective marketing of lottery products. Last, note that Vermont is surrounded by larger lotteries of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York and Quebec; Vermont residents have until recently been able to easily access all of these high prize lotteries.


Table 5-II
WESTERN LOTTERY STATES MARKETING AREAS COMPARISON
(1980 U.S. Census Data)

State	County	Total Pop	Prim Mkt Area Pop	PMA % of St	Maj Mkt Area Pop	MMA % of St
AK	Anchorage	174,431				
	Mat-Su	17,816				
	Kenai Pen.	25,282	217,529	<u>54.1</u>		
	Fbnks-NS	53,983				
	Juneau	19,528				
	Ketchikan	11,316				
	Sitka	7,803				
	Wrang-Pet	6,167				316,326
AZ	Maricopa	1,509,052				
	Pinal	90,918	1,599,970	<u>58.9</u>		
	Pima	531,443			2,131,413	<u>78.4</u>
CO	Denver	492,365				
	Adams	245,944				
	Arapahoe	293,621				
	Douglas	25,153				
	Boulder	189,625				
	Jefferson	371,753	1,622,461	<u>56.1</u>		
	El Paso	309,424				
	Pueblo	125,972				
	Larimar	149,184				
Weld	123,438				2,330,479	<u>80.6</u>
WA	King	1,269,749				
	Kitsap	147,152				
	Pierce	485,643				
	Snohomish	337,320				
	Thurston	124,264	2,364,128	<u>57.2</u>		
	Clark	192,227				
	Spokane	341,835				
	Yakima	172,508				3,070,698
OR	Clackamas	241,919				
	Multnomah	562,640				
	Washington	245,808				
	Marion	204,692	1,255,059	<u>47.7</u>		
	Lane	275,226				
	Linn	89,495				
	Benton	68,211				
	Jackson	132,456				1,820,447


Source: U.S. Census Bureau; County & City Data Book, 1983




Arizona









The fourth, and last, marketing factor listed above was that of unique conditions affecting a particular market. There are several obvious and some not-so-obvious conditions present in some of the currently operating lottery states which impact their sales.

Small states with large populations in the East have an advantage over large less populated states with regard to the physical marketing of their lottery product.

People in the northeastern states have experienced a long history of exposure to illegal lottery type games and are therefore familiar with the concept. They do not have to be educated about how lotteries are played.

Those least successful lottery states of Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire and Rhode Island are surrounded by the neighboring giant lottery states of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York and New Jersey. The convenience of buying lottery tickets from the large lotteries, with large prize structures, is such that many resident players from these smaller states choose to buy out of state. Why spend \$1 on a chance to win \$500,000, when the same \$1 will buy a chance to win several million dollars? This will likely change in the near future with the implementation of the Tri-State Lottery partnership of Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire, and the recent (May '85) reversal in federal law interpretation by the U.S. Postal Service resulting in a ban on subscription lottery sales across state lines.

Alaska is unique in the fact that it experiences a tremendous annual influx of tourists, in comparison to its resident population estimated to reach 533,000 in 1985². This tourist influx is large in the sense of its total volume, 776,600 projected for CY 86³, and as percentage of the resident population, 147.5%. In addition to the number of tourists, a significant number of airline and cruise ship crews, a total of 6,000⁴, are effectively part-time residents of the state. This situation is unique to Alaska, and of the lottery states only Colorado experiences a similar condition, although to a much lesser degree. These additional people would affect lottery sales Alaska in a positive direction.

² Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, (Draft) Alaska Population Overview, 1985: "If the in balance of migration to Alaska during 1984-85 were to be zero, which seems unlikely, the 1985 population of the state should reach 533,000 due to natural increase alone."

³ Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development, Division of Tourism.

⁴ The McDowell Group (cruise ship crews), and telephone survey of major Anchorage hotels (airline crews).

Alaska Compared to Colorado

Information contained so far in this discussion provides a basis for reasonable conclusions regarding a method to estimate probable net revenue for an Alaskan lottery. Although Alaska shares similarities with the most successful lottery states (economic and physical composition of its population), our population size does not reasonably allow for a direct comparison with these states. Likewise, although our population size compares with some of the least successful lottery states, other marketing factors; our degree of urban versus rural population, our degree of population concentration, the lack of accessible neighboring lotteries, and the economic and physical composition of our population; does not allow for a direct comparison with these states.

One lottery state, with a three year lottery income history, does have a number of similar characteristics to Alaska and qualifies as a reasonable model for generating revenue projections. Colorado is similar to Alaska in more aspects than any of the other lottery states.

A review of Table 2-II and the discussion pertaining to it illustrates that Colorado provides a basis for conservative comparisons from a per capita, family and household economic perspective. It provides for a very close comparison from the perspective of educational level of the populations. And when including the information from Table 5-II with columns H, I and J from Table 2-II, Colorado is a good match with Alaska regarding comparisons of the urban nature and population concentration patterns of the two states, as well as the male to female ratio and population over eighteen years of age factors.

Alaska Lottery Income Projections

Using an average of Colorado's last three years per capita net income, \$17.01 (Table 1-II), as a probable per capita income for Alaska will give a reasonable, conservative estimate for annual profit from an Alaskan lottery.

A second projection, using an average median per capita income from all lottery states for the last three years, \$26.07 (Table 1-II), will provide a second, possibly less conservative and more simplified projection for Alaska.

A population factor of 730,000 for Alaska has been determined to be most useful for computing a probable FY 87 net profit, should Alaska implement a state operated lottery by July, 1986. This population factor is based on the assumption that tourists to the state would play a lottery with much more frequency than the average for the state. Tourists are here to be entertained and they have the money to spend (82% of the visitors to Alaska in 1983 had household incomes over \$20,000, 25% over \$60,000⁴). However, since tourists are in the state for an average of only 16.8 nights (this represents more than

10.8 million person-nights per year spent in the state)⁵ a factor must be based on their short duration here. Therefore, an assigned factor of .25 is used as an approximation of their lottery play, compared to residents with a factor of 1.0. Likewise a factor of .50 is used to approximate the frequency of lottery play by crews from the airlines and cruise ships, who spend about one-fourth of the year in Alaska.

We now have enough information to compute a projection for an annual profit from operation of an Alaskan lottery.

<u>Population Base</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Total</u>
Alaska Total Population (Est. 1985):	533,000	x 1.00	= 533,000
Alaska Tourist Volume (Est. 1986):	776,600	x .25	= 194,150
Cruise Ship and Airline Crews (1985):	6,000	x .50	= <u>3,000</u>
Total Effective Population			730,150

Using this "effective population" figure and the two per capita profit amounts, one from Colorado (\$17.01) and the other from a national average (\$26.07), an expected range of total net revenue for Alaska can be determined.

1. Alaska Total Effective Population	730,150
Colorado '83-'85 Average Per Capita Profit	<u>x \$17.01</u>
Estimated Alaska Net Revenue (low)	<u>\$12,419,851</u>
2. Alaska Total Effective Population	730,150
National '83-'85 Average Per Capita Profit	<u>x \$26.07</u>
Estimated Alaska Net Revenue (high)	<u>\$19,035,011</u>

An Alaska lottery could expect to generate between \$12.4 and \$19.0 million in FY 87.

This low end estimate, \$12.4 million, is a very conservative figure when we consider that it is based on the Colorado lottery which is restricted to only operating instant games. A parallel comparison to this restriction would be to restrict a jewelry store to only selling gold jewelry. There is a large market for gold jewelry, but it's only a percentage of the total market.

The high estimate, \$19.0 million, is a fairly realistic estimate, and is only dependent on how freely the enabling legislation for an Alaska lottery allows it to respond to the market.

⁵ Overview, Alaska Traveler Survey and Visitor Industry Analysis 1983;
 Dept. of Commerce and Economic Development, Div. of Tourism PART

III: SOCIAL IMPACTS OF LOTTERIES

The five questions most often asked regarding lotteries social impact are:

1. What affect do state lotteries have on the "poor?"
2. What affect do state lotteries have on the "less educated?"
3. How do lotteries affect the incidence of compulsive gambling?
4. Does winning disrupt the lives of winners of large cash prizes?
5. Do lotteries cause a negative economic drain on rural communities?

Questions 1 and 2:

The most often raised objection to state operated lotteries is that people from lower income households and/or the less educated buy a disproportionate amount of lottery tickets. The implicit suggestion is that a lottery should be prohibited in order to protect the "poor" and "less educated." As a matter of empirical fact, it is simply untrue that the poor and/or less educated buy lottery products disproportionately to their percentage of the population.

Research has been conducted in every state with a lottery operating for over one year regarding these questions (#1 & #2), and the conclusion is always the same; the poor and less educated play the lottery to a lesser degree than their proportion of the population.


Some comments from a sampling of the numerous studies conducted follow. Please bear in mind that every statement to follow is based upon statistical evidence, not opinion.

Colorado: Chart 1-III, below, is comprised of two bar graphs. The top graph represents the income group's percentage of the Colorado population. The bottom graph represents an index of lottery participation by the income group. Where the bar is above zero, that group plays the lottery more than their relative proportion in the population, and vice versa.¹

¹ Chart reproduced from "Colorado Lottery Facts", Oct. 1983, included in the Report to the Colorado Legislature by the Lottery, dated Dec. 6, 1983.

Chart 1-III

COLORADO LOTTERY PLAYER



As the chart dramatically shows, the lower income groups play the Colorado Lottery substantially less than their proportion in the population. The Colorado Lottery explained the methodology of their analysis and also commented generally on this issue.

"Analysis of the winners in lottery games is a statistically perfect sampling of the players. During each year, several state lotteries do research on the profile of their players through analysis of winners' age, income, occupation, sex, residence, and lifestyle. Every study conducted in the legal lottery business in North America has shown that the bulk of the lottery tickets are purchased by middle income consumers. Typically, most tickets are bought by persons between the ages of 35 and 54 although the play of the lotteries ranges in age from 18 to over 65. In addition, although the range of players runs from low income to high income, the majority of the tickets are purchased by persons whose household incomes are between \$12,000 and \$36,000. Research in Colorado indicates that the average education and income of the players are higher than the national average. Even low income players play the lottery from their discretionary income,

low income players play the lottery from their discretionary income, that is to say, even low income persons purchase lottery tickets on a competitive basis with their purchase of candy, movies and softdrinks. An average of 90¢ a week played on the lottery, while being a higher percentage of the discretionary income of a low income person than it is in a middle income person, is still a minor decision..."²

The results of the Colorado studies are confirmed by numerous other studies about the income levels of lottery players in other states. For example:

Arizona: An independent study concluded that "the poor are dramatically underrepresented among lottery players."³

Delaware; 89% of the buyers of "Daily Numbers" lottery tickets had an annual family income in excess of \$10,000. The median family income of players was \$19,200 a year, while the median income of non-players was \$18,200 a year.⁴

Illinois; People with incomes below \$11,000 only participated in Lotteries about 75-78% of their percentage of the population.⁵

Maine; Studies "conclusively demonstrate that it is the middle income segment of the population that is the primary market for lotteries... [T]he poor (under \$5,000 in income) are extremely underrepresented among lottery players."⁶

Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania; An analysis of the household income profiles of over 6.5 million winners established that "the poor participate in the state lottery games at levels disproportionately less than their percentage of the population."⁷

² "Colorado Lottery Fact Sheet", Oct. 1983, p.8, included in Report, op. cit. fn. 1.

³ "Using Demographics to Increase Lottery Sales", G.E. Shippee, D.J. Schwartzman, K. Reynolds, Public Gaming Magazine, Aug. 1983. See also, "Analysis of Sales Data of Lotteries", July 1983, Scientific Games, Inc., cited in Public Gaming Magazine, Dec. 1983, p.29 (hereafter "Analysis"), and Time, May 28, 1984, p.42.

⁴ Report by Dr. Keiser, University of Delaware, College of Business and Economics, 1979.

⁵ Public Gaming Magazine, Jan. 1982, p.33, Table II.

⁶ "Analysis," op.cit., fn. 3.

⁷ "The Myth of the Poor Buying Lottery Tickets", by Dr. J.R. Koza, Public Gaming Magazine, Jan 1982, at p.40.

Table 1-III

INDEXED HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION
(Above-Average, Average & Below-Average Sales Areas of
17 \$1 Instant Lottery Games, New York State)

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME
(In 1980 Dollars)

	Over \$56,000	\$34,000- \$56,000	\$23,000- \$33,999	\$18,000- \$22,999	\$11,000- \$17,999	\$6,700- \$10,999	Under \$6,700
+ Ave.	105	128	120	99	83	75	75
Average	158	139	109	90	83	75	79
- Ave.	140	94	81	89	111	116	113

The income profile for the areas of the state having above-average sales have a relatively higher representation of high-income households. The same is true for of the areas of the state having average sales. For example; households with an income above the \$56,000 (1980 dollars) range have an index value of 158 in the "average sales" level areas. This means that this level income household occurs at a rate 58% higher than in the state as an average.

However, for the areas of the state having below-average sales, the income distribution is bi-modal. It contains the "poor" and it also contains a significant representatic:n of very high income people. The main point, however, is that the lower-income categories are relatively underrepresented in both the average and the above-average sales areas and that the lower-income households are overrepresented only in the below average sales areas.

Thus, using this slightly different perspective, the conclusion is again the same. Namely, that the poor participate in the lottery games at a disproportionate rate as compared to their percentage of the population.¹¹

Most analysis and comment from the studies conducted by states operating lotteries include educational levels as well as household income issues. These studies indicate similar conclusions with regard to education levels of those playing lotteries; the less educated play lotteries proportionately less than they are represented in the total population.

¹¹ "Myths", Public Gaming Magazine, Dec. 1983, pp. 28-33; and "Roses and Thorns of State Lotteries", by Bill Curry, State Legislatures Magazine, March 1984, p. 31-36.

The Washington State Lottery found that residents with 1 - 3 years of college were overrepresented in lottery play to a degree significantly exceeding that of any other educational group. Based on an index of 100, those in this category reached index levels as high as 141. Conversely, those with eight years of education or less were severely underrepresented, with indices ranging from 68 down to 43.

Final figures for FY 83 in Washington showed residents with 13 - 15 years of education totaling out at an index of 120, with those with eight years of education, or less playing at an index rate of 56, the lowest of any category.¹²

A study of six western counties of Washington state by KIRO Broadcasting, Inc. found that 78 percent of the lottery players had 12 or more years of education.

The Arizona Lottery also tested for educational level of its players. In every case, the median educational level of players exceeded that of Arizona residents overall.¹³

Pennsylvania contracted with Opinion Research Corporation to use the "low, average and heavy play" analysis procedure described above for New York. They found that in the "heavy play" group - the group showing the most interest in the lottery - only 9.8 percent had less than a high school diploma.¹⁴

Again, these are only a sampling of survey results all stating the same conclusion - the less educated segments of the population in lottery states play lottery games less than they are represented in the total population of their state.

These conclusions are no surprise to those who view lotteries as a business operated for profit. The tremendous growth in both lottery participation and profit to those states operating them could never be generated by a dependency on the poor and under-educated. This segment of our population simply does not constitute a large enough percentage base to target marketing efforts. The majority of the population in most states lives in middle income households and has a higher than median education level. This is the natural market.

¹² Washington State Lottery, 1983 Annual Report

¹³ "Using Demographics to Increase Lottery Sales", G.E. Shippee, D.J. Schwartzman, K. Renolds, Public Gaming Magazine, Feb. 1983.

¹⁴ Pennsylvania Study for the Bureau of State Lotteries, Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, NJ, 1981.

Question number 3:

How do lotteries affect the incidence of compulsive gambling?

Studies done thus far have shown the compulsive gambler to be someone who by nature seeks avenues other than state lotteries to satisfy his or her need for gambling; state lotteries do not provide what a compulsive gambler needs for gratification.

Dr. Robert Custer, acting director of mental health for the Veterans Administration in Washington D.C. and medical advisor to the National Council on Compulsive Gambling, has done extensive research into the incidence and treatment of compulsive gambling, and is widely recognized as an expert on the subject. Custer contends that state lotteries do not provide a sufficient outlet for a compulsive gambler to either alleviate withdrawal symptoms or to experience any sustained euphoria generated by most other types of gambling. Custer said that of the compulsive gamblers he has treated at the V.A., 20% have fallen into each of four different categories: addiction to horse race betting, casino games(not casinos in particular, but games associated with them such as craps and card games), illegal sports betting, and stock options and commodities. The remaining 20% is divided among all other forms of gambling, lotteries only amounting to perhaps 2%. Of compulsive gamblers, Custer said lotteries are "not their style," because play is too slow. "The shorter the interval between the time you place your bet and when you collect, the more addictive," adding that, "any game involving a waiting period for the outcome and/or collection of winnings, such as lotteries, does not sustain a compulsive gambler, ..." Two key elements that compulsive gamblers need for satisfaction are some feeling that s/he has an "edge" or privileged information regarding the bet, and that some element of skill plays a part in the outcome. Neither of these exist with state lotteries.

"I think winning is a lot more stimulating than we realize," said Custer. "Particularly winning amounts ranging from a fourth to a half of one's income. That's one of the things about the lottery that I've never been very concerned about, because people don't win big that often. There are a lot of \$1 and \$2 winners, but very few million dollar winners."

Custer states that no data exists supporting the contention that lotteries increase compulsive gambling.¹⁵

A study for the New Jersey Lottery, supervised by Dr. Peter Carlton of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, reached basically the same conclusions as did Custer's research; no cause-and-effect relationship was established showing lotteries to cause compulsive gambling, the same physiological changes were noted in gamblers as with the V.A. research. These results show that lotteries simply don't offer enough "action" to satisfy the needs of a compulsive gambler. A totally different environment of lottery-playing, as

¹⁵ "Do Lotteries Increase Compulsive Gambling?", The Lottery Journal, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 22 & 58.

opposed to other types of gaming, exists for state lottery participation. Lottery playing does not require a contained environment with a high degree of social interaction, as is found with other gaming activities. The decision to participate in a lottery game usually is an afterthought from some other activity.

John D. Quinn, Director of the New York State Lottery, and past president of the National Association of State Lotteries says that during his tenure as director of the N.Y. Lottery over 2 billion tickets have been sold and he has not received one phone call or letter saying a wife or husband "had spent the bread or milk money on the lottery."¹⁶

¹⁶ "Myths", op.cit., fn. 11, pp 39-41.

Question number 4:

Does winning disrupt the lives of winners of large cash prizes?

The results of a survey by the Ontario Lottery Corporation, updated through November of 1983, indicate that the lifestyles of the overwhelming majority of the lottery's jackpot winners changed little after their windfalls.

This survey of 870 people who won between \$7,000 and \$1 million in the lottery indicated that the overwhelming majority of the big-money winners kept their jobs and stayed in the same house. Few were bothered by adverse publicity or bothersome requests for donations.

Of the winners responding to the survey, 91.4% of those employed kept their job. Eight of the 25 winners of \$500,000 or more continued to work. Most of the winners bank their money, and few indulge in spending sprees. Only 2.2% spent the bulk of their winnings on luxuries. Twenty-five percent bought a new car, and only 22.6% took vacations. More than two-fifths of those winning large prizes, 40.8%, shared their good fortunes with family, friends and charities.

Ninety percent of the winners were not subjected to calls and letters begging for money, and 70% of those who were contacted did not consider the solicitations a problem.

Most of the big winners have not been bothered by media attention. Of those responding to the survey 90.1%¹⁷ said media treatment of their good luck had been fair and courteous.

Surley examples exist which illustrate that lives have been changed by the winning of large amounts of money, some of these changes would be considered positive and some negative. However, the statistics available, when considering broad cross-sections of winners, indicate that the majority of winners are not negatively affected. Ms. Mary Faulk, Director of the Washington State Lottery, puts it very well in her statement, "The lottery by design is open to maximum scrutiny by the public at all times. Our credibility is the first product we sell to the public. Identification of winners is an important responsibility to all our players. We feel that the media has shown responsible constraint in their handling of winners. Our winners have accepted this exposure with grace, because they recognize the public's right to know."

The administration of most lotteries use a prize award structure that makes payments to large winners over an extended time period; i.e., \$1,000 per month for life. This is financially advantageous to the state and to the winner, and helps prevent the possible disruption of a winners life with a \$1 million dollar check.

¹⁷ "Lottery Winner Research Indicates Life As Usual", Wendy Horne, Ontario Lottery Corporation.

Question No. 5:

Do lotteries cause an economic drain on rural communities?

This question is asking if it appears likely that a state run lottery will result in the residents of small remote communities spending an amount of their available cash to a degree exceeding the benefits these same communities would receive from the expenditures of lottery profits. Three additional questions must be examined to provide an answer to this concern of economic impact on rural communities:

1. How many communities and what population base is of concern?
2. What spending level for lottery products is likely to occur?
3. What level of benefits will these communities likely receive from the operation of a state lottery?

A conservative analysis, considering "worst case" possibilities for lottery expenditures by rural community residents and reasonable assumptions regarding benefits received from probable state lottery profits, indicates that a state operated lottery would not cause an economic drain on rural communities. In fact, the opposite is true.

For purposes of this discussion the term "rural community" is defined as a community of 2000 or less people. Alaska has a total of 262 communities of this size with a total population of 70,286, or 13.44% of the state's total population (see Table 2-III).

Individual spending on lottery products will be directly proportional to the degree to which residents of these communities would have access to lottery products. This access would only exist through state licensed lottery product retailers. Only qualified "viable businesses" would be issued lottery sales licenses upon application. A "viable business" is defined as one which would likely meet the qualifications established by a state lottery as necessary to be licensed as a lottery product retailer.

The Alaska WIC Program (Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children) has been selected as a means to identify the number of probable "viable businesses" in rural communities. The WIC program is a state subsidized health and nutrition program for pregnant women, breastfeeding mothers, infants, and young children. The state provides subsidies for foods and other health needs purchases by its participants to the retailers participating in the program. This program has been selected for analysis on the assumption that its retail participants are considered by the state as "viable businesses" meeting WIC's vendor qualifications.

A review of the total number and locations of WIC vendors (see Table 3-III), provides the following items of information. It appears that a community population of more than 100 is necessary to support the operation of a retail store, the most common form of rural business (only 4.55% of communities of less than 100 have WIC qualified vendors). Eighty eight rural communities, comprising .98% of the state's total population or 5100, do not have the population base to support retail enterprises. At least some of the businesses in communities over 100 will not desire to be qualified as lottery

Table 2-III

1984 ALASKA POPULATION ESTIMATES BY COMMUNITY SIZE

A	B	C	D	E	F
COMMUNITY SIZE	#	TOT. POP.	% of AK	# WIC	% SVD.
0 - 50	37	1,266	0.24	0	
51 - 100	51	3,834	0.73	4	7.8
101 - 150	23	2,881	0.55	3	12.5
151 - 200	24	4,087	0.78	7	29.2
201 - 250	23	5,194	0.99	10	43.5
251 - 300	19	5,252	1.00	4	19.1
301 - 400	23	7,883	1.51	10	43.5
401 - 500	23	10,370	1.98	21	91.3
501 - 600	18	9,821	1.88	10	55.6
601 - 700	8	5,242	1.00	7	87.5
701 - 800	2	1,509	0.30	2	100.0
801 - 900	4	3,448	0.66	5	100.0
1,001 - 1,500	4	4,690	0.90	4	100.0
1,501 - 2,000	3	4,809	0.92	1	33.3
2,001 - 2,500	4	9,424	1.80	6	100.0
2,501 - 3,000	2	5,892	1.13	4	100.0
3,001 - 3,500	4	13,066	2.50	6	100.0
3,501 - 4,000	2	7,462	1.43	4	100.0
4,001 - 5,000	1	4,850	0.93	3	100.0
5,001 - 8,000	1	7,611	1.46	3	100.0
9,001 - 15,000	2	21,446	4.10	8	100.0
15,001 - 25,000	2	47,100	9.01	11	100.0
25,001 - 50,000	1	25,791	4.93	4	100.0
50,001 - 75,000	1	62,175	11.89	9	100.0
75,000 - 250,000	1	243,829	46.62	36	100.0
BCSA's (Table 3-III)		4,116	0.78	0	
Total	283	523,048	100.00	180	

Source: Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis; (Draft) Alaska Population Overview, 1985; Table IV.2.

Alaska Department of Health & Social Services; Special Supplementary Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, Vendor List, Sept. 1985.

Column Explanations

- Self explanatory.
- Number of communities within the size indicated in column A.
- Total population of all the communities within that size group.
- Percent of the total population of Alaska within that size group.
- Number of WIC vendors serving communities within that size group.
- Percent of population within that size group served by WIC vendors.

Table 3-III

1984 ALASKA POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR COMMUNITIES OVER 2000

PLACE/S	POPULATION	% of AK.	
Anchorage Borough	243,829		
Subtotal		243,829	46.62
Fairbanks Area (Frbnks., Eielson, College, No. Pole, & Fox)	62,175*		
Subtotal		306,004	58.50
Palmer-Wasilla	25,791*		
Juneau Bourough	23,729*		
Kenai-Soldotna	23,371*		
Subtotal		378,895	72.45
Kodiak Area (Kodiak & Kodiak C.G.B.)	11,024*		
Ketchikan Area (Ketch., No. Tongas Hwy. & Saxman)	10,422*		
Subtotal		400,341	76.54
Sitka Borough	7,611		
Subtotal		407,952	78.00
Delta Jct. Area (Delta Jct., Big Delta & Ft. Greely)	4,850*		
Subtotal		412,802	78.92
Bethel	3,743*		
Valdez	3,719*		
Homer	3,373		
Petersburg	3,340*		
Nome	3,184*		
Adak	3,169		
Subtotal		433,330	82.85
Barrow	2,969		
Seward	2,923*		
Subtotal		439,222	83.97
Wrangell	2,499*		
Kotzebue	2,485*		
Cordova	2,356*		
Dillingham	2,084*		
Subtotal		448,646	85.78
Remainder (262 places of less than 2000)	70,286		
Balance of Census Subareas (BCSA's)**	4,116	523,048	100.00

Source: Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, (Draft)
Alaska Population Overview, 1985; Table IV.1.

* Population in BCSA included.

** Balance of Census Subareas (BCSA) contain those people living outside of defined communities designated as census areas; i.e., those living in the Kodiak area but outside of the Kodiak city limits.