

GAMBLING: IS IT A PROBLEM? WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

Choice #1: Cut the Red Tape on Gambling

Gambling has evolved into an American pastime called gaming. Excessive regulation should be removed. Gambling is not a problem; it's part of the solution: creating jobs, providing recreation, helping local economies, and raising revenue for public programs.

What is appealing about this option?

Small group #2: (1) Promote jobs, growth, helps local economy. (2) Not government job to regulate morality. (3) People should have a choice. (4) Free market economy—the American way.

Small group #3: (1) It's the Republican way. (2) It's profitable. (3) Not limiting. (4) Economic development coming quicker.

Small group #4: Pro: Individuals take care of themselves. Regulate would impede and streamline and move money around in circles. Betting on sports and football is exciting. Lure of a possible win makes it exciting. Some people enjoy gambling and the rush of a win. The marketing associate with gambling by hosting entertainment is effective to lure into gambling.

Small group #5: Less government involvement.

Small group #6: (1) What do we profit from it? Increased revenue/taxes. (2) Increased business for agriculture industry. (3) Increase business for local vendors. (4) Generate school revenue. (5) We don't get revenue from I-35 corridor (both sides of I-35). I-35 to Tinseltown is Austin (they get the tax revenue).

What makes this option a good idea?

Small group #2: Help local economy.

Small group #5: (1) Jobs for locals and others. Indian reservations have benefited. (2) People can make individual choices—not have choices made for them by government.

Small group #6: (1) New road construction. (2) Attract hotels/business (3) Meeting space for city.

What makes this option a bad idea?

Small group #2: (1) Invites organized (and unorganized) crime. (2) Government role is to regulate people sponsoring gambling, not the individuals doing gambling.

Small group #3: (1) Getting ripped off. (2) Noise.

Small group #4: (1) Exposing youth to decisions they are not ready for. (2) Lack of responsibility on the gaming to regulate the marketing.

Choice #1 Cont'd

Small group #5: (1) Addiction will need to be treated. Contradiction between promoting and treating. (2) Comparing baseball to gambling isn't a fair comparison. People tend to go to gamble at a horse track. At baseball games they don't go to formally gamble.

Small group #6: (1) Increased traffic to public park. (2) Noise. (3) Moral degradation of community. (4) It's a gamble/risk for a horse track. (5) City has to fund road improvements (6) More fire/police/EMS protection.

What is important to people who support this option?

Small group #2: (1) Individual's right to choose. (2) More opportunity for investors to make more profits.

Small group #4: (1) Personal freedom. (2) Lower taxes (3) Make money off people who gamble.

Small group #5: Speeding up process.

Small group #6: (1) Tourism dollar. (2) Attract businesses. (3) Reduce city taxes.

What might be the result of doing what this option proposes?

Small group #1: (1) Attraction of young to gambling. (2) Mob influence getting involved. (3) Increase of revenue (tax and accessory businesses). (4) Increase infrastructure costs.

Small group #4: (1) Slot machines everywhere. (2) Higher social costs.

Are there costs of not doing what this approach proposes?

Small group #1: Revenue decreased.

Small group #4: See above.

What possible outcome of this approach appeal to us?

Small group #1: Possible revenue enhancement.

What possible outcomes of this approach are unacceptable to us?

Small group #1: Increase in crime—attraction of bad element.

Small group #2: There has to be some regulation of gambling.

Choice #2: Regulate Gambling to Make it Safer

Gambling, like alcohol, is potentially dangerous and can be abused without adequate controls. Government should not promote gambling and should reduce its dependence on gambling revenues. Citizens should have final say at the polls.

What is appealing about this option?

Small group #2: (1) The industry should be regulated (not the consumers) to protect the public. (2) Regulations should not be too extreme to business or consumers.

Small group #3: (1) Regulate noise. (2) Regulate hours.

Small group #4: (1) Regulation would allow more input by citizens. (2) Regulation could control illegal elements. (3) Control location of gambling for the overall safety. (4) Better control time for noise, traffic flows, etc. (5) Governments want a piece of the pie.

Small group #5: Most places that have it regulate it.

Small group #6: (1) Sense of security. (2) With local or state regulations, revenue forthcoming. (3) We can control the growth of footprint of zone. (4) When government monitors zoning and regulates owners business. (5) The public/community should be able to vote or have input in regulation.

What makes this option a good idea?

Small group #2: Protects citizens from organized crime.

Small group #3: Regulate so that the whole community isn't based on gambling.

Small group #4: Control.

Small group #5: Regulate to keep criminal element out.

What makes this option a bad idea?

Small group #2: Over regulation will stifle financial benefits—no one will come.

Small group #4: (1) Corruption of government officials. (2) Cannot regulate all gaming trade.

Small group #5: (1) Don't think government can make it safer. (2) Regulations—are they going to be enforced? (3) Private initiatives have been more helpful than government regulation (e.g., M.A.D.D. and designated driver programs).

Small group #6: (1) Government interference (2) Ripe for corruption, undue influence (\$). (3) Increase cost to regulate (police, commissions, salaries). (4) Lawyers will take frivolous lawsuits (people lose their life savings and want to sue).

Choice #2 Cont'd

What is important to people who support this option?

Small group #4: Perception that there will be tax revenue.

What might be the result of doing what this option proposes?

Small group #1: (1) More control and less expense. (2) More protection for citizens.

Are there costs of not doing what this approach proposes?

What possible outcome of this approach appeal to us?

What possible outcomes of this approach are unacceptable to us?

Choice #3: Stop Gambling for Everyone's Sake

Gambling exploits human weakness, spreads social ills, and erodes moral fiber. It should not be given legal legitimacy. The whole culture of gambling should be phased out.

What is appealing about this option?

Small group #2: Some people think this is morally right.

Small group #4: (1) People have more money for other things. Disposable income increases. (2) Economics don't work. (3) Dangerous to people who can get [in] over their head—some addictions. (4) Keep out undesirable elements. (5) Fair business enterprise not there take money from others. (6) Keep Pflugerville reputation as family friendly.

Small group #5: Valid idea—depends on person.

Small group #6: (1) Standard morals for Pflugerville community. (2) Makes the community safer. (3) Saving people's life and quality of lives. (4) Frees up income for positive activities.

What makes this option a good idea?

Small group #4: See above.

Small group #5: Set a bar—keep it at horse racing—don't add video terminals.

What makes this option a bad idea?

Small group #2: (1) Cannot be regulated. (2) Cannot protect people from themselves—not government's job.

Small group #4: (1) The choice should be left to individuals. (2) Putting people out of work. (3) Push gambling to black market.

Small group #5: (1) Don't legislate morals—this is a personal issue, not a government issue. (2) Moderation is to be a goal (3) If participating—want it to be above board. (4) Do away with golf bets, school raffles...?

Small group #6: (1) You will never eliminate gambling. (2) You are not giving people the option to decide based on their religious beliefs. (3) Personal rights infringement.

What is important to people who support this option?

Small group #4: (1) If no gambling in the first place of jobs. (2) Image and public perception of community values.

Small group #6: (1) Imposing religious opinions on others. (2) Safer society. (3) Sloppy building standards/upkeep like Manor Downs.

Choice #3 Cont'd

What might be the result of doing what this option proposes?

Small group #1: (1) Revenue loss. (2) Drive gambling underground. (3) Reduce number of gamblers. (4) Generate additional revenue for other entertainment.

Small group #4: (1) Black market idea. (2) Does divide communities.

Are there costs of not doing what this approach proposes?

Small group #4: Tax shortfall if adopted.

What possible outcome of this approach appeal to us?

Small group #4: (1) Image of community. (2) Not taking something [from] others—exploitation.

What possible outcomes of this approach are unacceptable to us?

Small group #4: (1) Don't want government to tell us what to do. (2) Concerns with money leaving the state.