

**Gambling Impact and Behavior  
Study, 1997-1999: [United States]**

*National Gambling Impact Study  
Commission*

Community Database, 1980-1996, Codebook



**\*\*Processor Notes\*\***  
**Gambling Impact and Behavior Study, 1997-99**

- 1) The data for the community database includes two variables for latitude and longitude (INTPTLAT and INTPTLNG) which will produce a warning when used in SPSS due to their lengths.
- 2) Four variables (BINGOIND, LOTTIND, PERIMIND, and CASIND) were recoded to remove non-integer value labels. This change allowed STATA system files to be produced.

<u>Old Value</u>	<u>New Value</u>	<u>Value Label</u>
0	0	Not within 50 miles of community
.5	1	Facility opened during year
1	2	Facility within 50 miles of community

#### UPDATED PROCESSOR NOTE

The second edition of this data collection corrects errors in column locations for several variables, which were previously mis-specified. The recodes performed in this second edition changed the logical record length of the data files. The new column location specifications are documented in this revised codebook. Note, the column specifications in the codebook frequencies reflect the first edition.

UPDATED COLUMN LOCATIONS

GAMBLING IMPACT AND BEHAVIOR STUDY, 1997-1999: [UNITED STATES]  
 DATASET 0003: COMMUNITY DATABASE, 1980-1996  
 2<sup>nd</sup> EDITION

CASEID	1-4	EARNSERV	190-197	BIRTHYNG	398-402
YEAR	5-8	EARNHOTL	198-204	BIRTHADO	403-407
BINGOIND	9-10	EARNRECR	205-211	BIRTH15	408-410
LOTTIND	11-12	EARNSOCS	212-218	DEATHS	411-415
PERIMIND	13-14	EARNGOVT	219-225	DEATHRAT	416-419 (1)
CASIND	15-16	EMPLOYED	226-232	MVDEATH	420-422
INTPTLAT	17-25 (A)	EMPCONST	233-238	INFDEATH	423-426 (1)
INTPTLNG	26-35 (A)	EMPTRANS	239-244	MARRIAGE	427-431
STFP	36-37	EMPRETTR	245-250	MARRATE	432-436 (1)
COFP	38-42	EMPSEVVC	251-257	DIVORCES	437-441
CASSPEND	43-50 (4)	EMPGOVT	258-263	DIVRATE	442-445 (1)
PERISPND	51-57 (4)	INCTRANF	264-271	SUICIDES	446-448
BINGSPND	58-64 (4)	INCPERMT	272-278	NCHSPOP	449-455
LOTTSPND	65-72 (4)	INCUNEMP	279-285	ASUICRAT	456-460 (1)
POP1990	73-78	INCRETIR	286-293	SUICRATE	461-464 (1)
PERMRN	79-85 (4)	INCDVINR	294-301	TFILING	465-469
UCRPOP	86-91	PERCAPNT	302-306	TCHAP7	470-474
CRIME	92-96	PERCAPTP	307-310	TCHAP11	475-477
MCRIME	97-101	PERCAPIM	311-314	TCHAP12	478-479
MURDER	102-104	PERCAPUI	315-317	TCHAP13	480-483
RAPE	105-107	PERCAPRT	318-321	BFILING	484-487
ROBBERY	108-111	FEDEXPI	322-329	BCHAP7	488-490
ASSAULT	112-115	FEDEXRTD	330-336	BCHAP11	491-493
BURGLARY	116-120	FEDEXSAL	337-343	BCHAP12	494-495
LARCENY	121-125	DOCTORS	344-348	BCHAP13	496-498
MVTHEFT	126-130	HOSPBEDS	349-353	NBFILING	499-503
ARSON	131-133	CIVLABF	354-360	NBCHAP7	504-508
TOTINC	134-142	UNEMPLOY	361-366	NBCHAP11	509-510
COPOP	143-149	UNEMPRAT	367-370 (1)	NBCHAP13	511-514
PERINC	150-154	AFDCTOT	371-376	ID	515-517
EARNCONS	155-161	AFDCCHIL	377-382	MULTCO	518-519
EARNTRAN	162-168	AFDCFAM	383-388	CONAME	520-522
EARNRET	169-175	BIRTHS	389-393	STAB	523-524
EARNGEN	176-182	BIRTHRAT	394-397 (1)	UCRDATA	525-526
EARNEAT	183-189				



**CODEBOOK**  
**FOR THE**  
**GAMBLING IMPACT AND BEHAVIOR STUDY—**  
**COMMUNITY DATABASE**

**National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago**  
1155 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60637  
<http://www.norc.uchicago.edu>

This research was performed under contract to the  
National Gambling Impact Study Commission  
Washington, D.C.

June 1999





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	3
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. COMMUNITY DATABASE SAMPLE AND VARIABLES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
DRAWING THE SAMPLE OF COMMUNITIES .....	6
VARIABLE SELECTION AND SOURCES.....	8
<i>Employment patterns by industry</i> .....	9
<i>Unemployment</i> .....	9
<i>Bankruptcy</i> .....	10
<i>Personal income</i> .....	10
<i>Private and public earnings</i> .....	11
<i>Government expenditures</i> .....	11
<i>Income maintenance/AFDC</i> .....	11
<i>Crime</i> .....	12
<i>Vital statistics</i> .....	12
AVAILABILITY OF GAMING FACILITIES AND ESTIMATED GAMING EXPENDITURES .....	13
<i>Lottery spending estimates</i> .....	14
<i>Pari-mutuel spending estimates</i> .....	15
<i>Bingo and other charitable games spending estimates</i> .....	16
<i>Casino (table and device) spending estimates</i> .....	16



# 1. INTRODUCTION

This volume includes codebook information for the Public Use File of the Gambling Impact and Behavior Study's Community Database. This codebook is composed of the sampling and weighting report, list of variables in alphabetical order, and variables statistics (means, standard deviations, and ranges for continuous variables, frequencies for discrete variables).

For further documentation of this database, please consult the study archive at the NORC website, <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu>. The NORC study archive also makes available descriptions and analyses of all other data collected as part of the Gambling Impact and Behavior Study, as well as selected public use data files from other survey components, including the 100-Community Database, the 10 Community Case Studies, the Casino Survey, and the Youth Survey of 16- to 17-year-olds. These materials will also be deposited with the National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C., along with other records of the work of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission (1997–1999, <http://www.ngisc.gov>), for which the Gambling Impact and Behavior Study was performed.

## 2. COMMUNITY DATABASE SAMPLE AND VARIABLES

### Drawing the Sample of Communities

The following is a description of the procedures used to select the 100 communities for the community database portion of the Gambling Impact and Behavior Study. Many of the parameters for selecting these communities, such as the restriction of the sample to places with populations of 10,000 or more, were specified in the Commission’s request for proposals and made good research sense in terms of the need to assure minimum numerical thresholds for statistical analysis. In addition to the 100 non-tribal communities, five tribal communities were selected. However, statistical information for the social and economic variables used in the community database study was not available for the tribal communities and they had to be omitted from the analysis. NORC staff in consultation with technical advisors William Thompson (University of Nevada, Las Vegas) developed the sample design, Peter Reuter (University of Maryland), and Will Cummings (Christiansen/Cummings Associates [CCA]).

In order to define a community, we used the U.S. Census Bureau’s definition of “place.” Places are either legally incorporated, general-purpose geopolitical units such as cities and townships (in contrast to special-purpose units such as water districts), or they are statistical equivalents to such units, called census designated places (CDPs). For each decennial census since 1950, the Census Bureau in cooperation with state agencies has delineated CDP boundaries. CDPs are defined as “densely settled concentrations of population that are identifiable by name, but are not legally incorporated places.” More than 32,000 places were identified in the 1990 census, but only about ten percent or 3,148 places had populations of more than 10,000 persons. These 3,148 larger places accounted for 143,252,373 or about 58 percent of the U.S. population.

The 100 communities in the database were selected from these 3,148 “places.” The procedure described below was based on a simple random sampling without replacement procedure within the following four strata or cells, which were designed to optimize for statistical testing of casino proximity while reflecting co-occurrence of lotteries and other gambling opportunities:

- A.** 40 places: Within 50 miles of a lottery facility *and* a major casino;
- B** 5 places: *Not* within 100 miles of lottery facility but within 50 miles of a major casino;
- C** 40 places: Within 50 miles of lottery facility but *not* within 100 miles of a major casino;
- D** 15 places: No legal gambling, including off-track and on-track pari-mutuel betting facilities.

A major casino was defined as a gaming establishment with 500 or more electronic gaming devices (EGDs). In the discussion that follows we refer to the four sampling cells by their letters; the following table represents the criteria described above.

		Lottery	
		Yes	No
Casino	Yes	A (40)	B (5)
	No	C (40)	D (15)

The following seven steps describe how the places were sampled. Refinements in how places were assigned to cells are described after step 7.

- Assign permanent random numbers to all 3,148 places.
- Sort places by their permanent random number.
- Begin with the place with the smallest random number. Identify whether the place has *access* (as defined below) to:
  - one or more major gambling facilities; if ambiguous then exclude the place;
  - lottery sales outlets; if ambiguous then exclude the place;
  - any form of regulated gambling (if not, then cell D).
- Reject places that are “in the middle” (i.e., that are not clearly identifiable as having or not having access to major gambling facilities and/or lotteries).
- Repeat steps 3 and 4 for the first 500 places.
- Search the list of places past the first 500 places, considering only “no lottery” states, until cell B has 5 places and cell D has 15 places.
- Of the 500+ places classified 100 were selected, incorporating the points listed in the “Other considerations” section (see below).

As each candidate place was considered in step 3, we coded its access to a “major” gambling casino by first checking a map by hand to see if one or more major gambling facilities were nearby.

- Access to a major facility was classified as “**yes**” if one or more gambling facilities were within 50 miles of the place and at least one facility had table games and 500 or more EGDs. There was one exception to this rule: for Atlantic City, this distance was set at 75 miles.
- Access was classified as “**no**” if there were no major facilities within 100 miles of the place. Again an exception to this rule was established for Atlantic City, for which the distance was set at 125 miles.
- If there were small casinos or charity bingo places nearby (i.e. within 50 miles), or if the previous two tests did not result in a yes or no decision, then the place was considered ambiguous with respect to access to major casinos and it was excluded from consideration.
- Moreover, a place was excluded if it was a suburb of a big city (population over 1,000,000) *and* the city or another of its suburbs had already been selected into the 100-community sample.

Information about casinos was taken from “Where to Play in the USA: The Gaming Guide.” Distances were measured “as-the-crow-flies” irrespective of state boundaries.

Next, distances to lottery facilities were defined as follows:

- The lottery status for places in states with a lottery was defined as “**yes**.”
- For places in states without a lottery, the status was defined as “**yes**” if the place was within 25 miles of a place with population 10,000 or more located in a neighboring lottery state. For example, Mississippi has no lottery, but Mississippi residents living in places along the border with Louisiana may cross the border to purchase lottery tickets.

- Places not categorized by the previous two criteria were considered ambiguous and excluded from consideration.

Places excluded due to being “in the middle” with respect to lottery access account for a population of approximately 51 million. Among the exclusions were the New York and Philadelphia metropolitan areas. In addition, only one place could be selected from other major population centers such as greater Los Angeles or Chicago. These exclusions of places with ambiguous or middling status and bias in favor of smaller places (but not smaller than 10,000 persons) were intended to increase the capability to statistically detect the localized effects—whether positive or negative—of proximity to major casinos and lotteries.

A place was considered to have no access to any kind of gambling if

- The previous two tests yielded no access to casinos or lottery facilities, and
- It was at least 60 miles from any place of 10,000 population where any gambling establishment, including off-track and on-track pari-mutuel horse and/or dog race betting facilities, was available.

Other considerations:

- Atlantic City, NJ was automatically selected as a cell A member.
- Only one place was permitted to be selected per county.
- In each cell as many states were represented as possible. Consequently, multiple places from states with the largest number of places (with the largest number of random identifiers) were removed from the selection in order to reduce cells A and C to 40 places.

## **Variable Selection and Sources**

The Commission mandated the selection of certain types of demographic and economic variables for inclusion in the community database. The purpose of collecting these variables was to enable tracking of changes over time (on a year-to-year basis) in the economic and social conditions of communities and, where possible, to determine whether changes might or might not be correlated with access to gaming facilities or per capita spending on various types of games. Years of interest were 1980–1996.

The specific areas of interest were as follows:

### **Economic Conditions**

- Employment Patterns
- Unemployment Rates
- Bankruptcy Rates
- Personal Income
- Private & Public Earnings
- Government Expenditures
- Income Maintenance/AFDC

## **Social Conditions**

- Crimes
- Suicides
- Divorces
- Marriages
- Births
- Deaths

For each of these areas we examined data series available down to the level of geographic detail needed, which generally was at the county or municipality level. These data were compiled mainly in central statistical files, available in electronic form in the Regional Economic Indicator Series (REIS), City and County Data Book, FBI Uniform Crime Reports, and the NCHS Vital and Health Statistics series. Data series with the degree of geographic detail and annual frequency needed for the purposes of the community data base were virtually all in the form of governmental statistics developed or collected at the local level according to national standards and formats, and put together by federal agencies with the assistance of state and local agencies.

The following sections define the variables selected and the sources of the data series.

### ***Employment patterns by industry***

Employment statistics were available at the county level for most of the years. We selected the following variables from the Regional Economic Indicator Series (REIS) or the City and County Data Book.

- Total Employment (full- and part-time)
- Employment–Construction
- Employment–Transportation
- Employment–Services
- Employment–Local Government
- Employment–Retail Trade

### ***Unemployment***

As with employment statistics, these data series were available at the county level for most years from the REIS and the City and County Data Book. The following variables were selected.

- Civilian Labor Force–Unemployment
- Civilian Labor Force–Unemployment Rate

## **Bankruptcy**

Number of bankruptcy filings was available at the county level through the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The data were available for the years 1988–1996. The following variables were extracted:

- Business Chapter 7 Filings
- Business Chapter 11 Filings
- Business Chapter 12 Filings
- Business Chapter 13 Filings
- Non-Business Chapter 7 Filings
- Non-Business Chapter 11 Filings
- Non-Business Chapter 12 Filings
- Non-Business Chapter 13 Filings
- Total Chapter 7 Filings
- Total Chapter 11 Filings
- Total Chapter 12 Filings
- Total Chapter 13 Filings
- Total Bankruptcy Filings
- Total Business Bankruptcy Filings
- Total Non-Business Bankruptcy Filings

## **Personal income**

These data were available from the REIS and the City and County Data Book. We included the following variables:

- Personal Income–Total
- Personal Income–Dividends, Interest, and Rent
- Personal Income–Income Maintenance
- Personal Income–Retirement
- Personal Income–Transfer Payments
- Personal Income–Unemployment Insurance
- Per Capita Personal Income–Total
- Per Capita Personal Income–Dividends, Interest, and Rent
- Per Capita Personal Income–Income Maint.
- Per Capita Personal Income–Retirement



- Per Capita Personal Income–Transfer Payments
- Per Capita Personal Income–Unemployment Insurance

### ***Private and public earnings***

Private and public earnings were available through the REIS and the City and County Data Book. The specific variables selected were:

- Private Earnings–Construction
- Private Earnings–Eating and Drinking Places
- Private Earnings–General Merchandise
- Private Earnings–Hotel and Other Lodging
- Private Earnings–Amusement and Recreation
- Private Earnings–Retail Trade
- Private Earnings–Services
- Private Earnings–Social Services
- Private Earnings–Transportation
- Earnings–Local Government and Government Enterprises

### ***Government expenditures***

There was some variation in availability by year, with some information available annually, others every five years, and others only for recent periods. We selected the following variables to provide general information on government expenditures:

- Direct Federal Expenditures–Individuals
- Direct Federal Expenditures–Retirement and Disability
- Direct Federal Expenditures–Salaries and Wages

### ***Income maintenance/AFDC***

Data were available through the City and County Data Book. The following variables were included in the data series:

- Income Maintenance
- Per Capita Income Maintenance
- AFDC–Recipient Children
- AFDC–Recipient Families
- AFDC–Total Recipients

## **Crime**

The main data source at the necessary levels and frequencies is in the form of crimes reported to police, which are compiled in the FBI Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), Part I (UCR Part II includes only arrest data and is collected intermittently, with substantial gaps in reporting). We extracted the following categories of offenses at the community level:

- Overall Crime index
- Violent Crime Index
- Property Crime Index
- Arson
- Assault
- Burglary
- Larceny
- Murder
- Motor Vehicle Theft
- Rape
- Robbery

## **Vital statistics**

Reports of vital statistics at the county level were available through the Vital and Health Statistics periodic reports published by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and through CDC Wonder (<http://wonder.cdc.gov>). We extracted the following variables for the data series:

- Total Suicides
- Suicide Rate–Not Age Adjusted
- Suicide Rate–Age Adjusted
- Total Divorces
- Divorce Rate
- Total Marriages
- Marriage Rate
- Total Births
- Birth Rate
- Births to Mothers under Age 15
- Births to Mothers Ages 15–19
- Births to Mothers Under Age 20
- Total Deaths

- Death Rate
- Deaths from Motor Vehicle Accidents
- Infant Mortality Rate

## Availability of Gaming Facilities and Estimated Gaming Expenditures

Christiansen/Cummings Associates (CCA) provided data on the availability of gaming facilities and estimated gaming expenditures for each community for each year (at the county level). Availability was coded 1 if a gaming facility was within 50 miles of the community in the specific year; it was coded 0 if a gaming facility was not within 50 miles of the community. In the rare case where a facility opened during the particular year, a value of 0.5 was assigned. Facilities included bingo, casino, lottery, and pari-mutuel.

The following description provides the general approach to estimating the various gaming expenditures.

Data on gambling receipts as reported by state regulatory agencies for each year were compiled first. For those games in which customers rarely travel long distances (lotteries, charitable bingo, and other games), receipts were divided by the total state population for the relevant year. For these games, an “urban factor” was also included: CCA assumed that residents of metropolitan areas spend 10 percent more<sup>1</sup> than the residents of non-metropolitan areas.

The sources of the state population data were:

- 1980 and 1984–92: U.S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstracts of the United States 1993*
- 1995: Claritas Corporation
- Other years: CCA inter/extrapolations

For each community for each year, CCA assumed spending at the corresponding statewide rate; at the “rural” rate for communities not in metropolitan areas, and at the “urban” rate (10 percent higher) for those communities within metropolitan areas.

For those games in which customers often travel longer distances (casino gaming and pari-mutuel wagering on horse racing, greyhound racing, and jai-alai), CCA initially followed the same procedure to develop estimates of per capita receipts for each state for each year. CCA assumed no “urban factor” for these games. For horse and greyhound racing, the data suggested there was no such (consistent) factor, with great differences across various markets.<sup>2</sup> For casino gambling, the urban/rural differences may be real, but there were insufficient data to make an approximate quantitative estimate.

To estimate per capita spending for each community on pari-mutuel gambling, CCA “modulated” the statewide per capita receipts estimate for each year by a “proximity factor” based upon the distance

---

<sup>1</sup> CCA estimate, based upon several states for which there is (fragmentary) data by county or township. The 10 percent estimate is conservative; the result may be an underestimate for urban communities and an overestimate for rural ones.

<sup>2</sup> Horse and greyhound racing have much less competition from other professional sports, and other commercial entertainment activities in general, in rural as opposed to urban areas. In smaller, rural areas the proportion of the population which is occupationally connected with racing or related equine activities can be significant.

from each community to the nearest pari-mutuel facility (race track, jai-alai fronton, or off-track betting facility). For some communities near racetracks in other states (especially those located in states without tracks of their own, such as Missouri), the “base” rate of spending was assumed to be that of the state in which the track(s) is (are) located. (See the additional description below.)

For casino gaming, CCA developed separate estimates for table games and gaming devices (some states, such as Rhode Island, Delaware, and West Virginia, offer only the devices). For fourteen states, most prominently Nevada and New Jersey, CCA “spread” reported state receipts across the geographic areas from which most customers of these casinos come. (For Nevada this included the entire U.S.; for the other states, CCA assumed, as with lotteries and charitable games, that the spending of local residents generated essentially all of the receipts.) (See the additional information below.)

CCA then summed the estimated contributions from each state to each of the relevant casino jurisdictions; for example, Massachusetts residents were estimated to contribute various portions of the receipts reported in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Nevada. These contributions add up to the total estimated casino spending from each state. The total was then divided by the state population to estimate statewide per capita spending. As with the pari-mutuel sports, CCA next “modulated” the statewide spending estimate for each year by a “proximity factor,” based upon the distance from each community to the nearest casino or gaming-device facility.

For charitable games and for Indian gaming (bingo and casinos), receipt data are often fragmentary or non-existent. In these cases, CCA estimated receipts based upon the per capita receipts and/or spending rates of the most comparable markets for which data are available. CCA then included these estimated receipts figures in the statewide totals which form the basis for the procedures described above.

### **Lottery spending estimates**

Sources for lottery receipt data were

- 1993–1997: Christiansen (et al.), “Gross Annual Wager of the United States” articles in International Gaming and Wagering Business magazine (based, in turn, upon data from state lottery agencies)
- Other years: CCA estimates based upon lottery sales and prize data as follows:
- 1991–1992: LaFleur, 1995 World Lottery Almanac
- 1980–1990: LaFleur, 1990 Compendium of Lottery Statistics (with some adjustments to 1990 based upon LaFleur, 1995 Compendium of Lottery Statistics)

As described above, CCA divided each state’s total lottery receipts by total state population for the relevant year, adjusted by an “urban factor” which assumes that the residents of metropolitan areas spend 10 percent more than the residents of non-metropolitan areas. Mathematically, CCA’s procedure divides receipts by (total population + (10 percent x urban population)). This yields the per capita spending estimate for the non-urban population; the per capita spending estimate for the urban population is 10 percent higher.

Source for urban proportion of the population (specifically for 1990, but assumed equal for all years): U.S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1993

For each community for each year, CCA then assumed spending at the corresponding statewide rate, “urban” or “rural,” depending on the status of the community.

The resulting estimates for per capita spending on lotteries range up to \$160 (for Massachusetts, by far the highest). The estimated rates of spending for most of the communities in other (lottery) states ranged from \$30–100, with most near the middle of the distribution.

### ***Pari-mutuel spending estimates***

Sources for pari-mutuel receipt data were:

- 1993–1997: Christiansen (et al.), “Gross Annual Wager of the United States” articles in *International Gaming and Wagering Business* magazine (based, in turn, upon data from state regulatory agencies)
- 1992: ARCI (Association of Racing Commissioners International), *Statistical Summary*
- 1989–1991: CCA, *Summary of Pari-mutuel Taxation* (for each year)
- 1980–1988: CCA estimates based upon handle and takeout rate data from NASRC (National Association of State Racing Commissioners, the organization that preceded the ARCI), *Statistical Summary* (for each year)

CCA divided total receipts for each state by population to calculate per capita receipts for each year. As described above, urban dwellers are not assumed to (consistently) spend more than rural residents on pari-mutuel gambling.

CCA then “modulated” state per capita receipts estimates for each year by a “proximity factor” for each community. These were based upon the distance from each community to the nearest racetrack, jai-alai fronton, or off-track betting facility. These proximity factors range from 10 percent for most communities 50 miles or more from any pari-mutuel facility to 250 percent for a few communities containing or immediately adjacent to such facilities. The underlying basis for these proximity factors was survey data indicating that, for a reasonable range of distances, the rate of track attendance (and therefore, one may assume, spending) declines roughly in proportion to distance, i.e., the “elasticity” of spending with respect to distance is approximately -1.0.<sup>3</sup>

For some communities near racetracks in other states (especially those located in states without tracks of their own, such as Missouri), the “base” rate of spending was assumed to be that of the state in which the track(s) is (are) located.

In a few exceptional markets, the resulting pari-mutuel spending estimates range up to \$50 per person. For most communities relatively close to pari-mutuel facilities, the typical range is from \$15 to \$25. At the other end of the spectrum, for most communities 50 miles or more from a race track, spending is estimated at \$2–5 per person.

---

<sup>3</sup> For these particular calculations, CCA used some judgment in estimating these “proximity factors.” This is because the *statewide* per capita estimates to which they were applied result from a variety of market conditions with respect to average distance. In New York and Florida, for example, almost all of the state resides within a few miles of a pari-mutuel facility, while the (few) tracks in states like Arkansas and Minnesota are at some distance from most of the population. The “base” (statewide) rates for Arkansas and Minnesota therefore already reflect substantial discounts for (average) distance.

### **Bingo and other charitable games spending estimates**

CCA developed estimates for bingo and for other “charitable” games (primarily raffles, pull-tabs, punch cards, break-open tickets, and casino nights, for which the receipts reporting is often inferior to that for bingo).

Sources for bingo and charitable receipt data:

- 1993–1997: Christiansen (et al.), “Gross Annual Wager of the United States” articles in *International Gaming and Wagering Business* magazine (based, in turn, upon data from state regulatory agencies)
- Other years: CCA estimates (“backcasts”) based upon “Gross Annual Wager” estimates for the U.S. as a whole (prior to 1993, CCA did not publish estimates for individual states)

CCA followed procedures identical to those for lotteries, as described above. First, divide estimated receipts by total state population for each year, with urban residents assumed to spend 10 percent more than rural ones. Second, assume spending for each community at the corresponding statewide rate. For most communities, these estimates were in the single digits, \$2–10 per person. For a few states, most prominently Minnesota (with huge spending on pull-tabs), the estimates ranged up to \$56.

### **Casino (table and device) spending estimates**

Sources for casino (and gaming device) receipt data:

- 1993–1997: Christiansen et al., “Gross Annual Wager of the United States” articles on *International Gaming and Wagering Business* magazine (based, in turn, upon data from state regulatory agencies)
- 1980–1992: Nevada, New Jersey and other state Casino Control Commission (or equivalent agency) statistical reports
- Indian Gaming: CCA estimates

Because some states, such as Rhode Island, Delaware, and West Virginia, have offered only gaming devices, CCA developed separate estimates for casino table games and gaming devices.

For fourteen states, of which the most notable are Nevada and New Jersey, CCA “spread” reported state receipts across the geographic areas from which one may reasonably believe most customers of these casinos come (for Nevada, across the entire U.S.; the other states’ receipts “spread” in this fashion are Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.)

For the other casino states, CCA assumed, as with lotteries, that essentially all of the receipts are generated by the spending of local residents.

The “spread” of spending/receipts was based upon the distance of each state from the relevant casino state(s) and qualitative assessments of competitive factors. For Nevada and New Jersey, CCA calculated “effective market area populations” based upon distance and competitive factors. CCA then divided total receipts (in Nevada, for example) by the relevant total effective market area population to estimate “distance- and competition-adjusted per capita spending,” and then applied the

relevant distance and competitive factors for each state to estimate the contributions of its residents to such receipts.<sup>4</sup>

For other states, CCA simply estimated the proportions of receipts which arose from the spending of the state's residents and of those of nearby states. These estimates were based upon previous CCA detailed analyses similar to those applied for Nevada and New Jersey.

CCA then summed up the estimated contributions from each state to each of the relevant casino jurisdictions to generate total estimated casino spending from each state. CCA divided by the state population to estimate statewide per capita spending. As with the pari-mutuel games, to estimate per capita spending for each community CCA modulated the statewide spending estimate for each year by a proximity factor based upon the distance from each community to the nearest casino or gaming-device facility.

---

<sup>4</sup> The "distance" and "competitive" factors were based upon survey data from Nevada and New Jersey regarding the origin of their casinos' patrons. CCA estimated the "distance factors" (elasticity with respect to distance) to be about -0.6 for Nevada and -0.65 for New Jersey. (These are notably less severe than the -1.0 estimated for the pari-mutuel sports in general, i.e., casinos "pull" better from longer distances.) The "competitive factors" were estimated more qualitatively, but again were based on survey data. As an example, CCA estimated that due to competition from the closer casinos in Connecticut, Massachusetts residents patronized casinos in New Jersey at about 30 percent of the rate they otherwise would have, and casinos in Nevada, at about 40 percent--higher than New Jersey despite the greater distance because the casinos in Nevada offered a more attractive casino/resort experience.





## IDENTIFICATION

CASEID	CASE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
--------	----------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-1,890)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 522-525

ID	COMMUNITY ID
----	--------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-105)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 519-521

## SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

**YEAR**

**YEAR**

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
5.6	5.6	105	1980	
5.6	5.6	105	1981	
5.6	5.6	105	1982	
5.6	5.6	105	1983	
5.6	5.6	105	1984	
5.6	5.6	105	1985	
5.6	5.6	105	1986	
5.6	5.6	105	1987	
5.6	5.6	105	1988	
5.6	5.6	105	1989	
5.6	5.6	105	1990	
5.6	5.6	105	1991	
5.6	5.6	105	1992	
5.6	5.6	105	1993	
5.6	5.6	105	1994	
5.6	5.6	105	1995	
5.6	5.6	105	1996	
5.6	5.6	105	1997	

-----  
 100.0 100.0 1,890 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data code: -3  
 Columns: 1-4

**PERMRN**

**PERMANENT RANDOM NUMBER**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0001-.7774)

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 4  
 Missing-data code: -3.0000  
 Columns: 83-89

## GEOGRAPHIC

**STAB**

**STATE ABBREVIATION**

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
1.9	1.9	36	1	ALABAMA
1.0	1.0	18	2	ARKANSAS
4.8	4.8	90	3	CALIFORNIA
3.8	3.8	72	4	COLORADO
2.9	2.9	54	5	CONNECTICUT
2.9	2.9	54	6	FLORIDA
1.0	1.0	18	7	GEORGIA
1.0	1.0	18	8	HAWAII
3.8	3.8	72	9	IOWA
1.0	1.0	18	10	IDAHO
6.7	6.7	126	11	ILLINOIS
2.9	2.9	54	12	INDIANA
1.9	1.9	36	13	KANSAS
2.9	2.9	54	14	LOUISIANA
1.0	1.0	18	15	MASSACHUSETTS
1.9	1.9	36	16	MAINE
1.9	1.9	36	17	MICHIGAN
4.8	4.8	90	18	MINNESOTA
4.8	4.8	90	19	MISSOURI
3.8	3.8	72	20	MISSISSIPPI
5.7	5.7	108	21	NORTH CAROLINA
1.9	1.9	36	22	NEBRASKA
1.9	1.9	36	23	NEW HAMPSHIRE
2.9	2.9	54	24	NEW JERSEY
1.9	1.9	36	25	NEW MEXICO
1.9	1.9	36	26	NEVADA
1.9	1.9	36	27	NEW YORK
2.9	2.9	54	28	OHIO
1.0	1.0	18	29	OKLAHOMA
1.9	1.9	36	30	PENNSYLVANIA
1.0	1.0	18	31	RHODE ISLAND
1.0	1.0	18	32	TENNESSEE
7.6	7.6	144	33	TEXAS
2.9	2.9	54	34	UTAH
3.8	3.8	72	35	VIRGINIA
3.8	3.8	72	36	WISCONSIN

-----  
 100.0 100.0 1,890 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Columns: 530-531

**STFP****STATE FIPS CODE**

PCT VALID	PCT ALL	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.9	1.9	36	1	
1.0	1.0	18	5	
4.8	4.8	90	6	
3.8	3.8	72	8	
2.9	2.9	54	9	
2.9	2.9	54	12	
1.0	1.0	18	13	
1.0	1.0	18	15	
1.0	1.0	18	16	
6.7	6.7	126	17	
2.9	2.9	54	18	
3.8	3.8	72	19	
1.9	1.9	36	20	
2.9	2.9	54	22	
1.9	1.9	36	23	
1.0	1.0	18	25	
1.9	1.9	36	26	
4.8	4.8	90	27	
3.8	3.8	72	28	
4.8	4.8	90	29	
1.9	1.9	36	31	
1.9	1.9	36	32	
1.9	1.9	36	33	
2.9	2.9	54	34	
1.9	1.9	36	35	
1.9	1.9	36	36	
5.7	5.7	108	37	
2.9	2.9	54	39	
1.0	1.0	18	40	
1.9	1.9	36	42	
1.0	1.0	18	44	
1.0	1.0	18	47	
7.6	7.6	144	48	
2.9	2.9	54	49	
3.8	3.8	72	51	
3.8	3.8	72	55	
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 40-41

<b>CONAME</b>	<b>COUNTY NAME</b>
---------------	--------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-100)

Data type: numeric

Columns: 527-529

<b>COFP</b>	<b>COUNTY FIPS CODE</b>
-------------	-------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1,077-55,097)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 42-46

<b>MULTCO</b>	<b>MULTIPLE PLACE IN MORE THAN ONE COUNTY</b>
---------------	-----------------------------------------------

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
15.0	15.0	284	1	YES
85.0	85.0	1,606	2	NO
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890 cases		

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Column: 526

<b>INTPTLAT</b>	<b>INTERIOR POINT LATITUDE</b>
-----------------	--------------------------------

1,890 cases

Data type: character

Columns: 21-29

Note: INTPTLAT will produce a warning when used in SPSS due to its length.

<b>INTPTLNG</b>	<b>INTERIOR POINT LONGITUDE</b>
-----------------	---------------------------------

1,890 cases

Data type: character

Columns: 30-39

Note: INTPTLNG will produce a warning when used in SPSS due to its length.

## AVAILABILITY OF GAMING FACILITIES

### BINGOIND                      AVAILABILITY OF BINGO WITHIN 50 MILES

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
6.0	5.7	108	0.0	FACILITY NOT WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNIT
10.6	10.1	191	0.5	FACILITY OPENED DURING YEAR
83.4	79.4	1,501	1.0	FACILITY WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNITY IN
	4.8	90	-3.0	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 1  
 Missing-data code: -3.0  
 Columns: 5-8

### LOTTIND                      AVAILABILITY OF LOTTERY WITHIN 50 MILES

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
42.1	40.1	758	0.0	FACILITY NOT WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNIT
4.7	4.4	84	0.5	FACILITY OPENED DURING YEAR
53.2	50.7	958	1.0	FACILITY WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNITY IN
	4.8	90	-3.0	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 1  
 Missing-data code: -3.0  
 Columns: 9-12

<b>PERIMIND</b>	<b>AVAILABILITY OF PERIMUTUEL W/IN 50 MILES</b>			
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
41.1	39.2	740	0.0	FACILITY NOT WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNIT
2.5	2.4	45	0.5	FACILITY OPENED DURING YEAR
56.4	53.7	1,015	1.0	FACILITY WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNITY IN
	4.8	90	-3.0	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 1  
 Missing-data code: -3.0  
 Columns: 13-16

<b>CASIND</b>	<b>AVAILABILITY OF CASINOS WITHIN 50 MILES</b>			
---------------	------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
81.4	77.5	1,465	0.0	FACILITY NOT WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNIT
3.7	3.5	66	0.5	FACILITY OPENED DURING YEAR
14.9	14.2	269	1.0	FACILITY WITHIN 50 MILES OF COMMUNITY IN
	4.8	90	-3.0	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 1  
 Missing-data code: -3.0  
 Columns: 17-20



## GAMING SPENDING ESTIMATES

### LOTTSPND PER CAPITA LOTTERY SPENDING

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0000-145.4179)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Missing-data code: -3.0000  
Columns: 69-76

### PERISPND PER CAPITA PERIMUTUEL SPENDING

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0000-54.9913)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Missing-data code: -3.0000  
Columns: 55-61

### BINGSPND PER CAPITA BINGO & OTHER GAME SPENDING

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0000-52.4799)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Missing-data code: -3.0000  
Columns: 62-68

### CASSPEND PER CAPITA CASINO SPENDING

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 4.8352-597.2673)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Missing-data code: -3.0000  
Columns: 47-54

## EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS BY INDUSTRY

### EMPLOYED                      NUMBER EMPLOYED FULL & PART-TIME

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1,286-3,170,327)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 230-236

### EMPCONST                      PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT-CONSTRUCTION

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-125,520)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 237-242

### EMPTRANS                      PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT-TRANSPORTATION

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-194,778)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 243-248

### EMPRETTR                      PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT-RETAIL TRADE

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 68-470,122)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 249-254

<b>EMPSERV</b>	<b>PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT-SERVICES</b>
----------------	------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-1,055,436)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 255-261

<b>EMPGOVT</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT-LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b>
----------------	------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 324-248,713)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 262-267

## UNEMPLOYMENT

### **CIVLABF                      CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-2,757,532)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 358-364

### **UNEMPLOY                      CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE UNEMPLOYED**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-280,333)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 365-370

### **UNEMPRAT                      CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-35.1)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 371-374

## BANKRUPTCY

### TFILING

### TOTAL BANKRUPTCY FILINGS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-29,345)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 469-473

### TCHAP7

### TOTAL CHAPTER 7 FILINGS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-20,119)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 474-478

### TCHAP11

### TOTAL CHAPTER 11 FILINGS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-698)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 479-481

<b>TCHAP12</b>	<b>TOTAL CHAPTER 12 FILINGS</b>
----------------	---------------------------------

PCT VALID	PCT ALL	N	VALUE	LABEL
76.6	46.5	878	0	
16.1	9.8	185	1	
5.2	3.2	60	2	
1.2	0.7	14	3	
0.4	0.3	5	4	
0.3	0.2	3	5	
0.1	0.1	1	6	
	39.4	744	-3	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 482-483

<b>TCHAP13</b>	<b>TOTAL CHAPTER 13 FILINGS</b>
----------------	---------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-9,045)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 484-487

<b>BFILING</b>	<b>TOTAL BUSINESS BANKRUPTCY FILINGS</b>
----------------	------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-1,406)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 488-491

<b>BCHAP7</b>	<b>BUSINESS CHAPTER 7 FILINGS</b>
---------------	-----------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-631)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 492-494

<b>BCHAP11</b>	<b>BUSINESS CHAPTER 11 FILINGS</b>
----------------	------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-669)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 495-497

<b>BCHAP12</b>	<b>BUSINESS CHAPTER 12 FILINGS</b>
----------------	------------------------------------

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
76.7	46.5	879	0	
16.1	9.7	184	1	
5.2	3.2	60	2	
1.2	0.7	14	3	
0.4	0.3	5	4	
0.3	0.2	3	5	
0.1	0.1	1	6	
	39.4	744	-3	MISSING
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 498-499

<b>BCHAP13</b>	<b>BUSINESS CHAPTER 13 FILINGS</b>
----------------	------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-286)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 500-502

<b>NBFILING</b>	<b>TOTAL NON-BUSINESS BANKRUPTCY FILINGS</b>
-----------------	----------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-28,856)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 503-507

**NBCHAP7****NON-BUSINESS CHAPTER 7 FILINGS**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-19,823)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 508-512

**NBCHAP11****NON-BUSINESS CHAPTER 11 FILINGS**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-66)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 513-514

**NBCHAP13****NON-BUSINESS CHAPTER 13 FILINGS**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-9,028)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 515-518



## PERSONAL INCOME

**TOTINC**                      **TOTAL PERSONAL INCOME IN \$1000S**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 48,035-146,779,000)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 138-146

**PERINC**                      **PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME (IN DOLLARS)**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 5,673-38,841)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 154-158

**INCTRAF**                      **PERSONAL INCOME (1000S)-TRANSFER PAYMENT**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 19,340-20,904,996)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 268-275

**INCPERMT**                      **PERSONAL INCOME (1000S)-INCOME MAINTEN.**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 957-2,544,050)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 276-282

**INCUNEMP**                      **PERSONAL INCOME (1000S)-UNEMPLOY. INSUR.**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 74-1,003,869)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 283-289

**INCRETIR**                      **PERSONAL INCOME (1000S)-RETIREMENT/OTHER**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 18,175-17,806,138)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 290-297

**INCDVINR**                      **PERSONAL INCOME (1000S)-DIV./INT./RENT**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 9,094-27,045,423)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 298-305

**PERCAPNT**                      **PER CAPITA NET EARNINGS (DOLLARS)**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 3,482-26,356)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 306-310

**PERCAPTP**                      **PER CAPITA TRANSFER PAYMENTS (DOLLARS)**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 515-9,077)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 311-314

<b>PERCAPIM</b>	<b>PER CAPITA INCOME MAINTENANCE (DOLLARS)</b>
-----------------	------------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 22-1,066)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 315-318

<b>PERCAPUI</b>	<b>PER CAPITA UNEMPLOYMENT INSUR. (DOLLARS)</b>
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 4-449)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 319-321

<b>PERCAPRT</b>	<b>PER CAPITA RETIREMENT &amp; OTHER PAYMENTS</b>
-----------------	---------------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 473-8,086)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 322-325

## PRIVATE AND PUBLIC EARNINGS

### **EARNCONS**                      **PRIVATE EARNINGS-CONSTRUCTION**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-4,867,129)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 159-165

### **EARNTRAN**                      **PRIVATE EARNINGS-TRANSPORTATION**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-9,187,031)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 166-172

### **EARNRET**                      **PRIVATE EARNINGS-RETAIL TRADE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 703-8,474,987)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 173-179

### **EARNGEN**                      **PRIVATE EARNINGS-GENERAL MERCHANDISE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-1,201,271)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 180-186

**EARNPEAT****PRIVATE EARNINGS-EATING & DRINKING PLACE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-2,079,696)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 187-193

**EARNSERV****PRIVATE EARNINGS-SERVICES**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-35,288,838)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 194-201

**EARNHOTL****PRIVATE EARNINGS-HOTEL & OTHER LODGING**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-4,080,580)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 202-208

**EARNRECR****PRIVATE EARNINGS-AMUSEMENT & RECREATION**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-1,127,349)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 209-215

**EARNSOCS****PRIVATE EARNINGS-SOCIAL SERVICES**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-1,050,071)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 216-222

**EARNGOVT**

**EARNINGS-LOCAL GOV. & GOV. ENTERPRISES**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 6,055-8,962,114)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 223-229

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

### FEDEXPI DIRECT FED. EXPEND.-INDIVIDUALS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 2,129-14,424,713)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 326-333

### FEDEXRTD DIRECT FED. EXPEND.-RETIREMENT & DISABIL

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 3,809-7,891,467)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 334-340

### FEDEXSAL DIRECT FED. EXPEND.-SALARIES & WAGES

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 121-2,668,427)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 341-347

## INCOME MAINTENANCE/AFDC

### AFDCTOT                      AFDC-TOTAL RECIPIENTS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-491,436)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 375-380

### AFDCCHIL                      AFDC-RECIPIENT CHILDREN

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-335,669)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 381-386

### AFDCFAM                      AFDC-RECIPIENT FAMILIES

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-159,480)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 387-392



## CRIME

### UCRDATA FBI DATA COUNTY OR PLACE

PCT	PCT	N	VALUE	LABEL
VALID	ALL			
3.2	2.5	47	1	COUNTY
96.8	74.2	1,403	2	PLACE
	23.3	440	-3	Missing
-----	-----	-----		
100.0	100.0	1,890		cases

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 532-533

### UCRPOP UCR BASE POPULATION

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1,651-523,691)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 90-95

### CRIME OVERALL CRIME INDEX

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 10-77,595)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 96-100

### MCRIME MODIFIED CRIME INDEX

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 10-77,997)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 101-105

<b>MURDER</b>	<b>UCR MURDERS</b>
---------------	--------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-267)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 106-108

<b>RAPE</b>	<b>UCR RAPES</b>
-------------	------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-559)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 109-111

<b>ROBBERY</b>	<b>UCR ROBBERIES</b>
----------------	----------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-6,223)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 112-115

<b>ASSAULT</b>	<b>UCR ASSAULTS</b>
----------------	---------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-8,466)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 116-119

<b>BURGLARY</b>	<b>UCR BURGLARIES</b>
-----------------	-----------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-20,567)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 120-124

**LARCENY****UCR LARCENIES**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 8-38,492)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 125-129

**MVTHEFT****UCR MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-13,470)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 130-134

**ARSON****UCR ARSON**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 1-935)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 135-137

## VITAL STATISTICS

### POP1990                      POPULATION 1990 (US BUREAU OF CENSUS)

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 577-465,622)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 77-82

### COPOP                      COUNTY POPULATION-CENSUS MID-YEAR EST.

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 3,861-5,248,878)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 147-153

### BIRTHS                      NUMBER OF BIRTHS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-97,084)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 393-397

### BIRTHRAT                      BIRTHS PER 1000 POPULATION

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-44.0)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 398-401

**BIRTHYNG****BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-15,503)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 402-406

**BIRTHADO****BIRTHS TO MOTHERS AGES 15-19**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-15,066)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 407-411

**BIRTH15****BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 15 YEARS OF AGE**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-464)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 412-414

**DEATHS****NUMBER OF DEATHS**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-49,568)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 415-419

**DEATHRAT****DEATHS PER 1000 POPULATION**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-15.7)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 420-423

<b>MVDEATH</b>	<b>DEATHS FROM MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS</b>
----------------	--------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-759)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 424-426

<b>INFDEATH</b>	<b>INFANT DEATHS PER 1000 LIVE BIRTHS</b>
-----------------	-------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-35.1)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 427-430

<b>MARRIAGE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MARRIAGES</b>
-----------------	----------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-75,909)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 431-435

<b>MARRATE</b>	<b>MARRIAGES PER 1000 POPULATION</b>
----------------	--------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-205.0)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 436-440

<b>DIVORCES</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DIVORCES</b>
-----------------	---------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-21,096)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 441-445

<b>DIVRATE</b>	<b>DIVORCES PER 1000 POPULATION</b>
----------------	-------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-18.1)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 446-449

<b>SUICIDES</b>	<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF SUICIDES</b>
-----------------	---------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-592)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 450-452

<b>NCHSPOP</b>	<b>POPULATION USED BY NCHS FOR SUICIDE RATE</b>
----------------	-------------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 3,356-5,268,188)

Data type: numeric  
Missing-data code: -3  
Columns: 453-459

<b>ASUICRAT</b>	<b>AGE ADJUSTED SUICIDE RATE PER 100,000</b>
-----------------	----------------------------------------------

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-118.7)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 1  
Missing-data code: -3.0  
Columns: 460-464

**SUICRATE**

**SUICIDE RATE-NOT AGE ADJUSTED**

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: .0-88.3)

Data type: numeric

Decimals: 1

Missing-data code: -3.0

Columns: 465-468



## HEALTH CARE

### DOCTORS

### TOTAL NON-FEDERAL PHYSICIANS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-16,131)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 348-352

### HOSPBEDS

### TOTAL HOSPITAL BEDS

1,890 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-35,061)

Data type: numeric

Missing-data code: -3

Columns: 353-357