



**Center for California Native Nations  
Collaboration. Research. Service.**

**An Impact Analysis  
of Tribal Government Gaming in California**

**California Nations Institutional Development  
and Intergovernmental Relations**

Political Science Research Group  
Final Report<sup>1</sup>

Martin Johnson  
Assistant Professor

Jackie Filla  
Doctoral student

Jeff McLaughlin  
Doctoral student

---

<sup>1</sup> This report was prepared for Joel Martin, Co-Director of the Center for California Native Nations, UC-Riverside and Kate Spilde Contreras, CCNN Managing Director. Thanks to Anil Deolalikar, Gloria Gonzales-Rivera, Francis A. Hallowell, Mindy Marks, Anthony Miranda, Mark Neiswender, The Honorable Deron Marquez and Kate Spilde Contreras for their help in developing and fielding the surveys of California Indian and other local government officials.

## **California Nations Institutional Development and Intergovernmental Relations**

In this section of *An Impact Analysis of Tribal Government Gaming in California*, we analyze the institutional implications and political environment of Indian gaming in California. The 1988 Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) identified two principal goals for tribal government gaming in the United States. According to Congress, Indian gaming operations should support economic development for Indian tribes, but importantly, are intended also to strengthen tribal governments. We investigate the success of tribal government gaming in pursuit of these twin goals in the California context. We have two related research questions: How does Indian gaming affect tribal governance, service delivery, and intergovernmental relations with their policy making neighbors? Second, how do local policy makers in California view tribal government gaming and its effects? This research augments the skilled aggregate quantitative analysis conducted by our colleagues on the Economics team as well as the detailed qualitative research pursued by the investigators who have developed the case studies for this report.

We are focused on institutional and governmental development, and investigate public service delivery in California's Indian country. By public services, we are referring to the services Americans tend to expect from their local governments – from seemingly mundane things like trash pick-up, to vital functions like health care and fire protection, as well as important services such as education and cultural programs. Do tribal governments with gaming differ from non-gaming tribes in the public services they provide? How do tribal governments with gaming differ from non-gaming tribes with respect to their political institutions and the practice of government in their communities? To research the development of governmental

structures, we examine reported attributes of tribal codes that govern the conduct of members, as well as the development of professional public sector employment among American Indian tribal governments.

In addition to economic development, institutions, and service delivery, we also propose that an important element of the strengthening of tribal governments involves their relationships with other neighboring governments – local municipalities and counties. We anticipate that stronger governments will also have stronger ties to their neighbors, more involvement in important community and regional issues, and more professionalized dealings with neighboring governments as their administrative and technical capacities expand. We take up this question as well.

This report proceeds in six major sections. We develop a brief understanding of the political context for tribal government gaming in California in light of public opinion about the issue. Tribal government gaming has been both popular and controversial in California. We consider results from surveys of American Indian leaders in California and local California officials regarding their interactions with local tribal governments. The last two sections of this report are extensive appendices providing a comprehensive set of these survey results, along with reproductions of materials used to solicit responses and the survey instruments themselves.

## **1. The Public and the Political Environment of Indian Gaming in California**

Tribal Government Gaming in California is simultaneously a popular idea with the public and a contentious issue. In March 2000, California voters approved Proposition 1A, a ballot initiative authorizing the Governor to negotiate compacts with federally recognized tribes that allow gaming activities and providing the state with gambling license fees. The popular initiative

process has been a successful strategy for Indians to open the door to the negotiation of compacts with California and other states (Boehmke and Witmer 2002). Proposition 1-A changed the California constitution and state laws to allow tribes to operate slot machines and other electronic gaming devices (Brown 2003). The initiative passed statewide with 64.5 percent of voters supporting the measure. The initiative was supported by a majority of voters in all but one county in the state. This almost two-to-one margin of victory reflects a general tendency among Californians to support gaming in Indian country.

We have found public opinion research on the gaming issues from a variety of sources, dating back to almost 15 years. In November 1992, California residents surveyed by the Field Research Corporation<sup>2</sup> supported the conduct of a wide variety of gaming activities on Indian lands. At the time, bingo and poker were regarded as legal forms of gaming on Indian lands and strong majorities of the Californians supported allowing these forms of gaming to remain legal: 82% for Bingo and 72% for Poker. The Californians surveyed also supported the expansion of gaming operations to include lottery games (75%), electronic video games like video poker (62%), slot machines (63%), roulette (63%), keno (68%), and black jack (63%). Similarly, a January 1995 survey of 1,000 registered California voters<sup>3</sup> found that 76% said they would vote to allow “Indians to continue operating casino-style gambling on their reservations,” with 17% of respondents saying they would oppose this kind of measure.

More recent surveys of California voters suggest that a majority of Californians and California voters continue to support the idea. An April 2004 survey conducted by the *Los*

---

<sup>2</sup> Field Research Corporation surveyed 554 California residents for the Trinidad Rancheria, Rumsey Rancheria, and Table Mountain Rancheria. Field Research conducted the survey by telephone November 11–December 1, 1992.

<sup>3</sup> The survey was conducted by J. Moore Methods on behalf of California Indian tribes.

*Angeles Times*<sup>4</sup> found that majorities of state residents and voters have favorable impressions of tribal governments that operate casinos and continue to approve of the result of the Prop. 1A vote. Table 1 shows the balance of responses for two different questions – one about impression of gaming tribes and the other about the policy of allowing Indian casinos – among all respondents and restricted to voters. More than 55 percent of residents and voters assessed tribal governments with gaming operations favorably and more than 67 percent of residents and voters affirm their support for the Prop. 1A vote. In a May 2004 survey conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California<sup>5</sup> a majority of the state residents surveyed wanted to expand Indian gaming operations to raise additional revenues for the state (56% endorsed the idea, while 36% opposed it).

**Table 1. Indian casino items from April 2004 *Los Angeles Times* poll**

What is your impression of Indian tribes that own gambling casinos in California? As of today, is it very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, very unfavorable – or haven't you heard enough about that to say?			As you may know, four years ago California voters approved Nevada-style gambling, which includes slot machines, on Indian lands. As of today, do you approve or disapprove of gambling casinos on Indian lands? [WITH] Do you strongly (approve/ disapprove) or only somewhat (approve/ disapprove)?		
	All	Voters		All	Voters
Very favorable	23%	24%	Approve strongly	31%	33%
Somewhat favorable	32	32	Approve somewhat	36	36
Somewhat unfavorable	14	16	Disapprove somewhat	10	10
Very unfavorable	12	13	Disapprove strongly	14	14
Not aware	13	11			
Don't Know	6	5	Don't Know	9	7

<sup>4</sup> The *Los Angeles Times* poll was conducted by telephone April 17–21, 2004. Their researchers interviewed 1,571 California residents, of whom 1,265 identified themselves as registered voters.

<sup>5</sup> The Public Policy Institute of California interviewed 2,001 adult California residents by telephone. Asked of half of the survey's respondents in a split-ballot survey experiment, the question was, "Spending and tax reforms have been proposed to address fundamental issues in the state budget. For each of the following, please indicate whether you think this is a good idea or a bad idea. How about raising state corporate tax revenues by allowing the expansion of casino-type gambling on Indian lands?" The other form of the question solicited opinions about "allowing casino-type gambling on non-Indian lands," a less popular idea with 51% of respondents saying this is a good idea and 44% calling it a bad idea.

While a majority of Californians appear to support the presence of tribal government gaming in the state, the recent survey data suggests support may be slipping, although we are cautious about drawing this conclusion.<sup>6</sup> National Demographics Corporation conducted surveys for the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations in summer 2004 and spring 2005.<sup>7</sup> In summer 2004, a smaller percentage, 53% of respondents, said they would vote to give tribal governments exclusive rights to operate slot machines on their reservations if the initiative were on the ballot again today. Forty-one percent of respondents said they would vote against it. In the spring 2005 survey, support for the measure was 50% supporting an Indian casino gaming initiative if it were returned to the ballot, and 43% opposing the measure. A majority of Californians continues to support the spirit of Prop. 1A, but the margin of support may have declined.

Even with the general support for tribal government gaming in California, residents of the state are not without concerns over the implications of gaming in general. For example, in the May 2004 PPIC survey, respondents were asked which of the following they considered to be a more important consideration with regard to legalized gambling: “the crime and social problems it creates” or “the revenue and economic growth it produces.” A plurality of respondents identified the economic benefits as more important (49%), but a large minority expressed

---

<sup>6</sup> Variations in survey methodologies and the sources of this information prevent us from strongly concluding that support for legal protection of Indian gaming has dropped since 2003. The populations of interest for the public opinion surveys discussed here vary widely. The different surveys discussed take as a population of interest different groups of people and are usually not clear about how the populations of interest, the units from which to sample, were identified: “all California adult residents” has a clear meaning as does self-identified “registered voters,” but the precise definitions of “likely voters,” and “high propensity voters” are more elusive and vary from study to study. In addition, even if the populations of interest were the same across these surveys, the samples were likely drawn using different methods, and each question wording is slightly different. Consequently, we remain cautious about the potential for a downward trend in support for Indian casino gaming in California, while recognizing the possibility.

<sup>7</sup> The summer 2004 survey was conducted July 2-8, 2004, among 800 likely voters in the 2004 general election. The spring 2005 study was fielded March 28–April 4, 2005, among 1,204 “high propensity voters” according to the survey report.

concerns about the potential social problems (41%). In the spring 2005 National Demographics Corporation survey, the plurality of respondents, these high propensity voters, said they agreed that the number of Indian casinos is growing too quickly (46%) and a majority of respondents said they thought Indian casinos “have improper influence on Sacramento politics,” 56% of respondents. Dunstan (1997), for example, notes that Indian tribes have been active as political contributors in California since at least 1990, supporting candidates.

Tribal government gaming is by no means uncontroversial for California and other states. The issue has provoked litigation between tribes and the state over allowable gaming devices (Dunstan 1997) and other regulatory issues (McCulloch 1994). Indian casinos, like other gaming operations, appear to produce economic benefits for neighboring communities, but there are also concerns about negative effects as well, including traffic and housing congestion, crime, environmental problems (Dunstan 1997, Evans and Topoleski 2002, Teske and Sur 1991). It is within the context of this historical support for tribal government gaming and the controversy surrounding the issue that we investigate the effects of Indian gaming on tribes in California and on their relationships with local government leaders. We also take this opportunity to examine how controversy over the gaming issue enters into the local politics between tribal governments and their neighboring government officials.

## **2. Service Delivery and Institutional Development in Indian County**

“In short, self-governance ‘on-paper’ is insufficient, on its own...It must be backed up by creative institutional capacity building” (Cornell and Kalt 2003:ii).

Our primary interest is assessing differences between tribal governments with and without gaming with respect to their governmental strength. We anticipate that the strength of tribal governments will manifest themselves in terms of the services they offer, the development of their internal governmental operations, and the quality of their relationships with other local governments in California. Thus we investigate the practice of government among tribal governments in California.<sup>8</sup> This involves understanding how governance occurs within tribes in California, as well as what these governments do. In order to address these questions and further identify the political, public policy, and social effects of gaming on tribal life, we conducted a survey of tribe officials as well as a survey of officials in the municipalities and counties that neighbor tribal governments in California.

#### Methodology for Tribal Government and Public Service Survey

We developed contact lists for California tribal governments using lists provided by professional associates of the California Center for Native Nations (CCNN) at University of California, Riverside, as well as resources available on the Internet, sources including the California Nations Indian Gaming Association, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and California Gambling Control Commission. Our contact list was developed in coordination with CCNN Economics Group. Ultimately, we identified 107 federally-recognized tribal governments in California. In mid-September, 2005, we attempted to reach each tribe by telephone in order to confirm contact names and addresses. We spoke with a majority of tribes by telephone, or approximately 80 of the 107 tribes on our list.

---

<sup>8</sup> We also initially planned an analysis of tribal Constitutions and other organizing documents, comparing the institutions of government across tribes with and without gaming. This project has been hampered by the limited availability of documents from tribal organizations. We have collected 40 constitutions, articles of association, and charters from archives, the Internet, and personal contacts with tribes. However, the wide variance on the currency of the documents undermines inferences from them without a far greater investment in the systematic collection of documents. This comparative governance project remains a particularly promising research project provided document access issues can be resolved.

Following this telephone contact of tribal governments, we sent a letter of introduction under the signature of the project leader, Joel Martin, Co-Director of the CCNN. A copy of this letter, dated September 15, 2005, is included as an appendix to this report. The letter informed tribes that we hoped to “learn more about the organization and governance of tribal governments in California” and impressed upon them the importance of their response to the survey.

Approximately one week after the mailing of this announcement letter, we sent the survey to tribes, covered by a letter from Political Science Group investigator Martin Johnson. Copies of the cover letter, dated September 23, 2005, and the survey instrument are included in this report’s Appendix A. Tribes were encouraged to respond to the survey by mail or by facsimile. A self-addressed envelope with postage was included in each survey mailing. In addition, we established a toll-free telephone line to facilitate responses by FAX.

Approximately two weeks following the mailing of the survey, we contacted tribes by telephone to confirm their receipt of the survey. In early November, 2005, approximately six weeks after our initial mailing, we contacted tribal officials a final time with a postcard reminding them to respond to the survey. By the November 30, 2005, our office had received 21 responses to the tribal government survey, representing a 19.6% response rate to the survey.

While this is a comparatively low rate of response, we recognize that this is a special population of respondents with historical reasons to be disinclined to respond to surveys from public entities affiliated with state and federal governments. The major limitation this puts on us with regard to analysis below is that we are unable to do much in the way of multivariate analysis.

Consequently, we focus on differences between the gaming and non-gaming tribes responding to the survey.

## Results of Tribal Government and Public Service Survey

Among our 21 responding tribes, 11 operate casino gaming facilities and 10 do not. We cautiously infer differences between tribal governments according to whether or not they operate a gaming facility. Our primary conclusion is that there is a relationship between tribal gaming and a number of indicators of institutional and governmental development in Indian country. These differences manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Compared to tribal governments that do not engage in gaming, the gaming tribes provide more public services to their members, they have more fully developed tribal legal structures, employ more workers including far more administrators who are not tribe members, develop lines of communication with other local governments, are more likely to be engaged in policy discussions of regional and community issues, and have more diversified economic development activities. There is evidence that California's unique revenue sharing arrangement has produced institutional benefits for non-gaming tribes. Tribes without casinos also appear to have expanded the number of services offered to members, at a rate similar to that of gaming tribes, but have not seen the same amount of institutional development experienced by gaming tribes.

### *Institutional development*

All but one of the responding tribes report they have a written organizing document. These organizing documents include tribal constitutions, articles of association, or charters. Most (15 responses, 71.4% of participants) have a written tribal code. We are particularly interested in the expansiveness of tribal codes. We asked whether or not the tribe's code covers the follow policy issues: Family Law, Housing and Land Use, Environmental, Traffic, Tribal Affairs, Civil Commitments, Juvenile Justice, Commercial Transactions, Torts, Court

Procedures, Criminal Law, or Gaming. Respondents were asked to mark each policy area touched on by their tribal code, as well as given an opportunity to designate other policy areas addressed by their code. Table 2 suggests tribal governments with gaming address more issues in their tribal codes than non-gaming tribes. The median tribe with a casino addresses five of the issues we listed, while the median non-gaming tribe addresses three issues.

Table 2. Counts of specific issues covered by tribal code:

	Casino	No casino	All tribes
Average	5.1	2.8	4.1
Median	5	3	3.5
High	13	5	13
Low	0	0	0

Beyond the specific policy areas we addressed on the questionnaire, we asked tribes to tell us the total number of ordinances in their tribal code and the number that have been added since January 2000, a time just before the passage of Prop. 1A and a period of proliferation for tribal gaming enterprises in California. The median tribe reports that their tribal code has 7 or 8 ordinances and has added 3 ordinances since January 2000. As Table 3 reports, gaming tribes indicate that they have more extensive tribal codes than non-gaming tribes, and their tribal codes are developing at a faster rate. The median gaming tribe reports 13 ordinances in its tribal code, while the median non-gaming tribe reports 4 tribal code ordinances. The median gaming tribe enacted 10 ordinances during the last 5 years, compared to 0 for the median non-gaming tribe. Tribal governments with gaming operations today had more developed institutions in 2000 than tribes that do not operate casinos, but importantly, those institutions are developing at a faster rate.

Table 3. Tribal code ordinances and additions, January 2000 to present

Approximately how many ordinances does your tribe have in its tribal code?

	Casino	No casino	Total
Average	51.2	25.3	39.8
Median	13	4	7.5
High	350	200	350
Low	0	0	0

How many of these ordinances have your tribe enacted since January 2000?

	Casino	No casino	Total
Average	37.8	5.8	23.4
Median	10	0	3
High	300	40	300
Low	0	0	0

*Service delivery*

These results suggest gaming affects the institutional development of tribal governments, but we are also interested in the practical side of governing. What services do these institutions provide members of tribes? We also asked tribes to indicate what services they provide members, identifying an extensive list of possible government activities: Elementary education, Secondary education, College/scholarships, Day care services, Assistance to elders, Aid to dependent children, Aid to disabled members, Preventative health care, Emergency health care, Maternal & child health care, Dental services, Optical services, Geriatric health programs, Psychiatric care, Chemical dependency programs, Cultural preservation, Language preservation, Community activities (including community center), Other cultural activities, Law enforcement, Fire protection, Housing, Employment training, Small business loans, and Solid waste disposal. The survey allowed tribes to indicate whether they currently offer each of these services and whether they offered any of them in January 2000.

The number of services tribes provide appears to have expanded tremendously during the last five years, both for gaming and non-gaming tribes, shown in Table 4. As these tribal leaders recall and as shown in Table 4, the median tribe provided services in two of these areas from among the 25 on the survey in January 2000. The median tribe provides 10 of these specific services today.

Table 4. Counts of specific public services offered to tribe members, all tribes

Total services tribe offers to members (of 25 service areas included on survey)		
	January 2000	2005
Average:	6.7	11.8
Median:	2	10
High:	23	23
Low:	0	0

Given the patterns of institutional development seen with tribal ordinances, it is not surprising that tribal governments with gaming offer more services to members than non-gaming tribes. It is perhaps more interesting that both are aggressively adding services. Table 5 compares the number of services offered by the gaming and non-gaming tribes responding to the survey in 2000 and today. In January 2000, the median gaming tribe reported offering services in 7 of the 25 areas we surveyed, while the median non-gaming tribe reported offering none of these services. By 2005, the median gaming tribe offers 17 services, adding 10, while the median non-gaming tribe offers 9. The median number of services has shifted by the same amount for both gaming and non-gaming tribes, suggesting perhaps that revenue sharing has allowed non-gaming tribes to expand the services they offer in a way that is comparable to non-gaming tribes.

Table 5. Counts of specific services offered, gaming and non-gaming tribes

Total services offered, 2000		
	Casino	No casino
Average	9.8	3.2
Median	7	0
High	23	17
Low	0	0
Total services offered, 2005		
	Casino	No casino
Average	14.9	8.3
Median	17	9
High	23	17
Low	1	0

*Intergovernmental communication and engagement*

The survey also included items intended to explore differences between gaming and non-gaming tribes in their relationships with other neighboring governments and their work on

regional issues outside of internal Indian politics and government. We asked several questions about the amount of work tribal governments do with other local governments and patterns of communication among tribal and local governments, from the perspective of the tribal leaders surveyed. We find that tribal governments with gaming are more likely to say they work with other local governments on local and regional issues than non-gaming tribes. They also report higher levels of communication with other local governments.

We asked respondents to the survey of tribal governments, “How often would you say that your tribe works with city and county governments on issues of local/regional importance?” Across all respondents, there is an even split in the majority of responses – 9 tribes work often with local governments and 9 tribes work occasionally with local tribes. However, once we consider the presence or absence of a gaming operation in Table 6, we see that gaming tribes more often work with local governments than non-gaming tribes: 63.6% of gaming tribes (7) said they often work with local governments, while 22.2% of non-gaming tribes (2) said they often work with local governments.

Table 6. Gaming and work with other local governments

**Frequency of work with other local governments \* Casino Crosstabulation**

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Frequency of work with other local governments	Our tribe works with other local governments often	Count	2	7	9
		% within Casino	22.2%	63.6%	45.0%
	Our tribe occasionally works with other local governments	Count	5	4	9
		% within Casino	55.6%	36.4%	45.0%
	Our tribe rarely works with local governments	Count	2	0	2
		% within Casino	22.2%	.0%	10.0%
Total		Count	9	11	20
		% within Casino	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In addition to this, gaming tribes appear to enjoy a higher quality of communication with other local governments than non-gaming tribes. We asked respondents, “Communication between governments is sometimes difficult. If your tribe has active communication with local city and county governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?” Again, across all tribes, responses were split between categories for communication only on specific issues (10) and active engagement in issues (9). But, as with the patterns reported in Table 6, we find that gaming tribes are far more likely to be actively engaged on local issues (63.6%, 7 respondents), compared to 22.2% (2 respondents) among the non-gaming tribes.

Table 7. Gaming and communication with local governments

**Quality of communication with local governments \* Casino Crosstabulation**

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Quality of communication with local governments	City and county governments are hard to reach	Count % within Casino	1 11.1%	0 .0%	1 5.0%
	City/county governments communicate on specific issues only	Count % within Casino	6 66.7%	4 36.4%	10 50.0%
	City/county governments actively engage us in	Count % within Casino	2 22.2%	7 63.6%	9 45.0%
Total	Count % within Casino	9 100.0%	11 100.0%	20 100.0%	

*Economic development*

While the Economics group has thoroughly investigated the question of economic development, comparing gaming and non-gaming tribes, the survey we fielded builds on their insights. We were particularly interested in self-reported rates of employment, who is employed,

and economic diversification. Tribal governments with gaming employ more members of their tribes as well as non-members, and in a variety of economic sectors. We focus on tribal government and the provision of public services here.

We asked tribes to tell us their “total full-time employment in each of these areas,” and included space for the total number of members and non-members employed in tribal government and public service, gaming enterprises, and other economic activities. In general, gaming tribes employ more members and non-members than non-gaming tribes. Specifically in the government sector, tribal governments with gaming provide more jobs for members and non-members than non-gaming tribes, expanding the administrative capacities of gaming tribes. The median gaming tribe employs 9 members for government activities, while the median non-gaming tribe employs 3 or 4 members in this sector. The median non-gaming tribe employs 3 or 4 non-members in their public sector as well, while the median gaming tribe employs an additional 27 non-members to administer their government and public services, suggesting the presence of a much greater civil service sector working for gaming tribes. These results are consistent with the findings of other researchers who have found Indian casinos produce a great deal of growth in non-Native American employment in their neighboring communities (Brown 2003, Evans and Topoleski 2002).

Table 8. Member and non-member employment for tribal government and public services

Members employed		
	Casino	No casino
Average	33.8	5.2
Median	9	3.5
High	260	14
Low	0	0

Non-members employed

	Casino	No casino
Average	36.3	3.8
Median	27	3.5
High	101	13
Low	1	0

Tribal governments with gaming also have more diversified economies than non-gaming tribes. We asked tribal representatives to indicate which of the following economic development enterprises they engage in: Technology (computers, communications), Manufacturing, Agriculture & Fisheries, Mining (including oil and gas), Other natural resource management, Construction, Gaming, Retail, Hotel, Restaurant, and Live entertainment. We also provided an opportunity for tribes to indicate and list other economic development activities they pursue. Again, we count the number of these 12 areas (including the “Other” category as a 12<sup>th</sup> option), and compare gaming and non-gaming tribes, in Table 9. Across all tribes, the median tribe engages in economic development activities in only 2 economic sectors from among the 12 economic activities we surveyed. However, gaming tribes have much more diversified economic development activities than non-gaming tribes. The median gaming tribe reports engaging in 4 different economic sectors, while the median non-gaming tribe reports engaging in none of the 12 economic sectors we asked about on the survey.

Table 9. Gaming and economic enterprises

Total economic enterprise categories indicated (of 12 possible categories):

	Casino	No casino	All tribes
Average	3.9	0.3	2.3
Median	4	0	2
High	7	2	7
Low	1	0	0

In sum, the tribal governments with gaming that responded to this survey have more developed statutory and political institutions, expanded public services, more government employees, and more diversified economic development programs than the non-gaming tribes that responded. In spite of these differences, non-gaming tribes have expanding the number of services they offer at a rate comparable to gaming tribes. We remain cautious about these conclusions, given the relatively small number of cases we have to draw on for the analysis, but these differences are often substantial. Future research on the effects of tribal government gaming would profitably attempt to further expand the data available for this kind of analysis.

### **3. Intergovernmental Relations between Tribal Governments and Local Neighbors**

Alongside this survey of tribal leaders, we also investigate local responses to tribal governments and gaming by surveying local government officials in California. Here, we are interested in how local policy makers perceive their relations with tribal governments and how these governments fit into the fabric of local communities, from the perspective of their neighbors. Other research has found that tribes are more successful in their dealing with other government – local, state, and federal – as a function of their developing institutional capacity and their own policy expertise (Evans 2005). Certainly given the results of the survey of tribal leaders, we should expect to see differences in the extent to which gaming and non-gaming tribes are involved in local and regional issues and their patterns of communication with other local officials. As tribal governments build resources and their own administrative capacity, we might expect them to have a stronger presence and more visibility in local and regional communities. In this section of our report, we summarize the major insights we develop from a survey of officials in municipalities and counties that neighbor tribal governments in California.

## Methodology for Local Intergovernmental Relations Survey

We purchased contact lists for local California governments from the California State Association of Counties and the League of California Cities. Both of these organizations maintain lists of local officials responsible for a variety of administrative tasks, from the offices of City Clerks across California to municipal public information officers. Many of these officials have functions largely irrelevant to intergovernmental relations between tribes and local bureaucracies. We focused our survey on city officials in charge of community planning, community and economic development, and intergovernmental relations. We purchased mailing information for county officials responsible for planning and community and economic development.<sup>9</sup> We concentrated on planners, developers, and intergovernmental relations agents, because we thought these officials would be more likely for coordinating with Indian officials on development, public works, and long-term space and resource management.

The League of California Cities provided us with contact information for 661 municipal officials representing 445 cities, towns, and other municipalities in the state. The California State Association of Counties lists included 118 officials representing 95 county and regional planning and development agencies. In total, we distributed the survey to 779 potential respondents representing 540 distinct city and county governments. Because these lists were purchased from professional associations, rather than developed from multiple sources, we made no attempt to update the list before sending an announcement letter and the survey. As with the survey of tribal governments, we sent a letter of introduction to these local officials. This letter was sent under the signature of Martin Johnson. A copy of this letter, dated September 14, 2005, is included as an appendix to this report. The letter informed local officials that we hoped to

---

<sup>9</sup> The California State Association of Counties did not provide a list of intergovernmental relations contacts in September 2005 when the survey was fielded.

learn “more about how Indian casinos affect local communities” and impressed upon them the importance of their response to the survey. About two weeks after the mailing of this announcement letter, we sent the survey to local officials, covered by another letter from Johnson. A copy of the cover letter, dated September 30, 2005, and the survey instrument are included in this report’s Appendix B. Local officials were encouraged to respond to the survey by mail. A self-addressed envelope with postage was included in each survey mailing.

In early November, approximately five weeks after our initial mailing, we contacted the local officials a final time with a postcard reminding them to respond to the survey. By November 30, 2005, our office had received 198 responses to the local government survey, representing a 25.4% overall response rate to the survey, computed using the 779 potential individual respondents in the denominator. However, it is worth noting that we received responses from 192 separate municipal and county entities, which means that 35.6% of the 540 distinct governmental units we contacted are represented in the survey. We received responses from 171 municipal officials representing 165 California municipalities (37.1% of the cities we contacted). At the county level, we received 27 responses, each representing different county governments (28.4% of the county and regional development organizations we contacted). Mirroring our analysis of gaming and non-gaming tribes, we focus on differences between local government officials who perceive neighboring tribes with gaming and those without gaming enterprises and those with no neighboring Indian tribes.

#### Results of Local Intergovernmental Relations Survey

As we noted, we invited responses from planning, development, and intergovernmental relations officials. The survey included a place for the respondent to list her or his official title.

Table 10 shows the distribution of responsibilities among our respondents. We have suppressed their actual titles to help preserve the anonymity of respondents to the survey, but using their job titles, we characterize the primary role of each respondent as overall city/county administration, including City Managers, Deputy City Managers, and others; planning; development, including people designated as economic development, community development, or general development officials; intergovernmental relations officers; and respondents with other responsibilities, for example one respondent was a zoning officer and another was responsible for city code enforcement. Several respondents (18, 9.1 percent of respondents) declined to provide a job title.

Table 10. Job responsibilities of survey respondents

Local official responsibilities					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administration, including City Manager's office	24	12.1	12.1	12.1
	Planning	85	42.9	42.9	55.1
	Development, economic and community	59	29.8	29.8	84.8
	Intergovernmental Relations	5	2.5	2.5	87.4
	Other	7	3.5	3.5	90.9
	Declined to state	18	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	198	100.0	100.0	

We asked local officials to tell us how close they are to the nearest Indian tribe in their county. Their responses are shown on Table 11. Similar numbers of our respondents live within 5 miles of an Indian tribe (51 respondents, 28.8% of valid answers), within 5-20 miles of a tribe (40 respondents, 22.6%), more than 20 miles from one (39 respondents, 22.0%), or far enough away that they do not think the question applies to them (47 respondents, 26.8%). An additional 21 respondents did not answer the question.

Table 11. Respondent government distance from nearest neighboring Indian tribe

**Distance from tribes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5 miles	51	25.8	28.8	28.8
	5-10 miles	15	7.6	8.5	37.3
	10-15 miles	13	6.6	7.3	44.6
	15-20 miles	12	6.1	6.8	51.4
	More than 20 miles	39	19.7	22.0	73.4
	Does not apply	47	23.7	26.6	100.0
	Total	177	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	10.6		
Total		198	100.0		

We also asked respondents whether any of the tribal governments near them operated gaming facilities: “Do tribes near you operate a casino or other gaming facility?” The response set included options for yes and no responses, as well as “Does not apply.” Shown in Table 12, we have strong responses from officials with neighboring gaming tribes (40.3 % of responses, 77 cases), neighboring non-gaming tribes (28.3% of responses, 54 cases), and those with no tribe sufficiently close to their community for the respondent to feel the question applies to him or her (31.4%, 60 cases). Responses to this question allow us to compare the responses of local officials in communities with tribal government gaming to those in communities with tribes that do not operate gaming facilities to those with no tribes nearby. In most of the tables below, we produce a report on the response frequencies for officials living near tribal governments with gaming, those with non-gaming Indian neighbors, officials not aware of local tribes, and all survey respondents. This allows us to draw comparisons across these subgroups.

Table 12. Proximity to gaming tribes, non-gaming tribes, or none at all

**Nearby Indian casinos**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	77	38.9	40.3	40.3
	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	54	27.3	28.3	68.6
	Does not apply	60	30.3	31.4	100.0
	Total	191	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	3.5		
Total		198	100.0		

*Intergovernmental communication and engagement: Local issues*

We asked local officials a number of questions intended to gauge the strength of their relationships with neighboring tribes, if present. Relationships tend to build on communication. Consequently, we begin with a question about whether local governments communicate with neighboring tribes: “Acknowledging that communication between governments is sometimes difficult, if your city/county has active communication with tribal governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?” Across all respondents, the majority of officials (51.9%) said the question did not apply to them, suggesting little contact and communication between tribes and local officials. Just more than one-third of responses (33.5%) said they communicated with tribal governments on specific issues. Only 8.1% of officials said they found tribal governments to be active on local issues. Importantly, these respondents are concentrated entirely among officials who neighbor tribes with casino operations: One-fifth of officials near tribes with gaming facilities identify tribes in their area as actively engaged in local issues. Almost half (49.3%) of officials near gaming tribes identified these neighbors as communicative on selected issues.

Table 13. Communication among local governments, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

Quality of communication with tribes \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Quality of communication with tribes	Tribal governments are hard to reach	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	3 5.9%	3 5.1%	9 4.9%
	Tribal governments communicate on specific issues only	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	37 49.3%	21 41.2%	4 6.8%	62 33.5%
	Tribal governments are active in a variety of issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	15 20.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	15 8.1%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	17 22.7%	27 52.9%	52 88.1%	96 51.9%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	3 1.6%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	51 100.0%	59 100.0%	185 100.0%	

In a similar vein, we asked whether local officials see tribes in their area involved in important issues: “How often would you say that your government works with tribes on issues of local or regional importance?” Local officials in communities near tribes with casinos see Indian tribes far more active in regionally important issues than officials perceive neighboring tribes without casinos. Almost one-fourth of respondents (23.7%) in communities near gaming tribes see these nations as “constantly engaged in area issues” compared to 5.6% of respondents from communities with non-gaming neighboring tribes. The distributions of these responses are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Activity of tribes in local issues, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Activity of tribes in local issues \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Activity of tribes in local issues	Tribes in our area are constantly engaged in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	18 23.7%	3 5.6%	2 3.4%	23 12.2%
	Tribes in our area are occasionally active in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	41 53.9%	23 42.6%	9 15.5%	73 38.8%
	Tribes in our area are not active in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	11 14.5%	13 24.1%	3 5.2%	27 14.4%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	4 5.3%	15 27.8%	44 75.9%	63 33.5%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	2 2.6%	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 1.1%
<b>Total</b>	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	76 100.0%	54 100.0%	58 100.0%	188 100.0%	

Local officials in communities with casinos are more likely than officials in communities near non-gaming tribes to recognize the importance of joint cooperation with tribal leaders on local issues rather than reserve the leadership role for themselves. We asked, “Who do you think should take the lead on local issues that affect both tribal and local governments?” Shown in Table 15, the majority of communities accept the joint cooperation model as ideal, but this is more popular among communities neighboring gaming tribes (88.0%) than among communities neighboring non-gaming tribes (65.4%) or communities with no tribal neighbors (32.2%). This finding may reflect increased local confidence in the administrative capacities of tribal governments with casino operations, the resources these tribes may be thought to bring to bear, or both.

Table 15. Best leader on local issues, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Best leader on local and regional issues \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Best leader on local and regional issues	Local governments should take the lead	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	5 6.7%	8 15.4%	7 11.9%	20 10.8%
	Tribes should take the lead	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	2 3.8%	1 1.7%	6 3.2%
	Joint cooperation between governments is best	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	66 88.0%	34 65.4%	19 32.2%	119 64.0%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	1 1.3%	8 15.4%	32 54.2%	41 22.0%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	52 100.0%	59 100.0%	186 100.0%	

*Intergovernmental communication and engagement: Primary points of contact and information*

We are also interested in the primary point of contact between local officials and tribes: “If your city/county has contact with tribal governments, with whom do you deal with most often in terms of intergovernmental issues?” Local officials near tribal governments with gaming are more likely to interact with tribes through local tribes’ professional administrative staff, while officials near non-gaming tribes are more likely not to deal with tribes at all. More than one-third of community officials (36.5%) who neighbor gaming tribes said they interact with professional tribe administrators, compared to 10.0% of community leaders near non-gaming tribes. This may reflect the expanded public sector employment offered by tribes, seen in Table 8 above.

Table 16. Primary tribe contract for local officials, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Primary tribe contact \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Primary tribe contact	A tribal spokesperson or communication officer	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	19 25.7%	19 38.0%	4 7.0%	42 23.2%
	Professional tribal administrative management	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	27 36.5%	5 10.0%	1 1.8%	33 18.2%
	Tribal council members	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	5 6.8%	4 8.0%	2 3.5%	11 6.1%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	16 21.6%	22 44.0%	50 87.7%	88 48.6%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	7 9.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	7 3.9%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	74 100.0%	50 100.0%	57 100.0%	181 100.0%	

Another approach to this question involves sources of information about tribal governments and the gaming issue: “Information can be obtained from many sources, but where have you obtained most of your information about Indians and tribal governments?” We also asked about sources of information on “Indian casinos and gaming activities.” Officials in communities near a tribal gaming facility are three times more likely to cite direct communication with tribal governments as their primary source of information about Indians than officials near tribes without a casino, 48.6% compared to 16.7%, shown in Table 17. A similar but weaker pattern is observed for sources of information about tribal casinos and gaming, seen in Table 18. Local governments are primarily informed about tribal government gaming through local news media, but 12.7% of local officials neighboring gaming tribes cite direct contact with tribes as their principal source of gaming information, compared to 2.0% (1 respondents) among officials near non-gaming tribes.

Table 17. Officials’ information about Indians, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Main source of information about Indians \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Main source of information about Indians	Local news sources	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	22 30.6%	15 31.3%	23 53.5%	60 36.8%
	Professional organizations/publications	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	7 9.7%	9 18.8%	15 34.9%	31 19.0%
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	8 11.1%	15 31.3%	3 7.0%	26 16.0%
	Direct contact with tribal governments	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	35 48.6%	8 16.7%	2 4.7%	45 27.6%
	Reports filed by tribal governments	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	0 .0%	1 2.1%	0 .0%	1 .6%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	72 100.0%	48 100.0%	43 100.0%	163 100.0%	

Table 18. Officials’ information about Indian gaming, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Main source of information about Indian casinos \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Main source of information about Indian casinos	Local news sources	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	38 53.5%	34 68.0%	43 82.7%	115 66.5%
	Professional organizations/publications	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	15 21.1%	10 20.0%	9 17.3%	34 19.7%
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	9 12.7%	5 10.0%	0 .0%	14 8.1%
	Direct contact with tribal governments	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	9 12.7%	1 2.0%	0 .0%	10 5.8%
Total		Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	71 100.0%	50 100.0%	52 100.0%	173 100.0%

*Public service provision contracts between local governments and tribes*

Given our interest in the services tribal governments provide their members, we also asked local governments about patterns of service delivery and relationships among local governments and neighboring tribes for the delivery of public services. We asked these local municipal and county officials whether any tribes receive any services from them: “Do any tribal government contract with your government to provide services to Indian communities (for example, police or fire services)?” We also asked whether their municipal or county government receives public services from any local tribal government: “Does your government contract with any tribal government to receive services they provide (for example, police or fire services)?”

Shown in Table 19, these kinds of relationships for the provision of services are not the norm. However, where they exist at all, they are concentrated in communities with tribal gaming

operations. More than one-fourth (26.8%) of officials in communities with tribal gaming operations reported contracts to provide services to tribes, compared to 1.9% (1 respondent) among the officials with non-gaming neighbors. Contracting to receive services from tribes is less common, but again if it happens, it involves tribes with casinos: 8.3% (6 respondents) of officials near Indian casinos said their city or county government receives services from the neighboring tribe. These relationships were not reported by officials near non-gaming tribes.

Table 19a. Contracts for service delivery with tribes, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to provide services \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Contracting with tribes for city/county to provide services	Tribes contract to receive services from our government	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	19 26.8%	1 1.9%	1 1.7%	21 11.5%
	Tribes do not contract to receive services from our gov't	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	52 73.2%	52 98.1%	57 98.3%	161 88.5%
Total		Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	71 100.0%	53 100.0%	58 100.0%	182 100.0%

Table 19b. Contracts for service delivery with tribes, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to receive services \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Contracting with tribes for city/county to receive services	Our government contracts to receive services from a tribe	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	6 8.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	6 3.2%
	Our government does not contract for services from a tribe	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	66 91.7%	54 100.0%	59 100.0%	179 96.8%
Total		Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	72 100.0%	54 100.0%	59 100.0%	185 100.0%

*Evaluations of Indian casino gaming*

We also assess the reactions of these local officials to Indian casinos and their evaluations of gaming operations in the state. In general, we find these planning, development, and intergovernmental relations officials reflect the controversy surrounding the issue. On balance, however, gaming appears to be more popular and more likely to be perceived as beneficial to communities and local economies in places with gaming tribes than in localities without Indian gaming operations nearby.

Table 20. The perceived economic effects of casinos, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Casino effects on business \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Casino effects on business	Help business	Count	32	4	2	38
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	49.2%	7.7%	3.4%	21.7%
	Have no effect	Count	19	7	5	31
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	29.2%	13.5%	8.6%	17.7%
	Hurt business	Count	8	7	1	16
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	12.3%	13.5%	1.7%	9.1%
	Does not apply	Count	6	34	50	90
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	9.2%	65.4%	86.2%	51.4%
Total		Count	65	52	58	175
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

We asked officials whether gaming had positive or negative effects on business in their community and whether it had positive or negative effects on the community itself. Shown in Table 20, just less than half (49.2%) of the local government officials in communities near tribal governments operating a casino see gaming as a benefit to the local business community, compared to the 12.3% of officials (8 respondents) who perceive tribal government gaming hurt

local businesses. Only 7.7% of the officials we surveyed in communities with non-gaming tribes perceive casinos as beneficial to business. The majority of respondents in these communities (65.4%) indicated the question did not apply to them, but 13.5% (7 respondents) said Indian casinos hurt businesses.

Table 21 demonstrates that local government officials near tribal governments with gaming are more likely to associate positive effects of gaming operations on their communities (16.2%) than officials without gaming tribes (0%). That said, the majority of officials in communities near gaming tribes (52.7%) see both positive and negative community effects. Officials near gaming tribes are also slightly more likely than respondents near non-gaming tribes to see negative community effects (12.2% compared to 9.4%), but this is not a major difference.

Table 21. Perceived effects of gaming, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

**Casino effects of communities \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Casino effects of communities	Positive impact on community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	12 16.2%	0 .0%	2 3.3%	14 7.5%
	Negative impact on community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	9 12.2%	5 9.4%	1 1.7%	15 8.0%
	Both positive and negative impacts on community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	39 52.7%	2 3.8%	0 .0%	41 21.9%
	Neither positive and negative impacts on community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	8 10.8%	7 13.2%	9 15.0%	24 12.8%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	6 8.1%	39 73.6%	48 80.0%	93 49.7%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	74 100.0%	53 100.0%	60 100.0%	187 100.0%	

Finally in Tables 22 and 23, we examine the extent to which tribal government gaming is thought controversial in California communities. We asked officials whether Indian gaming is controversial as well as whether requests for Indian casino compacts have provided controversy. We find that tribal government gaming and compacts are less likely to be issues at all in communities with tribes that do not operate casinos, with the majority of respondents in these communities saying questions about gaming controversy and disputes over compacts do not apply to them (72.0% and 79.2%, respectively). In communities near tribes with casinos, one-third of respondents (33.3%) report no controversy, 36.0% report occasional controversy, and one-quarter (24.0%) report frequent controversy over gaming. In these communities, compacts have been less controversial: 21.5% said compacts were actively opposed, one-third (32.3%) reported moderate controversy, and 20.0% indicated no controversy over compact requests.

Table 22. Local controversy over gaming, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

Local controversy over gaming \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Local controversy over gaming	Indian gaming is not controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	25 33.3%	3 6.0%	1 1.7%	29 15.8%
	Indian gaming is sometimes controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	27 36.0%	2 4.0%	2 3.4%	31 16.8%
	Indian gaming is often controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	18 24.0%	9 18.0%	1 1.7%	28 15.2%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	4 5.3%	36 72.0%	55 93.2%	95 51.6%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	1 1.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .5%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	50 100.0%	59 100.0%	184 100.0%	

Table 23. Local controversy over gaming compacts, gaming/non-gaming tribal neighbors

Local controversy over gaming compacts \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Local controversy over gaming compacts	Gaming pacts were requested by tribes without controversy	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	13 20.0%	0 .0%	1 1.7%	14 7.9%
	Gaming pacts requests were moderately controversial	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	21 32.3%	1 1.9%	4 6.7%	26 14.6%
	Gaming pacts were actively fought by area residents	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	14 21.5%	10 18.9%	1 1.7%	25 14.0%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	17 26.2%	42 79.2%	54 90.0%	113 63.5%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	65 100.0%	53 100.0%	60 100.0%	178 100.0%	

#### 4. Discussion

This is a great deal of new information about intergovernmental relations in California and the relationships among casino gaming operations, institutional development, and service delivery for tribal governments in the state. We would be remiss, however, if we did not raise a few caveats, as well as make some broad conclusions. As noted, the data that underlies many of these conclusions is limited. Little research has systematically engaged tribal governments in the manner that we have here. Tribal governments are perhaps less accustomed than other governmental entities to being asked for information in this way. Many tribal governments may not be enthusiastic about sharing information about their inner-workings with anyone, including university researchers. Only 21 tribes responded to our survey, but several experts familiar with this project, including researcher Jonathan Taylor, anticipated a much smaller response, given anticipated difficulties associated with collecting data directly from tribes. Perhaps as this initial

report is disseminated future research on American Indian tribal politics, government, and intergovernmental relations will receive even more enthusiastic responses from native nations in California.

We have similar concerns about the local government data collected here. While we have more data from local governments and the overall response rate is greater than the response rate for tribes, both the 25.4% response rate and the figure of 35.6% of contact governments responding to our survey are lower levels of response than we would have liked. Many local government officials might have found the topics discussed in the survey too sensitive to participate in it. Further, several local government officials who have limited experience with Indian tribes contacted our research team to inform us that they would not respond to the survey because they did not think their experiences would inform our research. So we recognize these limitations as well as the possibility that governments with contact with tribes and gaming tribes in particular may be overrepresented in the survey relative to local governments with non-gaming neighbors and less contact with Indian tribes.

These caveats notwithstanding, we reach several major conclusions from these survey projects:

- a. There is no shortage of controversy over the issue of Indian gaming.** Public support for legalizing Indian gaming *may* be slipping. Californians and bureaucrats in local governments see benefits as well as costs associated with tribal government gaming. On balance, the public and these local officials appear to see more benefits than costs, but are certainly aware of both.
- b. That said, there is a relationship between the institutional and administrative capacities of tribal governments and whether they operate a casino facility.** This

relationship manifests itself in a variety of ways. Compared to tribes that do not have casino operations, gaming tribes have more extensive tribal codes, tribal legal structures that are developing more quickly, more professional administrative staff, and generally more public sector employment. From the viewpoint of neighboring governments, local officials with gaming tribes are more likely than officials with neighboring tribes without casinos to interact with professional staff and recognize tribal governments as regional partners.

- c. Further, Indian gaming is associated with more government services for tribal members, and services provided both on and off Indian lands.** Tribal governments with gaming facilities offer more services than non-gaming tribes, but non-gaming tribes have been able to expand the services they provide during the last 5 years, perhaps due to revenue sharing with gaming tribes. In addition to providing more services to tribe members, gaming tribes are more likely than non-gaming tribes to contract to receive from and, in some cases, provide services to neighboring non-Indian governments.
- d. Gaming tribes have more diversified economic development programs and create more jobs than non-gaming tribes.** Again, this research is based on a small amount of data but this conclusion complements research in other portions of this project as well. We find tribal governments with gaming invest in economic activities outside of gaming operations. They produce more public sector, gaming, and other enterprise employment opportunities than non-gaming tribes. These jobs affect members as well as non-members.

## References

- Boehmke, Fredrick J., and Richard Witmer. 2002. "State and American Indian Negotiation of Gaming Compacts: An Event Count Approach." University of Iowa. Typescript.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Joseph P. Kalt. 2003 "Alaska Native Self-Government and Service Delivery: What Works?" Joint Occasional Papers on Native Affairs No. 2003-01. Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Project on Native American Indian Economic Development.
- Dunstan, Roger. 1997. *Gambling in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau. <http://www.library.ca.gov/CRB/97/03/crb97003.html> (Accessed January 5, 2006).
- Evans, Laura. 2005. "The Use of Expertise: Exploring Tribes Relations with States." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2005, Chicago, IL.
- Evans, William N., and Julie Topoleski. 2002. "The Social and Economic Impacts of Native American Casinos," National Bureau of Economic Research working papers number 9198. Issued in September 2002. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- McCulloch, Anne Merline. 1994. "The Politics of Indian Gaming: Tribe/State Relations and American Federalism" *Publius* 24(3):99-112.
- Teske, Paul, and Bela Sur. 1991. "Winners and Losers: Politics, Casino Gambling, and Development in Atlantic City." *Policy Studies Review* 10(2/3): 130-7.

**APPENDIX A**

**Tribal Government and Public Service Survey**

## Tribal Government and Public Service Survey Announcement Letter

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

---

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

---

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OFFICE OF THE DEAN  
(951) 827-2762

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

September 15, 2005

[Contact Name]  
[Title]  
[Tribe Name]  
[Address]  
[City, CA ZIP Code]

Dear [Contact Name]:

I am writing to invite you to take part in an exciting research project at the University of California, Riverside to help the public understand tribal sovereignty. We hope to learn more about the organization and governance of tribal governments in California in order to show how tribes are impacting the economy of the state of California. In order to do this, we need your help!

Next week, a researcher at University of California, Riverside, will send you a survey in the mail asking questions about the size of your tribe, your government, economic development for the tribe and its members, and your relationships with other governments. His name is Dr. Martin Johnson, in the UC-Riverside Political Science department. We respectfully request your response to the survey as part of this effort.

This research on tribal governance, economic development, and local relations between tribes and other governments is part of UCR's mission to create partnerships with tribes in California. As part of this effort, we recently came together for a symposium with UC-Riverside researchers and representatives of the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. The research is supported with help from the California Nations Indian Gaming Association. To learn more about the study, please visit our website at [www.americanindian.ucr.edu](http://www.americanindian.ucr.edu) or contact Dr. Kate Spilde Contreras at (760) 533-9387.

This study is committed to keeping names and places confidential in all survey work. Our analysis of the data with this survey will not refer to, or use, the names of specific individuals or communities. You are not obliged to complete the survey and are free to decline participation entirely or with respect to particular items on the survey you will receive in the near future. Of course, we realize the many demands made on you, and we appreciate the time you devote to our project.

We hope you will take time to participate in this research study and tell us more about your government. The survey will arrive by mail in a few days. If you have any questions about this project, about the Center for California Native Nations, or I can be of any assistance, please contact me at (951) 827-2762.

Sincerely,

Joel Martin  
Professor and Costo Chair of American Indian Affairs  
Co-Director, Center for California Native Nations

## Indian Government and Public Service Survey Cover Letter

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE  
(951) 827-4612

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

September 23, 2005

[Contact Name]  
[Title]  
[Tribe Name]  
[Address]  
[City, CA ZIP Code]

#### RE: INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICE SURVEY

The Center for California Native Nations at University of California, Riverside, is investigating local governance in California communities. We are specifically interested in the relationships between Indian governments, cities, and counties in the state.

Enclosed you will find a survey asking questions about issues related to these relationships, the provision of public services, and Indian economic development, including casino gaming. Your responses to this survey are confidential; meaning reports using this survey information will combine all responses and not identify you specifically or single out your answers.

This study complies with the University of California's human subjects protection protocols, which mandate an uncompromising commitment to keeping names and places confidential in all survey work. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You are free to decline participation entirely or with respect to particular items on the survey. Of course, we realize the many demands made on you, and we appreciate the time you devote to our project. The survey is intentionally brief - two pages of questions.

We hope you will take time to participate in this short survey and tell us more about your government and how it relates to other governments. If you have any questions about this project, or would like a copy of the report on the information we collect, you can contact me by email ([martin.johnson@ucr.edu](mailto:martin.johnson@ucr.edu)), telephone (951-827-4612) and FAX (1-888-213-3791).

Again, thank you for participating in the survey. When you have completed it, please return the using the enclosed addressed and stamped envelope or **fax it to us at 1-888-213-3791**.

Sincerely,

Martin Johnson  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science  
University of California, Riverside

**Tribal Government and Public Service Survey Results**

**FREQUENCIES AND SUMMARY STATISTICS**

1. Name of Tribe: [Responses coded verbatim]
2. Name of representative completing survey: [Responses coded verbatim]
3. Title: [Responses coded verbatim]

**Tribal Government**

4. Does your government have a written Constitution, Articles of Association, Articles of Organization, or Corporate charter?

**Written Constitution or other organizing document**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	95.2	95.2	95.2
	No	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

5. Does your tribe have a written tribal code that establishes laws for members of the tribe?

**Written tribal code**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	23.8	25.0	25.0
	Yes	15	71.4	75.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

6. Please indicate which of the following issues are covered by your tribal code?

**Family Law**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	80.0	80.0
	Yes	4	19.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

6. Issues covered by tribal code, continued

**Housing and land use**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	6	28.6	30.0	30.0
	Yes	14	66.7	70.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Environmental**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	38.1	40.0	40.0
	Yes	12	57.1	60.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Traffic**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	80.0	80.0
	Yes	4	19.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Tribal affairs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	38.1	40.0	40.0
	Yes	12	57.1	60.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Civil Commitments**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	85.0	85.0
	Yes	3	14.3	15.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

6. Issues covered by tribal code, continued

**Juvenile Justice**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	85.0	85.0
	Yes	3	14.3	15.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Commercial transactions**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	85.0	85.0
	Yes	3	14.3	15.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Torts**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	75.0	75.0
	Yes	5	23.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Court procedures**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	75.0	75.0
	Yes	5	23.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Criminal law**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	85.7	90.0	90.0
	Yes	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

6. Issues covered by tribal code, continued

**Gaming**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	60.0	60.0
	Yes	8	38.1	40.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Other tribal code issues**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	70.0	70.0
	Yes	6	28.6	30.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

6. Total issues covered by tribal code from Question 6:

**Average:** 4.1  
**Median:** 3.5  
**High:** 13  
**Low:** 0

7. Approximately how many ordinances does your tribe have in its tribal code?

**Average:** 39.8  
**Median:** 7.5  
**High:** 350  
**Low:** 0

8. How many of these ordinances have your tribe enacted since January 2000?

**Average:** 23.4  
**Median:** 3  
**High:** 300  
**Low:** 0

9. How many enrolled members does your tribe have? (total number)

**Average:** 344.6  
**Median:** 284.5  
**High:** 1,084  
**Low:** 0

10a. Does your tribe have land in trust, or a reservation?

**Does tribe have land in trust, or a reservation?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	18	85.7	90.0	90.0
	No	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

10b. If so, how many Native Americans reside on this land?

**Average: 116.2**  
**Median: 39.5**  
**High: 600**  
**Low: 0**

**Government Services**

11. We are interested in what services your tribe's government provides for members today and in the past. For each service listed, check off ones you currently provide and those you were providing in January 2000.

a. Elementary education

**Elementary education 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total		21	100.0	100.0	

**Elementary education 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
Total		21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

b. Secondary education

**Secondary education 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Secondary education 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

c. College/scholarships

**College scholarships 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Yes	16	76.2	76.2	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**College scholarships 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	11	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Yes	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 6**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

d. Day care service

**Daycare 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Yes	12	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Daycare 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Yes	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

e. Assistance to elders

**Assistance to elders 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Yes	16	76.2	76.2	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Assistance to elders 2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	Yes	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 8**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

f. Aid to dependent children

**Aid to dependent children 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Aid to dependent children 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Yes	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

g. Aid to disabled members

**Aid to disabled members 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Yes	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Aid to disabled members 2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

h. Preventative health care

**Preventative health care 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	11	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Yes	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Preventative health care 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	76.2	76.2
	Yes	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 5**

i. Emergency health care

**Emergency health care 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Yes	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Emergency health care 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

j. Maternal & child health care

**Maternal and child health care 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Yes	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Maternal and child health care 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 3**

k. Dental services

**Dental services 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Yes	12	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Dental services 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 6**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

l. Optical services

**Optical services 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Optical services 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	76.2	76.2
	Yes	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 2**

m. Geriatric health programs

**Geriatric health programs 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Geriatric health programs 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 2**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

n. Psychiatric care

**Psychiatric care 1/2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Psychiatric care 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 0**

o. Chemical dependency programs

**Chemical dependency 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	11	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Yes	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Chemical dependency 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	Yes	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 2**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

p. Cultural preservation

**Cultural preservation 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Yes	16	76.2	76.2	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Cultural preservation 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 10**

q. Language preservation

**Language preservation 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	11	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Yes	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Language preservation 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 4**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

r. Community activities (including community center)

**Community activities 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Yes	15	71.4	71.4	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Community activities 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	Yes	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 7**

s. Other cultural activities

**Other cultural activities 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Yes	14	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Other cultural activities 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 7**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

t. Law enforcement

**Law enforcement 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Law enforcement 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 0**

u. Fire protection

**Fire protection 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Fire protection 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Yes	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number removing: 2**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

v. Housing

**Housing 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Yes	18	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Housing 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Yes	13	61.9	61.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 5**

w. Employment training

**Employment training 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	14	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Yes	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Employment training 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	76.2	76.2
	Yes	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number removing: 2**

11. Tribe services offered, continued

x. Small business loans

**Small business loans 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Yes	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Small business loans 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	81.0	81.0	81.0
	Yes	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number removing: 1**

y. Solid waste disposal

**Solid waste disposal 2005**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Yes	13	61.9	61.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Solid waste disposal 1/2000**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Number adding: 6**

Total services offered in Question 11

	<b>January 2000</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Average:</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>11.8</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10.0</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Economic Development**

12. What is your tribe's total full-time employment in each of these areas:

a. Tribal government & public services:

Members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>20.2</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

Non-members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>20.8</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

b. Gaming and related enterprises (gaming tribes only):

Members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>21.8</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>140</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

Non-members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>832.8</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>3000</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

c. Other business activities:

Members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

Non-members employed

<b>Average:</b>	<b>14.1</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>0</b>

13. Has the number of employees grown since January 2000?

**Has the number of employees grown since January 2000?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	15	71.4	78.9	78.9
	No	4	19.0	21.1	100.0
	Total	19	90.5	100.0	
Missing	0	2	9.5		
Total		21	100.0		

14. Please identify the types of economic enterprises your tribe currently engages in.

**Technology**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	20	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Yes	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Manufacturing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	21	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Agriculture and fisheries**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	20	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Yes	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Mining (inc. oil and gas)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	21	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Other natural resource mgmt.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	19	90.5	90.5	90.5
	Yes	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

14. Economic enterprises, continued

**Construction**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Yes	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Gaming**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Yes	12	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Retail**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	19	90.5	90.5	90.5
	Yes	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Hotel**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Restaurant**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	Yes	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**Live entertainment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

14. Economic enterprises, continued

**Other economic development**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	76.2	76.2	76.2
	Yes	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

Total economic enterprises categories indicated in Question 14:

**Average: 2.2**  
**Median: 2**  
**High: 7**  
**Low: 0**

**Government Relations**

15. How often would you say that your tribe works with city and county governments on issues of local/regional importance?

**Frequency of work with other local governments**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Our tribe works with other local governments often	9	42.9	45.0	45.0
	Our tribe occassionally works with other local governments	9	42.9	45.0	90.0
	Our tribe rarely works with local governments	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

16. If your tribe has contact with city/county governments, with whom do you deal with most often in terms of intergovernmental issues?

**Primary local government contact**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A local government communications officer	3	14.3	15.0	15.0
	Professional city or county administrative management	6	28.6	30.0	45.0
	Local elected officials	11	52.4	55.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

17. Communication between governments is sometimes difficult. If your tribe has active communication with local city and county governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?

**Quality of communication with local governments**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	City and county governments are hard to reach	1	4.8	5.0	5.0
	City/county governments communicate on specific issues only	10	47.6	50.0	55.0
	City/county governments actively engage us in issues	9	42.9	45.0	100.0
	Total	20	95.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

18. If you or other tribal governments in your area engage in gaming activities, how controversial would you say gaming activities are in your community?

**Local gaming controversy**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tribal gaming is not a controversial issue	6	28.6	31.6	31.6
	Tribal gaming is sometimes a controversial issue	4	19.0	21.1	52.6
	Tribal gaming is often controversial in our community	7	33.3	36.8	89.5
	Does not apply to our tribe	2	9.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	19	90.5	100.0	
Missing	0	1	4.8		
	System	1	4.8		
	Total	2	9.5		
Total		21	100.0		

19. Who do you think should take the lead on local issues that affect both tribal and local governments?

**Best leader on local issues**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Joint cooperation between tribal and local governments is best	20	95.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	0	1	4.8		
Total		21	100.0		

**Gaming Operations**

If you do operate a gaming facility,

20. In what year was the tribe's initial gaming facility (i.e., a bingo hall, card room, or facility for gaming devices) built:

**Median: 1995**  
**Most recent: 2005**  
**Oldest: 1980**

21. In what year did your first offer each of the following gaming opportunities?

a. Bingo

<b>Median:</b>	<b>1984</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>1998</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1980</b>

b. Other games similar to bingo

<b>Median:</b>	<b>1987</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>1990</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1984</b>

c. Poker

<b>Median:</b>	<b>1995</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1981</b>

d. Table games (including black jack)

<b>Median:</b>	<b>1996</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1981</b>

e. Slot machines

<b>Median:</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1994</b>

21. Gaming facility development timing, continued

f. Video poker

<b>Median:</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Most recent:</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Oldest:</b>	<b>1995</b>

22. What is the current size (in square feet) of the tribe's gaming facility (gaming floor only):

<b>Average:</b>	<b>72,483.33</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>31,500</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>3,600</b>

23. What is the minimum wage paid to casino employees?

<b>Average:</b>	<b>\$7.14</b>
<b>Median:</b>	<b>\$6.75</b>
<b>High:</b>	<b>\$8.50</b>
<b>Low:</b>	<b>\$6.50</b>

## CROSTABLATIONS WITH CASINO PRESENCE

The following tables present responses to survey items comparing tribes with a casino to tribes without a casino. We determine whether a tribe operates a casino from compacts and survey responses about casino operations.

On most tables below, each column represents a subgroup of the population and the percentages of responses in each column sum to 100 percent. In the cells, we report the number and percentage of responses to the given question in each of these three subgroups. The best way to understand what is going on in each of the tables below is to compare responses within rows and across the columns. For example, in the first table we compare the responses of tribes with a casino to those without a casino on the question of whether the tribe has a written organizing document. All of the non-casino tribes responding to the survey have a constitution, articles of association, or a compact, while 90.9% of respondents operating a casino (10 of 11 responses) report having an organizing document.

### Tribal Government

4. Does your government have a written Constitution, Articles of Association, Articles of Organization, or Corporate charter?

**Written Constitution or other organizing document \* Casino Crosstabulation**

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Written Constitution or other organizing document	Yes	Count	10	10	20
		% within Casino	100.0%	90.9%	95.2%
	No	Count	0	1	1
		% within Casino	.0%	9.1%	4.8%
Total		Count	10	11	21
		% within Casino	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

5. Does your tribe have a written tribal code that establishes laws for members of the tribe?

**Written tribal code \* Casino Crosstabulation**

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Written tribal code	No	Count	2	3	5
		% within Casino	22.2%	27.3%	25.0%
	Yes	Count	7	8	15
		% within Casino	77.8%	72.7%	75.0%
Total		Count	9	11	20
		% within Casino	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

6. Please indicate which of the following issues are covered by your tribal code?

Total issues covered by tribal code:

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

7. Approximately how many ordinances does your tribe have in its tribal code?

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>25.3</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

8. How many of these ordinances have your tribe enacted since January 2000?

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>5.8</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

9. How many enrolled members does your tribe have? (total number)

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>320.2</b>	<b>374.4</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>320</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>1,084</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>

10a. Does your tribe have land in trust, or a reservation?

**Does tribe have land in trust, or a reservation? \* Casino Crosstabulation**

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Does tribe have land in trust, or a reservation?	Yes	Count	8	10	18
		% within Casino	80.0%	100.0%	90.0%
	No	Count	2	0	2
		% within Casino	20.0%	.0%	10.0%
Total	Count	10	10	20	
	% within Casino	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

10b. If so, how many Native Americans reside on this land?

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>135.8</b>	<b>92.1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### **Government Services**

11. We are interested in what services your tribe's government provides for members today and in the past. For each service listed, check off ones you currently provide and those you were providing in January 2000.

Total services offered, 2005

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

Total services offered, 2000

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Economic Development**

12. What is your tribe’s total full-time employment in each of these areas:

a. Tribal government & public services:

Members employed

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>5.2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Non-members employed

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

c. Other business activities:

Members employed

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>.1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Non-members employed

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>.1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

13. Has the number of employees grown since January 2000?

Has the number of employees grown since January 2000? \* Casino Crosstabulation

			Casino		Total
			No casino	Operates casino	
Has the number of employees grown since January 2000?	Yes	Count	6	9	15
		% within Casino	66.7%	90.0%	78.9%
	No	Count	3	1	4
		% within Casino	33.3%	10.0%	21.1%
Total	Count	9	10	19	
	% within Casino	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

14. Please identify the types of economic enterprises your tribe currently engages in.

Total economic enterprises categories indicated:

	<b>Casino</b>	<b>No casino</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**Government Relations**

15. How often would you say that your tribe works with city and county governments on issues of local/regional importance?

**Frequency of work with other local governments \* Gaming Crosstabulation**

			Gaming		Total
			No	Yes	
Frequency of work with other local governments	Our tribe works with other local governments often	Count % within Gaming	2 25.0%	7 58.3%	9 45.0%
	Our tribe occasionally works with other local governments	Count % within Gaming	4 50.0%	5 41.7%	9 45.0%
	Our tribe rarely works with local governments	Count % within Gaming	2 25.0%	0 .0%	2 10.0%
Total		Count % within Gaming	8 100.0%	12 100.0%	20 100.0%

16. If your tribe has contact with city/county governments, with whom do you deal with most often in terms of intergovernmental issues?

**Primary local government contact \* Gaming Crosstabulation**

			Gaming		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary local government contact	A local government communications officer	Count % within Gaming	2 25.0%	1 8.3%	3 15.0%
	Professional city or county administrative management	Count % within Gaming	1 12.5%	5 41.7%	6 30.0%
	Local elected officials	Count % within Gaming	5 62.5%	6 50.0%	11 55.0%
Total		Count % within Gaming	8 100.0%	12 100.0%	20 100.0%

17. Communication between governments is sometimes difficult. If your tribe has active communication with local city and county governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?

**Quality of communication with local governments \* Gaming Crosstabulation**

			Gaming		Total
			No	Yes	
Quality of communication with local governments	City and county governments are hard to reach	Count % within Gaming	1 12.5%	0 .0%	1 5.0%
	City/county governments communicate on specific issues only	Count % within Gaming	5 62.5%	5 41.7%	10 50.0%
	City/county governments actively engage us in	Count % within Gaming	2 25.0%	7 58.3%	9 45.0%
Total		Count % within Gaming	8 100.0%	12 100.0%	20 100.0%

18. If you or other tribal governments in your area engage in gaming activities, how controversial would you say gaming activities are in your community?

**Local gaming controversy \* Gaming Crosstabulation**

			Gaming		Total
			No	Yes	
Local gaming controversy	Tribal gaming is not a controversial issue	Count % within Gaming	0 .0%	6 50.0%	6 31.6%
	Tribal gaming is sometimes a controversial issue	Count % within Gaming	1 14.3%	3 25.0%	4 21.1%
	Tribal gaming is often controversial in	Count % within Gaming	4 57.1%	3 25.0%	7 36.8%
	Does not apply to our tribe	Count % within Gaming	2 28.6%	0 .0%	2 10.5%
Total		Count % within Gaming	7 100.0%	12 100.0%	19 100.0%

19. Who do you think should take the lead on local issues that affect both tribal and local governments?

**Best leader on local issues \* Gaming Crosstabulation**

			Gaming		Total
			No	Yes	
Best leader on local issues	Joint cooperation between governments is best	Count	8	12	20
		% within Gaming	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	8	12	20
		% within Gaming	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**APPENDIX B**

**Local Government Intergovernmental Relations Survey**

## Local Government Intergovernmental Relations Survey Announcement Letter

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521

September 14, 2005

[Contact Name]

[Title]

[Community or organization]

[Address]

[City], CA [ZIP Code]

#### RE: LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

I am writing to invite you to take part in an exciting research project at the University of California, Riverside. We are undertaking a major investigation of relations between local and Indian tribal governments in California. We are also interested in learning more about how Indian casinos affect local communities. Your assistance is vital to the success of this study.

The University of California, Riverside, Center for California Native Nations is undertaking this research with support from the California Nations Indian Gaming Association. The project includes planning and economic development officials from all municipal and county governments in California. You will soon receive a questionnaire dealing with the topic of government/tribal relations, and gaming. We hope you will complete the survey when you receive it. We are undertaking a similar survey of tribal leaders across the state.

This study complies with the University of California's human subjects protection protocols, which mandate an uncompromising commitment to keeping names and places confidential in all survey work. Our analysis will not refer to, or use, the names of individuals or communities. You are not obliged to complete the survey and are free to decline participation entirely or with respect to particular items on the survey you will receive in the near future. Of course, we realize the many demands made on you, and we appreciate the time you devote to our project. The survey is intentionally brief – two pages of questions.

**If you are not the appropriate informant in your jurisdiction or if there is some error in your name, title, or mailing address, please let me know.** You can contact me by email ([martin.johnson@ucr.edu](mailto:martin.johnson@ucr.edu)), telephone (951-827-4612). If you have any questions about this research, please let me know that as well and I will try to be of assistance. We appreciate your help and will send the survey by mail soon.

Sincerely,

Martin Johnson  
Assistant Professor  
[martin.johnson@ucr.edu](mailto:martin.johnson@ucr.edu)  
Telephone 951-827-4612

## Local Government Intergovernmental Relations Survey Cover Letter

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521

September 30, 2005

[Contact Name]

[Title]

[Community or organization]

[Address]

[City], CA [ZIP Code]

#### RE: LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

The Center for California Native Nations at University of California, Riverside, is investigating local governance in California communities. We are specifically interested in the relationships between Indian governments, cities, and counties in the state.

Enclosed you will find a survey asking questions about issues related to these relationships, the provision of public services, and Indian economic development, including casino gaming. Your responses to this survey are confidential; meaning reports using this survey information will combine all responses and not identify you specifically or single out your answers. We hope you will answer the questions on the survey whether you regularly interact with tribal governments or do not have much contact with Indian tribes.

This study complies with the University of California's human subjects protection protocols, which mandate an uncompromising commitment to keeping names and places confidential in all survey work. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You are free to decline participation entirely or with respect to particular items on the survey. Of course, we realize the many demands made on you, and we appreciate the time you devote to our project. The survey is intentionally brief - two pages of questions.

We hope you will take time to participate in this short survey and tell us more about your government and how it relates to other governments. If you have any questions about this project, or would like a copy of the report on the information we collect, you can contact me by email ([martin.johnson@ucr.edu](mailto:martin.johnson@ucr.edu)) or telephone (951-827-4612).

Again, thank you for participating in the survey. When you have completed it, please return the using the enclosed addressed and stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Martin Johnson  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science  
University of California, Riverside

## Local Government Intergovernmental Relations Survey Results

### FREQUENCIES REPORT

1. Name of local government: [Responses coded verbatim]

The names of the local governments responding are not included to preserve the anonymity of respondents.

2. Is this a city or county?

#### City/County

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	City/Municipality	171	86.4	86.4	86.4
	County	27	13.6	13.6	100.0
	Total	198	100.0	100.0	

3. Your formal title(s): [Responses were coded verbatim]

Given the range of types of officials responding to the survey, we include the frequency distribution for the primary responsibilities of the survey respondents here.

#### Local official responsibilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administration, including City Manager's office	24	12.1	12.1	12.1
	Planning	85	42.9	42.9	55.1
	Development, economic and community	59	29.8	29.8	84.8
	Intergovernmental Relations	5	2.5	2.5	87.4
	Other	7	3.5	3.5	90.9
	Declined to state	18	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	198	100.0	100.0	

### Physical location of tribes

4. Are there any Indian tribes in your county?

#### Nearby tribes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	135	68.2	71.8	71.8
	No	53	26.8	28.2	100.0
	Total	188	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.1		
Total		198	100.0		

5. If you have Indian tribal governments active in your area, how far away from your city is the nearest Indian tribe?

**Distance from tribes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5 miles	51	25.8	28.8	28.8
	5-10 miles	15	7.6	8.5	37.3
	10-15 miles	13	6.6	7.3	44.6
	15-20 miles	12	6.1	6.8	51.4
	More than 20 miles	39	19.7	22.0	73.4
	Does not apply	47	23.7	26.6	100.0
	Total	177	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	10.6		
Total		198	100.0		

6. If you have Indian tribal governments active in your area, please use the space below to name the tribes you are familiar with: [Responses coded verbatim and not included to preserve the anonymity of respondents]

Intergovernmental relations

7. If your city/county has contact with tribal governments, with whom do you deal with most often in terms of intergovernmental issues?

**Primary tribe contact**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A tribal spokesperson or communication officer	42	21.2	22.8	22.8
	Professional tribal administrative management	34	17.2	18.5	41.3
	Tribal council members	11	5.6	6.0	47.3
	Does not apply	90	45.5	48.9	96.2
	Multiple responses	7	3.5	3.8	100.0
	Total	184	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	7.1		
Total		198	100.0		

8. How often would you say that your government works with tribes on issues of local or regional importance?

**Frequency of work with tribes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Our government works with tribes often	27	13.6	14.0	14.0
	Our city/county works with tribes occassionally	38	19.2	19.7	33.7
	Our city/county works rarely with tribes	50	25.3	25.9	59.6
	Our city/county has no contact with tribes	78	39.4	40.4	100.0
	Total	193	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.5		
Total		198	100.0		

9. Acknowledging that communication between governments is sometimes difficult, if your city/county has active communication with tribal governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?

**Quality of communication with tribes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tribal governments are hard to reach	9	4.5	4.8	4.8
	Tribal governments communicate on specific issues only	63	31.8	33.5	38.3
	Tribal governments are active in a variety of issues	15	7.6	8.0	46.3
	Does not apply	98	49.5	52.1	98.4
	Multiple responses	3	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	188	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.1		
Total		198	100.0		

10. Information can be obtained from many sources, but where have you obtained most of your information about Indians and tribal governments?

**Main source of information about Indians**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local news sources	61	30.8	37.0	37.0
	Professional organizations/publications	31	15.7	18.8	55.8
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	27	13.6	16.4	72.1
	Direct contact with tribal governments	45	22.7	27.3	99.4
	Reports filed by tribal governments	1	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	165	83.3	100.0	
Missing	System	33	16.7		
Total		198	100.0		

11. In your estimation, how active are local tribal governments in issues of local or regional importance?

**Activity of tribes in local issues**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tribes in our area are constantly engaged in area issues	23	11.6	12.1	12.1
	Tribes in our area are occasionally active in area issues	74	37.4	38.9	51.1
	Tribes in our area are not active in area issues	27	13.6	14.2	65.3
	Does not apply	64	32.3	33.7	98.9
	Multiple responses	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	190	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.0		
Total		198	100.0		

12. Who do you think should take the lead on local issues that affect both tribal and local governments?

**Best leader on local and regional issues**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local governments should take the lead	20	10.1	10.6	10.6
	Tribes should take the lead	6	3.0	3.2	13.8
	Joint cooperation between governments is best	120	60.6	63.8	77.7
	Does not apply	42	21.2	22.3	100.0
	Total	188	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.1		
Total		198	100.0		

13. Do any tribal government contract with your government to provide services to Indian communities (for example, police or fire services)?

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to provide services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tribes contract to receive services from our government	21	10.6	11.4	11.4
	Tribes do not contract to receive services from our gov't	163	82.3	88.6	100.0
	Total	184	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	7.1		
Total		198	100.0		

14. Does your government contract with any tribal government to receive services they provide (for example, police or fire services)?

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to receive services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Our government contracts to receive services from a tribe	6	3.0	3.2	3.2
	Our government does not contract for services from a tribe	181	91.4	96.8	100.0
	Total	187	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	11	5.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Indian casinos

15. Do tribes near you operate a casino or other gaming facility?

**Nearby Indian casinos**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	77	38.9	40.3	40.3
	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	54	27.3	28.3	68.6
	Does not apply	60	30.3	31.4	100.0
	Total	191	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	3.5		
Total		198	100.0		

16. If local tribal governments engage in gaming activities, how controversial would you say gaming activities are in your community?

**Local controversy over gaming**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Indian gaming is not controversial in our community	29	14.6	15.6	15.6
	Indian gaming is sometimes controversial in our community	32	16.2	17.2	32.8
	Indian gaming is often controversial in our community	28	14.1	15.1	47.8
	Does not apply	96	48.5	51.6	99.5
	Multiple responses	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	186	93.9	100.0	
Missing	System	12	6.1		
Total		198	100.0		

17. Tribal gaming pacts in California must have approval of the Governor. Are you aware of any controversy that surrounded a local tribal government in your area requesting a gaming pact with the State?

**Local controversy over gaming compacts**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gaming pacts were requested by tribes without controversy	14	7.1	7.8	7.8
	Gaming pacts requests were moderately controversial	27	13.6	15.0	22.8
	Gaming pacts were actively fought by area residents	25	12.6	13.9	36.7
	Does not apply	114	57.6	63.3	100.0
	Total	180	90.9	100.0	
Missing	System	18	9.1		
Total		198	100.0		

18. Thinking about conditions in California, on balance, would you say that casinos have done more to help or hurt other businesses in your community?

**Casino effects on business**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Help business	39	19.7	22.0	22.0
	Have no effect	31	15.7	17.5	39.5
	Hurt business	16	8.1	9.0	48.6
	Does not apply	91	46.0	51.4	100.0
	Total	177	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	10.6		
Total		198	100.0		

19. Taking everything into consideration would you say that the impact of casinos on your community has been positive or negative?

**Casino effects of communities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive impact on community	14	7.1	7.4	7.4
	Negative impact on community	15	7.6	7.9	15.3
	Both positive and negative impacts on community	43	21.7	22.6	37.9
	Neither positive and negative impacts on community	24	12.1	12.6	50.5
	Does not apply	94	47.5	49.5	100.0
	Total	190	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.0		
Total		198	100.0		

20. Where have you obtained most of your information about Indian casinos and gaming activities?

**Main source of information about Indian casinos**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local news sources	116	58.6	66.3	66.3
	Professional organizations/publications	35	17.7	20.0	86.3
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	14	7.1	8.0	94.3
	Direct contact with tribal governments	10	5.1	5.7	100.0
	Total	175	88.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	11.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Background questions

21. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ years

**Average: 47.3**  
**Median: 49**  
**High: 66**  
**Low: 22**

22. How long have you been working with the government identified in question #1? \_\_\_\_ years

**Average: 10.0**  
**Median: 7**  
**High: 33**  
**Low: less than 1**

23. What is your gender?

**Respondent gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	121	61.1	68.4	68.4
	Female	56	28.3	31.6	100.0
	Total	177	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	10.6		
Total		198	100.0		

24. Which of the following best describes your partisan identification? Please mark one of the following:

**Respondent partisanship**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Republican	27	13.6	15.0	15.0
	Democrat	54	27.3	30.0	45.0
	Independent	21	10.6	11.7	56.7
	Prefer not to answer	78	39.4	43.3	100.0
	Total	180	90.9	100.0	
Missing	System	18	9.1		
Total		198	100.0		

25. Generally, how would you describe your political beliefs? Please mark one of the following:

**Respondent political ideology**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very conservative	2	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Conservative	19	9.6	10.4	11.5
	Moderate	71	35.9	39.0	50.5
	Liberal	29	14.6	15.9	66.5
	Very liberal	11	5.6	6.0	72.5
	Prefer not to answer	50	25.3	27.5	100.0
	Total	182	91.9	100.0	
Missing	System	16	8.1		
Total		198	100.0		

26. Which of the following categories best describes your number of years of schooling? Check one of the following categories:

**Respondent education**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than high school	1	.5	.5	.5
	Some college	5	2.5	2.7	3.3
	Completed college	50	25.3	27.3	30.6
	Some graduate work	19	9.6	10.4	41.0
	Completed graduate work	98	49.5	53.6	94.5
	Prefer not to answer	10	5.1	5.5	100.0
	Total	183	92.4	100.0	
Missing	System	15	7.6		
Total		198	100.0		

## CROSTABULATIONS WITH CASINO PRESENCE

The following tables present responses to intergovernmental relations items from the survey comparing:

- government officials near tribes with a casino
- government officials near tribes without a casino, and
- government officials with no nearby tribes.

We determine whether officials are near tribes with casinos, without casino, or not near a tribe on the basis of their responses to question 15 on the survey: “Do tribes near you operate a casino or other gaming facility?” Participants who said the question does not apply to them are treated as not living near a tribe.

On the tables below, each column represents a subgroup of the population and the percentages of responses in each column sum to 100 percent. In the cells, we report the number and percentage of responses to the given question in each of these three subgroups. The best way to understand what is going on in each of the tables below is to compare responses within rows and across the columns. For example, in the first table below, we compare the responses of officials near tribes with a casino to those near tribes without a casino and those not near a tribe on the question of who they deal with in discussing intergovernmental issues. The main insight from the table is that officials near tribes with casinos are far more likely than their counterparts near tribes without casinos to interact with professional administrators from tribes. From these responses, officials in communities near tribes with casinos are 3 times more likely than officials in communities near tribes without casinos to be communicating with administrative professionals.

Intergovernmental relations

7. If your city/county has contact with tribal governments, with whom do you deal with most often in terms of intergovernmental issues?

**Primary tribe contact \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Primary tribe contact	A tribal spokesperson or communication officer	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	19 25.7%	19 38.0%	4 7.0%	42 23.2%
	Professional tribal administrative management	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	27 36.5%	5 10.0%	1 1.8%	33 18.2%
	Tribal council members	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	5 6.8%	4 8.0%	2 3.5%	11 6.1%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	16 21.6%	22 44.0%	50 87.7%	88 48.6%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	7 9.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	7 3.9%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	74 100.0%	50 100.0%	57 100.0%	181 100.0%	

8. How often would you say that your government works with tribes on issues of local or regional importance?

**Frequency of work with tribes \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Frequency of work with tribes	Our government works with tribes often	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	26 33.8%	1 1.9%	0 .0%	27 14.2%
	Our city/county works with tribes occassionally	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	23 29.9%	12 22.6%	3 5.0%	38 20.0%
	Our city/county works rarely with tribes	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	20 26.0%	21 39.6%	7 11.7%	48 25.3%
	Our city/county has no contact with tribes	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	8 10.4%	19 35.8%	50 83.3%	77 40.5%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	77 100.0%	53 100.0%	60 100.0%	190 100.0%	

9. Acknowledging that communication between governments is sometimes difficult, if your city/county has active communication with tribal governments, how would you rate the quality of that communication?

**Quality of communication with tribes \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Quality of communication with tribes	Tribal governments are hard to reach	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	3 5.9%	3 5.1%	9 4.9%
	Tribal governments communicate on specific issues only	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	37 49.3%	21 41.2%	4 6.8%	62 33.5%
	Tribal governments are active in a variety of issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	15 20.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	15 8.1%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	17 22.7%	27 52.9%	52 88.1%	96 51.9%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	3 1.6%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	51 100.0%	59 100.0%	185 100.0%	

10. Information can be obtained from many sources, but where have you obtained most of your information about Indians and tribal governments?

**Main source of information about Indians \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Main source of information about Indians	Local news sources	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	22 30.6%	15 31.3%	23 53.5%	60 36.8%
	Professional organizations/publications	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	7 9.7%	9 18.8%	15 34.9%	31 19.0%
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	8 11.1%	15 31.3%	3 7.0%	26 16.0%
	Direct contact with tribal governments	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	35 48.6%	8 16.7%	2 4.7%	45 27.6%
	Reports filed by tribal governments	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	0 .0%	1 2.1%	0 .0%	1 .6%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	72 100.0%	48 100.0%	43 100.0%	163 100.0%	

11. How active are local tribal governments in issues of local or regional importance?

Activity of tribes in local issues \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	Total
Activity of tribes in local issues	Tribes in our area are constantly engaged in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	18 23.7%	3 5.6%	2 3.4%	23 12.2%
	Tribes in our area are occasionally active in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	41 53.9%	23 42.6%	9 15.5%	73 38.8%
	Tribes in our area are not active in area issues	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	11 14.5%	13 24.1%	3 5.2%	27 14.4%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	4 5.3%	15 27.8%	44 75.9%	63 33.5%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	2 2.6%	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 1.1%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	76 100.0%	54 100.0%	58 100.0%	188 100.0%	

12. Who do you think should take the lead on local issues that affect both tribal and local governments?

Best leader on local and regional issues \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	Total
Best leader on local and regional issues	Local governments should take the lead	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	5 6.7%	8 15.4%	7 11.9%	20 10.8%
	Tribes should take the lead	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	3 4.0%	2 3.8%	1 1.7%	6 3.2%
	Joint cooperation between governments is best	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	66 88.0%	34 65.4%	19 32.2%	119 64.0%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	1 1.3%	8 15.4%	32 54.2%	41 22.0%
Total	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	52 100.0%	59 100.0%	186 100.0%	

13. Do any tribal government contract with your government to provide services to Indian communities (for example, police or fire services)?

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to provide services \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Contracting with tribes for city/county to provide services	Tribes contract to receive services from our government	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	19 26.8%	1 1.9%	1 1.7%	21 11.5%
	Tribes do not contract to receive services from our gov't	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	52 73.2%	52 98.1%	57 98.3%	161 88.5%
Total		Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	71 100.0%	53 100.0%	58 100.0%	182 100.0%

14. Does your government contract with any tribal government to receive services they provide (for example, police or fire services)?

**Contracting with tribes for city/county to receive services \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Contracting with tribes for city/county to receive services	Our government contracts to receive services from a tribe	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	6 8.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	6 3.2%
	Our government does not contract for services from a tribe	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	66 91.7%	54 100.0%	59 100.0%	179 96.8%
Total		Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	72 100.0%	54 100.0%	59 100.0%	185 100.0%

Indian casinos

16. If local tribal governments engage in gaming activities, how controversial would you say gaming activities are in your community?

**Local controversy over gaming \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Local controversy over gaming	Indian gaming is not controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	25 33.3%	3 6.0%	1 1.7%	29 15.8%
	Indian gaming is sometimes controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	27 36.0%	2 4.0%	2 3.4%	31 16.8%
	Indian gaming is often controversial in our community	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	18 24.0%	9 18.0%	1 1.7%	28 15.2%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	4 5.3%	36 72.0%	55 93.2%	95 51.6%
	Multiple responses	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	1 1.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .5%
<b>Total</b>	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	75 100.0%	50 100.0%	59 100.0%	184 100.0%	

17. Are you aware of any controversy that surrounded a local tribal government in your area requesting a gaming pact with the State?

**Local controversy over gaming compacts \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Local controversy over gaming compacts	Gaming pacts were requested by tribes without controversy	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	13 20.0%	0 .0%	1 1.7%	14 7.9%
	Gaming pacts requests were moderately controversial	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	21 32.3%	1 1.9%	4 6.7%	26 14.6%
	Gaming pacts were actively fought by area residents	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	14 21.5%	10 18.9%	1 1.7%	25 14.0%
	Does not apply	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	17 26.2%	42 79.2%	54 90.0%	113 63.5%
<b>Total</b>	Count % within Nearby Indian casinos	65 100.0%	53 100.0%	60 100.0%	178 100.0%	

18. Thinking about conditions in California, on balance, would you say that casinos have done more to help or hurt other businesses in your community?

**Casino effects on business \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Casino effects on business	Help business	Count	32	4	2	38
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	49.2%	7.7%	3.4%	21.7%
	Have no effect	Count	19	7	5	31
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	29.2%	13.5%	8.6%	17.7%
	Hurt business	Count	8	7	1	16
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	12.3%	13.5%	1.7%	9.1%
	Does not apply	Count	6	34	50	90
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	9.2%	65.4%	86.2%	51.4%
Total		Count	65	52	58	175
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

19. Taking everything into consideration would you say that the impact of casinos on your community has been positive or negative?

**Casino effects of communities \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation**

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Casino effects of communities	Positive impact on community	Count	12	0	2	14
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	16.2%	.0%	3.3%	7.5%
	Negative impact on community	Count	9	5	1	15
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	12.2%	9.4%	1.7%	8.0%
	Both positive and negative impacts on community	Count	39	2	0	41
	% within Nearby Indian casinos	52.7%	3.8%	.0%	21.9%	
	Neither positive and negative impacts on community	Count	8	7	9	24
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	10.8%	13.2%	15.0%	12.8%
	Does not apply	Count	6	39	48	93
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	8.1%	73.6%	80.0%	49.7%
Total		Count	74	53	60	187
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

20. Where have you obtained most of your information about Indian casinos and gaming activities?

Main source of information about Indian casinos \* Nearby Indian casinos Crosstabulation

			Nearby Indian casinos			Total
			Local tribes do operate a gaming facility in my area	Local tribes do not operate gaming facility in my area	Does not apply	
Main source of information about Indian casinos	Local news sources	Count	38	34	43	115
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	53.5%	68.0%	82.7%	66.5%
	Professional organizations/publications	Count	15	10	9	34
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	21.1%	20.0%	17.3%	19.7%
	Other non-tribal government agencies and government reports	Count	9	5	0	14
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	12.7%	10.0%	.0%	8.1%
	Direct contact with tribal governmnets	Count	9	1	0	10
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	12.7%	2.0%	.0%	5.8%
Total		Count	71	50	52	173
		% within Nearby Indian casinos	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%