



# The WAGER Vol. 5(21) - National Gambling Impact Study Commission: Redux

May 31, 2000

The release of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission's (NGISC) final report last year sparked much controversy and debate. Not long after the release date, Representative Frank Wolf (R-Va) asked the United States General Accounting Office to evaluate the NGISC's work. The GAO agreed, and released its report in April of this year, which, in turn, reignited the controversy. The GAO shared a draft copy of the report with former NGISC chair Kay James, who replied with a list of comments and suggestions. Her criticisms and the GAO's responses are summarized in the graphics below. Was the GAO report really necessary? Readers should read the full report and decide for themselves.





*The GAO's treatment of the Atlantic City case study should be expanded--*

**Information reported on the economic impact of casinos on non-casino restaurants differed from**



The 1998 information received by the NGISC did not include data for both casino and non-casino establishments. The GAO chose to use 1996 data, which included both types of establishments.



*The GAO's treatment of the Atlantic City case study should be expanded--*

**Coverage of adolescent gambling**



Appendix III now includes more data on adolescent gambling, although the report still does not provide a detailed analysis on the subject.



The draft report does not provide adequate coverage of problem and non-pathological gamblers.



The primary objective of the GAO report is to report the prevalence of pathological gambling. However, the National Opinion Research Center's (NORC) findings regarding non-pathological gamblers are included in both the draft and final versions.



The draft report did not adequately discuss the lifetime costs of problem and pathological gambling.



The draft report included NORC's research on social cost. In response to Ms. James, further social cost research is provided in Appendix II of the final report.



*The GAO's treatment of the Atlantic City case study should be expanded--*

**Coverage of adolescent gambling**



Appendix III now includes more data on adolescent gambling, although the report still does not provide a detailed analysis on the subject.