

FACT SHEET ON SEN. BONACIC'S CASINO GAMING BILL (S.5586)

- Would site 5 casinos over the next three to four years upstate;
- Would maintain Native American exclusivity so long as exclusivity exists (if exclusivity does not exist, or is not renewed, three opportunities to site casinos in formerly exclusive areas would exist);
- Would likewise authorize up to three casinos in the Catskills consistent with the 2001 law authorizing up to three casinos there (none were actually sited in the Catskills while three were located in Western NY under the 2001 law);
- Would create an opportunity for one casino in the Tioga region, one in the Capital region. Those regions would be as defined by Governor Cuomo two weeks ago;
- The first five casinos would require local resolutions of support (County and Town/City/Village);
- The remaining two casinos would be in Westchester or Queens Counties or any County that a casino was formerly prohibited in but no longer is due to the expiration or non-existence of an exclusivity compact. Those casinos would not be sited before 2019;
- With the exception of Sullivan County, no County could have more than one casino in it;
- The gaming commission would have 9 year terms and be full time, giving it greater independence;
- The gaming commission would appoint a site selection board to recommend to the commission who the casino operators should be;
- The site selection board would have enunciated standards based on job creation and investment in site selection in order to make their recommendations;
- In order to contravene the recommendations of the site selection board, the gaming commission would have to make on the record findings detailing why the commission is not in agreement with the site selection board;
- Would authorize VLTs at one OTB facility each in Nassau and Suffolk Counties;
- Would authorize a study by the gaming commission on VLTs elsewhere;
- Would create a Belmont revitalization fund to be funded by proceeds from any Queens casino over five years (up to \$75 million per year);
- Would otherwise (other than the Belmont fund), allocate revenue 80% to education and 20% to property tax reduction (split between the host community and the rest of the counties of the State);
- Would preserve payments to the racing industry.