



**STATE OF WASHINGTON
GAMBLING COMMISSION**

P.O. Box 42400 • Olympia, Washington 98504-2400 • (360) 486-3440 • TDD (360) 486-3637 • FAX (360) 486-3631

**Betting Limits Increased on a Limited Basis
at the February 12, 2004, Commission Meeting**

After six months of debate and testimony, on a 4-1 vote the Commission continued betting limits of \$100, but permitted house-banked card rooms to allow up to \$200 betting limits on one table if authorized for five tables or less; two tables if authorized for six to ten tables; and, 3 tables if authorized for more than ten tables. This WAC change will become effective July 1, 2004.

The original petition for rule change submitted by the Recreational Gaming Association was for a WAC change to allow an across the board \$300 wager limit. At the October 2003 meeting, the Commission amended the Petition to a \$200 betting limit for a limited number of tables, with a sunset (end) after one year. The sunset was not included with the increased betting limits adopted at the February meeting.

The Commission has received a lot of input both for and against the increase in betting limits. In addition to comments received, the following issues were raised during the debates over the last six months:

-Legal Counsel to the Commission advised that in his opinion the decision was not an expansion issue in the Constitutional sense

-The Lottery had similar authority and has launched a new game at \$20 per ticket

-Tribes have a \$500 Compact limit and there will soon be 22 Tribal casinos operating in the state

-The Legislature has moved two bills out of Committee that may increase gambling locations or opportunity

-The Governor expressed opposition but only connected to a tax increase which is not within the Commission's authority

-Bills to change the Commission's authority to regulate wager limits have not moved out of Committee

-The issue has been pending for six months and the Commission is statutorily responsible for a decision

-Increases have been allowed in the past

-There is no apparent regulatory reason to deny an increase; and

-The decision is very limited in impact and number of locations