



Tuesday, December 4, 2018

**Is it Possible That Horse Racing is One Referendum
Away From Disappearing in Your Jurisdiction?
Lessons Learned From the Greyhound Industry**

Presenter:

Marsha Kelly: Principal, MSK Ventures, Inc.

Ms. Wendy Davis: Again, I'd like to thank our sponsors, Trakus, our session sponsor and NYRA, the sponsor for our beverage break, and as we have everybody starting to come back in the room.

Today we have a panel that has probably too long of a title.

I thought that we really needed to really get the point across: Is it possible that horse racing is one referendum away from disappearing in your jurisdiction.

I think until recently, everyone of us would have said absolutely not.®

One of the quotes that really struck me, and this was made by Rick Arthur, probably three or four or five years ago, with regards to California, and we have the animal welfare issues.

He said, "You know, I think about it, and California could be just one referendum away from losing horse racing."

I don't think people listened and nodded, but now, it's not California, but it's Florida and it's greyhound racing, and it's happened.

I think there are some really big lessons to learn here.

Marsha Kelly, who is very knowledgeable about the greyhound industry and the whole process is here to visit with us about this issue.

She's had more than 40 years of experience in strategic communications, public relations and issue management.

She's also provided those services to the AJC, the American Greyhound Council.

It's an organization of greyhound breeders and track operators to fund and manage greyhound welfare adoption programs and coordinate greyhound racing responses to animal rights challenges.

She also provides counsel to the American Greyhound Track Operator's Association, also known as AGTOA.

She is one of the few people in the country who has real extensive experience in dealing with these kinds of issues.

I'd like to thank Marsha for coming down and visiting with us today.

She knew she was here at the tail end of our program here, but I'm really pleased to see so many of you in the room.

This is a really big issue, and thanks for being here, and Marsha, thank you for presenting.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Thank you Wendy.

It's a pleasure to be back here at RTIP.

I started coming to this symposium in 1995 when I began working with greyhound racing.

Before that, I didn't have exposure to the racing community, either horse racing or dog racing to any significant extent, but I had intense exposure to the animal rights issued because I had worked with the fur trade, both domestic fur producers, trappers and people that were involved in wildlife management.

I came into animal rights issue management from that perspective.

Then just due to a quirky intersection with one guy in the fur trade that also was involved in greyhound racing, I wound up getting involved in greyhound racing, and here I am more than 25 years later looking at a very sad development, which is Amendment 13 in the passage of constitutional amendment to ban greyhound racing in the state.

If you know anything about the history of greyhound racing, not only in Florida, but nationwide, you know that it goes back a long, long way.

In the state of Florida, they started doing greyhound racing before it was legal or illegal, it was just there. Back in the early 1910s, 1915.

By 1931 greyhound racing had been legalized in the state of Florida, which meant not only could people bet on it legally, but the state could take revenues from the proceeds, which was always a huge benefit, and one of the defenses of greyhound racing of the economic impact that it generated.

I know that people in the horse racing community used those same arguments, when you're trying to establish the value of your industry, to whether it's legislators or regulators, much of the discussion focuses on the economic benefit that you produce for your communities and your states.

The industry was legalized, it became very successful.

At one time greyhound racing was the fifth or sixth largest spectator sport in the country. Then in probably I would say the late 1980s early 1990s, greyhound racing began to be a target of the animal rights movement.

It followed a very similar trajectory to the kind of responses that the animal rights movement has had to other fields of animal endeavor, like the fur trade, like circuses, like zoos.

The initial battleground of course, was in the media.

Animal rights groups are great at generating media attention, they're great at publicity stunts.

That was where the battle was fought initially.

It was fought in the media.

It was fought over the protests that would occur at a greyhound track or a fur store or a place where they sold wild furs and so on.

There was that media flavor to the initial battleground.

Then in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, the battleground started to shift.

It shifted away from the media public relations publicity stunt arena into the legislative arena.

That's partly because animal rights groups got a lot smarter and a lot wealthier.

They started being able to afford good lawyers.

They started recruiting lawyers that were very dedicated to the animal rights point of view who had worked pro bono.

Many of these big animal rights groups, and now the ones that have multimillion-dollar budgets, they can afford to handle good lawyers and hire good lawyers, but they get volunteers.

They get lawyers right out of law school that specialized, graduated with specialized degrees in animal rights law.

Now more than two dozen law schools around the country offer specialties in animal rights law.

There are a lot more lawyers out there defending the interests of animals than there used to be.

All of a sudden, the attack shifts to the legislative arena.

Now for the most part, tracks have done pretty well, both horse and dog tracks have done pretty well in that legislative arena.

Because track owners and the people who raise horses have always been pretty plugged in politically.

You were smart enough to get engaged politically.

You probably make political donations to the candidates and legislators who you consider to be your friends.

Year after year after year, greyhound racing, and particular greyhound racing in Florida, 'cause there was — more than half the tracks in the country were in Florida.

Year after year after year the animal rights movement would get a legislator here or there to carry some anti-racing initiative, and the pro-racing legislative allies of the industry would just kill it dead as a doornail, and it would be done and you'd never hear from it again.

People got pretty complacent. You're gonna hear the word complacency a lot in the next 20 minutes.

It was pretty easy to fight those battles because the people in these racing communities were smart about strategically picking legislative allies.

That legislative arena was an arena where we felt pretty confident.

We felt pretty complacent.

We felt pretty secure.

Now the animal rights attack on greyhound racing really focused on two major areas.

One of course was greyhound welfare.

Their big thing is animal care, animal welfare, and so they worked very hard to take isolated incidents, and we all know if you work with animals there are gonna be a handful of people in your industry that never play by the rules that make everybody else look bad that just don't get it, okay?

We know we have it in the horse community.

We know we have it in the dog community.

People who don't provide proper care for the animals, who don't accept their responsibilities, and as a result of that, they make everybody look bad.

The animal rights movement became very adept at finding and highlighting these incidents, these isolated incidents, and portraying them as sorta the norm across the industry, "Ah, they're all like that.

It's an inhumane industry," because a handful of people screwed up.

The other focus then in addition to that greyhound welfare focus is the economics focus.

As the industry began suffering the effects of competition from other gambling venues, from the advent of electronic gaming and all the changes that technology has made to the way we look for entertainment.

Everybody in racing knows that racing is not a fast sport.

Despite the fact that dogs and horses can move pretty quickly for a couple of minutes on the track, the sport is not a face paced sport generally speaking.

We've got a whole generation of kids coming up that is interested in immediate gratification and instant feedback from their videogames and from their video entertainment, and it's very hard to compete with that.

There were a lot of competitive factors that began impacting the economics of racing. Racing began generating less and less revenue, for the states and for the localities in which those tracks were located.

The economics and the greyhound welfare combined, and the animal rights groups, of course, are very adept at combining those messages.

Now you have a message that says, "Greyhound racing is declining in popularity, nobody wants to see greyhound racing anymore because it's an inhumane sport."

Even though there's no direct linkage between the two issues, the animal rights movement creates those linkages and then promotes them.

In response to the animal rights challenge that the greyhound racing community was confronting, they were actually pretty proactive.

Back in the late 1980s they formed The American Greyhound Council, which was a joint effort of the track operators and the breeders that basically focused on animal welfare and adoption issues in greyhound racing.

They adopted standards for the care of greyhounds at the kennel and at the track.

They adopted very tough penalties for people that violated those standards, if you have a greyhound breeder that is racing a dog at any track, or a kennel operator that's racing a dog on any track in the United States, and that kennel operator is found guilty of violating these standards, they can be banned from greyhound racing for life.

Anybody who does business with them can also be banned from greyhound racing for life.

That's an enforcement policy with some teeth.

That was a significant step forward.

They committed themselves to better greyhound care, better greyhound welfare, tough standards, tough enforcement.

They also committed themselves to education and training within the industry.

They did a lot of training programs for breeders.

They did a lotta track about track safety.

They held symposiums to discuss how tracks could be maintained and groomed better, so that there would be fewer injuries.

All of that contributed to, not only the image of the sport, but the actual better behavior and performance of the people within greyhound racing, as they saw that they could achieve better results with a little bit more effort.

They also made a major thrust in the area of greyhound adoption, looking to find adoptive homes for greyhounds when they were leaving the tracks.

They spent on average, more than a million dollars a year between the tracks and the breeder organizations on adoption programs.

The American Greyhound Council collected fees from both the breeder's side and the track side, put those funds in a pot.

We gave out adoption grants, usually between \$100,000 and \$150,000 a year in adoption grants to individual adoption groups that were helping find adoptive homes.

The end result of that was a huge success story for greyhound racing and adoption.

More than 95 percent of all registered greyhounds in the United States are either adopted or returned to the farm when they retire.

They did a really fantastic job of improving the record and the destiny of the greyhounds that were in their care.

Of course, the whole time that that was going on, the animal rights movement was maintaining that pressure.

When you have groups that have multimillion-dollar budgets, they have a lot of resources that they can use to beat you up, to take undercover video and post it all over the media.

Of course, with the advent of social media, that became an even more dangerous thing.

A little bit of information disseminated over a wide variety of social media channels can do you infinite harm, even though the original incident was very isolated and very unique.

The animal rights movement was continuing to keep this pressure on.

They used a couple of really important strategies, and this is stuff that we can all learn from, trust me.

This is the same pattern again and again and again.

One of them is what I call the 'Divide and Conquer Strategy'.

We all know that in racing, as in many other animal industries, you would be surprised to know that the fur industry was very much parallel.

There is a natural tension between the breeders who breed the animals, and what we call the retail sector.

That is the point at which the animal meets the public, okay, whether that's a fur store or a greyhound track or a race track.

There's always this tension. I mean, how many of you in this room have lived your life free of conflict with the other side of your industry.

If you're a track operator, how many times could you ever say, "I've never had a dispute with any of the breeders?"

Does that sound unlikely?

I would think.

We know that there's that natural tension.

The animal rights movement was very adept at exploiting that.

They would look for allies within the industry on their message.

Now in greyhound racing, it was easy, because some track owners really didn't wanna keep live racing.

Some track owners were able to put slot machines at their tracks, and they realized that slot machines were more profitable and less hassle than dealing with live animals.

There was a tension even within the track community between the people who wanted to keep live racing, and the people who thought that they had other options that were better.

The animal rights movement exploited those divisions, so the next thing you know you don't have a united industry going to the legislature, you have a divided industry going to the legislature.

You have divisions, not only between breeders and track operators, but you've even got divisions within the track community.

That's not conducive to a positive public image and the future preservation of the industry.

The animal rights movement would find these allies within the industry, introduce legislation, usually using greyhound welfare as a pretext.

For example, in Arizona, here right in Tucson, Tucson — is it Maricopa County, I can't remember what the name of the county is here?

Is it Tucson County?

Pima County, yes thank you.

Pima County introduced new legislation at the county level that dictated how the greyhound track would exercise its greyhounds, how many times they had to be let out of the kennel to be exercised, what they could be fed.

You had micromanagement of a local regulatory body trying to impose these greyhound welfare standards that were supposedly in the interest of the greyhound.

They actually had nothing to do with greyhound care or welfare.

In fact, they were counterproductive.

They were passed by people who don't know anything about greyhound racing and greyhound dogs, at the behest of animal rights activists who knew very little about the animals.

You get this hostile legislation cycle going where they keep passing more and more restrictive bills.

They keep trying to impose more and more regulations on the breeder's side and on the track operator's side.

They justify them, not only on the animal welfare grounds, but on economic grounds.

The industry is shrinking anyway, the industry is dying.

Nobody goes to see horse racing anymore, nobody goes to see dog racing anymore.

Look at the all the tracks that have gone out of the business, and the next thing you know they've got a very potent message.

If at first you don't succeed, the animal rights movement says, "Hey, it doesn't bother us, we'll keep trying."

They come back year after year after year.

In Massachusetts for example, they tried to ban the greyhound racing industry, first in 2000.

They tried it and failed, on a referendum.

Tried it again in 2004 and failed.

Finally scored on the third time out in 2008, they were successful in banning greyhound racing in the state.

In other states they didn't bother to put it on the ballot, they just got the regulators, at the behest of animal rights groups under animal rights pressure, to pass such draconian regulation and taxation on greyhound racing, that it basically forced the greyhound tracks outta business.

They couldn't afford to be in business anymore with those tax and licensing and regulatory fees, so they got in kinda by the back door.

Once Massachusetts and a couple of those other states on the East Coast went down, the animal rights movement began focusing on Florida, because that was, as I said, where more than half of the tracks were located.

They immediately began working on decoupling.

Most of you know what decoupling is. I

n Florida there was a law that basically said, and this probably is true in some other states as well, that in order to have other gambling activities like poker rooms or slot machines at casinos, at tracks, you had to have live racing.

The live racing was directly linked to those other gambling activities.

The tracks began working with the support of animal rights groups to decouple those two pieces, so that they wouldn't have to have live racing, but they could continue to operate other gambling activities, simulcasting included.

The decoupling became another divisive issue, and in the state of Florida, it really pitted breeders against tracks, as you can imagine.

Because decoupling protects the interest of track operators, but it doesn't do much for the breeders who make their living breeding animals for racing.

It was kind of a snowball effect.

As you started to see this division between the tracks and the breeders, you started to see the push toward decoupling, because tracks were out there saying they don't want live racing anymore.

Some tracks actually became actively allied with the animal rights groups who were delivering the anti-racing message.

Instead of just limiting their comments to the fact that this makes economic sense for us, which people can understand, even if they disagree with it, they sort of climbed on the animal rights bandwagon.

That wasn't helpful.

At the same time, you had greyhound breeders out there saying, "You know the reason why we have injuries at the track is because the tracks don't care about greyhound safety, they're not doing the right thing to make the track surfaces safer.

They're not doing the right thing to keep better care of the animals when they're racing."

You had all this public division, and these finger pointing exercises that the two sides engaged in with each other.

The net effect was from the public standpoint people looked at it and said, "You know well, maybe there just ought to be a pox on both your houses because we don't really understand who's in charge, whether the kennel operators are telling the truth, or the track operators are telling the truth. You're all the same to me, it's all greyhound racing. Maybe it's just more bother than it's worth."

When you have this industry division, that's the ultimate result.

The legislators get confused.

They don't feel comfortable carrying your water because you're divided internally.

The public gets confused, they're getting mixed signals and mixed messages.

Even though the polls all showed, right up until the end of September, that this amendment was going to fail, it ultimately of course did not fail.

It passed by a fairly resounding margin.

In Florida it required a 60 percent vote for passage.

When we did some initial polling back in June, we found that voters were about evenly split on the issue.

We had about 44 percent that were opposed to the ban, and we had about 44 percent that were in favor of the ban.

They had to get from 44 percent to 60 percent.

We had to just keep them from getting to 60 percent.

In the end, they beat us with 69 percent of the vote.

They spent a ton of money.

The greyhound community raised about \$350,000 to fight this.

Between the Humane Society of the United States and the Doris Day Animal League, they spent almost \$2 million to defeat it — I mean to pass it, excuse me.

What are the lessons learned, very quickly?

One lesson, you can't assume the continued support of people who have previously been legislative allies because the political landscape has changed.

I don't think anybody in Florida doubted that the political landscape had changed when they saw the outcome of this vote.

What was interesting, and I'm treading in a little bit dangerous water here, 'cause we usually don't talk politics in these environments, but this is relevant and significant.

There's always been conventional wisdom that republican legislators, no matter where they were, were more sympathetic to business, and therefore, more reliable allies of the greyhound racing and the horse racing communities.

The democrats, all those mush headed liberals that are tree huggers and stuff, they were all the ones that were supporting the animal rights movement.

In the Florida situation, the daughter-in-law of President Donald Trump and the Republican Attorney General of Florida, Pam Bondi, were two of the leading forces in pushing this constitutional amendment onto the ballot, and then pushing for its adoption.

A lot of people that had formerly been allies of the greyhound racing community, were not gonna take on the daughter-in-law of Donald Trump, and so they disappeared from the landscape.

Never assume that the political constituency that you have today is going to be the constituency that you have tomorrow, because you cannot count on it.

You can't count on lobbying always being your last line of defense.

When the issue got on the ballot in Florida, the breeders filed a lawsuit hoping that they would be able to win the argument that this shouldn't be a ballot issue, it's too specific an issue to be in the constitution, it shouldn't be a constitutional amendment. The greyhound racing community complacently assumed that the courts would uphold that argument, because it was legally very sound.

They got a lower court decision validating that argument.

They were like, "Oh, we're home free, the state supreme court will never overturn that lower court on that decision."

They basically did nothing on the assumption that that lower court ruling was gonna be upheld.

That lower court ruling didn't even come out until after Labor Day, and when it came out it was against the industry.

The issue went back on the ballot, but at that point the industry hadn't done a thing, despite the fact that some of us had been urging them to proceed as if you know it's going to be on the ballot because you've got a lot of work to do between now and election day.

By the time the court ruled that the issue would be on the ballot, they were already casting early votes.

You should never make the assumption that you've got protection from the courts or from legal intervention or from lawsuits.

That stuff is always dicey.

You gotta keep on moving as if you are in the worst case scenario.

The other critical thing that came out, and this is something that I preached at this symposium many times in the past, building alliances with other animal use groups.

You may think that you can handle these pressures alone, when they finally come to bear, the reality is that you can't.

Your industry is too small.

The money is too small.

You're not important enough by yourself to generate the kinda leverage that you need to win a statewide ballot issue.

You've gotta have friends in the agriculture community.

You've gotta have friends in the sporting and conservation community.

Don't wait to build those alliances until you have a crisis and you got six weeks to put something together.

Build those alliances today.

Be present with other animal user groups, get engaged with agriculture.

You've got to have friends in order to win these campaigns.

The other key piece I think is that you can't stand aside and look the other way when members of your own industry help destroy your image.

That's one thing that I really have great respect that the greyhound racing community did right.

They really took the bull by the horns in adopting tough standards and getting tough with people who didn't follow those standards, and in trying to deal with the people in the industry who were bad apples.

If we don't do that, if we don't weed out the bad apples, pretty soon the bad apples poison the whole barrel and all of you are in trouble because of the actions of a few.

We can't afford to look the other way when the bad actors in the industry do things that put us all at risk.

I think the bottom line for me, and it comes down to that one word, complacency.

It's so easy to believe that you can't be threatened, that your lobbying relationships are too strong, your legislators are too supportive, your tax revenues are too big for the state to overlook.

We all know that that can change very quickly.

Please don't let yourself be complacent.

It would truly break my heart to see horse racing ultimately end up where greyhound racing now, which is functioning and operationally active in five states.

That's what could lie ahead if you're not careful.

Thanks.

[Applause]

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Any questions?

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Yes sir.

Mr. Lonny Powell: Marsha, I'd just like to make a comment, excellent presentation.

I'm Lonny Powell, the CEO of the Florida Thoroughbred Breeders and Owners Association.

For the last seven years I've lived every day of this.

You hit on something very key, which the horse industry needs to listen to, is the animal welfare issue was a certainly platform, but what carried the day was all but a couple of greyhound track owners walking to the microphones, talking down their product, acting like they didn't want to be associated with it.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: That's right.

Mr. Lonny Powell: 'Cause they wanted to pocket the breeder's awards and the purses in their pockets and be a free-standing casino, so it doesn't have to happen by a referendum.

All these jurisdictions need to look at that.

If you see your tracks, we have one in the Miami area trying to become [unintelligible 27:34] see tracks trying to exploit legislative loopholes or talking down their product, and slots are out there, that is a big danger.

Hopefully, the greyhound track operators [unintelligible 27:56] horse guy, I couldn't believe seeing these track operators tearing down their own story, their own business and that's what carried the day for a long time.

I think not only do we have to worry about the referendums and the initiatives, we have to look at the **[unintelligible 28:20]** stay in the business, and working well with this horse men, but you gotta watch the temptation with them and the freestanding casino **[unintelligible 28:25]** exploited, and that's what happened in Florida.

You think that everybody's thinking that I would have voted yes on prop 13, I voted no, because I have operated a couple greyhound tracks and the animal welfare was very important.

I also knew that it was more of a money grab than anything else by the greyhound track operators, so it wasn't truly what it said on the ballot.

Ultimately, it sets a bad precedence for everybody else no matter what part of the pari-mutuel industry you're in.

The greyhound track operators, they both feel the responsibility of Florida.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Let me clarify, I don't wanna give the wrong impression.

There were only a couple of tracks that took that approach.

Most of the tracks were horrified when those track operators came out publicly in partnership with animal rights groups.

Everybody was coming from the same perspective.

They all said, "Look, we understand if your economic imperative is such that you really can't handle the live racing anymore. We get that."

It's okay to talk about the economics of your business, but we draw the line at climbing into bed with the guys that they perceived as the enemies.

I don't want to suggest that that was prevalent in the track community, 'cause it wasn't. In fact, many track operators confronted those guys themselves at meetings.

Mr. Lonny Powell: It was prevalent even amongst the folks that didn't want to align with the animal welfare 'cause they wanted these standalone casinos.

I was there for every day, I saw it.

That was almost uniform throughout all the track operators.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: There were some that were very horrified —

Audience Speaker 3: Except Derby Lane.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Well except Derby Lane, and there were some that tried not to take a position on some of that stuff, like on the decoupling.

There were some tracks that didn't take a position.

Of course, in this particular election cycle there was another gambling issue on the ballot.

It was a measure to force voter approval of any casino gambling in the state.

That was basically driven by the Seminole Tribe and by the Disney Corporation.

The tracks were putting a lotta money into trying to defeat that initiative, which mean that they really didn't have a lot of time to spend or money to spend on question 13,

although they did ultimately contribute to the NGA's effort, the National Greyhound Association's effort to do — kind of a little bit too little, too late.

The whole industry approach, as I said was too little, too late 'cause they were relying on their lobbyists, and then they were relying on their lawyer to pull their fat out of the fire in the lawsuit.

By the time all those options were close to them, early voting had already begun.

You can't sit around and wait for the developments.

You've gotta be proactive.

You've gotta be out there. You gotta assume the worst and prepare for it and do what needs to be done.

Then if you win those issues, great.

You're not standing there with your bloomers down around your ankles waiting for disaster, and that's what happened here.

Audience Speaker 4: Ms. Kelly, thank you, great presentation.

You used a term that I'd like to maybe have you expound upon, allied within the industry.

Unfortunately, in the Thoroughbred world, and specifically we have an HSUS ally, it was very open, they let 'em in, and **[unintelligible 32:00]** committees, what do you suggest for those of us who are dealing with this on a day-to-day hand-to-hand combat sort of fashion?

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Well, and I know I'm gonna get myself into trouble with Wendy.

Audience Speaker: Don't worry about it.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: I promised Wendy that I wouldn't cause her an more heartburn than I already have.

That's a serious problem.

There is no good outcome to these alliances.

I've seen it happen again and again and again.

Not only with HSUS, they're not the only one.

I've seen it with other organizations as well.

To me, as an industry you have to collectively recognize that either these alliances are gonna help you or they're gonna hurt you.

If you agree that they're gonna hurt you, which I am convinced after almost 30 years of managing this issue, there is no other outcome.

Then you have to take whatever steps you need to take to change the players so that better decisions get made in the future.

I don't know how that happens, I don't know any of the internal workings of your industry, and I don't presume to know who's on first and what's on second, you know.

These alliances with animal rights groups do not work.

They create these alliances in order to be able to force you into constant capitulation to their position.

I don't know how long you've had this relationship, but I'm sure that you're already starting to see demands that they make on you internally for changes in the way that you do business and changes in the way that you handle animals, and some of that may be okay.

Maybe it's some of the stuff that you've talked about internally yourselves.

In the long run, it's much better for you to be doing those things on your own than to be doing them at the insistence of an animals rights group who's got a gun at your back basically saying, "Do this or we're gonna come out against you."

Ultimately, there's no good outcome. That's my conviction.

Audience Speaker 4: I agree with you.

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Anything else?

Audience Speaker 5: Marsha, one last question?

Ms. Marsha Kelly: Yes.

Audience Speaker 5: Without Florida, can greyhound racing survive?

Ms. Marsha Kelly: I think it can for a while.

I know that, for example, one of the remaining states where greyhound racing is still successful and active is West Virginia, that is on the animal rights target list next.

They've already made public pronouncements to the fact that their next big push is gonna be in West Virginia.

Fortunately, I think some of the folks in West Virginia have been pretty proactive about trying to build relationships.

It may not be a referendum, it may be legislation.

There are a lot of different ways for them to do what they need to do put you out of business if that's their goal.

I think it's kind of the lap of the Gods Wendy, I mean I think they're gonna target the states where greyhound racing is still active and viable, Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa and West Virginia.

It won't take much.

In some of those states the racing situation is tenuous already.

In Texas they're running a very abbreviated schedule on a circuit that the breeders put together, and there's a very tense relationship between the breeders and the tracks, so that doesn't bode well.

In Iowa they have an operation that's basically run by the breeder's association, it manages and — I think it owns the track or controls the track, I'm not sure how the business is structured, but it's basically under the control of the breeders, they do their own thing.

It's a very narrow range of programs that are still active and operating.

Every one of them is vulnerable now because of the loss of Florida.

Because Florida had more than half of the tracks, Florida was more than half of the funding for all the programs that we have that fight animal rights opposition.

When those tracks are gone that funding goes away.

Now instead of having this little bit of money, we've got this little bit of money.

Because all the people that were making good money and funneling it into our programs are gone.

It's a ripple effect.

Anybody else?

Thank you all?

I didn't mean to be a bearer of bad news, sorry.

[Applause]