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Abstract

Since the early 1990s, rural decline has led many communities to begin social and economic restructuring. Several locales are seeking alternative approaches to the primary sector to support their declining industrial base (Markey et al, 2008). The tourism industry is an alternative to traditional rural livelihoods. Rural amenities and scenic landscapes have encouraged stakeholders to develop heritage tourism.

The commodification of heritage has a profound impact on the place identity of rural landscapes. This is illustrated in the Model of Creative Destruction. In an earlier paper, Mitchell (1998) described the process of creative destruction through 5 stages being early commodification, advanced commodification, early destruction, advanced destruction and post destruction. In later papers, Mitchell and Vanderwerf (2010) describe the model as one that predicts that rural landscapes may evolve through three identities; rural town-scape, heritage-scape (or heritage village) and leisure-scape. Communities will remain as heritage-scapes if the desire to preserve is a dominant motivation. In contrast, if stakeholders are motivated more by a desire to profit or promote economic growth, then investments in non-conforming venues may result. This ultimately will shift the identity from one of heritage-scape to leisure-scape of mass consumption. Such investments may jeopardize a tourist’s heritage-seeking experience, and their perception of the community as a heritage village.

Gaming recently has been introduced as a form of rural economic development in communities that commodify heritage (i.e. heritage-scapes). The introduction of slot machine parlours at racetracks (racinos) has helped combat the decline in the horse racing industry (Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). Furthermore, the positive economic impacts of these facilities are numerous. Negative implications, however, also accompany this type of tourism development. To date, little research has been conducted on the impacts that racino gaming developments have on communities, and, more specifically, on heritage-scapes. This thesis seeks to address this deficiency in a case study of Elora, Ontario and the Grand River Raceway.

The purpose of this study was i) to determine the impact of the Grand River Raceway on Elora’s identity as a heritage village; ii) to identify the positive and negative socio-
economic benefits that the facility has on the community and iii) to provide recommendations to communities who are considering similar development. To meet these objectives, data were collected through business and tourist surveys, unstructured interviews and a content analysis of secondary sources.

Results suggest that the Grand River Raceway has not compromised Elora’s identity as a heritage-scape, in the eyes of business owners and tourists. Although the presence of the Grand River Raceway suggests that Elora is at the stage of early destruction or is on the way to becoming a leisure-scape, its presence has not detracted from visitor experience, as predicted by the model. This situation is attributed to marketing, location and uniformity with the existing landscape.

Furthermore, the Grand River Raceway has had both positive and negative socio-economic impacts on Elora. Some of the benefits include employment, tax revenues, sponsorships and financial contributions to the municipality. At the same time, however, the Grand River Raceway has created a divided community, generated several legal issues and resulted in an uneven distribution of economic benefits. It is recommended that public consultation and resident involvement in decision making will help to minimize these negative impacts.
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Chapter 1: Setting the Stage

1.1 Introduction

Rural decline is often described as an inevitable process as globalization and urbanization continue to restructure regional economies (Markey and Halseth and Manson, 2008; Figueiredo, 2008). Rural countrysides have been the catalyst for the development of provincial economies, acting as hinterlands that can be exhausted for their abundant resources. Reinvestment back into the Canadian rural economy has not been a provincial or national government priority (Markey et al, 2008). In recent decades, socio-economic activities in rural areas have led to the creation of “marginal spaces or areas of low income and productivity” (Figueiredo, 2008, p. 159). To combat rural decline, many rural communities have been forced to create new ways of generating economic development. Primarily, countrysides have begun to capitalize on their aesthetic qualities to stimulate their economy. Rural tourism is a sustainable activity that provides a tool for local economic development (Sharpley and Robets, 2004; Shunli and Huang, 2009). Moreover, both national and international governments have begun to recognize that rural tourism can combat rural decline and out-migration (Figueiredo, 2008).

1.2 Rationale

Heritage plays an important role in travel amongst those who desire to experience the historic and culture attributes of rural communities (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). As a result heritage tourism has, and continues to be, an important component of economic development in areas that posses rural idyllic identities (Mitchell, 1998). Heritage significantly differs on a
local and global scale. So too, does the place identity associated with each destination (Gu and Ryan, 2008). Mitchell and de Waal (2009) suggest that the development of large-scale non-heritage facilities can transform a heritage landscape. In doing so, it may change the identity of a destination and the types of consumers who seek it out (Mitchell and de Waal, 2009).

Casino gaming is the fastest growing form of tourism and the placement of gaming facilities at racetracks is a recent trend (Benar and Jenkin, 2008). These ‘racinos’ are pari-mutuel racetracks that permit legalized slot machines to operate adjacent to the horse betting facility (Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). Casino gaming has developed over the past decade to counteract the decline in racetrack attendance (Marshall, 1998; Mahtesian, 1996; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008; Timmons, 2002) but these gaming facilities also have been introduced to act as a catalyst for rural economic development (Carmichael, 2000; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2003; Pizam and Pokela, 1985; Stitt et al, 2005; Hjalager, 2006; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). Placing slot machines at racetracks is an economically strategic way to increase tourism receipts and revenues in a small community, but their presence may also challenge rural identities and existing heritage tourism (Mitchell and de Waal, 2009; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). It is important, therefore, to understand the impact that these facilities may have on communities that base their development on rural heritage.

Elora is a world renowned heritage village located in Ontario, Canada whose identity is largely based on historical architecture, scenery and culture (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Elora developed as a heritage village in the 1960s because of its untouched crafted limestone, cultural heritage and geographic location next to the Elora Gorge, which is situated adjacent
to the scenic Grand River (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). In 2000, the town of Elora was approached by the Grand River Agricultural Society (GRAS) and the Ontario Lottery Corporation (OLG) to build a 200 slot machine facility and racetrack on the outskirts of the village (CTV, 2002). An unprecedented controversy arose within the community between citizens and town council over the construction of this facility that would be “bigger than downtown” (CTV, 2002). Residents opposed to the development voiced their concerns that the slots facility, to be named the Grand River Raceway (GRR), would ruin the long-standing historical and cultural identity of Elora and the existing heritage tourism product (Eedy, 2000, p. 3). Residents in favour of the GRR looked to the economic benefits that the facility would provide. The opposition, however, was so strong that local residents formed the Centre Wellington Citizens’ Coalition (CWCC) (Mitchell and Singh, in press). Together, they presented their case to the Ontario Municipal Board, the Ontario Supreme Court and finally to the Ontario Court of Appeal in Toronto (Mitchell and Singh, in press). Despite their concerns, the development proceeded and the CWCC lost their case (Mitchell and Singh, in press). To date, the impacts of the GRR on the community of Elora are unknown and this provides a unique research opportunity.

1.3 Problem Statement

While the socio-economic impacts of gaming are well recognized in literature pertaining to the casino industry (e.g. Carmichael, 2000; Eadington, 1984; Eadington; 1999; Eadington; 2002; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2003; Stokowski, 1993) little attention has been paid to the impacts that racino gaming developments may have on rural community identity. Also, the implications that racino gaming development may have on heritage tourism has yet to be
investigated. This overreaching goal of this research is to address these gaps using Elora, Ontario, Canada as a model test case.

1.4 Research Objectives and Questions

This research is structured around three major objectives. First is to determine the impact of the GRR on Elora’s identity as a heritage tourism village. Second is to identify the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of the GRR; and third is to provide recommendations that may be used by other communities who are considering similar development.

To achieve these objectives, the following research questions are addressed:

i) How does the development of the gaming facility impact local identity and heritage tourism?

ii) What are the current views on gaming development from a business owner and tourist perspective?

iii) What are the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of the GRR on the community of Elora?

iv) Has the GRR altered tourist motivations for visiting Elora or changed their travel patterns?

v) Has Elora altered its marketing strategy as a heritage tourism community to one that advertises horse racing and slot machines?

vi) What are the socio-economic advantages and disadvantages of the GRR on the community of Elora?
1.5 Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 2 presents a literature review that covers a broad range of topics pertaining to rural communities, heritage tourism, creative destruction and the gaming industry. Chapter 3 provides a detailed history of Elora, the evolution of its tourism base and the debate concerning the development of the GRR. Chapter 3 also discusses the research approach, the methods that were used to conduct this study, and the techniques of analysis. Chapters 4 and 5 cover the key findings and results of the objectives and set of research questions. Chapter 6 provides a detailed discussion that links the results of this study to the literature. Finally, Chapter 7 provides conclusions, recommendations, and identifies avenues for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to set the context for this study by reviewing two relevant bodies of literature: i) tourism in rural communities and ii) tourism and the casino gaming industry. This review will shed light on the gap that currently exists in our understanding of the relationship between community identity, heritage tourism and casino gaming.

2.2 Tourism in Rural Communities

2.2.1 Background

Rural has been defined in a variety of ways (e.g. Woods, 2005) but for this study, the official definition of “Rural and Small Town”, used by Statistics Canada, is adopted. A Rural and Small Town (RST) refers to the population living outside the commuting zone of Larger Urban Centres (LUCs) – specifically, outside Census Metropolitan Areas (CMA) and Census Agglomerations (CA). RST includes all municipalities with urban populations of 1,000 to 9,999 and rural areas, where less than 50 percent of the employed individuals commute to the urban core of a CMA/CA. This definition is preferred over others, since it encompasses communities of somewhat larger size (Rothwell et al, 2002).

Many rural communities across the developed world declined during the latter half of the 20th century (Markey et al, 2008; Floysand and Jakobsen, 2007) Markey et al. (2008, p. 409) suggest that “rural decline is often described as an inevitable process associated with
such broader structural trends as globalization and urbanization”. These scholars also argue that rural decline, in part, has been the result of the exploitation of abundant hinterland resources and the failure to reinvest capital back into rural economies (Markey et al, 2008).

Since the early 1990s, rural decline had led numerous countries to begin rural economic restructuring (Cawley and Gillmor, 2008). Alternative restructuring approaches are used to support declining incomes from traditional sources (Fløysand and Jakobsen, 2007; Miller, 1989). However, recent trends suggest that globalization and urbanization are occurring at unprecedented rates and are further threatening the economic prosperity of rural and small town areas (Markey et al, 2008). The lack of social services, infrastructure and investment in rural areas contributes to the marginalization of smaller communities (Markey et al, 2008). Hibbard and Romer (1999, p. 87) find that the traditional source of livelihood in rural areas, formerly agriculture and natural resource production, has been comprised.

In addition to resource exhaustion, rural communities are also losing their population base (Hugh, 2005). This has occurred for several reasons. The shift from family farms to large-scale industrial agriculture has threatened the retention of rural populations in some regions (Bjorkhaug and Richards, 2008). A lack of education and employment opportunities in rural areas also makes it difficult to retain rural youth (Bollman, 2000; Corbett 2007). Many choose to relocate to urban areas, where the opportunity for education, professional employment and financial opportunities are more attractive (Kuhn and McAusland, 2009). Research suggests that many, who leave rural areas, are unwilling to return. This is particularly true for Canadian women who are unlikely to return to the countryside upon
completing higher education (Corbett, 2007). A solution to rural economic decline and out-migration, however, can be found in the tourism industry.

Many scholars and organizations have attempted to define tourism but, thus far, there is no single definition that can encompass all of its components. For example, some authors (Leiper, 1979; Wilson, 1998) quote the World Tourism Organization definition of tourism. The World Tourism Organization defines tourism as “the activities of persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business, and other purposes” (World Tourism Organization, 2010). Scholars, in contrast, suggest that tourism is a mixed industry of public, private and non-profit organizations that varies depending on ownership, governance, structure and content (Andersson and Getz, 2009; Jamal and Getz, 1995). The definition of tourism that was used for this thesis is adapted from the World Tourism Organization because it encompasses distance travelled from the tourists place of origin and involves several types of activities that could be pursued (Wilson, 1998).

Over the past few decades, the restructuring of many rural economies away from traditional resource-based employment has led to economic development in the tourism sector (Cawley and Gillmore, 2008; Miller, 1989; Gartner, 2005; Sharpley, 2007). This has been fuelled, in part, by the increase in disposable income that occurred after World War II, leading to greater demand for leisure activities (Gartner, 2005, p. 36). Many rural settlements have looked to develop tourism-based economies that distinguish them from their urban counterparts (Smith and Krannich, 1998). This has been achieved through the promotion of uncongested environments (Miller, 1989), and outdoors activities that are not available in
urban centres (Gartner, 2005). As Gartner (2005, p. 36) states “rural tourism development is directly tied to the need for natural resources to fuel economic development”. It has also been suggested that rural culture, heritage and architectural interests attract tourists to rural areas (Hohl and Tisdell, 1995; Miller, 1989). This recognition has given rise to a particular type of tourism, based on the commodification of heritage resources.

2.2.2 Heritage Tourism

Rural destinations have recently begun to focus development efforts around heritage tourism (Mitchell, 1998; Mitchell and Coghill; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009). Rather than developing new attractions, heritage tourism draws attention to the existing assets of historic, cultural and natural resources (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Many rural communities have adopted heritage tourism as an economically strategic solution to counteract out-migration and rural economic decline (Carnegie and McCabe, 2008; McMorran, 2008; Stokowski, 1993).

Researchers consider heritage a rural tourism product (e.g. Bonn et al, 2007; McMorran, 2008; Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Heritage can be defined as something that is either a “tangible resource (e.g. natural or built landscape, building, museum piece, or personal heirloom) or an intangible resource (e.g. festival, value, way of life, or ceremony)” that is consistently referenced to the past (McMorran, 2008, p. 336). The uniqueness involved with a destination’s heritage is a compelling attribute in the tourism industry.

A variety of events has encouraged consumers to seek out heritage environments. McMorran (2008) suggests that the Renaissance, the Industrial Revolution, urbanization, two
World Wars, and recently amplified globalization, have all inspired nostalgia for lost or vanishing architecture and social values. Furthermore, travel for the contemporary tourist is less restricted, due to increased vacation time and financial flexibility, than it was in the past (Bonn et al, 2007; Urry, 1990). Tourist destinations have responded to this growing demand by commodifying rural heritage.

The commercialisation of rural heritage is frequently referred to as commodification (Medina, 2003). Commodification is a characteristic of modern capitalism that involves the transformation of products into commodities (Watson and Kopachevsky, 1994). Commodification of heritage is complex because it places value on communities, culture, society, and aesthetic environmental landscapes (Watson and Kopachevsky, 1994). Watson and Kopachevsky (1994, p. 647) describe the relationship between commodification and communities as “such a world is one in which image, advertising, and consumerism and leisure take primacy over production per se and commoditization is shaped by specific influential groups in society utilizing a mixture of social, cultural, and political resources.”

There is general consensus that commodification both preserves heritage and creates a nostalgic environment for heritage-seeking consumers (Ashworth and Larkham, 1994; Halbwachs, 1992; Lowenthal, 1995; McCabe, 1998; McMorron, 2005; Miller, 1989). Others, however, observe that commodification represents partial histories, which may silence certain groups and events (Panelli et al, 2008). Medina (2003) concurs, indicating that the use of culture to attract tourists can result in inauthentic representation. Despite these concerns, commodification is widely used as a development tool.
In recent decades, heritage tourism has experienced significant growth in many rural areas and smaller communities (Miller, 1989). As Li and Wu and Cai (2008, p. 309) point out, heritage is one of the fastest growing components of tourism in many developed economies. In North America, the commodification of heritage landscapes emerged in the late 1970s (Fan and Wall and Mitchell, 2008, p. 648). This trend developed, in part, because of the limited capital needed to establish a heritage tourism destination (Carnegie and McCabe, 2008). Moreover, communities each have their own unique heritage, making them vulnerable to commodification. The perception of benefits has prompted many communities to embark on the development of heritage tourism.

Despite concerns above, communities can benefit economically from commodification of their culture and natural surroundings. Selling heritage is viewed as a way to strengthen economic development, create employment, reduce poverty, preserve traditional culture, and replace older sectors that are in decline (Zoomers, 2008). The promotion of local heritage can instil a sense of pride amongst enthusiast locals. It is also considered to be an important way to create a national identity (Badyopadhyay and Morais and Chick, 2008). The interaction of tourists and residents in heritage communities also serves as an educational tool. Medina (2003) points out that some tourists have a desire to learn local culture and this interest gives rise to a positive form of economic development.

### 2.2.3 Place, Identity and Tourism Impacts

A tourist’s experience in a destination often influences their decision to re-visit (Alegre and Juanda, 2006). Researchers in leisure and tourism studies suggest that the
recreation experience has a psychological component comprised of two distinct dimensions: a symbolic or affective attachment to place and a functional attachment (Gross and Brown, 2006). Thus, the study of place attachment in heritage communities is particularly important in understanding why tourists are drawn to these destinations as is a study of the impact of heritage tourists on place identity (Gross and Brown, 2006).

Accordingly, the need to satisfy some tourists’ desire to experience heritage has given select rural spaces a new identity (Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). According to Mannarini et al (2006), identity is the distinctiveness of a place, or the qualities that distinguish it from any other place. In a heritage setting, this identity is based on a number of characteristics including history, culture, practice and tradition. Each of these is combined to create a product that is marketed to tourists (Panelli et al, 2008). Visitors may subsequently become attached to this identity, as it contributes to their recreational experience (Gross and Brown, 2006).

While providing benefits to local residents, this new identity may conflict with the place identity valued by local residents. As suggested by Massey (1993) places do not exhibit single and unique identities. Rather, they are spaces of internal conflict that are ever-changing. The nature of this impact will depend on a variety of factors. Some of these factors include the duration of residency, occupation (especially in the tourism industry), age, gender, ethnicity, and proximity to tourist zones. Also, Gu and Ryan (2008, p. 640) suggest that local residents may be affected depending on “their sense of place attachment and stage of destination development within the tourism life cycle”.
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Increasing awareness of residents’ perceptions of tourism has become a primary concern (Stitt et al, 2005). Further acknowledgment of residents’ perceptions stems from the social and personal disruptions that may result with tourism development. Despite the well-known positive economic contributions attributed to tourism, the benefits do not always outweigh the costs (Park and Stokowski, 2009). Among the variety of negative disruptions, including noise, crime, and congestion, is the loss of “sense of community and sense of place” (Park and Stokowski, 2009, p. 905). According to some (e.g. Park and Stokowski, 2009; Stitt et al, 2005), social disruption theory is a useful way of measuring the level of disruption in a tourism community. This theory suggests that the initial negative impacts of tourism development typically have a profound effect on the lives of local residents (England and Albrecht, 1984; Park and Stokowski, 2009). This transition of tourism development is marked by “a period of generalized crisis, resulting from the transitional stress of sudden dramatic increases in demand for public services and community infrastructure” (Perdue and Long and Kang, 1999, p. 166). Others suggest that the rapid change in a community, due to the temporary population increases from tourism, can lead to numerous social problems such as crime and congestion (Greider and Krannich and Berry, 1991; Park and Stokowski, 2009). Over time, however, social disruption theory suggests that host communities begin to adapt to tourism development (Perdue et al., 1999). Local residents begin to adjust to the social and environmental changes in the community by increasing public services and infrastructure. Community members ultimately become accustomed to many of the social disruptions and either adapt, or in extreme cases, move away (Perdue et al, 1999). Throughout the process of tourism development, therefore, residents’ quality of life is expected to decrease initially,
only to increase once they have adapted to their new surroundings (Krannich and Berry and Greider, 1989; Perdue et al, 1999).

Tourism development, in many communities, is intended to improve the quality of life for local residents. The benefits are primarily seen in the economic impacts, such as tax revenues and additional visitors at local businesses. The costs, however, typically come in the form of social problems (Carmichael, 2000; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2003; Stitt et al, 2005). Jurowski and Gursoy (2003, p. 297) suggest that “the acceptability of these changes is likely to be influenced by perceptions of the benefits residents receive in exchange for the disbenefits they observe”. The costs and benefits of tourism development are highly dependent on a resident’s position within the community. For example, those who may have gained employment as a result of development are likely to consider tourism a benefit. Conversely, local residents may feel that tourism development has encroached on their lived space or disrupted the natural environment (Carmichael, 2000; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2003; Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Stitt et al, 2005). These residents may view certain aspects of tourism development to be costs. Other scholars suggest that a local community is more likely to accept and adapt to tourism development as long as the benefits continue to outweigh the costs (Hsu, 1999; Kwan and Mccartney, 2005). The costs and benefits of tourism development can be better understood with the use of the social exchange theory (Ap, 1990).

Social exchange theory is derived from sociology and used to understand the exchange of resources occurring from tourism development (Ap, 1990; Ap, 1992; Back and Lee, 2005; Carmichael, 2000; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2003). Its premise is to provide a
springboard for assessing why residents perceive the impacts of tourism differently (Ap, 1990; Ap, 1992; Stitt et al, 2005). It is suggested that social exchange theory predicts that those who benefit personally from tourism development will have a more positive outlook. Those who view tourism negatively are likely to benefit the least from its development (Stitt et al, 2005). It is important to note, however, that, over time perceptions of costs and benefits may change (Stitt et al, 2005).

Tourism development can also have a profound impact on the identity of the host community (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009; Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). The expansion of a tourist destination may ultimately influence the identity of that destination. If tourist developments begin to deviate from the heritage theme, then it is likely that a visitors’ experience may be compromised (Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2008). Moreover, tourists may cause a “demonstration effect” that can alter the characteristics of a heritage tourism village (Gu and Ryan, 2008, p. 639). This predicts that some local businesses may develop around the needs of visitors (Gu and Ryan, 2008). Some suggest that a change in tourist clientele can alter the amenities and services that businesses provide (Gu and Ryan, 2008). Although scholars suggest that an abundance of literature exists on tourism impacts on host communities (Gu and Ryan, 2008), it is crucial to consider the impacts that heritage tourism can have on the identity of host destinations.

This impact has been considered in work conducted in conjunction with the concept of creative destruction. This concept originated in the field of economics (Schumpeter 1942), where it was used to explain the impact that the creation of new technologies has on older innovations (i.e. their destruction). Harvey (1987) then used this concept to demonstrate that
the development of new innovations lead to the creation of new landscapes of accumulation, and destruction of those based on older innovations. Mitchell (1998) then borrowed the concept to describe the evolution of localities whose development has occurred around the commodification of heritage.

In an early paper (1998), Mitchell first described the process of creative destruction as occurring through five stages (early commodification, advanced commodification, early destruction, advanced destruction, and post destruction) (Mitchell, 1998). In the first stage, the commodification of local heritage begins. Investments in the community are beneficial for local residents and entrepreneurs. At this stage, residents’ attitudes are fairly positive about tourism development (Mitchell, 1998). The second stage, advanced commodification, is marked by increasing investments. At this stage a heritage landscape is formed. Increasing investments and tourist numbers causes partial destruction of the rural idyll, in the eyes of local residents. Overall, the benefits of tourism outweigh the costs and resident’s perceptions remain positive (Mitchell, 1998). Early destruction is the third stage of the model. At this point investment into non-heritage and large-scale facilities occurs. The number of visitors continues to grow and some businesses stray from the original heritage theme. Residents begin to witness a change in their lived space, as their community identity continues to evolve (Mitchell, 1998). Advanced destruction occurs when residents adapt and accept the inevitability of tourism development. Servicing the tourism market becomes the primary concern and major development of non-heritage facilities replaces small-scale heritage venues. At this stage in the model, local residents may decide to move away as the sense of community has eroded (Mitchell, 1998). The final stage is post-destruction where investment
levels have raised significantly and the heritage destination lacks authenticity. This stage marks the point where heritage-seeking visitors are no longer attracted to the atmosphere of the community as it becomes similar to what they are trying to escape from. New types of tourists may come; those that are not seeking the rural idyll. At this stage, “consumption levels will again rise and the hope of regaining any vestige of the rural idyll is completely lost” (Mitchell, 1998, p. 277)

In a series of later papers, Mitchell argued that historic towns progress through these stages, if three key characteristics are present (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009; Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). The first characteristic is accessibility to a large and relatively affluent population. The second characteristic is availability of cultural markers (e.g. significant physical features; appealing local culture, presence of small town atmosphere etc.). Finally, is the presence of stakeholders, motivated by profit, preservation and/or promotion of economic growth (Mitchell and de Waal, 2009).

The presence of these characteristics may cause a historic locale to evolve through the model’s various stages, giving rise to three different landscape forms and place identities. This transformation is dependent on the extent to which heritage is exploited and used for profit or to promote economic growth (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Mitchell and Vanderwerf 2010). If profit and promotion are the dominant motivators, then non-heritage developments will likely be introduced, causing the transformation to be complete. In this scenario, the identity of the community will shift from one valued for its provision of unique and authentic heritage products (i.e. a heritage-scape), to one that caters to the mass tourist market (i.e. a leisure-scape).
A number of papers have tracked the evolution of historic communities through the model’s various stages (Mitchell, 1998; Mitchell and Coghill, 2000, Mitchell and de Waal, 2009; Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010; Mitchell and Singh, in press). However, to date, no attempt has been made to demonstrate if the introduction of a large scale, non-heritage venue will cause a change in place identity. This paper will address this deficiency by considering if the placement of a gaming facility has caused Elora’s identity to shift from heritage-scape to leisure-scape.

2.3 Tourism and the Casino Gaming Industry

2.3.1 Background

In the late 1960s, the liberalization of gambling in Canadian communities paved the way for electronic gambling machines (Smith and Campbell, 2007). Rapidly increasing profit margins encouraged the decriminalization of electronic gaming that also allowed for fixed foundations to house this form of gambling (Smith and Campbell, 2007). Not coincidently, racetracks around the turn of the century were experiencing severe decline. This was attributed to their inability to compete with a) the ever expanding accessibility to off-track wagering and; b) the increasing alternative forms of gaming such as resort casinos (Thalheimer, 2008; Thalheimer and Ali, 1995). Racetracks have traditionally and conveniently been located in, or near, rural communities. Their association with culture and tourism, therefore, is almost inseparable (Ham and Brown and Jang, 2004). Several studies have sought to determine the associated impacts of horse betting on tourism and local economic development (Ham et al, 2004; Thalheimer ,1998; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008).
2.3.2 Horse-betting and Racetracks

Horse racing is considered one of the “oldest sports in history” and has a historically profound place in heritage, culture and rural communities (Vamplew and Kay, 2005, p. 150). Thus, it is no surprise that there is a linkage between horseracing, horse related activities and rural communities, considering that the latter are typically associated with agricultural and livestock farming. Ollenburg (2005, p. 47) suggests that “historically, horses formed a critical component of human transport systems, worldwide, whether personal, commercial or military”. Furthermore, Ollenburg (2005, p. 47) argues that “in some countries they still do, at least in rural areas”. In the modern world, horses are used for many commercial and outdoor recreational activities, aside from horse-farming. For example, the horseracing industry is sometimes viewed as analogous to the ski and resort type tourism industry (Ollenburg, 2005).

Horse and equestrianism-related activities are deeply seeded in the image of many rural communities and have a long-term relationship with the growth of local heritage (Chalip and Costa, 2005). Place identity is significantly related to the branding of the destination. In marketing literature, branding is directly related to image (Chalip and Costa, 2005). Although Chalip and Costa (2005, p. 231) focus on sporting and destination branding, their article pays considerable attention to the importance of cultural events such as “music, food art or other cultural activities”. They label these cultural events as “vital components” of building a tourism product (Chalip and Costa, 2005, p. 231). It would be difficult in rural areas, therefore, to separate horse farming and equestrianism-related activities where
heritage is the primary attraction. Furthermore, the branding of rural communities is likely to involve the heritage image of horses.

Until recently, racetracks in rural communities were quite successful in attracting tourists (Thalheimer, 1998; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). However, the legalisation of gambling, particularly in North America, in the latter part of the 21st century, induced a saturation of gaming institutions (Thalheimer and Ali, 2008, p. 2396). Subsequently, visitors to racetracks declined. To offset the decline in attendance, racetracks permitted newer forms of gaming technology. Thus, slot machines became the new face of gaming at racetracks (Thalheimer and Ali, 2003; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008).

2.3.3 Gaming Industry

Casino gaming has been a part of civilizations for several centuries and it is believed that the first casino was constructed during mid-19th century (Barnhart, 1997, p. 371). However, it was not until the early 1930s that gambling became a legalized industry (Eadington, 1984). The United States was the first country to adopt legalized gambling. Throughout history, gambling has been perceived as an immoral vice. This was attributed to its negative socio-economic implication, such as gambling addiction and crime. Two important factors caused the legalization of casinos. The first factor was the state’s attempt to control the vast illicit underground gambling economy (Eadington, 1984). As a result, the second factor was to create a legitimate commercial industry that brought revenue and capital to governments (Eadington, 1984). In Canada, casino development coincided with the legalization of casinos in the United States. However, rapid growth in casino tourism did not
begin until the early 1990s. This was because of strict government regulations on the number of gaming facilities. By 1997, increasing government flexibility, with motives of increasing revenue, encouraged the continued growth of the casino market (Marshall, 1998).

Gaming has contributed to significant economic development in many host destinations (Long, 1995). Research finds that the tourism sector produces more revenue than any other industry in the world (Eadington, 1999; Eadington, 2002). Tourism and gaming have been closely linked throughout history and, in many cases, gaming operations have been a major contributing factor to the growth of tourism in a host destination (Anderson, 2005; Carmichael, 2000; Eadington, 1999; Eadington, 2002; Long, 2005; Park and Stokowski, 2009; Stokowski, 2009). Casino tourism has also proven to be financially beneficial to local governments and Native communities, and provides numerous developmental opportunities (Eadington, 1999; Eadington, 2002; Long, 2005). Casino employment is also a significant factor in the gaming industry. Local residents benefit financially from the increase in jobs that the gaming industry produces (Light, 2008; Park and Stokowski, 2009). Governments have generally encouraged the growth of casinos as a way to improve tourist numbers and generate wealth in the community (Anderson, 2005; Eadington, 1999, Eadington, 2002; Long, 2005; Park and Stokowski, 2009; Perdue et al, 1999). It should also be noted that not only has domestic travel to gaming facilities increased, but so has the international market for casino tourism. In both aspects, the gaming industry creates a demand for facilities such as hotels, infrastructure, and a sub-set market of entertainment (Back and Lee, 2005; DiNardo, 2007). For example, the development of casinos has fostered other tourism-related activities, such as live shows, restaurants,
concerts and many other activities (Back and Lee, 2005; DiNardo, 2007).

Currently, casino gaming is considered to be the fastest growing form of tourism (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). The motivations behind the development of any casino can be attributed to a community’s desire for positive economic growth (Anderson, 2005; Perdue et al, 1999; Park and Stokowski, 2009). Similarly, Ham et al (2004, pp. 391) suggest that “casino development, like other forms of tourism development, is expected to contribute to the activation of the local economy in a community”. The industry also has other major components of gambling that include pari-mutuels, lotteries, bingo, racetrack betting and video lottery terminals, more commonly known as slot machines (Eadington, 1999). Gaming is not restricted to traditional casino facilities. Riverboat casinos have become increasingly popular as they are seen as an added value in a community that promotes tourism (Husaker, 2001; Navin and Sullivan, 2007). Also, video lottery terminals are located on airplanes, ferries, nightclubs, bowling allies, restaurants, convenient stores, taxi stands and in several licensed and non-licensed establishments (Gilliland and Ross, 2005).

The nature of casino tourism is constantly evolving and the growth of gaming facilities is increasing parallel to the demand from consumers (Burton, 2008). According to Mohsin and Lockyer (2008, p. 164) “Canadians spend more on legal, government-operated gambling than they do on clothing, shoes and medicine combined”. Casino tourism is the fastest growing activity within the Canadian tourism sector (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). Statistics Canada, as cited by Marshall (1998, p. 7) claims that the continuous growth in casino tourism “outstrips” any other industry in terms of employment and revenue in the travel and tourism industry.
In Canada, the gaming industry has seen unprecedented growth over the past decade (Maclaurin and Wolstenholme, 2008). Gaming, including casinos and government lotteries, has seen revenues increase from $2.7 billion in 1992 to $13.3 billion in 2000 (Maclaurin and Wolstenholme, 2008, p. 320). In terms of employment, gaming related jobs in Canada have risen from 11,000 in 1992 to 40,000 in 2006 (Maclaurin and Wolstenholme, 2008, p. 320). Average hourly pay has also increased from $13.51 per-hour in 1997 to $20.37 per-hour in 2006 (Marshall, 1998, p. 9). These employment numbers are expected to continually increase as “gaming in Canada remains the fastest growing component of the Canadian tourism industry” (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008, p. 164). The number of “full-service” casinos in Canada has reached a total of 64 (Maclaurin and Maclaurin, 2003, p. 328). Full service casinos are gaming facilities that offer accommodation, food service, retail and other services typical of resort destinations (Maclaurin and Maclaurin, 2003; Rephann, 1997). Mohsin and Lockyer (2008) suggest that, as the industry grows, Canadians have become more accepting of gambling. In the late 1990s, gaming at racetracks began to emerge in Canada (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008, p. 164). A discussion of the evolution of gaming at racetracks follows below.

### 2.3.4 Gaming at Racetracks

The introduction of slot machines, specifically in the past few decades, was a result of the decline in the racetrack industry. This modern form of electronic gambling provides racetracks a competitive edge to large full service casinos (Thalheimer, 2008; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). The introduction of slot machines, at a pre-existing racetrack, started first, in West Virginia, United States. This development was intended to improve attendance at a
racetrack that had been experiencing severe decline with the growth of casinos and other forms of legalized gambling (Thalheimer, 2008). Slots at racetracks soon earned the name “racino” which is defined as a facility that permits slot machines at pari-mutuel racetracks (Thalheimer, 2008 p. 2396). Interestingly, the majority of patrons that visit racinos are betting on the slots as opposed to horseracing (Mahtesian, 1996).

Revenues from slot machines are supporting racetracks that have struggled to compete with the growing casino industry (Mahtesian, 1996). Research reveals that horse betting declined by 61 percent from 1960 to 1994 (Thalheimer, 1998, p. 531). Researchers also believe that the rapid growth in the casino industry, due to the legalization of many new commercial, Indian and riverboat casinos, has been the major factor in the decline of racetrack patrons (Mahtesian, 1996). Steven Crist, Vice President for the New York Racing Association, states that “no racetrack has the resources to compete with other forms of gambling” (Mahtesian, 1996, p. 30). Simulcast and off-track betting sites have also caused a decline in racetrack attendance (Greenhouse, 1998). Simulcasts have made it possible for people to watch and wager on multiple races without attending a race live (Greenhouse, 1998). Thalheimer (1998, p. 531) suggests that “additional revenue generated from the VTL\(^1\) [video lottery terminal] is found to more than offset the decline in pari-mutual revenue and the increased expense associated with the VLTs, given that a sufficient number of terminals are made available”.

Slot machines have more than supplemented the decline in racetrack betting. Today, racinos are a unique form of tourist attraction that offers live horse racing and slot machine

---

\(^1\) Video lottery terminals are also known as slot machines
gaming in one facility. Slot machines, however, cause mixed emotions in many host communities.

2.3.5 Gaming Impacts and Residents’ Perceptions

The development of commercialized casino gaming has had a long history of controversy. The activity has been condemned as either a waste of time or immoral (Eadington, 1984). The legalization of casinos has been an extensive process that has varied among countries, states and provinces, but particularly in North America (Eadington, 1984; Stitt et al, 2005). Nevada, which is coined the modern day birthplace of commercialized casino gaming, legalized gambling in 1931 (Eadington, 1999, p. 175). Authorities considered Nevada an outcast state that “violated an implicit moral code against gambling to which all other states had adhered” (Eadington, 1999, p. 175). The controversial nature of this type of activity stems from the associated negative impacts. The positive contributions, however, quite often outweigh the pitfalls.

Casinos provide a wide range of economic benefits such as increased tourism and employment and tax revenues, each of which may improve the quality of life for residents (Andereck et al, 2005). Casino tourism is also a way to economically enhance the quality of life of the people through investments and social programs in a host community (Wicks and Norman, 1996). Benar and Jenkins (2008) found that casinos develop turnover taxable profits that are comparable to other major forms of tourist attractions.

Initially, casino gaming was introduced to aid in times of recession and economic stagnation. Previous studies have found that the initial surge in casino development and state
lotteries have boosted an economically threatened community (Pizam and Pokela, 1985). Several former mining communities in the United States illustrate the economic success of gaming development. For example, Central City, Black Hawk and Cripple Creek, Colorado, have all resorted to casino development as a strategy to revitalize their declining economies (Kang et al, 2008; Stokowski, 1993). Gaming development became increasingly appealing in these historic mining towns after experiencing severe unemployment rate and out-migration (Kang et al, 2008; Stokowski, 1993). Deadwood, South Dakota is another example where gaming has revived the economy of a post-industrial community. Numerous studies on Deadwood reveal that the implementation of limited-stakes gaming has increased tourism and revitalized this dying centre (Nickerson, 1995; Stitt et al, 2005; Stubbles, 1990). It is no surprise, therefore, that many rural communities are anxious to carve out their own niche in the casino industry, given that it has acted at the fulcrum of economic development in several locales (Chen and Hsu, 2001; Pizam and Pokela, 1985).

The expansion of gaming in many smaller communities has resulted in increased attention toward their socio-economic impacts and residents’ perceptions. Scholars suggest that some of the negative impacts of casinos involve street crime, loan sharking, prostitution, drugs, tourist/host conflict, compulsive gambling, increase in traffic, larceny, auto theft, robbery, driving under the influence, pollution, noise, and violence to name a few (Andereck et al, 2005; Brathe, 2009; Chhabra, 2009; Ham et al, 2004). In the case of Deadwood, increased crime, noise, violence, congestion and problem gambling are just some of the social pitfalls that have developed (Nickerson, 1995). However, these social consequences related to casino development are similar to many tourism attractions (Andereck et al, 2005).
Gambling addiction is the most common social issue associated with casinos. More importantly, the high prevalence of gambling addiction has a strong correlation to the proximity of gambling facilities accessibility to consumers. It has also been established that residents of casino tourism destinations are more likely to be susceptible to problem gambling (Miller and Currie, 2008; Moshin and Lockyer, 2008). Pearce et al (2008) also argue that gambling patterns are influenced by accessibility and the spatial location of gambling facilities located in socially deprived neighborhoods. Thus, the development of a casino, in economically-deprived areas, may induce individual financial burden along with social problems (Pearce et al, 2008). Researchers suggest that regions of particular concern are rural communities, due to the rapid development of slot machine facilities (Pearce et al, 2008; Stitt et al, 2005; Stokowski, 1993). Many host communities feel the impacts of casino gaming, particularly local residents. Thus, numerous studies on casinos have aimed to acknowledge residents’ perceptions of gambling (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007).

Residents’ perception of casino development is crucial, considering the numerous social, economic, cultural and environmental impacts of gaming. Residents’ attitudes can be differentiated on the basis of several factors including the direct economic benefits received, their socio-cultural background and their geographic/demographic location with respect to the gaming facility (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007). These factors influence whether residents have a positive or negative attitude towards casino development (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007).

Residents’ perceptions of casino development are typically determined prior to and post development of a casino (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007). Local authorities in Deadwood
for example, enticed local residents to vote for gaming development. Nickerson (1995, p. 54) states that “gaming was touted as a method to revive the town and acquire funds to historically restore the town. Gaming was viewed as a way to increase visitors and money spent in Deadwood which in turn would be used to improve the historic look of the community”. Local resident’s initial feelings towards gaming development were mostly positive because it was believed that the gaming development would provide jobs, increase business revenue, and revitalize decapitated infrastructure (Kang et al, 2008; Nickerson, 1995).

Over time, however, residents became increasingly hostile in both Deadwood and the other Colorado gaming communities (Kang et al, 2008; Nickerson, 1995). As gaming development increased, so did the price of property. Many store owners, who were told that gaming development would help their firm, were forced to give up their lease (Nickerson, 1995). Also, several residential areas became too pricy for locals families. Developers became anxious to buy out property to create commercial space for casinos and parking lots (Kang et al, 2008; Nickerson, 1995). Many complained that gaming brought in a transient society which encroached on their living space. As illustrated in these communities, gaming can have both positive and negative implications.

Stokowski (1993, p. 35) refers to the results of tourism development as “lag effects”. There are several forms of lag effects and they can be both a positive and/or negative effect of tourism development. Stokowski (1993) discusses lag effects with the use of gaming development. The desirable lag effects occur when the perceived negative impacts fail to accompany, or result less quickly, with tourism development. The less desirable lag effects
occur when the positive benefits of tourism development fail to materialize or take longer than expected (Stokowski, 1993). The social exchange theory is also another way to measure the perceived benefits of gaming.

Social exchange theory, as mentioned earlier (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007; Di Domenico and Tracey and Haugh, 2009) is a common way to measure residents’ perceptions on gaming impacts. The social exchange theory “explicitly views interpersonal interactions from an exchange perspective in which social costs and benefits are ‘traded’ in relationships governed by normative rules and agreements” (Di Domenico et al, 2009, p. 890). This theory also suggests that “residents are likely to support tourism development as far as the expected benefits of tourism are greater than the perceived costs” (Ham et al, 2004, p. 393). This conclusion is supported by Chhabra and Gursoy (2007) who suggest that a more positive attitude is held when residents perceive casino development to be economically beneficial to their community. Conversely, residents may perceive casino development as negative if they are aware of the social implications, such as crime, congestion and gambling addiction. Social attributes such as race, educational attainment and household income also influence resident’s perceptions (Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007).

Unfavourable change in community character is another factor that influences residents’ perceptions of casino development (Ham et al, 2004). Pizam and Pokela (1985) found that residents’ perceptions are heavily influenced by the negative image of a casino in their host community. In later papers, Park and Stokowski (2009) and Stitts et al (2005) and Stokowski (1993) found that residents’ attitudes were overwhelmingly negative, given their
recognition of the perceived unfavourable change of character that their town might undergo with the introduction of a casino.

2.4 Chapter Summary

This review of the literature has revealed the importance of heritage tourism to local economic development. The foundations of heritage tourism and its ability to stimulate the economy are routed in place identity. However, this heritage attraction is threatened by the process of creative destruction, which predicts the introduction of non-conforming venues in locales where profit or economic growth are the dominant motivations. As a non-conforming heritage product, gaming may provide a variety of socio-economic impacts. Residents’ perceptions of these impacts depend on a variety of factors. As discussed, residents are more likely to embrace gaming development if they believe that benefits will be received locally. Although much has been written about the costs and benefits of these facilities, little is known about their impact on place identity. This thesis will aim to partially fill this gap in the literature by examining the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of racinos, and their implications for place identity, as perceived by tourists and local business owners. In doing so, it will contribute to literature on both rural tourism and gaming.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to first describe the study area of Elora, Ontario and then outline the research design used to collect and analyse the data for this study. The study area will also be described and justified. The research design section will revisit the goals, objectives and research questions of this thesis. A detailed description of each method and data analysis approach is included in this chapter. This chapter will illustrate how the research was conducted using qualitative interviews, quantitative surveys and a content analysis of various secondary sources.

3.2 Study Area Description

Elora is an historic village located in southern Ontario roughly 30 km from Kitchener-Waterloo, 18 km from Guelph and approximately 110 km from Toronto, as illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Elora is ideally situated central to many major urban centres and offers a rural getaway for tourists who enjoy a diverse range of heritage products (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Its unique historical background, scenic landscape, and rustic rural setting cater to a niche market of heritage tourists. Well known for its crafts people and artistic residents, Elora is a community that has evolved as an artistic centre throughout the 20th century (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000, p 90). Since then, arts and crafts and historical buildings have paved the way for the transformation of Elora into a heritage shopping village, or heritage- scape (Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). The downtown core is designated to unique boutiques.
offering everything from eccentric art, antiques and historical memorabilia (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Figure 3.2 and 3.3 below illustrate some of the heritage shops in Elora.

Figure 3.2 Heritage shops in Elora.
Elora has been successful in attracting tourists, not only provincially, but on a national and international scale (Interview 1). To maintain Elora’s appeal, the village has resisted tourism development that does not blend with the heritage aspect of the village. This resistance became apparent in 2003, when conflict arose over a proposal to construct a racetrack and slot machine facility in Elora.
In November of that year, a racetrack in Elmira, located only several kilometres from Elora, closed due to deteriorating infrastructure and major decline in business (CTV, 2002; Interview 5). At the time, racetracks across the province were adding the gaming component of slot machines to increase business. The addition of slot machines was suggested as a solution to compete with revolutionary forms of gambling attractions (Mahtesian, 1996; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). Elmira is home to many Mennonites who are very religious and against gambling. Consequently, the Elmira council voted no to the addition of slot machines to their existing racetrack. As a result, the racetrack was moved to Elora and the Grand River Raceway and slot machine parlour were constructed (Figure 3.4).

![The Grand River Raceway in Elora.](image)

Figure 3.4 The Grand River Raceway in Elora.
The founder of the Grand River Agricultural Society (GRAS), and general manager of the Grand River Raceway stated that the decision to add slot machines to the racetrack in Elmira was at large a religious battle. The decision to implement a racetrack with slot machines in Elora, however, was primarily a cultural issue (Interview 3, 5). The addition of the slot machine facility was looked upon by financial stakeholders as an exciting way to encourage economic growth.

The placement of this facility in Elora was highly controversial. Most were not opposed to the racetrack, but to the addition of a slot machine parlour (Interview 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7). Figure 3.4 illustrates the Grand River Raceway with a slot machine parlour. Furthermore, minimal implementation notice, and the lack of public consultation, also created much animosity amongst local residents (Interview 1, 2, 4, 6). Out of fear, the Centre Wellington Coalition (CWCC) was formed as a voice for local residents who had concerns about slot machines in their community (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6). Over 2000 Elora residents signed the petition that opposed the facility (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6). A public meeting was held on March 29th 2000 at the community hall where approximately 1500 residents attended. The hall held only 450 people so nearly 900 had to relocate to the ice rink to watch the meeting on big screen televisions and overhead projectors (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6). Hundreds of people had no choice but to line up outside the hall during the middle of winter and many elderly people were forced to return home because of the cold (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6). The next afternoon, despite the overwhelming resistance, council adopted the amendment of the racetrack and slots and outlined the benefits that the facility would bring to the community (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6).
The decision to implement the racetrack and slots divided the community in half. The opposition was so strong that the CWCC filed an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and an application to the Superior Court May 3rd claiming that the public participation was unjust and undemocratic (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6). After three legal appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board and the Supreme Court, the CWCC lost, owing $86,000 in court fees. The hostility from thousands of angry residents and the CWCC is something that has lingered until this day as a story of democracy gone wrong (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6).

The Grand River Raceway is a facility that does not conform to Elora’s traditional heritage tourism. This suggests that Elora is an ideal case study site to test the impact of a non-heritage\(^2\) facility on community identity. Furthermore, the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of racino gaming have yet to be studied in a rural setting, Elora therefore is an excellent location to conduct research.

### 3.3 Research Design

According to Creswell (2009) there are three types of research approaches: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods that integrate both qualitative and quantitative techniques. A mixed methods approach is used in this study. In this type of research, qualitative and quantitative research methods are not viewed as “polar opposites” but rather representative of “different ends on a continuum” (Creswell, 2009, p. 3). Mixed methods are neither a predominately qualitative or quantitative method. Rather, a mixed methods approach sees the two as equal components of the research design.
After choosing a type of research design, the researcher must also determine a “strategy of inquiry” (Creswell, 2009, p.11). This involves the choice of approaches that are necessary to conduct qualitative and/or quantitative research. Typically, quantitative approaches involve survey and experimental research. Conversely, qualitative research can involve ethnography, grounded theory, case studies, phenomenological and narrative research. A mixed method approach involves sequential, concurrent and transformative mixed methods. Each approach aims at merging both qualitative and quantitative research to produce a more comprehensive analysis and to allow for a broader interpretation of the results (Creswell, 2009).

3.3.1 Revisiting the Purpose Statement, Goals and Objectives

The overreaching goal of this study is to determine the impacts that the GRR has had on the heritage community of Elora. The first objective was to determine the impact of the GRR on Elora’s identity as a heritage tourism village. Several steps were taken to meet this objective. These steps were to:

- identify Elora’s history and heritage background.
- develop an understanding of the construction of the gaming facility and the addition of the slot machines.
- investigate the current tourism product:
  - how it is promoted?
  - what is promoted as the community’s heritage?
  - who does this type of heritage tourism cater to?
  - what types of businesses attract tourists?
- determine the reasoning behind the opposition of gaming in the community.

2 The Grand River Raceway is defined as a non-heritage facility because it does not conform to the heritage that is currently commodified in Elora.
● determine the reasoning behind the proponent’s decision to build the gaming facility.
● determine whether the gaming facility has enhanced or compromised the unique characteristics of the community.
● determine whether the gaming facility has hindered or compromised heritage tourism in the community.
● examine the previous versus current marketing strategies for the community to determine whether they market their community based on tourism or gaming.
● determine what percentage of tourists visit the gaming facility as part of their trip to Elora.
● determine whether or not the gaming facility conformed to the surrounding scenery of the community.
● determine what, if any, mitigation measures were used to minimize the community’s negative response to the construction of the gaming facility.
● determine tourist’s primary motivations for visiting Elora.

The second objective of this study was to determine the positive and negative (social and economic) impacts of the GRR on the community of Elora. The following is a list of steps taken to collect this data:

● determine annual financial contributions from the OLG to the municipality.
● determine annual financial contributions from the GRAS to the municipality and where it is allocated.
● determine marketing strategies that the OLG uses to promote heritage and cultural tourism in Elora and where it is allocated.
● determine marketing strategies that the GRAS used to promote heritage and cultural tourism in Elora.
● discover what types of programs the OLG and the GRAS employ as part of their giving back to the community.
● examine the opinions of the Business Improvement Area (BIA), Economic development department, Council members, Chamber of Commerce the Mayor and other public authority figures and organizations within the community regarding the development of the gaming facility.
● determine what percentage of employment is local.
● determine what percentage of patrons are tourists.
● determine whether the gaming facility has contributed to economic prosperity through the promotion of tourism.

The final objective was to provide a set of recommendations. These recommendations are based on the results found in this study. A set of recommendations are intended to aid
communities who are adopting gaming facilities as a form of socio-economic development. This will also assist other rural communities in minimizing the negative and maximizing the positive impacts involved with gaming facilities.

3.3.2 Quantitative Data Collection

Business Surveys

Surveys were delivered door-to-door to all businesses in Elora (85). Of those distributed, 77 (80.5%) were returned. All of these local businesses were surveyed to determine the economic impacts that the GRR had on the business community. Questionnaires were dropped off and collected in the downtown core and uptown business district. Surveying businesses is important because local proprietors have first-hand knowledge of the economic advantages or disadvantages of the GRR.

The majority of questions were designed to shed light on the economic impacts of the GRR on the community, the business sector and the respondent’s business in particular. However, questions associated with the impacts that the facility has had on heritage tourism were also included. The final component of the business survey requested that the respondents indicate whether or not the same characteristics had been enhanced, compromised or had no change by the presence of the GRR. The business survey used in this study is shown in Appendix C.

The surveys were designed based on a series of open-ended and closed-ended questions. Some general questions included the type of business, how long it has been in operation and what percentage of business can be attributed to tourism. Questions were asked
about their place of residence and the time they have resided in their home community. Questions also asked the respondent to rate several characteristics based on community attributes. Rating related questions were developed using the Likert scale where -2 represented ‘strongly disagree’, -1; ‘disagree; 0, ‘neutral, 1, ‘agree’; and 2, ‘strongly agree’ or 1 represented ‘very low’; 2, ‘low’; 3, ‘middle’; 4, ‘high’; and 5 ‘very high’. This scale allows an individual to “define his attitude towards each statement by choosing among a number of r grade scores (scores, degrees) on the r-grade Likert scale” (Gob and McCollin and Ramalhoto, 2007, p. 604). Moreover, this type of data collection approach recognizes that the respondent may have responses that fit somewhere in the middle of an ‘agree or disagree’ question. Gob et al (2007) suggests that the Likert scale is appropriate for measuring attitudes in the service sector with consumer surveys.

Business surveys were distributed in person to the business owners during the last week of May, 2009. Surveys were distributed in May to allow sufficient time for businesses to complete them before the busy tourism season began. A cover letter explaining the intent of the research, the length of time it would take to complete, and the researcher’s contact information was also provided. Since the survey typically could be completed within 3-5 minutes, a drop-off and pick-up method was employed. This method is often used to ensure a higher response rate (Clark and Finley, 2007). A few business owners insisted on completing the survey at the time of delivery. However, most surveys were picked up within one month of distribution. All business owners were thanked for their time and contribution to this study.
Tourist Surveys

A total of 178 questionnaires were distributed to determine tourists’ demographics, motivations and travel patterns, what activities they pursued while visiting Elora and their perceptions of the GRR. A site for conducting visitor surveys was conveniently located in the heart of downtown Elora (Figure 3.5). The site was also strategically chosen far enough away from businesses on either side to ensure that tourists shopping at local stores were not distracted. The site chosen was central to all major amenities in the village. The tourist survey used in this study is shown in Appendix D.

For the tourist survey, a total of 19 open and closed-ended questions were created. Questions ranged from yes/no answers to circle one of the following. Open-ended questions were provided to give participants an opportunity to offer extra information about the GRR. The final two sections of the survey duplicated the Likert questions asked on the business survey. Again, these questions asked respondents to rate the following characteristics of Elora and to note whether or not they felt that the GRR had enhanced, compromised or had no change on characteristics of the community. A comment box was also provided for tourists to provide any additional information that they wished to provide.

The tourist survey was distributed after the business surveys had been collected. It was strategically planned to wait until the busy tourism months (June, July and August) to ensure that the highest volume of tourists would be present. Surveying took place around noon once the stores had been open (on average most businesses were open from 11-5 weekly). Surveying was conducted on average for about two hours, two days a week. This ensured a diverse selection of tourists and also avoided surveying the same visitors twice in
the same week. This also guaranteed that visitors were not approached twice accidentally or that they felt pressured to avoid certain areas of town. Tourists were not approached in areas such as coffee shops, outdoor patios or in front of shops to ensure that the researcher was not disrupting visitor activities in Elora and to avoid soliciting. Figure 3.5 illustrates the researchers study site in front of the Grand River in downtown Elora. It was estimated that only about 5 percent of tourists approached, declined the opportunity to fill out the survey. Most respondents were delighted to contribute their opinions to this study. Overall, the response rate was remarkably high, with only a few respondents commenting that the survey was slightly lengthy. Tourism participants were thanked for their time and contribution to this thesis.

Figure 3.5 View of the Grand River from downtown Elora.
3.3.3 Qualitative Data Collection

Unstructured Interviews

Recruiting key informants for unstructured interviews required the researcher to obtain a list of key community members. Key informants who were deemed beneficial for this study included members of the Grand River Raceway, Business Improvement Area (BIA), Centre Wellington Local Economic Development Department, Elora Chamber of Commerce, Council members, the Mayor, the President of the Grand River Agricultural Society, the General Manager of the Grand River Agricultural Society (GRAS) and one of the Chair members from the CWCC. Many of these people were located using the Centre Wellington Webpage, by visiting the tourism office, and by word of mouth from local business owners. The researcher contacted them via email or approached them at their place of employment to request a meeting at their convenience. Fortunately, all of the anticipated interviewees agreed to set aside time to meet for informal discussions.

Interviews were intended to allow each participant to discuss their position regarding the development of the GRR. Thus, the interviews were unstructured and were led with a general inquiry about their role in tourism, community development and position on gaming in the community. Several of the interviewees also offered additional information, such as publicly disclosed reports. Many of these reports contained information on tourism planning and community economic development. Depending on the interviewee’s familiarity with the topic, meetings usually ranged from 30-45 minutes. All participants were asked permission to be recorded or if they preferred that information be taken by hand notes. Business cards with contact information were distributed to key informants after the meeting. This ensured that if
they had any further questions or concerns they could contact the researcher at any time. Finally, all interviewees were thanked for their time and contribution to this research.

Secondary Data Collection

Secondary data collection was also employed at the site. Data collection took place at several locations including the Museum archives, local tourism information centre, storefronts, and from interview participants. The secondary data sources that were also consulted included tourism pamphlets, marketing magazines, advertisements, newspaper articles, business reports, minutes from council meetings and annual economic reviews. Information was also gathered from local websites, museum archives and academic articles with information on Elora. Community business reports and council minutes were easily accessible via the internet because they are publically disclosed documents. Historical documents on the development of the GRR were available from newspaper articles at the Wellington County archives museum. A meeting with the museum administrator was helpful for locating the materials required to assess the background information on the development of the GRR and the CWCC debate. Photographs of the town layout, signage design and marketing advertisements were also taken to provide valuable information regarding the community’s approach to marketing their tourism product.

Audio-Visual Materials

Creswell (2009) describes audio-visual materials as photographs, videotapes, art objects, computer software and film. For this study, photographs and a film “Elora and the meaning of Beauty” were used as qualitative data. Creswell (2009) also describes some advantages and disadvantages of this type of qualitative data collection. Advantages include
that it is an unobtrusive method of data collection, it allows participants to share their direct reality and it creates and captures attention visually. Disadvantages include that it may be difficult to interpret, it may not be easily accessible to the public, and that photographs may be intrusive as the participants may not be aware that they are being photographed.

3.3.4 Data Analysis

A triangulation approach was utilized to analyze the multi-sourced data collected in this study Creswell (2009, p. 191) states that one should:

- triangulate different data sources of information by examining evidence from the sources and using it to build a coherent justification for themes. If themes are established based on converging several sources of data or perspectives from participants, then this process can be claimed by adding to the validity of the study.

Jick (1989) also suggests that triangulating two or more methods strengthens (i.e. cross-examines) the validation of the findings. This study incorporated data from several key participants in tourism along with secondary documents. Themes emerged from all data sources, thus, it was useful to triangulate. This method aided in filling gaps in research where only one particular data source could not. A discussion of the data analysis is presented in the following sections.

Quantitative

For both sets of business and tourist surveys, open-ended and closed questions were analyzed quantitatively. All survey questions were inputted into Predictive Statistical SoftWare (PASW). All responses were given a numerical code when inputted. Open-ended questions were grouped by theme and then given a numerical code. The analysis involved
frequencies, descriptive statistics, chi-square tests and correlations. Descriptive statistics and
frequencies were the most commonly used statistical function to determine percentages.
Descriptive statistics and frequencies are PASW functions such as mean, median and mode
(Rogerson, 2006). Chi square tests were used to test for statistical significance. Statistical
significance was determined at p=<0.05. Chi square tests are used to measure the relationship
between two categorical variables (Rogerson, 2006). Correlations were used to compare how
one variable relates to the other (Rogerson, 2006). Correlation analysis was used to
determine how distance and length of stay by respondent related to one another. For example,
does the distance travelled relate to how long the respondent stayed in Elora? Also,
correlation analysis was used to determine whether the age of the respondent effected the
time spend in the village. The perceived income from tourists was also tested to the length of
time the business had been open using correlation analysis. All survey data were also
imputed into Microsoft Excel to calculate percentages and create illustrative figures. The
results from these statistical tests will be examined later on in chapters 4 and 5.

Qualitative

Interviews were recorded and then transcribed qualitatively by typing out the exact
conversations that were held with interviewees. This involved listening to the interviews
several times to ensure that all phrases and information was transcribed correctly. Once the
interviews were transcribed they were divided into key themes. The themes were also
divided into subthemes. The impacts, that the GRR had on Elora’s identity, as a heritage
tourism village, had three major themes. Additional themes emerged on the positive and
negative socio-economic advantages that the GRR had on the community. This accounted for
an additional 8 major themes. Initiatives that were either in progress or planned for the future also accounted for another 5 major themes. Overall a total of 18 themes were chosen and divided into sections pertaining to each objective. The use of themes from unstructured interviews filled the gaps in information provided in the survey data. Some quotations were used from interviews. This ensured the direct identification of the issue without the compromise of the researcher’s interpretation.

Secondary data was also used to determine these themes. Most secondary data was compared before and after the development of the GRR. This helped to determine if there were changes in the marketing of Elora’s tourism. Comparing secondary data before and after development also helped to determine whether the GRR had an impact on the number of visitors to the village. The use of photographs helped determine whether the scenic village had altered its landscape with the development of the GRR. Some of these photographs include the newly reformed signage program that will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 4. The video “Elora and the Meaning of Beauty” was used to describe the cultural, historical and heritage aspects of the community.

### 3.3.5 Ethical Considerations

This study received full ethics approval from the University of Waterloo before the research began. One ethical consideration was the sensitivity of the study. Given the controversy of this subject, participants were not asked to provide their name or their involvement in the community. All business owners surveyed remained anonymous. Surveying was not conducted near or on the property of the GRR. The privacy of the GRR
patrons was respected given that gambling is considered to be an anonymous activity. Thus, for the purpose of this study, it would not be ethical to survey tourists at the gaming facility.

3.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has covered several key areas. First, it outlined the approach, both qualitative and quantitative, and integrated current literature to support the research design. Second, this chapter revisited the goals and objectives of this study and provided some key research questions that were used to complete this mixed methods study. Third, this section included a detailed discussion of the data collection, research collected and data analysis process. Finally this chapter drew attention to some ethical considerations. The results of this study will follow in both chapters 4 and 5.
Chapter 4: Gaming Impacts: Heritage and Community Identity

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of this research. This chapter first provides a brief overview of the demographics and the role of the business and tourist survey respondents who participated in this study. Second, this chapter presents the results related to whether or not the development of the GRR has had an impact on Elora’s identity as a heritage tourism community. Furthermore, this chapter addresses why, why not and/or how the GRR has had an impact on the community of Elora. Finally, strategies that have been employed to reduce the impact of the GRR on the identity of this heritage community are discussed.

4.2 Characteristics of Survey Participants

4.2.1 Businesses

Based on the surveys of all the local businesses, it is found that food and beverage is the leading business sector in Elora with almost one-third of all businesses occupying this category at 29 percent (Figure 4.1). Clothing stores are the next most prevalent business at 25 percent with stores providing children and/or adult ware, accessories and unique attire (Figure 4.1). Gift shops account for 10 percent of businesses in Elora, with many offering a myriad of tangible memorabilia (Figure 4.1). Fewer than 10 percent of the businesses in Elora consist of hardware, general stores, government operations, antique shops, art shops and accommodation respectively (Figure 4.1). Some of these firms likely cater to the local population such as the hardware business category that includes auto body shops and gas
stations. Other businesses in Elora, such as general stores and government businesses also provide goods and services necessary to support the permanent residents of the community. The presence of art and antique shops, and accommodation is small at 4 percent (Figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1 Percentage breakdowns of the different businesses in Elora.](image)

Figure 4.2 illustrates businesses perceived income from tourism, the years the owner has lived in Elora, and tenure of the business. Approximately three-quarters of businesses in Elora perceive that tourism contributes nearly 50 percent of their total income. Twenty businesses report that tourism contributes less than 20 percent of their annual income. Only 4 businesses perceive that tourism accounts for 80-100 percent of their yearly income. Results also find that approximately 41 percent have been open for less than 3 years. Seven businesses have been open for more than 30 years with the remainder falling somewhere in
between 3 and 30. The number of years that the respondents report living in Elora is fairly evenly dispersed, with only 8 business owners residing in the community for less than 3 years, and 6 for more than 31 years.

Figure 4.2 Characteristics of Elora businesses by type.

These results suggest that business owners’ perceive tourists to be a vital part of Elora’s economy. Businesses that received the least income from tourism (on average less than 15%) are government operations and hardware shops. These businesses tend to have been in operation longer then arts and crafts or tourist shops and cater to local residents as they are a staple in most communities. Naturally, these businesses have been open longer than tourist shops because they were established to meet the demands of a growing
community. Among the bottom three businesses, who acknowledged tourism as a main source of income, were antique shops at roughly 10 percent. Interestingly the antique shops perceived tourism income as low and do not appear to rely on tourists. As expected, however, accommodation business perceived that tourism was a significant (roughly 50%) contributor to their annual income. The remaining businesses, on average, reported that approximately 40-50 percent of their income was attributed to tourism. Elora’s main shopping attraction is clothing and accessories. Thus, the researcher speculates that retail businesses that offer unique and/or original clothing, jewellery, gifts and memorabilia are more likely to prosper from tourism. An interesting observation is that businesses, who report the highest percentage of income from tourism, are typically newer to the community. These businesses are primarily owned by residents who have resided in Elora for less than 10 years. Accommodation was the only sector that reported being open for a significant number of years (on average 50 years).

Correlation analysis finds that there is no strong or significant relationship (R= .001; p= 0.991) between the number of years that the respondent has lived in Elora and the number of years their business has been open. However, there is a weak inverse relationship between the average number of years the business has been open and the perceived percentage of income that comes from tourists (R= -.349; p=0.002). According to these results, the longer the business has been open, the less perceived income it generates from tourism. Or, the business perceives to generate more income from tourism if it has been open a shorter period of time. There is also a weak inverse relationship between the number of years that business respondents have lived in Elora and their perceived income from tourists (R= -.153;
p=0.197). This suggests that the longer the business owner has lived in Elora, the lower the perceived dependency on tourism.

In summary, the majority of businesses in the community likely cater to tourists. Furthermore, if it were not for visitor clientele, many businesses would not survive throughout the year. It may also be concluded that the high turnover amongst businesses could be due to the instability of income during the non-tourism season. This might explain the dispersion in the number of years respondents reported living in the community.

4.2.2 Tourists

Of the 178 tourists surveyed, 47 percent were male and 53 percent female giving a fairly even gender split. When asked if their visit to Elora was a part of a longer vacation, 25.4 percent responded ‘yes’, compared to 74.6 percent who reported ‘no’ indicating that most tourists are day-trippers to Elora. Looking at the percentage breakdown of respondents’ age, average distance travelled to Elora, and how long they anticipated their visit to last, reveals important information regarding the typical tourist who visits Elora.

Table 4.1 Tourism respondents’ age, distance travelled and length of stay in Elora by percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage N=178</th>
<th>Age Group N=178</th>
<th>Percentage N=178</th>
<th>Anticipated Length of Stay N=178</th>
<th>Percentage N=178</th>
<th>Distance Travelled N=178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>&lt; 4 hours</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>&lt; 5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6-24 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>25-50 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3-7 days</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51-100 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>&gt; 7 days</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>100-500 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>66 or older</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>&gt; 500 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of visitors reported their age being between 46-65 years (Table 4.1). This is not surprising because downtown Elora has been known to cater to middle aged
tourists (Interview 1). Therefore, it is not surprising that the categories with the least amount of visitors are the lower and upper age groups (Table 4.1). Nearly two thirds of those who visit Elora spent less than four hours in the community and only 20 percent of visitors spent a full day (Table 4.1). This is also not surprising, given Elora’s close proximity to major urban centres and the growing frequency of day-tripping among the general population (Aquiar and Hurst, 2007). Only 16 percent of respondents reported that their visit to Elora exceeded 2 or more day thus confirming that Elora is typically a day trip destination.

Although many visitors reported spending relatively little time in the community, 23 people indicated travelling more than 500km. Furthermore, those who reported that their trip was part of a longer vacation traveled greater distances from their home town. Chi-square tests confirmed that this result is highly significant (p=0.000), also highly significant is that as time travelled increased, so too did the number of respondents who reported that Elora was a part of their longer vacation (p=0.003). For example, of the 25 respondents who reported travelling 6-24km to visit Elora, 3 respondents noted that Elora was part of a longer vacation. The remaining 22 respondents noted that it was not part of a longer vacation. Of the 23 respondents who reported travelling 500km or more, 20 noted that Elora was a part of a longer vacation. The remaining 3 respondents stated that their trip was not vacation-related. Thus, it can be concluded that those who travel further distances are either not day-trippers or they are visiting Elora as a day trip and touring elsewhere as part of their vacation.

Correlation analysis suggests that there is no significant relationship between the distance that the respondents travel and the amount of time spent in Elora (R= .088; p= 0.243). However, there is a weak inverse relationship between respondents’ age and the time
spent in Elora (R= -.217; p= 0.004). This result suggests that, on average, the older the respondent, the less time spent in Elora. Or, younger respondents spent more time in the village.

In summary, the majority of tourists to Elora are middle-aged day-trippers. The further the tourist travelled the more likely they were to be on a longer vacation. However correlation analysis suggests that the further the tourist travelled does not necessarily mean the longer they stayed in Elora.

4.3 Grand River Raceway Impacts on Heritage Tourism and Community Identity

Heritage tourism and community identity were discussed previously throughout this thesis. The result of rural restructuring has paved the way for tourism in many small towns, most notably heritage tourism. Place identity in Elora was discussed because of the possible impacts that may have resulted from the GRR. The question to be examined, therefore, is whether or not the GGR has had an impact on either heritage tourism or place identity, if so, why and if not, why not?

4.3.1 Community Fear

The highly publicized and controversial development of the GRR had a profound impact on members of the community. Initial speculations about the impacts of the GRR on the heritage, cultural, artistic and historical aspects of the village were largely cynical and sceptical. This is largely because of the negative stigma associated with this activity
Throughout history, gambling has favoured economic advantages over social costs (Eadington, 1999; Eadington, 2002). Therefore, it is no surprise that the historical village of Elora would retaliate against gambling within their community. Newspaper articles, magazines and local media emphasised the negative aspects of the GRR, claiming that it would ruin the unique heritage village. For example, an article in the local newspaper, the *Elora/Fergus News Express*, expressed the fears of the GRR on the historic village. The title of this article reads “Elora Festival concerned about Elora Raceway’s impact on scenic village setting” (Eedy, March 29, 2000, p.3). The synopsis of the article expresses the community fears that the lack of time provided for public consultation could have serious consequences that may not be fully understood. In this article, James Prichard, the Elora Festival Chairman, stressed that “Our fear is that the presence of gambling facilities would not be in keeping with this, and that cultural events would suffer from declining attendance” (Eedy, March 29, 2000, p. 3). Furthermore, he states that “if the Elora Festival and other entertainment activities in Centre Wellington are diminished or forced to leave or close down, it might have a serious economic impact on the community, offsetting part or all of the perceived financial benefit to be derived from gambling” (Eedy, March 29, 2000, p. 3)

An article found in the same local newspaper entitled “Heritage Committee fears proposed raceway will destroy Elora as a Heritage village” also illustrated the fears that the GRR would not fit in with the historical and heritage setting of the village. According to Robinson (2000, p. 3) the heritage Centre of Wellington recognized that:

> Elora has one of the highest levels of heritage excellence in the province. However, the maintenance of heritage buildings depends on individual owners who value a historical ambience. We fear that the raceway would damage this ambience so much that owners of heritage buildings would leave the area in
an escalating withdrawal. Furthermore, few new lovers of heritage buildings would want to purchase property in Elora. The net loss of responsible owners would lead to a serious decline in heritage property values, and many under-valued heritage buildings would either decline into squalor, or be replaced by ephemeral modern structures. Your committee fears that the raceway would largely destroy Elora as a heritage village and that no recovery of its heritage reputation would be possible.

The media also played a role in creating fear in the community (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). Newspapers illustrated the damage the GRR would cause on the heritage village. False assumptions of impacts of the GRR have not materialized. The slots parlour at the racetrack facility does not compare in size or scale to casinos in the province. Despite this, residents are still fearful that it will bring about similar problems including congestion, crime, prostitution, gambling addiction and a transient society (Interview 6). The fears that the GRR would offset the heritage appeal of the community, was largely due to the lack of public consultation and mitigation measures. Also, the fear of the unknown possible impacts that the GRR could have on the community, fuelled public concern and panic (Interview 1).

It was suggested that the media, however, created a false sense of fear. For example, many interviewees stated that those who opposed the development of the gaming facility stressed the idea of “urban sprawl”, “hookers”, “more traffic”, and “drugs” (Interview 1, 2, 3). Furthermore, several respondents shared the notion that there was a lot of scare mongering involved to ward off the development (Interview 1, 2, 3). One resident, and local community member, stated that “people with gambling problems don’t have to leave their own home to do that, [gamble] this is a form of entertainment” (Interview 2). The president of the GRAS suggested that a lot of people were misled about the negative spin-offs that would be associated with gambling by stating “[he] doesn’t know where people got their
fear, it’s the myth that goes with gambling. It’s the same as drinking and smoking, if they
take it [the gaming facility] away, people will just drive further” (Interview 3). Perhaps if
given the appropriate time frame for public consultation and impact assessment reports were
made readily available to the community, less public concern would have resulted. Many
perceived negative effects to destroy their village simply because of the unknown. However,
the accusations presented in the local media have yet to result with the development of the
GRR.

4.3.2 Elora’s Identity as Perceived by Local Businesses and Tourists

Despite initial concerns, results of this study suggest that these fears have yet to
materialize. Figure 4.3 shows a number of characteristics that can be used to determine how
individual business owners perceive their community.
Figure 4.3 Local business owner’s rankings of Elora’s community characteristics.

On average, heritage buildings, scenic environment, unique handicraft products, friendly people, artistic appeal, rural and small town atmosphere and unique rural identity were ranked very high by the business owner’s of Elora. The community of Elora has a reputation for its artistic history, architectural streetscape and natural environment (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000) and therefore it is not surprising that local business owners rate these attributes accordingly (Interview 1, 6, 7). Only a handful of respondents (<5%) rated these characteristics as low therefore the majority of the business owners in Elora perceive these qualities as predominant in their current perception of Elora’s identity.
Figure 4.4 Tourist rankings of Elora’s community characteristics.

The same questions were also posed to the tourists. On average, tourists reported slightly higher ratings for the same characteristics compared to the business owners (Figure 4.4). Notable characteristics that tourists found “very high” include attractive heritage buildings, scenic environment, relaxed atmosphere and rural and small town atmosphere. One characteristic that was ranked “very low” was reasonable prices (Figure 4.4). Chi-square tests were performed to determine if there was any significant difference in business owner and tourist ratings for each characteristic. From Table 4.2 a chi square test indicates that there is no significant difference between tourists verses business owners’ ratings on
these characteristics. A chi-square test was also run to determine whether visitors who had traveled to Elora before the GRR was constructed (n=105) had different opinions regarding a change in Elora’s characteristics, than those who had not made a visit prior to construction (n=65). As illustrated in Table 4.3 no significant difference was found.

**Table 4.2 Chi-square results of significant difference of Elora rating characteristics between tourists and business owner’s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Significance (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Heritage Buildings</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Environment</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Cuisine</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Handicraft Products</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly People</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Accommodation</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Streetscapes</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed Atmosphere</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Activities</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and Small Town Atmosphere</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Experience</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Rural Identity</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Prices</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3 Chi-square results of significant difference between Elora characteristics ratings for tourists who had, or had not, travelled to Elora before the construction of the Grand River Raceway.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Significance (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Heritage Buildings</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Environment</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Cuisine</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Handicraft Products</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly People</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Accommodation</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Streetscapes</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed Atmosphere</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Appeal</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Activities</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and Small Town Atmosphere</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Experience</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Rural Identity</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Prices</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the eyes of tourists, there is no significant difference between the ratings of these characteristics before and after the development of the GRR. From a tourist’s perspective, therefore, the development of this facility has not had an impact Elora’s identity as a heritage tourism village. Overall, most community characteristic ratings from businesses and tourists were high. This suggests that businesses and tourists believe that the village’s scenic, historical and cultural characteristics currently define Elora’s identity. This confirms that the place identity of Elora as heritage village has remained unaltered by the development of the GRR.

A short film by David Neelin, a business owner in downtown Elora, provides further evidence into the relationship that local residents have with their community. The film titled “Elora and the meaning of Beauty” is comprised of 30 interviews with resident’s aged 15 to 90. This film gives insight into the relationship that locals have with their community and local heritage (Neelin, 2008). When asked to define “what beauty was to them” the most common response was the natural surrounding and something that was not man-made (Neelin, 2008). Most respondents replied that beauty and identity cannot be defined but it is something that one feels from the inside. Furthermore, this film illustrates the strong attachment that residents share not only with their scenic environment but the artistic beauty that Elora is so widely recognized for (Neelin, 2008). Personal communication with this entrepreneur provided more insight into the filming of this video. Neelin commented on the uniqueness of the tight knit community. Furthermore, he commented on the negative impacts, as perceived by local residents that the development of the GRR would have on the community. This film was intended to emphasise the rural and artistic nature of not just
Elora, but rural landscapes entirely. Residing in an urban setting, Neelin relocates to Elora on weekends to pursue an antique business and to enjoy the cultural ambiance during the summer months.

Based on the above results, it can be concluded that there was a general fear that the GRR would destroy Elora’s characteristics as a heritage village. Content analyses of newspaper archives indicate that members in the community, involved with the historical preservation, were the ones most concerned. However, results in the study find that businesses and tourists perceived the current scenic, historical and cultural aspects to be that of Elora’s identity. According to narratives in Neelin’s (2008) film, residents also strongly feel that these characteristics represent Elora’s current identity. This further suggests that the GRR has not had an impact on the community’s identity as a heritage tourism village.

4.3.2 Gaming Impacts on Community Identity

It was widely publicized that the GRR would have a mostly negative impact on the community of Elora. This point was agreed by a large number of community members who were against the development of the facility (CWCC, 2009; Eedy, 1999).Ultimately, in the weeks preceding the final vote, opponents argued that the slot machine facility would reduce the moral fibre of the community and devalue the existing attributes of the heritage village (Interview 1, 2, 3, 6, 7). The results of this survey, however, indicate that the majority of business owners believe that the gaming facility has not impacted Elora’s existing identity.
Figure 4.5 Business owner’s perception of the Grand River Raceway’s influence on Elora’s community characteristics.

As illustrated in Figure 4.5, about one-quarter (29%) of local business owners believe that the gaming facility has compromised Elora’s scenic environment. Relaxed atmosphere followed closely behind with roughly 18 percent of local business owners believing that the gaming facility had compromised this attribute of the community.

Conversely, according to local businesses, local cuisine is perceived to be an enhanced component due to the GRR. The surveys suggest that 22 percent of entrepreneurs believe that the GRR had enhanced local eateries. The number of local business owners who reported ‘no change’, however, is particularly important. As illustrated above, characteristics with the highest percentage of ‘no change’ are friendly people (90%) followed by attractive...
streetscapes, attractive heritage buildings and unique products at 84 percent, 84 percent and 81 percent respectively.

Tourists were also asked to determine whether or not the GRR enhanced, compromised or had no change on their perceptions of Elora’s identity. The following Figure (4.6) illustrates the responses from tourists.

![Figure 4.6 Tourist’s perception of the Grand River Raceway’s influence on Elora’s community characteristics.](image)

This figure suggests that tourists share similar attitudes as local businesses. From a tourist perspective, the majority of the characteristics have experienced ‘no change’ since the development of the GRR. Furthermore, tourists were given the option to indicate
that they “did not know” whether the GRR has had any impact on these characteristics. First time visitors may not know whether the GRR has had an impact on these characteristics. Therefore, they may be unable to answer this question. Tourists who responded that they “did not know” represent 27.5 percent of the sample.

Similar to the business owner respondents, a small number of tourists believe that the facility has compromised or enhanced these characteristics. The most notable compromise was “scenic environment” reported by 18 percent of the sample. All other characteristics received a 90 percent or more response rate that the characteristics had experienced no change or “did not know”.

4.3.3 Grand River Raceways Impact on Heritage Tourism

Of all the visitors surveyed approximately 80 percent responded that this was not their first visit to Elora. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that they had visited Elora more then 5 times. Figure 4.7 illustrates the primary reasons that visitors reported travelling to Elora. Viewing or purchasing unique products in a pleasant atmosphere was the primary reason for visiting Elora (47%). However, nearly 29 percent reported other reasons for visiting. A variety of reasons were offered by these that included: i) scenic environment ii) history and ambiance of the village and iii) to enjoy the unique products and activities offered in the village. Surprisingly, only 1 respondent (of 178) indicated that their primary reason for visiting Elora was to play the slot machines at the GRR.
Although the respondents did not indicate that visiting the GRR was their primary motivation for visiting Elora, this does not mean that it is not on their agenda. To verify this, the tourists were asked what they had, or were planning to, participate in while in Elora. Similar to their primary motivations, participants indicated their interest in shopping downtown (23%), dining downtown (20%), visiting the Elora gorge (20%), and nature walks (10%) (Table 4.4). Less than 2 percent of respondents indicated an intention to visit the GRR. At this point in the survey, visitors were now well aware of the GRR. Despite this, 98 percent of people reported that they were not going to participate in activities at the GRR.
Table 4.4 Percentage breakdown of activities that tourist plan on or have already participated in while in Elora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Downtown</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Downtown</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora Gorge</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Walks</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora Quarry</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora Conservation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora Mill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Tours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing the Slot Machines at the GRR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagering on a Horse at the GRR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8 illustrates what activities the tourists surveyed would like to participate in if they returned to Elora. Given the array of activities noted, the responses were grouped into categories. The primary reason (45%) for returning to Elora was because they liked the village. Some of the responses that were placed in this category were the “ambiance of the town”, “atmosphere”, “friendly community”, “relaxing village to browse,” among many others. Approximately 18 percent reported that dining and shopping were also primary reasons for returning. Only 1 percent of respondents indicated that they would return to Elora for the purpose of attending the GRR.
Figure 4.8 Percentage breakdown of surveyed tourists who would return to Elora following their visit (left pie chart) and resulting reasons given by tourists for returning (right pie chart).

Table 4.5 illustrates the results of the tourists’ surveyed perceptions of the GRR.

Again, this demonstrates the minor impact the facility has had on Elora as a heritage tourism destination in the eyes of the tourists. Moreover, tourists’ reasons for returning do not involve the GRR.
Table 4.5 Summary of tourist perceptions of the Grand River Raceway when visiting Elora during the summer of 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (by percentage)</th>
<th>No (by percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before coming to Elora, where you aware of the Grand River Raceway facility?</td>
<td>41 (N=178)</td>
<td>59 (N=178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, did you come to Elora specifically to watch horse racing?</td>
<td>1 (N=178)</td>
<td>99 (N=178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, did you come to Elora specifically to use their gaming machines?</td>
<td>2 (N=178)</td>
<td>98 (N=178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If slots machines were not in Elora, would you still visit?</td>
<td>99 (N=178)</td>
<td>1 (N=178)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Elora: An Unaltered Heritage-Scape

Three themes emerged from an analysis of interviews, secondary data, and participant observation. These themes helped determine what impact the GRR has had on Elora’s identity as a heritage village. These themes include marketing, location and uniformity. Thus far, it has been determined that Elora’s identity, in the eyes of local business owners and tourists, is that of a heritage tourism village. Results also find that Elora continues to attract tourists that choose to participate in heritage activities. Some of these activities include cultural, historical, and outdoor festivities. Thus, it appears that heritage tourism in the village has not been impacted by the development of the GRR. The following themes address why community identity and heritage tourism has not been impacted, despite development of the GRR.
4.4.1 Marketing

A content analysis of marketing material revealed that Elora significantly downplays the GRR and continues to promote its historical and cultural aspects. Tourism pamphlets that were developed prior to construction of the GRR, present Elora as “Ontario’s Beautiful Village” (Elora: Ontario’s Beautiful Village, 1998). Prior to the GRR, a wide variety of activities were cited as available in Elora (i.e shopping, performing arts and artistic related activities, dining, the farmers’ market, Elora festival series, fishing, unique accommodation, the Elora Quarry and Gorge, hiking and nature walks, nightlife and historical tours). Elora was also named the 1997 champion of “Communities in Bloom”, Canada (Elora: Ontario’s Beautiful Village, 1998), and their business and tourism directory, described Elora in the summer as:

a lazy, almost idyllic, time along the quiet streets and pathways of the Village. The majestic Grand River tumbles through the Village on its way south nurturing dozens of activities for visitors. Local artisans and crafts people not only sell their wares, they show you how to make them! Streetside and riverside cafes let you watch the world go by, at your speed. Mennonite merchants arrive in town in their horse drawn buggies to sell the wares of the year’s quite occupation…fresh vegetables, maple syrup and quilts. In July, the Elora Festival presents some of North America’s finest music, in some of the most unusual venues

An evaluation of annual tourism guides, pamphlets and activity maps produced since 2003 reveal that the village of Elora has not changed its marketing tactics since the development of the GRR. For example, an information guide “Elora: Celebrating 175 years” lists some 88 places to dine, shop, play and relax along with a list of local events from April to October – this same guide offers no information on the GRR. Two years after, the same guide renamed “Map & Guide to the Best of Elora” (2009- 2010) provides an updated
version of things to see and do including an entertainment section. The GRR, however, is not included, despite the brochures recognition of a separate section for nightlife and entertainment. The 2008-2009 “Complete Guide to just about everything to do in Elora and Fergus, Ontario” provided by Elora & Fergus Tourism Services, only designates the last page of an 83-page booklet to an advertisement of the GRR. However, the advertisement is largely focused on horse racing entertainment in a “charming, rural setting”. Furthermore, the gaming component of the GRR receives just as much attention as the party and conference centre, indicating that the promotion of slot machines is only one component of the facility.

In summary, pamphlets, brochures and travel guides significantly downplay the GRR as a tourism site in Elora. Advertisements that do allot space to display the GRR give little recognition to the slot machines. Rather, these advertisements focus on the rural horse racing aspect of the GRR. Thus, despite the development of the GRR, strategic marketing has played a role in preserving the heritage aspect of the village.

4.4.2 Location

This research also suggests that the location of the gaming facility, on the outskirts of town, has a role in minimizing the GRR impacts on the community. The Mayor of Centre Wellington stated that the location of the GRR results in minimal impacts to the community in terms of “making it fit” (Interview 4). Her familiarity with the GRR is a result of her participation in the municipal government of Center Wellington since 1993 and her position on town council at the time of the vote. It was suggested that the location on the outer fringe of the village would not hinder the appearance of the downtown core or Elora’s unique
scenic environment (Interview 4). Locating the track on the outskirts of town was a strategic decision, since it placed the facility out of sight and, thus, out of mind. She further indicated that traffic and congestion would not be a problem in the downtown core because of its location. Furthermore, the location would not deter tourists from the downtown because they did not have to pass by the facility to participate in Elora’s activities (Interview 4).

The importance of location was also confirmed through meeting with the Chair of the Business Improvement Area (BIA) and the Chair of the Elora Chamber of Commerce (Interview 1, 7). The Chair of the BIA pointed out that the GRR is “out in the middle of nowhere”. The Chair of the Chamber of Commerce suggested that the location has resulted in minimal community impacts because residents do not see the GRR as part of their community (Interview 1). The administrator of the Centre Wellington Archives Museum, and Elora resident for 30 years, suggests that the location was a huge factor in protecting community heritage. It was also suggested that the identity of the community has not been alerted because of the development of the GRR and that “Elora is still Elora” (Interview 9).

### 4.4.3 Uniformity and Incorporation of Existing Heritage

Conforming to the existing scenery of the heritage village was also a top priority for many of those with decision-making power (Interview 1, 2, 3, 4). The Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) indicated that several guidelines had to be met to conform to the current theme of a heritage setting in the village (Interview 1, 2, 4). For example, several interviewees suggested that it had to resemble a “big barn” to fit in with the rural heritage appeal and agricultural aspect of the community (Interview 4, 7). The size of the facility was also
restricted and the number of slot machines permitted was minimal (i.e. 200) compared to other gaming and horse racing facilities across the province (Interview 3). The GRR has no flashy signs attracting people from the highways and does not use the Ontario Lottery and Gaming logo on existing signs compared to most other horse racing facilities in the province. All advertising of the GRR is uniform with other attractions offered in the community. The following picture illustrates current signage program used in Elora. The OLG conforms to the existing signage program and its logo is not presented on the sign.

Figure 4.9 Elora’s current signage program
Local resident, merchant and President of the GRAS, stated that the GRR wanted to conform to the rest of the community and “blend in with the scene” (Interview 3). He also stated that they have done a remarkable job at blending in with the heritage theme of the village. He provided some examples including the barn-type design of the facility, which includes the two silos on either side of the entrance, metal siding and roofing (Figure 3.2).

A member from town council believes that the GRR is not the first impression people get when they visit Elora. This is because it has done such a wonderful job at conforming to the theme of the village (Interview 3). Furthermore, he suggested that it has not changed the identity of the community whatsoever because it fits in with the agricultural history and existing heritage of Elora (Interview 3).

It was also argued by several of interviewees that horse’s, horse farming, and horse racing is embedded in many rural communities (Interview 1, 3, 4 5). On gambling, a local resident stated that “betting on a horserace is the same [same as gambling on slot machines] but it is more grass roots and socially acceptable (Interview 1). Furthermore, “it’s the farmer’s sheer thrill of a rural experience and they don’t have to spend a dime” (Interview 1). When asked if the GRR had an impact on the heritage of the community, a few interviewees argued that the GRR goes a long way to promote local awareness of horse farms, agriculture and local foods. Moreover, the promotion of horse farming and agriculture is in their mandate (Interview 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). The Chamber of Commerce Chair states “would the horse racing industry be where it is today in the community, with the additional standardbred
industry tracks? I don’t think so” (Interview 1). The interviewee was implying that the OLG has helped re-establish horse tracks by adding slot machines to the facility (Interview 1).

Additionally, the same interviewee said “I do not believe that our culture, heritage, integrity or our historical background has been jeopardized. If anything, they (OLG) have supported programs to raise community awareness” (Interview 1). Another interviewee added that the OLG was a necessary component of the GRR. They were referring to the collapse of the original racetrack located in Elmira (Interview 1). One interviewee suggested that in the 1980s, “racetracks were dying” and that “there is always something that saves them, it goes back to our roots and society, people have it [horses] embedded in society and identity” (Interview 3). The Mayor also commented that the GRAS “truly had a vision for the industry [horseracing] and they knew that their industry couldn’t survive without gaming” (Interview 4). Moreover, “horses and horseracing is very much a part of Elora’s cultural, history and heritage” (Interview 4). Others suggest that because of the GRR “we have a large equestrian base in Centre Wellington, horse farms have grown. Having a major horse attraction in the community, a lot of money goes into local horse farms from the raceway” (Interview 2). A detailed discussion relating to the social and economic spin offs of the GRR is presented in Chapter 5.

Several participants interviewed either acknowledged the GRAS and the OLG as being good community partners and the work that they do to support local events and collaborate with local businesses. Interviews with representatives of the Elora Chamber of Commerce, B.I.A, Centre Wellington Economic Development Department and the GRAS emphasized that the GRR is a great corporate partner and promoter of local heritage
(Interview 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7). For example, through donations and/or hands on involvement, the GRR sponsors all of the major festivals and events that Elora puts on including, the annual truck show, Sensational Elora, the Scottish Festival and historical walking tours (Interview, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). A member from the Centre Wellington Economic Department insists that there has been a “significant footprint from the entire facility” and that they have increased the number of “community events and community facilities” (Interview 2). Additionally, the GRR “brings dollars to the table” and “allow us to market more aggressively”, whereas “it would be harder to run local stuff without the OLG dollars” (Interview 1). The following Figure 4. 10 is a picture taken from a local newspaper of the GRR.

![Grand River Raceway](image)

**Figure 4.10 Grand River Raceway.**
(Source: Davis, The Record, 2003)
Tourist numbers have steadily increased as a result of the marketing dollars for local events and festivals from the GRR (Interview 1). Thus, it can be determined that through partnerships and sponsoring, the GRR has promotes heritage tourism. Furthermore, they have brought people into the community to participate in local festivals and events (Interview 1). Through marketing and promoting traditional tourism activities in Elora, the GRR will, as a result, receive more traffic passing by their facility (Interview 1). A further discussion regarding economic contributions that are a result of local partnerships is presented chapter 5.

4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents a number of key findings regarding the impact of a non-conforming facility on the identity of a heritage village. It is generally concluded that tourists from various locales visit Elora and consist of many different age groups. The majority of tourists who visit Elora are same-day tourists and are particularly interested in dining, shopping and outdoor activities. Gaming, however, is not an activity that many heritage tourists in Elora engage in. Those who reported they would return to Elora in the future have no intention of visiting the GRR.

Respondents of both business and tourist surveys indicated that they viewed Elora’s identity to be based on its heritage characteristics. This response is parallel to the narratives of this study. Moreover, when asked if the GRR has had an impact on the characteristics that comprise Elora’s identity as a heritage village, the majority of businesses and tourists believe it has not. Results suggest that the development of the GRR has not had an impact on Elora’s
heritage tourism identity. This is a result of strategic marketing, location and uniformity with existing scenery despite initial fears raised by the media.
Chapter 5: Socio-Economic Impacts of the Grand River Raceway

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: i) to identify the economic impacts of the GRR on Elora and ii) to highlight some social issues that have risen as a result of the raceway and slots facility. These topics are addressed to meet the second objective of this thesis which is to determine what socio-economic impacts result from the presence of the GRR in the community.

5.2 Positive Socio-Economic Impacts of the Grand River Raceway

5.2.1 Economic Impacts of Tourists

Results from the self-administered business surveys provided insight into the economic impacts that the visitors to the GRR have had on the community of Elora. When asked “have the slot machines provided economic opportunities for the community”, 63.7 percent of respondents indicated that they either strongly agreed or agreed and only 11.7 percent responded that they either strongly disagreed or disagreed. From the results it can be suggested that the majority of business owners felt that the money spent at the GRR has had a positive economic impact in the community. When asked to indicate whether visitors to the GRR has provided economic opportunities to businesses in Elora, 29.9 percent either strongly agreed or agreed compared to 41.6 percent who either strongly disagreed or disagreed. This suggests that business owners are less convinced that visitors to the GRR have provided economic benefits for businesses in the community. When asked if visitors to the GRR had provided economic advantages for their business, only 15 percent agreed. On
the topic of whether more visitors shop at their business when races are on, the majority (58.5%) of respondents indicated that they either strongly disagreed or disagreed. Only 7.5 percent either strongly agreed or agreed to this question. When asked if people who go to the GRR shop at their business, again nearly half (49.4%) indicated that they strongly disagreed or disagreed and only 16.9 percent either strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. When asked if additional slot machines at the GRR would benefit their business, the majority (65%) indicated that they strongly disagreed or disagreed. Only 11.7 percent of businesses either strongly agreed or agreed to this question.

Results of the tourists’ surveys are in agreement with the business surveys. As indicated earlier in Figure 4.7 and Figure 4.8, the vast majority of people who shop downtown have come to Elora for its heritage tourism, not to visit the GRR. When asked if the GRR had increased the number of visitors that come to Elora, nearly half of business owners (45%) either strongly agreed or agreed, while only 27 percent either strongly disagreed or disagreed. The results were fairly divided when asked if the GRR has been a valuable addition to Elora. According to the results, 36.4 percent of businesses indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed compared to 23.4 percent either strongly disagreeing or disagreeing.

Thus, business owners believe that visitors to the GRR have been positive in terms of economic opportunities for the community. However, they are less convinced that visitors to the GRR have been good for businesses in the community and even less satisfied that they are economically advantageous for their particular business. The general consensus is that people who visit the GRR are not the same clientele who are inclined to shop at local
businesses. Although the GRR may have been a valuable asset to the community, business owners are not convinced that it has encouraged travel from the facility downtown. Also, business owners do not believe that expanding the facility would have an impact on this current trend.

Narratives recorded in this thesis present similar viewpoints on the economic impact of visitors to the GRR. Key informants, involved with community economic affairs, provided information that was useful in determining how the GRR may be beneficial to the village and local businesses. According to the Centre Wellington Economic Department, businesses in close proximity to the gaming facility, such as the Tim Horton, Subway and Hill Top Variety have benefited financially from patrons to the facility (Interview 3). Brief discussions with business owners located near the GRR also suggest that they have a more positive outlook financially. However, the vast majority of tourist-oriented businesses indicated that visitors to the GRR have not been beneficial for their business. Many of these businesses were located downtown and out of sight of the facility.

In summary, an analysis suggests that the GRR has provided economic benefits to the host community with the surplus in visitors. The facility has attracted visitors who spend their money at selected businesses near the facility and on gaming at the GRR. This, in turn, economically benefits the village. Visitors of the facility, however, are a different clientele than those who visit the village for heritage tourism. Most likely, this is why business owners indicate that the facility has not been economically advantageous for their store. Key informants, involved in economic affairs, also suggest that the GRR has been economically beneficial for the community. This is a result of the monies that are generated from visitors to
the facility. However, only a few businesses, near the facility, reported financial benefits from the increase in visitors to the GRR.

5.2.2 Economic Impacts of the Ontario Lottery Corporation and the Elora Facility

Municipal donations and financial contributions from the OLG have a profound impact on several communities. From April 1st 2007 to March 31st 2008, the OLG generated $3.7 billion in economic activity in the province of Ontario. The monies were divided three ways 1) contributions to the province ($1.8 billion), 2) corporate responsibility ($53 million), and 3) support for local economies ($1.8 billion) (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). Investments to the province included gaming proceeds donated through the Ontario Trillium Foundation to local and provincial charities ($105 million), support for amateur athletes ($10 million) through the Quest for Gold program, and $1.7 billion to hospitals and other health-related programs (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). Some of the corporate responsibilities monies went towards partnering in education, research and prevention of problem gambling ($44 million), sponsorship of local music events ($1.2 million) and electronic bingo proceeds donated to local charities ($7.3 million) (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). Lastly, support for local economies included $142 million of goods and services from local businesses, payroll for OLG employees (7,700 people) at approximately $406 million, payroll for OLG resort casino partners (11,400 people) at an estimated $537 million, municipality payments to communities that host OLG gaming facilities ($115 million) and payments to the Ontario horseracing industry at an estimated $336 million (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009).

The OLG is considered to be a major economic contributor to local communities with regards to employment, financial support to hospitals, educational programs and community
cultural/recreational activities. The OLG has contributed an estimated $467.7 million of non-tax revenue since 1999 to 2006 host charity casino communities and 17 host communities with racetrack and slot facilities. Moreover, tens of millions of dollars have also been distributed to other direct and indirect economic benefits to host communities (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). Below, Table 5.1 and 5.2 illustrate some facts and financial contributions from gaming in Ontario in 2007.

**Table 5.1 Number of slots machines and table games, employees, and customer visits for Ontario Slots and Casino gaming facilities in 2007.**
(Source: OLG, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slot Machines</td>
<td>12,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Games</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>6,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Visits</td>
<td>24,055,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.2 Allocation and amount of revenues from Ontario’s slots and casino gaming facilities for 2007.**
(Source: OLG, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenue to Municipalities</td>
<td>467,756,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant in Lieu of Taxes to Municipalities</td>
<td>23,882,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission to Racetracks</td>
<td>1,032,690,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission to local horse associations</td>
<td>1,032,690,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll (including benefits)</td>
<td>1,817,676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenditures and contributions</td>
<td>309,533,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Community Contributions</td>
<td>918,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Benefits (Direct and Indirect to Host Communities)</td>
<td>4,684,249,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrated below in Table 5.3 and 5.4 are some of the facts and financial contributions provided from the GRR to the municipality of Centre Wellington since opening in 2003.
Table 5.3 Number of slots machines and table games, employees, and average customer visits for the Grand River Gaming facility since opening in December 4, 2003.
(Source: OLG, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slot Machines</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Customer Visits</td>
<td>656,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Allocation and amount of revenues from the Grand River Raceway’s gaming facility in 2007.
(Source: OLG, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenue to Municipality</td>
<td>5,409,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission to Racetrack</td>
<td>1,819,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission to local horse association</td>
<td>10,819,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payroll</td>
<td>19,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenditures and contributions</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Corporate Community Contributions</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Benefits (Direct and Indirect to Centre-Wellington)</td>
<td>47,766,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal communication with the GRR site manager provided further information regarding the economic contributions provided to the municipality. It was confirmed that the GRR contributes 5 percent of their total annual revenues to the municipality of Centre Wellington. However, according to the GRR site manager, the distribution of this 5 percent is unknown. Interviews with the President and the General Manager of the GRAS provided insight into the allocation of this 5 percent (Interview 3, 5). The majority of the 5 percent contribution from the OLG goes directly into coffers and is divided up accordingly to different areas of the municipality. Communities that host racetracks receive a percent of gross revenue from the first 450 slot machines and 2 percent from additional machines (Interview 3). From that, 20 percent of gross slot machine revenue is split evenly by the track
and horsemen through purses (Interview 3). Two percent of slot machine revenue from racetracks goes into problem gambling programs (Problem Gambling Association, 2009). A specific breakdown of the financial contributions was not available. However, in recent years, money has been allocated to the local hospital, recreation programs, and improvement of streetscapes and green spaces such as Bristol Park in Elora. Money has also been contributed to the current signage program, and infrastructure upgrades to improve Elora’s downtown (Interview 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

The OLG, however, is not the only financial contributor from the GRR. The GRAS is a non-profit organization that operates under the Agricultural Societies Act of Ontario (Grand River Agricultural Society, 2009). This association is run by volunteers and they own and operate the GRR and hold a number of events. Some of these events include the Grand River Truck and Tractor Pull and River Calf Show, and an annual Pizza Perfect program that educates grade 3 students on many aspects of agriculture (Interview 4, 5, 10). Their mission is to “provide opportunities for people involved in the life of their community through agriculture, environmental and rural initiatives” (Grand River Agricultural Society, 2009). Donations from the GRAS are provided to qualifying community groups and individuals as part of their “in-kind” program. This ‘in kind’ program is designed to give back to the community through their philanthropic fund. For example, the GRAS Bursary/Scholarship Program, established in 2006, provides financial assistance to college or university students that are enrolled in agricultural programs. Awards are $1,000 each and a total of 10 awards annually are distributed to qualifying students (Grand River Agricultural Society, 2009).
The GRAS has also donated $250,000 to the local hospital, and $50,000 to recreation programs and has generated thousands more to the community by opening their facility for local events to fundraise money (Interview 2). In 2008, the GRAS donated $125,000 to revitalise Elora’s Bristol Park (Interview 2). The GRAS’s philanthropic fund operates under a mandate that ensures all donations are subsequently related to agriculture. For example, cleaning up brown fields, getting involved in environmental projects and sponsoring local farmers are some of the projects that fit their mandate (Interview 3, 5). Aside from the financial contributions, the GRAS and the OLG are recognized for their assistance in socio-economic programs in the community (Interview 5, 10).

5.2.3 Sponsorships and Community Partnerships

Many of the programs that are attributed to the GRR have significant financial advantages. Documents provided by the OLG site at the GRR, consist of multiple sponsorships that are provided to the municipality (Personal Communication with OLG, 2009). Over a one-year time period, from April 1st 2008 to May 31st 2009, the following events were sponsored by the OLG:

1) 7th Annual Business and Community Awards of Excellence (Centre-Wellington Chamber of Commerce

2) Guelph Awards of Excellence 2008

3) Reminiscence Festival Homecoming Dinner and Dance

4) Elora Festival—Jazz and Popular Series

5) Fergus Truck Show
6) Fergus Scottish Festival 2008
7) Guelph Symphony Orchestra 2008-2009 Season
8) Sensational Elora Gala
9) Centre-Wellington Chamber of Commerce Mayor’s Breakfast

An estimated $44,000 was spent in sponsorships over this one-year time period. The following are just some of the sponsorships that the OLG will participate in with the municipality for the following year, from April 1st 2009 to May 31st 2010:

1) 8th Annual Business and Community Awards of Excellence (Centre-Wellington Chamber of Commerce)
2) Guelph Awards of Excellence 2009
3) Elora Festival and Singers
4) Fergus Truck Show
5) Fergus Scottish Festival
6) Sensational Elora-Celebration of the Senses Opening Gala

The total thus far in sponsorships is estimated at $41,750 for the next fiscal year (Personal Communication with OLG, 2009). More importantly than the direct financial contributions from the OLG, is the personal involvement and hands-on work that they provide. The Elora Chamber of Commerce considers them “great corporate partners” because they are “9 times out of 10, a leading tourism stakeholder” (Interview 1). Not only are they “good community minded” and a significant financial contributor, but their “elbow grease” involved in advertising and promoting local events goes a long way in strengthening Elora tourism.
Interview 1). Having the OLG as a major stakeholder in tourism development has significantly increased attendance numbers over the past several years (Interview 1, 10).

It is difficult to assess whether or not the OLG sponsorship and marketing of local events has had a significant impact on increased attendance. This is because the tourism market in Elora had been increasing annually well before the development of the GRR (Interview 1, 2, 3). In 1984, the Ministry of Tourism estimated that there were roughly 225,000 annual visitors to Elora (The Corporation of Elora, 1987, p. 3). By 1987 Elora had estimated over 500,000 visitors a year indicating that tourism in increasing in the area.

Attendance at the Elora Gorge and the Elora Festival has also increased over the past several years (Interview 1, 2). In 1998, prior to the development of the GRR, the Elora Gorge attendance was roughly 192,899 people. In 1998, the Elora festival attendance was an estimated 10,058 visitors (Mitchell and Coghill, 1999). The Elora Gorge and Conservation area now claims that they receive over a quarter of a million visitors each year. In 2009 the Elora festival attracted over 30,000 (Interview 2). More importantly, visitors to Elora’s major tourist attractions, including the Elora Festival and Sensational Elora, have increased after the development of the GRR (Interview 1, 2). Again, this increase in visitors does not necessarily suggest that sponsorships from the OLG or the GRAS are contributing factors. Rather, the development of the GRR has certainly not deterred tourists from coming to Elora to participate in heritage tourism.

Unfortunately, several attempts to attain current estimates of the total number of visitors to Elora, in the past several years, were unsuccessful. The Centre Wellington Economic Department and the Elora Chamber of Commerce both suggested that tourism has
been increasing over the past several years (Interview 1, 2). Also, the president of the GRAS suggested that August long weekend this year (2009) saw the highest number of visitors thus far in the village (Interview 3). According to the Elora tourism information centre, the total number of tourists that have visited the tourism information booth in 1998 (before the construction of the tourism centre) had increased by 2007 (Interview 1). Information was available for comparison for the months of July and August only. The total number of visitors to the tourist information booth in 1998 was 4134 people (Interview 1). In 2007, the tourist information centre received an estimated 5386 drop-ins for tourist inquiries (Interview, 1). This increase, however, may be a result of the duration of the tourism booth being open, the types of inquiries made and recording errors. Nevertheless, these figures do indicate that the number of tourists inquiring about Elora tourism has increased since development of the GRR. However, this is not necessarily related to the development of the GRR. Rather it suggests that the facility has not had a negative effect on their heritage tourism.

Similar to the OLG, the GRAS also generates economic benefits by promoting community-initiated programs. Documents provided by the General Manager of the GRR, outlined the “in kind” log that the GRAS began in 2004. This “in kind” log was developed as a way to give back to the community. The annual amount that the GRAS has contributed to fundraising and donating facility space is illustrated below in Table 5.5 (see Appendix B for complete log).
Table 5.5 Grand River Agricultural Society’s in kind contribution to Elora, Ontario from 2004 to 2009.
(Source: Interview 5, 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>35,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>36,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>52,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This log represents the amount that has been either fundraised for the community or the amount that the facility saved the community in rental space. It includes money from “in kind” contributes to labour, equipment etc to host events at their location. It is important to note that over the past 6 years, the amount that has been either donated back to the community or available for the aforementioned events, has steadily increased. According to the Mayor, as the development debt of the GRR decreases, the amount that is available for donations and socio-economic programs increases. It was also mentioned that “from the beginning we had a huge debt, still have some, and it was a risk. We realized that there was a bottom line we had to meet to pay it off and after just 3 months, we realized that the bottom line was way too low and that we were exceeding it and it kept getting better and better” (Interview 4) specifically:

In the beginning there was such a huge debt and it was difficult for the facility to give back to the community in a way that they had envisioned further down the road. However, all the time that we paid it (the debt) back, we focused on what we can do for nothing and so we
started the “in kind” program. It was first opened to the rotary club to use our facility with TVs’ and audio equipment for bingos. The rotary club had volunteers and we provided the facility and they raised money to go to the hospital. This was an in-kind thing because at the time we didn’t have a lot of money because it was going to the debt so we tried to think of things that didn’t have to cost money.

After the huge success of the rotary club, additional groups, as illustrated in Appendix (B), sought use of the facility to hold functions and to raise money for the community. The “Pizza Perfect” program is another social advantage that has had, and continues to have, a profound impact on educational benefits for children (Interview 4). The GRR had “spent time with consultants to get visions for educating kids on understanding agriculture and agri-business” (Interview 4). The GRAS started a program for grade 3 kids “to come to barns and learn how to make pizza from scratch, how to make sausage, cheese, grow tomatoes and make dough” (Interview, 4, 5). The program began as a one-day event and gained such popularity that it was extended to 3. This event also draws in over 3000 grade 3 student each year (Interview 4). The Mayor emphasized that these ‘in-kind’ programs were ways to connect with the community and “if we can’t give them money, how can we give them the opportunity to make money themselves” (Interview 4). The annual fireworks display is another function that the GRR has recently held for the community. This event was previously held by the Lions Club at the Elora Community Centre. Unfortunately, they could never turn a profit. The GRR has hosted this event for the past few years. They charge a two dollar entrance fee to cover the cost of the event. Turn-out rates have subsequently increased and the change in venue provides ample space for parking.
It appears, therefore, that the GRR has a positive impact on the village. This conclusion is verified by the Mayor. She commented that the GRR has had a huge economic and social impact on the community thus far. She further believes that it will only continue to prosper as the debt is paid down and more money is available to give back to the community (Interview 4).

5.2.4 Employment

The Elora Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey in 1984 to estimate the number of people employed in the tourism industry. From this survey it was found that in 1984, tourism directly employed approximately 260 people (The Corporation of the Village of Elora, 1987). It further concluded that tourism accounted for 15.4 percent of employment in Elora (next to industry at 45%) and employed 119 full time and 145 part time people (The Corporation of the Village of Elora, 1987, p. 4).

The development of the GRR has increased employment opportunities in Elora. The GRR provides jobs for at least 150 OLG employees and employs over 61 people during the horse racing season (Interview 5). Table 5.6 provides a breakdown of the GRR employment by percentage and area of residency. The highest percentages of employees are local (Fergus/Elora area) at 29 percent. This suggests that the GRR has been a major contributor to local job creation in the tourism sector. However, many employees quickly climb the corporate ladder and move to management positions typically located in urban areas such as Toronto (Interview 2). Thus, it has become harder to keep local residents who are employed at the GRR in the community. On average, the community of Elora exports 2800 highly
qualified professionals a day out of the community to jobs in other locations (Interview 3).
However, it was suggested that the GRR has provided many opportunities for many local professionals in jobs at offsite offices (Interview 3). Nevertheless, the racetrack offers many different positions that have resulted in the creation of several jobs for local and non-local residents (Interview 1, 2, 3).

Table 5.6 Breakdown of the Grand River Raceway employee’s place of residence.
(Source: Personal communication with Elora OLG site manager, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur/Mt. Forest</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto/Hamilton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge/Paris/Brantford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener/Waterloo</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fergus/Elora</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.5 Tax Revenues

The GRR is also a significant contributor to local tax dollars. Tax revenues are mostly collected from the OLG renting space from the GRAS. Twenty percent of these tax dollars go to the community to support social services such as policing, health care and infrastructure (Interview 2). In total, roughly $800,000 has gone towards capital projects (Interview 2). Furthermore, $1.6 million dollars annually is paid in taxes from the OLG. This is said to be double the taxes paid from local residents (Interview 2). Roughly $7 million, over the past 5 years, has been paid to the municipality of Centre Wellington and is considered a “significant footprint” (Interview 2).
5.3 Negative Socio-Economic Impacts of the Grand River Raceway

5.3.1 Divided Community

As discussed in Chapter 3, the development of the slot machine parlour generated much controversy. Despite local residents’ positive attitudes towards tourism development, gambling, for example, was looked upon as a negative addition to the community. This is attributed to the notion that it would destroy the image of this heritage village along with the perceived associated costs. What was not anticipated, however, was the affect the development would have on social cohesion. In fact, one of the most significant negative implications of the GRR was that it divided the community in half.

Specifically, Elora is a tight-knit community and many locals have relatives in the community or are friends with one another (Interview 1, 7). Decision-making was difficult given that council members also shared friends and family in the village (Interview 1, 7, 8). When the time came to vote for the implementation of the GRR, members of council, including the Mayor, were torn between two sides. Either way, they were faced with scrutiny from opposing friends and/or family (Interview 1, 4, 7, 8). As a result, council members were at a “lose lose” situation and those who were in favour of the development were faced with nearly half a community that was opposed. Several council members were also active business members in the community. Unfortunately, many council members lost business at their firms and community support in preceding elections (Interview 1, 4, 7, 8). Many local residents that opposed to the GRR development refused to support local businesses owned by proponents (Interview 7, 8). Dissolved community unity resulted in animosity and
resentment amongst local residents. Thus, the creation of a fractured community was one social impact that resulted from the development of the GRR.

5.3.2 Legal Issues

Court battles and associated fees were another consequence of the GRR facility (Interview 6). Personal communication with a Chair member of the CWCC provided detailed insight into the events leading up to, and after, the decision to host the GRR. Furthermore, a file containing the chronology of the debate and court battle was attained through this interview. This file contained all the recorded information including emails, newspaper articles, quotations from local residents and politicians, and those involved in this event. The following are key dates that acknowledge the disadvantage that residents had due to lack of public consultation in amendment of the facility. The following also provides insight into the negative impact that the decision of implementing the facility had on the community (CWCC, 2009; Interview 6).
As illustrated above, the CWCC continued to fight after the decision was made to implement the GRR. They took legal action by appealing to the Superior Court and OMB only to lose, resulting in over $86,000 in court fees. Exhausted and disgruntled, the CWCC was responsible for paying back the entire court costs (Interview 6). Consequently, local residents felt punished for acting legally on an issue they felt was undemocratic and which ultimately led to their costly court fees (Interview 6).
5.3.3 Uneven Economic Benefits

Business surveys aimed at determining whether the GRR had been economically beneficial for the community, businesses in general and the surveyed business in particular. However, the survey did not question the reasoning behind the participants’ answer. Revisiting the results from the business survey, finds that the majority (63.7%) of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the GRR had been economically beneficial for the community. A considerably smaller percentage of respondents (29.9%) either strongly agreed or agreed that the GRR had been financially beneficial for business. Even fewer respondents (15.6%) strongly agreed or agreed that it had been financially beneficial for their business.

The drop off and pick up method of surveying businesses involved personal interaction with owners. This allowed for business owners to share additional comments on the economic benefits of the GRR. For example, several respondents reported that the GRR was beneficial to the community because revenues are assigned to the development of many projects in the village. Surprisingly, a vast majority of business owners suggested that patrons of the GRR never come downtown and therefore, do not spend money at their store. Other respondents suggested that people who visit the GRR are different from those who visit Elora for its heritage appeal. The same conclusions were drawn through personal observation and discussions with tourists. Only 1 of the 178 tourists in the downtown area showed interest in visiting the GRR. Furthermore, the majority of tourists were unaware that the facility existed. As a result, local business owners argue that the financial benefits from the GRR have not been felt equally by the business community.
Many business owners suggested that they were unaware of the money allocation. Discussions with shop owners suggest that there are many areas of the community that could still be improved. These areas should be top priority given the increase in municipal funds provided from the OLG and the GRAS. Some of these projects include the walking bridge, which had been recently torn down due to unsafe infrastructure, streets and sidewalk repair, and the overall landscaping of the community. A meeting with a member of the BIA also suggested that residents and local business owners are not seeing the direct financial benefits. The BIA representative argued that most of the money generated by the GRR is not put back into the community. Rather, she suggests that it “just sits in coffers and collects interest” (Interview 7).

Uneven distribution of monies was identified as another disadvantage. Centre Wellington is the amalgamation of several communities including Fergus, Elora, Pilkington, Nichol, West Garafraxa and Eramosa Townships. It is considered to be one of the fastest growing communities in Ontario with an estimated 26,000 residents (TCI Management Consultants, 2009). The amalgamation was formed in 1999 as an initiative to “strengthen the Township’s economy and help guide longer-term economic growth and development in the municipality” (TCI Management Consultants, 2009). The two major population centres are Elora and Fergus. These communities are home to approximately 26,000 residents. Elora is well known for its tourism sector, whereas Fergus has a large industrial sector (Interview 7). Profits from the OLG and the GRAS are divided amongst each community. This causes resentment with Elora residents because the GRR is in their backyard (Interview 6, 7). One local resident and business owner argued “why couldn’t they have put it [the GRR] in
Fergus. They are more industrial. It would be better suited there” (Interview 7). Furthermore, some suggest that Elora should receive more financial assistance considering that they host the gaming facility (1, 6, 7).

In retrospect, some groups see the uneven distribution of profits as a disadvantage. Local business owners suggest that the GRR has not increased the number of tourists who shop at their firm. This is attributed to the fact that most patrons of the GRR do not participate in heritage tourism. It has also been argued that the distribution of money is not being allocated to the most needed areas of the community. Finally, the GRR is located in a popular heritage tourism village in the municipality. Since the village of Elora host this gaming facility, many believe they should receive a greater portion of the revenues that is granted to the municipality from the GRR³.

5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed a number of social and economic impacts of the GRR. The economic benefit from visitors is best seen in the money put back into the community from the facility. Fewer economic benefits are seen in local businesses. This can be attributed to the fact that patrons from the GRR rarely participate in heritage tourism activities in Elora. The economic benefits from the facility are many. The GRAS and the OLG have proven to be supporters of the promotion of local heritage tourism as well as financial contributors to community-based events. Increased tax revenues and employment are also major economic benefits of the gaming facility.
The GRR also has several social impacts. One of the most prominent positive aspects of the GRR is the social programs that are organized through the GRAS. Furthermore, their promotion of local culture, agriculture and horse farming is highly beneficial for the community, especially children. Some negative aspects of the GRR, however, can be seen in the division of community unity, court battles resisting gaming development and the uneven distribution of monies.

---

3 Gambling addiction was not examined in this thesis.
Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Introduction

The overall goal of this thesis was to determine the impacts that gaming has on rural heritage communities. More specifically, it has aimed to understand i) the impacts that gaming has on Elora’s identity as a rural heritage village and ii) the positive and negative (social and economic) impacts that gaming has on this village and iii) to develop a set of recommendations for communities who are considering adopting similar development. To date, literature on the impacts of racinos in rural spaces is minimal and the impact that gaming has on heritage-scapes of host communities is under-researched. Elora, Ontario, is a useful example of gaming in a rural heritage-scape setting. This study has ultimately led to a better understanding of the impacts that this form of economic development may have on a heritage setting.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results and impacts that stem from this research and relate them back to existing literature. The findings of this study help to close gaps in literature on heritage tourism as a catalyst for rural revitalization, place identity and the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of gaming in rural communities. Similarities and differences will also be discussed regarding the results and literature to date.
6.2 Heritage Tourism as a Catalyst for Rural Revitalization

Rural decline is often a result of social and economic restructuring (Gartner 2005; Markey et al, 2008). Countrysides are rapidly becoming economically disadvantaged to their urban counterparts as an inevitable process of globalization (Markey et al, 2008). Communities located in rural locales often have a lack of social services and financial support to maintain existing infrastructure (Hugh, 2005; Markey et al, 2008). Quite often, this lack of investment leads to the marginalization of rural communities and results in out-migration (Hugh, 2005; Markey et al, 2008). Recent restructuring of rural landscapes, however, has resulted in economic prosperity through tourism (Bjorkhaug and Richards, 2008; Bollman, 2000; Hugh, 2005; Markey et al. 2008; Rothwell et al, 2002). It has been argued that rural tourism is one of the fastest growing providers of rural livelihood in many communities (Gartner, 2005; Paddison and Calderwood, 2007; Sharpley, 2007; Smith and Krannich, 1998). It has also been proven that heritage is a catalyst for tourism in communities with historical and cultural attributes (Paddison and Calderwood, 2007; Sharpley, 2007; Smith and Krannich, 1998). The preservation of a historical society, along with a collection of memories, has been documented as a way of creating a nostalgic setting for the modern day heritage tourism industry (Badyopadhyay et al, 2008; Knox, 2008; Poria et al, 2006; Stebbins, 2002).

Results from this thesis have revealed that Elora markets their village as a heritage tourism destination. Poria et al (2006) and Shepard (2005) indicate that a heritage tourism village is one that emphasizes historical and cultural artefacts. As illustrated in Figures 4.1 and 4.2, the majority of retail outlets offer products that relate to the historical or heritage
aspects of the village. Many stores offer products, such as arts and crafts, antiques, and historical memorabilia that represent the artistic and cultural base of the community. As indicated in this study, tourism in the village is a product of the expression of local identity. This is realized through the production and consumption of authentic art and craft products.

Thus, like many other rural communities that have adopted tourism, Elora, Ontario has created a unique theme by combining rural heritage, culture and their pristine landscape. The rural idyllic setting, historical architecture and abundant local and non-local craft entrepreneurs have encouraged the creation of a heritage place identity. A general consensus is that tourism is widely accepted within the community. This is likely due to the prosperity of local businesses from visitors during the peak tourist season. In the off-season, however, businesses are highly dependent on local residents to remain afloat. Thus, the high turn-over in businesses is likely to be a direct result of the instability of this type of industry. Despite this, heritage tourism appears to have had a positive impact on Elora.

6.3 Place Identity and Gaming

Rural spaces may develop a new identity based on their desire to satisfy a heritage tourism experience (Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). This identity may change, however, if non-heritage facilities are introduced into the community. Racinos are one form of activity that has emerged in rural Ontario communities. Despite abundant literature on the social impacts of gaming, the implications of racino gaming on place identity remains untapped.

A review of local newspapers revealed that local residents believed that the development of the GRR would lead to the destruction of Elora’s identity as a rural heritage
village. Also, archives from the CWCC suggest that approximately half of the community opposed gaming development. The community of Elora feared that a number of negative impacts would accompany the facility. Some of these impacts include crime, congestion and gambling addiction and that it would not only detract heritage tourism visitors, but would also destroy the environmental and social atmosphere of their heritage village.

Literature indicates that these impacts have existed in similar rural gaming communities (Carmichael, 2000; Park and Stokowski, 2009; Stitts, 2005; Stokowski, 1993). Several locations in the United States, including small towns in Massachusetts, and four communities in Colorado and South Dakota, reported that although they were aware of the benefits of gaming development, they were prepared to accept the associated costs. These associated costs included increased crime, traffic congestion and “deterioration in the image of their community” (Stitt et al, 2005, p. 188). Although concerns were voiced that the GRR would destroy the identity of Elora, results of this thesis find that this has not occurred. As illustrated in Figures 4.3 and 4.4, local businesses and tourists still have a strong perception of the village as a heritage tourism destination. The results of this study also reveal that the fears of gaming in the community have not yet materialized.

Narratives taken from the interviews point out that horseracing is embedded in the heritage of many rural communities. Literature also suggests that horseracing is deeply seeded in rural communities. Specifically, being one of the oldest sports in rural history, horse racing provides a link between heritage and culture (Chalip and Costa, 2005; Vamplew and Kay, 2005). Rural communities, throughout history, have been traditional spaces of agriculture and livestock farming which are directly associated with horses and equestrian-
based activities (Ollenburg, 2005; Vamplew and Kay, 2005). As indicated in the results of this thesis, some believe that horses and horseracing are part of Elora’s heritage image. Therefore, the racetrack conforms to their rural community identity.

   Fitchen (1991) suggests that rural spaces have a strong sense of unity that typically defines their current identity. Tourists and local business owners were surveyed for opinions regarding the current image of Elora. Figures 4.5 and 4.6 both depict tourists and local businesses ranking highly those current aspects that project a heritage identity in their community. These ranking suggest that respondents feel strongly that these characteristics define Elora as a heritage community. This further indicates that the presence of the gaming facility has not altered Elora’s image. Narratives presented in this study also reveal that gaming in the community has not compromised the historical and cultural characteristics of the community.

   Elora’s identity was not compromised by development of the GRR for several reasons. These reasons include marketing, spatial location of the GRR and its conformity to the existing landscape. Contrary to casino destinations, such as Las Vegas and Macao (Gu and Zhicheng, 2006), Elora employed several tactics to minimize gaming development on community identity. The size and scale of the facility could also play a role in its minimal impacts on Elora’s heritage. The GRR is approximately 45,000 square feet and holds only 200 slot machines (Mitchell and Singh, in press) making is considerably smaller than other gaming facilities examined in this thesis (Park and Stokowski, 2009; Perdue et al, 1999; Stitts et al, 2005; Stokowski, 1993).
Marketing, clearly, was a major contributor to the preservation of Elora’s heritage tourism identity. Brochures, signs and travel guides significantly downplayed the gaming facility as a tourist attraction. Although the GRR is indicated as a point of interest on local maps, it was not highlighted as a main attraction. A study by Mitchell and Singh (in press), point out that the GRR was one of the largest investments made in the village in recent years. Similar to the results of this thesis, Mitchell and Singh (in press) suggest that marketing campaigns significantly downplay the facility as a part of Elora’s image. Other rural gaming communities, such as Deadwood and several Colorado towns, have marketed casinos as their primary tourist attraction (Park and Stokowski, 2009; Stokowski, 1993; Stitt et al, 2005). As a result, several studies indicate that these communities are vulnerable to the loss of sense of place and historical identities (Park and Stokowski, 2009; Perdue et al, 1999) This study, therefore, highlights that strategic marketing of racino gaming is a way to preserve the image of rural heritage communities.

The location of the GRR on the outskirts of the village has also preserved Elora’s heritage-scape. As indicated in chapter 4, visitors to the GRR are not participating in heritage tourism and visitors who come to Elora for its heritage are highly unlikely to take part in gaming activities. This research suggests that the GRR location outside the downtown core separates gaming from heritage tourism, which is vital to maintaining the heritage-scape identity. Furthermore, the GRR is not visible to tourists who are dining and shopping downtown.

Recent literature suggests that tourists have a profound impact on host destinations and local businesses will develop to meet needs of visitors (Gu and Ryan, 2008). Some
scholars suggest that a change in tourist clientele can alter the amenities and services that businesses provide through the demonstration effect (Gu and Ryan, 2008). This can be illustrated in the town of Deadwood, South Dakota, as their current industry has developed around gaming. What began as a small number of gambling machines in local businesses, resulted in the branding of this destination for casino tourism. As the demand for gaming-related services rose, new types of businesses developed leaving older ones to vanish (Nickerson, 1995; Park and Stokowski, 2009).

Efforts to conform the racino to the existing rural setting have resulted in minimal impacts on Elora’s image. The design of the facility is uniform with the existing landscape. The facility has two silos representing a barn-type structure and the exterior is made with metal paneling. The colours blend in with the architecture of the town and the two rows of windows in the front represents the loft of a barn. Typical casino-type destinations draw attention to bright lights and extravagant monuments as a motive to attract tourists to their gaming facility (Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009). In Elora, the absence of flashy casino lights conforms to the existing image. It can be suggested, therefore, that the heritage product likely remained unaltered because of its conformity with the surrounding landscape. This finding contributes to our understanding of how to minimize the impacts of racino gaming on the image of a heritage tourism community.

In summary, heritage has a major impact on place identity. This can be seen in the attachment that local residents have with their heritage surroundings (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). Gaming literature primarily focuses on the economic benefits of casinos. However, literature has paid less attention to mitigation methods to preserve local culture. In the case of
Elora, most local businesses and tourists believe that the characteristics of Elora’s heritage village have not been compromised by gaming development. This can be attributed to strategic marketing, the location of the facility, and its uniformity with the existing heritage-scape. A further discussion of place identity, heritage commodification (Shepard, 2002) and the development of the GRR will be discussed in reference to the Model of Creative Destruction.

6.4 Creative Destruction and Gaming

The Model of Creative Destruction describes the commodification of historic landscapes by local, or non-local entrepreneurs (Mitchell, 1998). It focuses on the evolutionary process that sees historic landscape evolve through three phases (town-scape, heritage-scape and leisure-scape), as a result of the actions of stakeholders driven by profit, preservation or promotion of economic growth (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). The model has been applied to many communities, including Elora.

The model was first applied to the village of Elora because it exhibited the three main criteria required for the development of a commodified heritage landscape (see chapter 3). Previous studies on Elora determined that after the development of the GRR, the community moved to the stage of early destruction (Mitchell and Singh, in press). This is the first stage in the transformation of a heritage-scape to a leisure-scape of mass consumption. It was predicted that this large-scale non-heritage facility would cause a transformation to the existing landscape, and in doing so, would destroy its identity as a heritage-scape (Mitchell and Singh, in press).
This study, however, found no evidence that the racino has destroyed Elora’s identity, in the eyes of business owners and tourists (Figures 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6). This was attributed to i) marketing, which significantly downplayed Elora as a casino tourism destination, ii) the location on the outskirts of the village, and iii) the uniformity of the facility with the existing heritage-scape. In combination, these factors have led to the maintenance of Elora’s identity as a heritage village.

These factors may also be responsible for the largely positive attitudes that residents have about tourism in Elora (Table 6.1). Mitchell and Singh (in press) suggest that although negative attitudes were expressed about development of the GRR, residents’ attitudes toward tourism development are now largely positive. Of particular importance is that traffic congestion and parking difficulties seem to be less of a problem post GRR development.4

Table 6.1 Residents attitudes towards tourism in Elora 1998-2008.
(Source: Mitchell and Singh, in press)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>1998 (n= 150) % responding</th>
<th>2008 (n=89) % responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates income or employment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to beautification or opening of interesting shops</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates traffic congestion or crowding</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates parking difficulties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Raceway has led to gambling addictions</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 shows that attitudes are slightly more positive in 2008 compared to 1998.

The suggestion that “ruralite attitudes may be less negative during latter stages if the tourist

---

4 Resident’s attitudes towards gambling addictions could not be compared from 1998-2008 because the facility was not built until 2003.
district does not overlaps with their lived space” Mitchell and de Waal (2009, p. 164),
appears to be confirmed. However, if further development of similar non-heritage venues
occurs near the racetrack, attitudes of residents, heritage shop owners and heritage tourists,
may turn increasingly negative, as non-heritage tourism participants increase. If this scenario
unfolds, it may be indicative that Elora is transforming into a leisure-scape of mass
consumption, as the model predicts.

For the time being, however, it may be argued that the GRR actually has enhanced
Elora’s heritage destination image. Investment into the Elora Festival, which had experienced
near bankruptcy, and the addition of Sensational Elora in 2008, created new initiatives for the
prosperity of heritage tourism (Mitchell and Singh, in press). According to key informants,
the money generated from the development of the GRR has largely contributed to the
promotion and prosperity of these cultural events (Interviews 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7). These
investments may have contributed to the increase in visitors that has occurred at these events.

In retrospect, the Model of Creative Destruction predicts that Elora has progressed
from advanced commodification to early destruction. Increased investment and visitors to the
village have confirmed this claim (Mitchell and Singh, in press) however, several mitigation
methods to preserve the heritage-scape of this village have resulted in positive attitudes of
local residents. Furthermore, local businesses and tourists perceive that the development of
this non-heritage large-scale investment has not altered the heritage attraction of this village.
This confirms that, although Elora has progressed to early destruction, tourists’ experiences
have not been compromised by non-heritage development. Moreover, local businesses and
residents, thus far, believe that the development of the GRR has not jeopardized the identity of the community.

6.5 Socio-Economic Impacts

6.5.1 Positive Impacts

Results of this thesis find that the economic impacts provided by the GRR are extensive. These results support existing literature that gaming may contribute to significant economic development in many host destinations. Specifically, tourism and gaming have also been closely linked throughout history and in many cases gaming operations have been a major contributing factor to the growth of tourism (Back and Lee, 2005; Eadington, 1984; Eadington, 1999). Local governments have generally encouraged the growth of casinos as a way to improve tourist numbers and generate revenue (Back and Lee, 2005; Eadington, 1999). The motivations behind the development of any casino can be attributed to a community’s desire for positive economic growth (Back and Lee, 2005). Ham et al (2004, pp. 391) suggest that “casino development, like other forms of tourism development, is expected to contribute to the activation of the local economy in a community” and the development of casinos is to attract tourists that will spend money in the local community.

Similarly, the GRR was viewed as a way to stimulate economic activity in Elora. The addition of the slot machine parlour was to support the evolutionary decline in horse-track betting that has occurred over the past few decades (Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). The majority of literature to date, however, focuses on casinos gaming destinations. This thesis, however, aimed at determining the economic benefits of racinos in rural areas. As illustrated in the
results, the economic impacts are a combination of both increased visitors to the area and the financial contributions from the GRR to the community (Tables 5.3 to 5.5).

The increase in visitors that attend the facility generates revenue and, in turn, this is partially distributed back into the local economy. The results from this study indicate that, since the opening of GRR, the facility has attracted more than 656,500 people. This figure corresponds to Mitchell and Singh’s (in press, p. 16) study which suggests that each month nearly 38,000 patrons visit the facility. Some firms near the facility reported increased business from patrons of the GRR. The majority of heritage-oriented shops in the downtown, however, reported no increase in business, re-affirming that patrons of the facility are not heritage tourism participants.

Literature suggests that gaming development provides a variety of economic advantages aside from the increase in visitors to local businesses (Andereck et al, 2005; Eadington, 1999, Eadington, 2002). Some of these economic benefits from the GRR include facility donations, sponsorships, tax revenues, and employment. This corresponds to recent literature which suggests that casinos are a significant contributor to the local economy through increased employment and profitable taxes (Andereck et al, 2005). From approximately 1987-1997, the United States gaming industry generated $10 billion annually in revenue (Rephann, 1997). From 1997 to 2001 gambling expenditures increased from $US60 billion to $US 90 billion (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). In 2006, the United States gaming industry earned $90.93 billion in gross revenue. Statistics Canada claims that the continuous growth in casino tourism “outstrips” any other industry in terms of employment and revenue within the travel and tourism sector (Marshall, pp.1, 1998). The annual revenue
of the GRR was not determined but 5 percent of the annual income is distributed back into the community. According to the OLG (2007), $1.8 million has been given back to local communities in Ontario. Since the development of the GRR, $5,409,993 has been donated back to the Municipality of Centre Wellington (Table 5.4).

In regards to sponsorships, the OLG and the GRAS are significant contributors to local events. Gaming literature largely focuses on the economic stimulation that gaming provides to host communities. Although well documented by local and national governments, racino sponsorships and economic donations have yet to be published in the literature. According to the results of this thesis, sponsorship and donations are generated from both the OLG and the GRAS. The OLG distributes 5 percent of their gross revenue to the municipality of the Center Wellington. They are also significant stakeholders in the promotion of local culture through festivals and events. Narratives in this study suggest that the OLG is a key player in the promotion of local activities related to heritage tourism.

According to the GRR site manager, $44,000 was donated to the community for endorsing local and cultural events from April 1st 2008 to May 31, 2009. Furthermore, this financial contribution from the OLG is expected to continue annually with a projected amount of $41,750 for the next fiscal year. Similarly, the GRAS has sponsored community events such as the fireworks, Pizza Perfect program for elementary children and scholarships for college and university students perusing agricultural programs. The GRAS has also donated and sponsored community events with financial contributions from their “in kind” have increase yearly from $14,045.00 in 2004 to $52,031.77 in 2009 (Figure 5.5).
The economic impact of horseracing and racetracks has received little attention in literature (Allsop, 2008; Anonymous, 1987; Neibergs, 2000). A case study of Hayward, California predicted that the opening of a racetrack could generate approximately $1.5-$1.8 million in parimutual gaming. However, this proposed racetrack was also amidst additional forms of entertainment such as a shopping centre, amusement park and other activities (Anonymous, 1987). This study, however, is slightly outdated and does not accurately provide a true estimate of racetrack tax revenues without the slot machine component.

Within the last two decades, the revenue that casinos produce has been gaining increased attention in literature (Allsop, 2008; Maclaurin and Maclaurin, 2003; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008; Walker and Jackson, 2008). This can be attributed to the rapid growth in the gaming industry, particularly in North America (Walker and Jackson, 2008). Slot machine revenue at racetracks, however, has received less attention in the literature. Rather, studies that have sought to understand the competition for revenue amongst state or provincial gambling institutions (Anders and Siegel and Yacoub, 1998; Davis and Filer and Moak, 1992; Popp and Stehwien, 2002; Siegel and Anders, 2001). For example, Walker and Jackson’s (2008) study “Do U.S gambling Industries Cannibalize each other?” discusses the competition of inner and outer states gambling types. These types of gambling include horse racing (without the presence of slot machines) dog racing, state lotteries, Indian, commercial, and riverboat casinos. Furthermore, literature on tax revenues produced from gaming is highly centralized around the United States (Anders et al, 1998; Davis et al, 1992; Siegel and Navin, 2002; Thalheimer and Ali, 1995; Walker and Jackson, 2008).
This case study on the GRR contributes to existing literature on gaming revenues from a Canadian perspective and also focuses on revenues generated from a racino. As indicated in the results, 20 percent of tax revenue from the GRR goes directly into community programs. Some of these programs include policing, healthcare and infrastructure (Interview 2). Furthermore, $1.6 billion tax revenues are collected by the community. These tax revenues are estimated to be double that what is paid by local residents. The example of Elora illustrates how slot machine gaming can produce significant tax revenues that are economically beneficial to local communities. The majority of tax-revenues are generated from the OLG who rent space at racetracks for their slot machine parlours.

Gaming development has also attributed to an increase in employment in host destinations. Literature on gaming employment primarily focuses on casino tourism destinations (Eadington, 1999; Light, 2008; Maclaurin and Wolstenholme, 2008). This study on rural Elora, Ontario, however, provides insight into employment opportunities in rural communities at racinos. According to the American Gaming Association (2008) the gaming industry in the United States has produced more than 1 million jobs directly related to gaming since legalization. The National Gambling Impact Study Commission states that:

Legalized gambling has unquestionably had certain positive economic effects in some of the communities in which it has been introduced. Hundreds of employees in several cities enthusiastically described to the Commission the new and better jobs they had obtained with the advent of casinos

The number of employees in the American gaming industry increased from 198,657 in 1990 to 354,921 in 2005 representing a 79 percent increase (American Gaming Association,
Gaming related jobs in Canada has risen from 11,000 in 1992 to 40,000 in 2006 (Maclaurin and Wolstenholme, 2008, p. 320). Results suggest that gaming development in Elora has also created a number of employment opportunities and the GRR has provided roughly 250 jobs in gaming and racing. Furthermore, roughly 29 percent of the employees at the GRR are local residents (Figure 5.6).

6.5.2 Negative Impacts and Residents’ Perceptions

The most negative notable social impact is gambling addiction (Miller and Currie, 2008; Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008; Pearce et al, 2008). However, this thesis aimed to recognize other social impacts from gaming. Some social implications of gaming that are discussed in literature include crime, corruption, congestion, noise, tourist/resident conflict, drugs and drug trafficking, prostitution, negative resident perceptions/and or resistance to development and the cannibalization of existing businesses (Andereck et al, 1995; Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007; Ham et al, 2005 Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). The legalization of gambling first, in the United States, then in Canada, was controversial given concern for the aforementioned implications (Andereck et al, 2005; Eadington, 1984 Eadington, 1999; Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). Furthermore, the impacts that gaming may have on a host community is also a deterrent in many locations (Andereck et al, 2005; Eadington, 1984; Eadington, 1999; Ham et al, 2005; Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008).

Some scholars refer to the impacts of gaming development as the social disruption theory that states “communities experiencing rapid growth typically enter a period of generalized crisis and loss of traditional routines and attitudes. The crisis affects individuals,
whose mental health, worldviews, ways of behaving, and social relationships and networks may all be affected” (Park and Stokowski, 2009, p. 905). This theory also suggests that this rapid change in community will also lead to numerous social problems that are common with many forms of tourism development (Park and Stokowski, 2009). Quite often, rapid development is followed by extensive growth in non-traditional facilities that leads to overwhelming social problems (England and Albrecht, 1984; Park and Stokowski, 2009).

The development of the GRR has yet to encourage alternative growth related to the gaming facility. Many local residents predicted that the development of the GRR would encourage crime, prostitution, congestion and gambling addiction. Parallel to the social fears expressed in literature are those that were acknowledged in the village of Elora. Results suggest, however, that none of these impacts have yet to materialize. This could be due to the rural location and racetrack component of the facility, whereas previous studies have focused on the negative impacts of larger casinos, primarily in urban areas (Gu and Zhicheng, 2006). Perhaps the rural location and relatively small size of the facility plays a role in the absence of these social implications. However, the GRR has only been in operation for seven years and, therefore, the long term impacts are unknown.

The results of this thesis find that the most notable negative impacts of the GRR were a divided community, legal issues and the uneven distribution of gaming profit. The village of Elora was virtually divided into two groups. First were the proponents; these with authority and economic influence in the community and second, were the opponents; those being the cultural and religious residents and business community of the village. Literature suggests that gaming has caused turmoil and the division of other community groups. A
study in Hamilton, New Zealand for example found that gaming caused the division of approximately 134,000 local residents. Similar to Elora, the proponents were those with political and economic authority and the opponents were the remaining local residents (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008, p. 183). This study by Mohsin and Lockyer (2008) also indicates that gaming patrons are likely to have a positive outlook on the development of a facility in their community.

Social exchange theory is often used to describe the exchange of resources between certain groups of individuals (Stitt et al, 2005). The theory suggests that those who are likely to benefit from tourism are considerably more accepting of its development. As suggested earlier in this thesis, community members who benefit from economic development may view gaming development as favourable (Ap, 2000; Ap, 2002). Those who do not benefit may be opposed (Ap, 2000; Ap, 2002). Stitt et al (2005, p. 189) suggests that “in the context of casino gambling, social exchange theory suggests that those that benefit most from the casino show the greatest support for it”. This is especially true in the case of Elora where local authorities representing the BIA, the local Economic Development Department, GRAS and the OLG saw the GRR as an economic opportunity. Conversely, those who anticipated minimal benefits (local residents and businesses) from the GRR, believed it to be a negative addition to their quality of life.

This theory is related to the term “lag effects” that is described by Stokowski (1993, p. 35). As discussed earlier, lag effects refers to “outcomes of tourism development processes that lag anticipated goals”. According to Stokowski (1993) lag effects can be either positive or negative depending on the outcomes from tourism development. Undesirable lag effects
include lack of employment from tourism development or increases in congestion and traffic. Desirable lag effects occur when the worst possible outcomes fail to arise or when the positive outcomes outweigh the negative (Stokowski, 1993). For example, several communities in Colorado (Central City, Black Hawk and Cripple Creek) petitioned for gambling facilities. With the hopes of revitalizing existing infrastructure and boosting their economy, these communities were approved limited-stakes gaming in 1991 (Stokowski, 1993, p. 37). Some of the undesirable effects were the increase in property taxes that forced residents and businesses to pack-up and leave. Although the economic benefits have occurred over the years, the social benefits, such as improved infrastructure, seem to lag (Stokowski, 1993).

In the case of Elora, the economic and social benefits from the GRR have increased each year since gaming development. As indicated in the GRAS “in kind” log sponsorships and donations have increase annually as the debt of the facility decreases and more money is available to give back to the community. The OLG has also continued to contribute 5 percent of their revenues back to the community that has been designated for improved infrastructure and social services. As indicated by the Mayor of Centre Wellington, the initial amount given back was minimal because of the overhead debt of the facility. However, as each year that goes by, the facility is able to contribute more and more back into the local economy. According to Stokowski (1993) this is a positive lag effect. Local businesses were led on that the GRR would increase customers to their firm but according to the results of this thesis, this has yet to happen and therefore, this would be considered an undesirable lag effect.
Residents’ perceptions and gaming have been cited often in recent literature. Particular concern has been given to residents’ resistance to gaming development because of the associated negative stigma (Andereck et al., 1995; Eadington, 1984; Eadington, 1999; Chhabra and Gursoy, 2007; Ham et al., 2005; Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008). However, to date, literature on racino gaming development does not suggest that local resistance was of the magnitude that it was in Elora. After three appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board, this unprecedented event of conflict ended in the defeat of the CWCC. Court fees exceeding $86,000 caused resentment and further division in this village of family and friends.

Findings from this study further indicate that resentment is still present within Elora. Local residents and business owners are not reaping the financial benefits predicted by the proponents. As suggested by Mitchell and Singh (in press), merchants and the Elora BIA anticipated that the development of the facility would increase annual tourist numbers. Further studies suggest that local businesses are generally positive about the development of a gaming facility because of the increase in visitors at their firm (Back and Lee, 2005; Eadington, 1984, Eadington, 1999; Light, 2008; Mohsin and Lockyer, 2008; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008; Wenz, 2008). The results of this study suggest that the facility has caused an increase in visitors to the community. However, patrons from the facility are not visiting the downtown. Thus, the economic benefits of the GRR are not felt by local merchants. This contrasts findings of Back and Lee’s (2005, p. 45) in their study on the Kangwon Land Casino in South Korea. Here it was found that sales at local businesses, including accommodations, restaurants, taxis and gas stations, had increased by 50 to 200 percent since the opening of their casino. However, their study was conducted in an urban setting where
gaming is the main attraction and therefore, it is likely that businesses cater to this type of clientele.

Previous literature also points to casino tourism destinations in urban areas. Considering that these destination are typically followed by the development of similar forms of entertainment, surrounding businesses are likely to prosper (Intini, 2007; Friess, 2008). Other activities also play a major role in the development of gaming destinations and casino tourism (Friess, 2008). For example, in 2007 nearly 60 percent of revenue generated from Las Vegas tourism came from non-gaming activities (Friess, 2008, p 1). Elora is known for its heritage, rather than casino tourism thus, similar developments related to the GRR are not present. This may explain why local businesses do not prosper from tourists who come to Elora to participate in casino tourism.

As documented earlier, a percentage of gaming revenue from the GRR is contributed back into the community. However, where the money goes is difficult to trace. The results of this study suggest that money is allocated accordingly to social services such as hospitals. Also, part of the money is allocated for the improvement of infrastructure and protected areas. Results from both sets of surveys suggest that patrons of the GRR rarely shop at local businesses. Strategies to improve relations between local business and gaming facilities are not addressed in literature. This thesis has aimed to fill this gap. The following section will discuss the current initiatives for improved relations between the OLG, GRAS and the financial district of downtown Elora.
6.6 Local Initiatives

Representatives from the GRR and the local business district indicate that GRR and local business partnership has room for improvement. The GRR has the potential to encourage their patrons to explore the downtown area of the village. Local businesses indicate that the increase in visitors to the GRR could have the potential to draw more people to their firms. Both the GRR and the business community suggest that several initiatives could improve tourism at the facility and in the downtown. Five initiatives were determined from several interviews.

First, several interviewees suggested that the main sidewalk leading from downtown to uptown needs to be extended. The current sidewalk ends at the liquor store on the border of downtown. It was suggested that this discourages tourists from walking uptown because the sidewalk is discontinued. Furthermore, more visitors would likely travel uptown to the GRR and other businesses if the sidewalk was extended. More importantly, patrons of the GRR have no user friendly sidewalk to venture downtown. Elora’s business community and tourism stakeholders recognize this as a roadblock that needs to be improved. It is likely that both the GRR and downtown firms would see an increase in tourists if there was a sidewalk connecting the uptown and downtown (Interview 1, 2, 3, 5).

A second initiative involves a token program. Patrons of the GRR will receive a $5.00 token that is only redeemable at businesses in Elora. This may encourage visitors at the facility to shop downtown. This program should economically benefit local business (Interview 1, 3). Also, shop owners will recognize that patrons of the facility are shopping downtown with a token representing a five dollar gift certificate.
A shuttle bus was identified as a third initiative. The shuttle would provide free service between the facility and the downtown core. This would allow patrons to shop or eat downtown and then return to the facility at different times throughout the day. This might be advantageous for spouses or caregivers of the elderly who may be more interested in purchasing locally-produced crafts, than those who engage in gambling activities. The shuttle would be free of charge and illustrate that patrons of the facility are shopping and eating downtown (Interview 1, 3, 5).

Coach tours are also common amongst many casinos and slots at racetracks. A provincial stipulation of casino coach tours is that they must offer at least one non-gaming activity (Interview 1). If the tour provided patrons the opportunity to gamble at the slot machines and bet on the horses, the third activity has to be one of non-gambling nature. Therefore, a coach tour to the GRR could offer a non-gambling activity such as shopping, dining or visiting the Elora Gorge Conservation area. This would enhance Elora tourism and also support business in the downtown (Interview 1, 3).

A final initiative was to encourage local businesses to extend their hours of operation. Currently, only 10 businesses have made a pact to stay open past 5 o’clock on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights (Interview 1, 2, 3). Many entrepreneurs use their store as supplementary income. It was suggested that the shop owner either have a spouse who earns the majority of the household income or it is their second source of livelihood. Thus, many businesses are not obligated or encouraged to open early or close later in the evening. As a result, there are limited activities for overnight visitors in the evening (Interview 1, 3). If businesses were open later, perhaps patrons of the GRR would venture downtown. However,
will these local initiatives cause further destruction of the village of Elora? Although these initiatives may be economically beneficial, they could cause residents to become increasingly hostile towards tourism development. Also, encouraging patrons of the GRR may jeopardize the experience of Elora’s heritage-seekers. Further research could examine the impacts of increasing investments into attracting gaming patrons along with the impact of increased visitors to the downtown.

6.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter illustrated how the findings of this thesis conform, or deviate, from studies presented in the literature. It has also shown how this thesis has contributed to research on gaming in rural communities. It has been determined that tourism is a major source of livelihood for rural communities. Several scholars have suggested that gaming is a way to boost economically-deprived areas. Similarly, the construction of the GRR was perceived to increase visitors to the area and provide several financial contributions to the village.

Proponents of the GRR illustrated their reluctance to adopt this controversial form of tourism. Claims that the GRR would destroy the heritage identity and cultural appeal of the community were expressed. Literature suggests that gaming in most areas has largely focused on the economic benefits while placing the negative implications on the backburner. One of these negative implications is the violation of place identity, existing tourism and local culture. However, this study finds that Elora has done a remarkable job of preserving their heritage identity and existing tourism base. This is attributed to strategic marketing, the GRR location on the outskirts of town, its small scale and uniformity with the existing
heritage-scape. The Model of Creative Destruction is used to determine the level of transformation of a heritage landscape. According to the model, Elora has graduated from advanced commodification to early destruction. This suggests that Elora is evolving from a heritage scape to a leisure-scape of mass consumption. Results of this thesis predict that this has occurred. However, despite the large scale investment into a non-heritage facility, tourists and local businesses indicate that the identity of the village as a heritage tourism destination has not changed. Previous studies have illustrated that Elora residents feel generally positive about tourism development. This could be attributed to the minimal impacts that have resulted with the development of the GRR. However, further research is warranted. Further development of non-heritage venues, accompanied by the gaming facility, may cause local residents and businesses to become hostile.

The positive benefits of gaming are cited often in literature. Many of these benefits have resulted with the construction of the GRR. These benefits include tax revenues, employment, sponsorships/donations and social programs. The negative aspects of gaming have also been observed in the literature. These include gambling addictions, crime, prostitution, congestion, to name a few. Although these aspects were not explored in this thesis, it was found that the facility gave rise to a divided community, significant legal fees and the uneven distribution of monies.

Lastly, a set of initiatives was identified from narratives provided in this study. These include increased accessibility for visitors, a token program to increase business downtown, the extension of business hours and coach and shuttle bus tours to enhance tourism in the
village. These recommendations will also be discussed in greater detail in the chapter to follow.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

7.1 Thesis Summary

The purpose of this thesis was to determine the impacts of gaming on rural communities. The objectives of this research were to i) determine the impacts of gaming on the identity of a heritage tourism village, ii) determine the positive and negative (socio-economic) impacts of gaming on rural communities, and iii) provide recommendations for similar areas considering this type of tourism development. A case study of Elora, Ontario, Canada, provided an ideal setting to conduct this research.

A review of literature suggests that rural economic restructuring has led many communities to adopt tourism as an alternative to traditional agricultural and industrial livelihoods (Gartner 2007). The geographic location outside urban areas and rural scenic landscapes provide an excellent base of tourism activities (Gartner, 2007; Hohl and Tisdell, 1995; Mitchell and Coghill, 2000). The historic and distinctive cultures found in many rural communities encourage the commodification of heritage for a niche tourism market (Hohl and Tisdell, 1995; Mitchell and Coghill, 2000).

The commodification of heritage, however, has been proven to have a profound impact on place identity in rural landscapes (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009; Mitchell and Singh, in press; Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). This can be illustrated in the Model of Creative Destruction. The production and consumption of heritage, if driven by entrepreneurs in search of profit, often further induces the transformation of landscapes and destruction of the heritage-scape (Mitchell and Vanderwerf 2010).
Over the last few decades, the investment into slot machine parlours at racetracks has been sought to combat the decline in the horse racing industry (Mahtesian, 1996; Thalheimer, 2008; Thalheimer and Ali, 1995). The economic impacts are many. The positive implications, however, are also accompanied by negative effects. Conflict is often illustrated in the stand taken by governments and policy-makers versus local residents. As a result, much literature to date has focused on residents’ perceptions of gaming development (Miller and Currie, 2008; Moshin and Lockyer, 2008).

To conduct this study, a research design consisting of both quantitative and qualitative methods was employed. Surveys, interviews and a content analysis were triangulated and analysed. A number of key findings emerged.

First, this study concludes that heritage is the primary tourism product in the village of Elora. Both local business owners and tourists view heritage to be Elora’s main identity. Second, the development of the GRR has not altered this identity nor has it detracted from several characteristics that comprise the existing tourism product. Despite local concerns that the development of a gaming facility would destroy the heritage appeal of the community, results suggest that this did not materialize.

Increased investment into a large-scale non-heritage gaming facility led Elora from a state of advanced commodification to early destruction (Mitchell and Coghill, 2000; Mitchell and Singh, in press). This further suggests that Elora is a post productivist heritage-scape on its way to becoming a leisure-scape of mass consumption (Mitchell and Vanderwerf, 2010). Findings of this study reveal that the heritage-scape identity has remained unaltered in the eyes of tourists and proprietors despite Elora’s evolution along the path of creative
destruction. Also, local residents still report a positive attitude towards tourism. This can be attributed to the fact that the location of the facility has not encroached on their living space. Strategic marketing, the ideal location of the GRR and its scale and uniformity with the existing landscape, played a key role in the preservation of Elora’s identity.

Key findings also point to the positive and negative implications of the GRR. The facility has had several economic and social benefits. Some of the economic benefits are increased tourism, tax revenues, and financial contributions from both the GRAS and the OLG. The social benefits include tourism partnerships, employment, social programs for the youth, community development projects and the promotion of local agriculture. Many of the social advantages can also be seen through the economic contributions that the GRAS and GRR make to local programs and the use of the facility for public fundraising. The negative impacts of the facility, however, are also visible. These include a divided community, court fees and an uneven distribution of monies within the community.

7.2 Recommendations

Three recommendations arise from these findings that may be of benefit to Elora and other communities considering racinos are a catalyst for economic development. First, if a community wants to maximize the economic benefits of the facility for local businesses, then, the initiatives presented in chapter 6 should be pursued. These include: encouraging the extension of business hours, establishing a token program to draw patrons from the facility to the shopping district, ensuring maximum accessibility to the downtown (in Elora’s case by extending the sidewalk) maintaining consistent store hours, and, finally, launching a local
shuttle and/or coach tours to promote shopping in the tourist district. These initiatives would strengthen the partnership between the GRR and downtown businesses thereby creating further financial benefits for the local proprietors. However, it must be recognized that additional tourists may cause further destruction of the heritage village.

Second, it is recommended that the allocation of community revenues generated from the racino be publicized. In Elora, local residents and businesses are, for the most part, unaware of the distribution of gaming profits. It is recommended that an annual statement be published by the facility to demonstrate their economic activities and how these are benefiting various user groups.

Finally, resident participation and public consultation should be incorporated in planning and decision making. As illustrated throughout this thesis, the lack of public consultation, created animosity, resentment and fear of the unknown. Public consultation and participation is common in many forms of tourism development (de Silva, 2006; Raymond and Brown, 2007). It should be mandatory, given the controversy involved with this type of development. If public consultation had taken place in Elora, it is likely that the unprecedented debate would have occurred.

7.3 Academic and Applied Implications and Future Research

This thesis illustrates that the status of rural communities, place identity, heritage tourism and the gaming industry is well documented. However, there is a need to integrate these bodies of literature. This thesis has contributed to existing literature on the impacts of
gaming on rural place identity and heritage tourism. It has been determined that the village of Elora has minimized the impacts of gaming on its heritage tourism identity. Preserving this identity has been successful through marketing, location and uniformity of the GRR. However, further research is warranted regarding the impacts of implementing the local initiatives indicated in chapter 6. If investments were made to increase gaming patrons to the downtown core, this could potentially move Elora further along the path of destruction.

Empirical evidence on the impacts that gaming has on rural communities is minimal. Although racinos have been acknowledged in literature, research has yet to examine the impacts that this form of gaming has on culture and local heritage. Moreover, literature that does exist on the impacts of gaming on heritage destinations, dominates in urban areas (Back and Lee, 2005; Eadington, 1984; Eadington, 1999; Eadington; 2002). However, this relatively newer rural form of gaming at “racinos” has serious implications where further research could supplement the results found in this thesis.

The Creative Destruction Model predicted that large-scale non-heritage facilities could cause the transformation of place identities (Mitchell and Singh, in press; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009). Thus far, no evidence has supported this notion. This thesis confirmed that the GRR has caused the village to move further along the model from advanced commodification to early destruction (Mitchell and de Waal, 2009) due to increased investment and visitors. However, according to tourists and local business owners, the identity of this heritage village has remained unaltered. Moreover, residents’ attitudes towards tourism development have remained positive (Mitchell and Singh, in press). According to Mitchell and de Waal (2009) resident’s attitudes are likely to vary depending
on the geographic location of tourism development and whether or not it encroaches on their living space. The positive attitudes amongst local residents, business owners and tourists are likely a result of the geographic location of the GRR on the outskirts of the village. Further research, however, should consider residents’ attitudes regarding gaming in rural communities. Furthermore, residents’ attitudes are a vital component of Mitchell’s (1998) model. This thesis aimed to determine the impacts of the GRR from the eyes of tourists and local business owners. Therefore, further research on residents’ attitudes, in relation to racino gaming in rural communities, is warranted.

Further gaming research should also incorporate strategies for greater public consultation and community involvement in decision-making. It is anticipated that with greater resident involvement, the benefits of gaming will be increasingly advantageous for figures of less authority. Furthermore, local businesses in Elora could equally share in the profit that is derived from gaming in their community. The absence of literature on the positive and negative impacts of racinos in rural areas makes comparison difficult. Further research into the impacts of gaming in similar communities could contribute to the understanding of its strengths and weaknesses. As illustrated in this thesis, both positive and negative implications resulted from the construction of the GRR.

The long-term impacts of racinos in rural areas are unknown. This thesis has indicated that the GRR has not altered the place identity of Elora. However, further development of non-heritage facilities could cause residents to become hostile (Mitchell and deWaal, 2009). Furthermore, racinos in Canada are a recent phenomenon (Hjalager, 2006; Ontario Lottery Corporation, 2009; Thalheimer and Ali, 2008). The infancy of slot machines
at racetracks, therefore, deserves further attention. Also, gambling addiction, as a result of racinos in rural areas, deserves greater research. The possibility of gaming saturation could impose serious impacts to communities whom may become economically dependent on this type of attraction (Thalheimer and Ali, 2008), and thus deserves further attention.

Finally, future gaming research should determine strategies that maximize the positive benefits while minimizing the negative. As indicated in this thesis, there are numerous positive economic and social impacts of racinos in rural areas. The negative impacts, however, are also present. Future research and long-term improvement strategies can underpin positive development (Sharpley, 2007). Proper consultation and increased public involvement can also ensure that all voices of a community are heard.
Appendices

Appendix A: List of Interview Participants

Interview 1: Chair of the Elora Chamber of Commerce (Monday July 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 2: Manager of the Economic Development Department of Centre Wellington (Monday July 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 3: President of the Grand River Agricultural Society (Tuesday July 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 4: Centre Wellington Mayor (Wednesday August 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 5: General Manager of Grand River Raceway (Friday August 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 6: Citizens Coalition Member (Friday August 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 7: Elora Business Association Improvement (Thursday July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2009)

Interview 8: Centre Wellington Council Member (Thursday July 9\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)

Interview 9: Heritage Museum Administrator (Thursday July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2009)

Interview 10: Grand River Raceway Marketing & Communications Manager (Friday August 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2009)
## Appendix B: GRAS “In Kind” Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/30/04</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$5,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/04-7/30/04</td>
<td>The Elora Festival &amp; Singers</td>
<td>The Elora Festival</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/04</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/04</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,045.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/05</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/05</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/05</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/05</td>
<td>Commun. Mental Health Clinic</td>
<td>Silent Auction</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/05</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/05-10/24/05</td>
<td>Eramosa Elk Enterprises</td>
<td>Rockwood Fire Fighter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/05</td>
<td>Elmira &amp; Dist. Assoc. for Comm. Lvg.</td>
<td>Annual Auction</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/05</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$3,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/05</td>
<td>W.W.Commun. Futures Dvmt. Corp.</td>
<td>Beautification Program</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,795.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/06</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/06</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Mayor’s Breakfast</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/06</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/06</td>
<td>World Assoc. of Agriculture Conf. Gala Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/06</td>
<td>CWCC Business Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/06</td>
<td>Ride for Dad Motorcycle Run</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/06</td>
<td>Mount Games Across Canada International Teams Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/06-</td>
<td>The Elora Festival &amp; Singers The Elora Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/06</td>
<td>Fergus Truck show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/06</td>
<td>4-H Calf Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/06</td>
<td>Jr. 4-H Dairy Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/06</td>
<td>Arthur Agricultural Society 150 Yr. Celebration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/06</td>
<td>Fergus Agricultural Society Fergus Fall Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/06</td>
<td>OHHA? Horseman's Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/06</td>
<td>CWCC Networking Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/06</td>
<td>Elmira &amp; Dist. Assoc. for Comm. Lvg. Fall Sale</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/06</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/06</td>
<td>4-H Square Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$35,530.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/21/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/07</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Mayor's Breakfast</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/07</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Business After 5</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28/07</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Networking Breakfast</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/07</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Networking Breakfast</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/07</td>
<td>Ride For Dad 2007</td>
<td>Motorcycle Run</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/07</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada</td>
<td>International Teams Competition</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/07-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/04/07</td>
<td>The Elora Festival &amp; Singers</td>
<td>Elora Festival</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/07</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada</td>
<td>International Teams Competition</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/07</td>
<td>Fergus Truck Show</td>
<td>Fergus Truck Show</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/07-8/12/07</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/07</td>
<td>Waterloo 4-H</td>
<td>Grand River Open 4-H Dairy</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/07-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/07</td>
<td>Holstein Assoc. of Canada</td>
<td>West-Central Jr. 4-H Dairy Show</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/07-9/9/07</td>
<td>Arthur Agricultural Society</td>
<td>Fall Fair</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/07-</td>
<td>Arthur Agricultural Society</td>
<td>Fall Fair</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/07</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/07</td>
<td>Elmira &amp; Dist. Assoc.for Comm. Lvg</td>
<td>Fundraising Sale</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/07</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival</td>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>$503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/07</td>
<td>Twp.of Centre Well. Roads Dptmt.</td>
<td>Plow Demo day</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/07</td>
<td>Elmira &amp; Dist. Assoc.for Comm. Lvg</td>
<td>Fundraising Sale</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/07</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival</td>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>$503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/07</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/07</td>
<td>Twp.of Centre Well. Roads Dptmt.</td>
<td>Plow Demo day</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/07</td>
<td>Township of Centre Wellington</td>
<td>Elora- Fergus Tourism Meeting</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/07</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Square Dance</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,733.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/08</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Mayor's Breakfast</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/08</td>
<td>Elora Minor Baseball</td>
<td>Coaching Clinic</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28/08</td>
<td>Groves Memorial Community Hospital</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/08</td>
<td>Elora Minor Baseball</td>
<td>Coaching Clinic</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/08</td>
<td>Elora Minor Baseball</td>
<td>Coaching Clinic</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/08</td>
<td>Outdoor Writers of Canada</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>$525.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/08</td>
<td>Ride For Dad</td>
<td>Charity Motorcycle Ride</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/08</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada</td>
<td>Mounted Teams Competition</td>
<td>$370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/08</td>
<td>Wellington County 4-H</td>
<td>4-H Judging School</td>
<td>$620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/08</td>
<td>The Elora Festival Gambrel Barn Series</td>
<td>Elora Festival</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/08</td>
<td>ON Prince Phillip Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/08</td>
<td>Fergus Truck Show</td>
<td>Fergus Truck Show</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/08</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada</td>
<td>Mounted Teams Competition</td>
<td>$370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/08</td>
<td>Waterloo 4-H Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/08</td>
<td>Holstein Assoc. of Canada</td>
<td>West-Central Jr. 4-H Dairy Show</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/08</td>
<td>Business Takes Action (CME)</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce meeting</td>
<td>$284.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/08-9/7/08</td>
<td>Arthur Agricultural Society</td>
<td>Fall Fair</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/08</td>
<td>ON Prince Phillip Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/08</td>
<td>Fergus Agricultural Society</td>
<td>Fall Fair</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/08</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival &amp; Highland</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,454.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/08</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/08</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>$2,454.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/08</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival &amp; Highland</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/08</td>
<td>Township of Centre Wellington</td>
<td>Elora-Fergus Tourism workshop</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$42,132.84
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/11/09</td>
<td>Cdn. Assoc. of Farm Advisors Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/09</td>
<td>Central Wellington Jr. Farmers Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/09</td>
<td>OVC- U of G Research Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/09</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc. Monthly meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/09</td>
<td>Wellington County 4-H Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/09</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc. Monthly meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/19</td>
<td>Community Resorce Centre Guest Speaker Event</td>
<td></td>
<td>$470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3/09</td>
<td>Centre Welling.-Centennial Rotary Club Grand Taste of C.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/09</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada Mounted Teams Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/09</td>
<td>Ride For Dad Charity Motorcycle Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/09</td>
<td>ON Maple Syrup Producers Assoc. Planning Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/09</td>
<td>Mounted Games Across Canada Mounted Teams Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/09</td>
<td>The Elora Festival Gambrel Barn Series Elora Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/09</td>
<td>Wellington County 4-H 4-H Judging School</td>
<td></td>
<td>$620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/09</td>
<td>Fergus Truck Show Fergus Truck Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/09</td>
<td>Standardbred Showcase Standardbred Showcase Scottish Festival &amp; Highland Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5/09-8/10/09</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival Grand River Open 4-H Dairy Games</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/09</td>
<td>Waterloo 4-H Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/09</td>
<td>West-Central ON Jr. 4-H Dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/09</td>
<td>Holstein Assoc. of Canada Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/09</td>
<td>Wellington Federation of Agriculture Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/09</td>
<td>CW Chamber of Commerce Clean Tech Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>$724.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/09</td>
<td>Advanced Agricultural Leadership Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$649.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/09</td>
<td>Sensational Elora Races with Taste</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora</td>
<td>$2,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/09</td>
<td>CW Chamber of Commerce CWCC Business Luncheon</td>
<td>CW Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/09</td>
<td>OMAFRA Meeting and tour</td>
<td>OMAFRA</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/09</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc. Monthly meeting</td>
<td>ON Appaloosa Horse Association Inc.</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/09</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora Rotary Foundation Bingo</td>
<td>Fergus-Elora</td>
<td>$2,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/09</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival &amp; Highland AGM</td>
<td>Fergus Scottish Festival &amp; Highland</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $52,031.77
Appendix C: Business Survey

Survey for Business Owners/Operators in Elora

1. What type of business do you operate? _________________________________

2. When did this business open at this location? ____________________________

3. Approximately what percentage of your business comes from tourists? ________

4. In which community do you live? ___________________________ 

5. If you are a resident of Elora, how many years have you lived here? __________

6. Please circle your response to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Grand River Raceway has changed Elora’s character.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The slot machine facility has provided economic benefits to the municipality</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The slot machine facility has provided economic benefits to businesses in Elora</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The slot machine facility has provided economic benefits to my business</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More visitors come to my business when races are being run at the track</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People who come to Elora for the raceway also shop at my business</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Raceway has increased the number of people who come to Elora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I was in favour of the Raceway when it was first proposed
   -2  -1  0  1  2
9. The Raceway has been a valuable addition to Elora
   -2  -1  0  1  2
10. My business would benefit if they increased the number of slot machines at the raceway
    -2  -1  0  1  2

7. How would you rate Elora on the following characteristics (1 being very low, 5 being very high).

   Attractive, heritage buildings  1  2  3  4  5
   Scenic environment            1  2  3  4  5
   Excellent cuisine             1  2  3  4  5
   Unique hand-crafted products  1  2  3  4  5
   Unique Accommodation          1  2  3  4  5
   Friendly people               1  2  3  4  5
   Attractive streetscapes       1  2  3  4  5
   Relaxed atmosphere            1  2  3  4  5
   Artistic                      1  2  3  4  5
   Recreational activities       1  2  3  4  5
   Rural and Small town atmosphere 1  2  3  4  5
8. In your opinion, have these characteristics been enhanced or compromised by the presence of the gaming facility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>Compromised</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive, heritage buildings</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic environment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cuisine</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique products</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly people</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive streetscape</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your time!
Please provide any additional comments in the box provided.
Appendix D: Tourist Survey

Survey Questions for Tourists in Elora

1. Is your visit to Elora today part of a longer vacation?
   □ Yes
   □ No

2. How much time do you plan on spending in Elora?
   □ < 4 hours
   □ 1 day
   □ 2 day
   □ 3 – 7 days
   □ More than a week

3. How far is Elora from your home?
   □ Less than 5 km
   □ 6 – 24 km
   □ 25 – 50 km
   □ 50-100km
   □ 100km-500km
   □ Over 500km

4. Is this your first visit to Elora?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If no, how many times have you visited before?

   □ 1 time
   □ 2 – 5 times
☐ More than 5 times

If no, did you come to Elora before 2003?
☐ Yes
☐ No

5. What was your primary reason for visiting Elora? (please check only one reason).

☐ Visit family or friends
☐ View and/or purchase unique products in a pleasant atmosphere
☐ Dining
☐ Play the slot machines at the Grand River Raceway
☐ Conduct business
☐ Watch a horse race
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________

6. What other reasons motivated you to come to Elora today?

7. What types or activities will you participate in while in Elora?

☐ Dining in Downtown Elora
☐ Dining at the raceway restaurant
☐ Shopping in Downtown Elora
☐ Shopping at the raceway
☐ Wagering on the horse races
☐ Playing the slot machines
☐ Visiting the Elora Gorge
☐ Hiking or nature walking
☐ Arts and Crafts events/shows
☐ Day Spas
☐ Participating in guided tours
☐ Fishing
☐ Water activities (kayaking, canoeing, tubing etc)
Festivals/music shows
Visiting Elora Quarry
Visiting Elora Conservation Area
Staying at the Elora Mill Inn
Sporting activities
Other ________________________________

8. Before coming to Elora today, were you aware of the Grand River Raceway and slots facility?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If yes, did you come to Elora specifically to watch a race at the Raceway?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If yes, did you come to Elora specifically to use their gaming machines?
   □ Yes
   □ No

11. If slot machines were not available in Elora, would you still have travelled here today?
   □ Yes
   □ No

10. Do you think that the development of the gaming facility has changed Elora?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Don’t know

   If yes, has this change been positive or negative? ____________
If yes, can you describe the nature of this change?

11. Which answer would you agree with in regards to the impact that the Grand River Raceway has had on Elora’s identity as a heritage community?

☐ Strong negative impact
☐ Negative impact
☐ Neutral
☐ Positive impact
☐ Strong positive impact
☐ Not aware of Raceway and Slot facility

12. Has the gaming facility impacted your visit to Elora in any way?

☐ No
☐ Yes, it has increased my enjoyment
☐ Yes, it has reduced my enjoyment
☐ Don’t know

13. Will you return to Elora in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

If yes, why?

If no, why not?
14. In your opinion, do you think that the slot machine facility is a positive or negative asset to the community?

□ Positive
□ Negative
□ No opinion

Please explain your answer.

15. How would you rate Elora on the following characteristics (Please circle the following: 1 being very low, 5 being very high).

Attractive, heritage buildings

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Scenic environment

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Excellent cuisine

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Unique hand-craft products

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Friendly people

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Unique Accommodation

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Attractive streetscapes

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Relaxed atmosphere

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Artistic

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

Recreational activities

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □
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16. In your opinion, have any of these characteristics been enhanced or compromised by the presence of the gaming facility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>Compromised</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive, heritage buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cuisine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive streetscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Was your visit to Elora today more or less enjoyable than you anticipated?

- [ ] More enjoyable
- [ ] Less enjoyable
18. What is your age?

- □ 18-24
- □ 25-35
- □ 36-45
- □ 46-55
- □ 56-65
- □ 66 or older

19. Are you:

- □ Male
- □ Female

Thank you very much for your time!
Please provide any additional comments in the box provided.
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