

Table i
1969-1999 Regression Results for Trimmed Sample versus Full Sample
(For reservations with American Indian populations exceeding 1,000 in 1999)

Independent Variables	Full Sample	Trimmed Sample
Intercept	168.51	168.46
State jurisdiction (=1 if state has jurisdiction)	31.06	28.25
Robust t-statistic	(2.86)	(2.24)
Cluster t-statistic (by state)	(2.72)	(1.97)
<u>Reservation-Level Controls</u>		
American Indian per-capita income (1969)	-0.02 (6.14)	-0.02 (4.08)
Log of Reservation Acres (constant across time)	-7.37 (3.25)	-7.53 (3.17)
% of reservation land in fee-simple (constant across time)	0.15 (0.90)	0.19 (1.03)
Energy-resources dummy (constant across time)	29.56 (2.87)	24.44 (2.31)
Natural amenity endowment (constant across time)	3.26 (1.77)	3.86 (1.60)
% of adult population with HS degree (1969)	0.19 (0.31)	0.37 (0.62)
<u>Surrounding Area Controls</u>		
Distance to nearest metropolitan area (1969) (in miles)	-0.04 (1.21)	-0.03 (0.69)
Adjacent county population density (1969)	0.12 (0.83)	0.14 (0.51)
% Change in adj. county pop. density (69-99)	-0.15 (1.47)	-0.15 (1.27)
Adjacent county PCI (69)	0.003 (0.66)	0.003 (0.46)
Adjacent county PCI growth (69-99)	0.81 (2.00)	0.85 (1.76)
Observations	67	58
Adjusted R-squared	0.63	0.54

Notes: (1) The absolute values of robust t-statistics are in parentheses. (2) All comparisons use definition 3 of state jurisdiction. (3) The trimmed sample drops the five wealthiest reservations with state jurisdiction and the five poorest reservations without state jurisdiction based on 1969 per-capita income. The resulting mean levels of 1969 income are not significantly different from each other. Excluded state jurisdiction reservations are the Colville and Makah (Washington), the Hoopa Valley (California), and the Alleghany and Cattaragus (New York). Excluded tribal jurisdiction reservations are the Jemez Pueblo and the Santo Domingo (New Mexico), the San Carlos and Tohono O'odham (Arizona), and the Uintah & Ouray (Utah).

Table ii
The Effect of Omitting all Reservations in
Each State on the State Jurisdiction Coefficient
1969-1999

(For reservations with American Indian populations exceeding 1,000 in 1999)

		OLS Coefficient on state jurisdiction (definition #3)
<i>Omitted State</i>	<i># of large reservations in omitted state</i>	<i>1969-1999</i>
None	0	31.06 (2.86)
Arizona	11	32.17 (2.56)
California	2	31.33 (2.72)
Colorado	2	31.01 (2.95)
Idaho	3	35.56 (3.27)
Michigan	2	31.06 (2.86)*
Minnesota	4	26.24 (2.27)
Mississippi	1	31.07 (2.86)
Montana	8	31.91 (2.75)
Nebraska	2	34.91 (3.19)
New Mexico	11	30.39 (2.36)
New York	3	31.02 (2.84)
North Carolina	1	31.17 (2.87)
North Dakota	2	31.07 (2.85)
Oklahoma	1	31.06 (2.86)*
Oregon	2	29.81 (2.51)
South Dakota	8	23.15 (2.42)
Utah	1	31.08 (2.85)
Washington	9	40.43 (2.78)
Wisconsin	5	24.90 (2.28)
Wyoming	1	31.15 (2.84)

Notes: (1) The absolute values of robust t-statistics are in parentheses. (2) All coefficients are estimated using the same variables as Table 5, column 6. (3) Although Alaska has one Indian Reservation, this reservation is already omitted because the amenity scale endowment data was not collected for Alaska counties/boroughs. (4) * indicates that all reservations from these states were already omitted from the entire sample due to incomplete data (e.g., Michigan reservations do not have 1969 per-capita income data, so they cannot be included in any regression). Therefore, the coefficients derived from dropping these states are identical to those obtained from the full sample.

Table iii
The Effect of Omitting Reservations with Casinos
on the State Jurisdiction Coefficient
1969-1999

(For reservations with American Indian populations exceeding 1,000 in 1999)

	OLS Coefficient on State Jurisdiction (definition #3)
<i>Number of gaming reservations omitted</i>	<i>1969-1999</i>
None	31.06 (2.86)
Top 5 gaming reservations	34.82 (3.12)
Top 10	36.32 (2.92)
Top 15	18.70 (2.29)
Top 20	26.26 (3.15)
Top 25	26.85 (3.15)
Top 30	24.80 (2.27)
All gaming reservations (38 reservations)	19.19 (1.41)

Notes: (1) The absolute values of robust t-statistics are in parentheses. (2) All coefficients were generated using the same variables as Table 5, column 6. (3) Gaming reservations are ranked by the 1999 number of slot machines on the reservation per American Indian resident.

Table iv
The Effect of Including other Measures of Reservation Institutions
and Culture on the State Jurisdiction Coefficient
1989-1999

(For reservations with American Indian populations exceeding 1,000 in 1999)

Independent Variables	Baseline	With institutional controls	With acculturation controls	With all controls
State jurisdiction	15.11	17.44	16.02	16.31
Robust t-statistic	(2.39)	(2.84)	(2.39)	(2.32)
Cluster t-statistic (by state)	(1.91)	(2.43)	(1.80)	(2.07)
<u>Reservation-Level Controls</u>				
American Indian per-capita income (1989)	included	included	included	included
Log of Reservation Acres	included	included	included	included
Percent of reservation land in fee-simple	included	included	included	included
Energy-resources dummy	included	included	included	included
Natural amenity endowment	included	included	included	included
% of adult population with HS degree (1989)	included	included	included	included
Slot machines per American Indian (1989)	included	included	included	included
<u>Surrounding Area Controls</u>				
Distance to nearest metropolitan area (1989)	included	included	included	included
Adjacent county population density (1989)	included	included	included	included
% Change in adj. county pop. density (89-99)	included	included	included	included
Adjacent county PCI (1989)	included	included	included	included
Adjacent county PCI growth (89-99)	included	included	included	included
<u>Institution Controls</u>				
% of adult population employed by tribal government (1989)	omitted	included	omitted	included
Payments per-capita from the BIA to the tribal government (average for 1990s)	omitted	included	omitted	included
<u>Acculturation Controls</u>				
Log of total Am. Indian population (1989)	omitted	omitted	included	included
% of reservation pop. that is Am. Indian (1989)	omitted	omitted	included	included
% of Am. Indian population speaking a native language (1989)	omitted	omitted	included	included
Observations	78	71	78	71
Adjusted R-squared	0.46	0.60	0.51	0.65

Table v
1989 – 1999 Regression Results including Small Reservations
(Regressions include all reservations with American Indian Populations > 250)

Independent Variables	Am. Indian population > 250	Am. Indian population > 1,000
Intercept	81.68	22.88
State jurisdiction	18.98	15.11
Robust t-statistic	(2.21)	(2.39)
Cluster t-statistic (by state)	(2.12)	(1.91)
<u>Reservation-Level Controls</u>		
American Indian per-capita income (1989)	-0.008 (2.97)	-0.009 (5.00)
Log of Reservation Acres	-1.63 (0.89)	-0.28 (0.17)
Percent of reservation land in fee-simple	-0.18 (1.62)	-0.04 (0.49)
Energy-resources dummy	9.54 (1.61)	8.51 (1.71)
Natural amenity endowment	-1.46 (0.86)	-0.45 (0.49)
% of Adult population with HS degree (1989)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.87 (2.74)
Slot machines per American Indian (1989)	9.49 (1.33)	12.36 (2.69)
<u>Surrounding Area Controls</u>		
Distance to nearest metropolitan area (1989)	-0.06 (1.63)	-0.07 (2.31)
Adjacent county population density (1989)	0.14 (0.99)	0.02 (0.36)
% Change in adj. county pop. density (89-99)	0.05 (0.26)	0.15 (0.84)
Adjacent county PCI (1989)	0.001 (0.41)	0.000 (0.24)
Adjacent county PCI growth (89-99)	0.66 (1.60)	0.24 (0.75)
Observations	128	78
Adjusted R-squared	0.29	0.46

Notes: (1) The absolute values of robust t-statistics are in parentheses. (2) All comparisons use definition 3 of state jurisdiction.