

CHURCHILL DOWNS INC
Form 10-K
February 27, 2013
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549
FORM 10-K

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012

OR
 TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____
Commission file number 001-33998

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Kentucky 61-0156015
(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization) (IRS Employer Identification No.)

600 North Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 400 (502) 636-4400
Louisville, Kentucky 40222
(Address of principal executive offices) (zip code) (Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:
Common Stock, No Par Value The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC
(Title of each class registered) (Name of each exchange on which registered)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:
None
(Title of class)

Indicate by check mark if the Registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes No

Indicate by check mark if the Registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act during the preceding 12 months and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the Registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of Registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer or a smaller reporting company. See definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer

Smaller reporting
company

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

As of February 25, 2013, 17,610,679 shares of the Registrant's Common Stock were outstanding. As of June 30, 2012 (based upon the closing sale price for such date on the NASDAQ Global Market), the aggregate market value of the shares held by non-affiliates of the Registrant was \$777,753,545.

Portions of the Registrant's Proxy Statement for its Annual Meeting of Shareholders to be held on April 23, 2013 are incorporated by reference herein in response to Items 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Part III of Form 10-K. The exhibit index is located on pages 103-105.

Table of Contents

CHURCHILL DOWNS INCORPORATED
INDEX TO ANNUAL REPORT ON FORM 10-K
For the Year Ended December 31, 2012

Part I

<u>Item 1. Business</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Item 1A. Risk Factors</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Item 2. Properties</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Item 3. Legal Proceedings</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	<u>34</u>

Part II

<u>Item 5. Market for Registrant’s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>Item 6. Selected Financial Data</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>Item 9. Changes In and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Item 9A. Controls and Procedures</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Item 9B. Other Information</u>	<u>98</u>

Part III

<u>Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	<u>98</u>
<u>Item 11. Executive Compensation</u>	<u>98</u>
<u>Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	<u>98</u>
<u>Item 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u>	<u>99</u>
<u>Item 14. Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u>	<u>99</u>

Part IV

<u>Item 15. Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedule</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Signatures</u>	<u>101</u>
<u>Schedule II—Valuation and Qualifying Accounts</u>	<u>102</u>
<u>Exhibit Index</u>	<u>103</u>

Table of Contents

PART I

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

A. Introduction

Churchill Downs Incorporated (the "Company") is a diversified provider of pari-mutuel horseracing, casino gaming, entertainment, and is the country's premier source of online account wagering on horseracing events. We offer gaming products through our casinos in Mississippi, our slot and video poker operations in Louisiana and our slot and poker operations in Florida. We were organized as a Kentucky corporation in 1928. Our principal executive offices are located at 600 North Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 400, Louisville, Kentucky, 40222.

We manage our operations through four operating segments as follows:

1. Racing Operations, which includes:

• Churchill Downs Racetrack ("Churchill Downs") in Louisville, Kentucky, an internationally known thoroughbred racing operation and home of the Kentucky Derby since 1875;

• Arlington International Race Course ("Arlington"), a thoroughbred racing operation in Arlington Heights along with ten off-track betting facilities ("OTBs") in Illinois;

• Calder Race Course ("Calder"), a thoroughbred racing operation in Miami Gardens, Florida; and

• Fair Grounds Race Course ("Fair Grounds"), a thoroughbred racing operation in New Orleans along with twelve OTBs in Louisiana.

2. Gaming, which includes:

• Riverwalk Casino Hotel ("Riverwalk") in Vicksburg, Mississippi, which we acquired on October 23, 2012. Riverwalk operates approximately 700 slot machines, 18 table games, a five story, 80-room attached hotel, multi-functional event center and dining facilities;

• Harlow's Casino Resort & Spa ("Harlow's") in Greenville, Mississippi, which operates approximately 825 slot machines, 15 table games and a poker room, a five-story, 105-room attached hotel, multi-functional event center, pool, spa and dining facilities;

• Calder Casino, a slot facility in Florida adjacent to Calder, which operates approximately 1,200 slot machines and includes a poker room operation branded "Studz Poker Club";

• Fair Grounds Slots, a slot facility in Louisiana adjacent to Fair Grounds, which operates approximately 625 slot machines; and

• Video Services, LLC ("VSI"), the owner and operator of approximately 725 video poker machines in Louisiana.

3. Online Business, which includes:

• TwinSpires, an Advance Deposit Wagering ("ADW") business that is licensed as a multi-jurisdictional simulcasting and interactive wagering hub in the state of Oregon.

• Fair Grounds Account Wagering ("FAW"), an ADW business that is licensed in the state of Louisiana;

• Velocity, a business that is licensed in the British Dependency Isle of Man focusing on high wagering-volume international customers;

• Luckity, an ADW business launched during October 2012 that offers over 20 unique online games with outcomes based on and determined by pari-mutuel wagers on live horseraces;

• Bloodstock Research Information Services ("BRIS"), a data service provider for the equine industry; and

• Our equity investment in HRTV, LLC ("HRTV"), a horseracing television channel.

4. Other Investments, which includes:

• United Tote Company and United Tote Canada (collectively "United Tote"), which manufactures and operates pari-mutuel wagering systems for racetracks, OTBs and other pari-mutuel wagering businesses;

• Bluff Media ("Bluff"), a multimedia poker content brand and publishing company, acquired by the Company on February 10, 2012;

• Our equity investment in Miami Valley Gaming & Racing, LLC ("MVG"), a joint venture to develop a harness

Table of Contents

racetrack and video lottery terminal facility in Ohio; and

Our other minor investments.

B. Acquisition and Development Activity

Riverwalk

On October 23, 2012, we completed our acquisition of Riverwalk Casino Hotel ("Riverwalk") in Vicksburg, Mississippi for cash consideration of approximately \$145.6 million. The transaction includes the acquisition of a 25,000-square-foot casino, an 80-room hotel, a 5,600-square-foot event center and dining facilities on approximately 22 acres of land. The acquisition continues our diversification and growth strategies to invest in assets with an expected yield on investment to enhance shareholder value. We financed the acquisition with borrowings under our amended and restated credit facility.

Miami Valley Gaming & Racing Joint Venture

During March 2012, the Company announced an agreement to enter into a 50% joint venture with Delaware North Companies Gaming & Entertainment Inc. ("DNC") to develop a new harness racetrack and video lottery terminal ("VLT") gaming facility in Monroe, Ohio.

On December 21, 2012, MVG completed the purchase of the harness racing licenses and certain assets held by Lebanon Trotting Club Inc. and Miami Valley Trotting Inc. for total consideration of \$60.0 million, of which \$10.0 million was funded at closing with the remainder to be funded through a \$50.0 million note payable over a six year term effective upon the commencement of gaming operations. In addition, there is a potential contingent consideration payment of \$10.0 million based on the financial performance of the facility during the seven year period after gaming operations commence. Construction began in December 2012 on a new gaming and racing facility located in Monroe, Ohio. The new facility is expected to open during the first quarter of 2014, and will include a 5/8-mile harness racing track and a 186,000-square-foot gaming facility, featuring up to 2,500 VLTs on the 120-acre site. MVG will invest approximately \$215 million in the new facility, including the \$50 million license fee payable to the Ohio Lottery Commission. During the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company funded \$19.9 million in initial capital contributions to the joint venture.

Bluff

During February 2012, we completed the acquisition of the assets of Bluff Media ("Bluff"), a multimedia poker content brand and publishing company for cash consideration of \$6.7 million and contingent consideration of \$2.5 million based on the probability of the enactment of federal or state enabling legislation which permits Internet poker gaming during the five year period after acquisition. Bluff's assets include the poker periodical, BLUFF Magazine; BLUFF Magazine's online counterpart, BluffMagazine.com; ThePokerDB, a comprehensive online database and resource that tracks and ranks the performance of poker players and tournaments; and various other news and content forums. In addition, Bluff also publishes Fight! Magazine, a premier mixed martial arts magazine and its online counterpart, FightMagazine.com.

C. Live Racing

We conduct live horseracing at Churchill Downs, Calder, Fair Grounds and Arlington. The following is a summary of our significant live racing events, a description of our properties and our annual racing calendar.

The Kentucky Derby and the Kentucky Oaks, both held at Churchill Downs, continue to be our premier racing events offering minimum purses of \$2.0 million and \$1.0 million, respectively. The Kentucky Derby is the first race of the annual series of races for 3-year old thoroughbreds, known as the Triple Crown. Our other significant stakes races include the Summit of Speed at Calder, the Arlington Million at Arlington, and the Louisiana Derby at Fair Grounds, each of which offers purses of approximately \$1.0 million.

Churchill Downs

The Churchill Downs racetrack site and improvements (the "Churchill facility") are located in Louisville, Kentucky. Churchill Downs has conducted thoroughbred racing continuously since 1875 and is internationally known as the home of the Kentucky Derby. The Churchill facility consists of approximately 147 acres of land with a one-mile dirt track, a seven-eighths (7/8) mile turf track, permanent grandstands, luxury suites and a stabling area. The Churchill facility accommodates approximately 55,000 persons in our clubhouse, grandstand, Jockey Club Suites and Finish Line Suites. The facility also includes a simulcast wagering facility designed to accommodate 1,500 persons, a general

admissions area, and food and beverage facilities ranging from concessions to full-service restaurants. The Churchill facility also has a saddling paddock, accommodations for groups and special events, parking areas for the public and our racetrack office facilities. The stable area has barns sufficient to accommodate approximately 1,400 horses, a 114-room dormitory and other facilities for backstretch personnel. During 2010, the Churchill facility added permanent lighting in order to accommodate night racing events. Additionally, during January 2013, the facility

Table of Contents

opened a new simulcast wagering facility, "The Parlay", designed to accommodate 600 persons, which will be Churchill Downs' simulcast wagering facility during the months outside of its live racing meets and house the track's media operations in the weeks leading up to the Kentucky Derby. The facility is also expected to open a new hospitality venue, "The Mansion", during the second quarter of 2013. The Mansion, located on the sixth floor of the Clubhouse, will be used primarily during the Kentucky Derby and Kentucky Oaks. The Mansion will have accommodations for 296 guests and will offer settings in its Dining Room, Living Room, Library, Parlor and Veranda. To supplement the facilities at Churchill Downs, we provide additional stabling facilities sufficient to accommodate 500 horses and a three-quarter (3/4) mile dirt track, which is used for training thoroughbreds, at a training facility also located in Louisville. Referred to as Trackside Louisville, this facility provides a base of operation for many horsemen between the Spring and Fall meets and enables us to attract new horsemen to race at Churchill Downs. Trackside Louisville is not open to stabling during the winter months.

As part of financing improvements to the Churchill facility, during 2002, we transferred title of the Churchill facility to the City of Louisville, Kentucky and leased back the facility. Subject to the terms of the lease, we can re-acquire the facility at any time for \$1.00.

Calder

The Calder racetrack and improvements (the "Calder facility") are located in Miami-Dade County, Florida. The Calder facility is adjacent to Sun Life Stadium, home of the Miami Dolphins, and consists of approximately 231 acres of land with a one-mile dirt track, a seven-eighths (7/8) mile turf track, a training area with a five-eighths (5/8) mile training track, permanent grandstands and a stabling area. The Calder facility includes clubhouse and grandstand seating for approximately 15,000 persons, a general admissions area and food and beverage facilities ranging from concessions to a buffet dining area. The stable area consists of a receiving barn, feed rooms, tack rooms, detention barns and living quarters and can accommodate approximately 1,800 horses. The Calder facility also features a saddling paddock, parking areas for the public and office facilities.

Fair Grounds

The Fair Grounds racetrack facility, located in New Orleans, Louisiana, consists of approximately 145 acres of land, a one mile dirt track, a seven-eighths (7/8) mile turf track, permanent grandstands and a stabling area. The facility includes clubhouse and grandstand seating for approximately 5,000 persons, a general admissions area and food and beverage facilities ranging from concessions to clubhouse dining. The stable area consists of a receiving barn, feed rooms, tack rooms, detention barns and living quarters that can accommodate 132 persons and approximately 2,000 horses. The Fair Grounds facility also features a saddling paddock, parking areas and office facilities.

Arlington

The Arlington racetrack, located in Arlington Heights, Illinois, was constructed in 1927 and reopened its doors in 1989 after a devastating fire four years earlier. The racetrack sits on 336 acres, has a one and one-eighth (1 1/8) mile synthetic track, a one-mile turf track and a five-eighths (5/8) mile training track. The facility includes a permanent clubhouse, grandstand and suite seating for 6,045 persons and food and beverage facilities ranging from fast food to full-service restaurants. The stable area has 34 barns able to accommodate approximately 2,200 horses and a temporary housing unit that accommodates 288 persons. The Arlington facility also features a saddling paddock, parking areas and office facilities.

Racing Calendar

The following table is a summary of our expected 2013 and actual 2012 live thoroughbred racing dates and the number of live racing days for each of our four racetracks. Racing dates are generally approved annually by the respective state racing authorities:

Table of Contents

	2013		2012	
	Racing Dates	# of Days	Racing Dates	# of Days
Racetrack				
Churchill Downs				
Spring Meet	April 27 - June 13	38	April 28 - July 1	38
September Meet	Sept. 5 - 29	12		
Fall Meet	Oct. 27 - Nov. 30	25	Oct. 28 - Nov. 25	21
		75		59
Calder Race Course				
Calder Meet	April 6- Aug. 31	85	April 9 - Aug. 31	83
Tropical Meet	Sept. 1 - Dec. 6	65	Sept. 1 - Nov. 30	65
		150		148
Arlington	May 1 - Sept. 30	89	May 4 - Sept. 30	90
Fair Grounds				
Winter Meet 11/12			Jan. 1 - April 1	57
Winter Meet 12/13	Jan. 1 - Mar. 31	57	Nov. 22 - Dec. 31	27
Winter Meet 13/14	Nov. 28 - Dec. 31	24		
		81		84
Total thoroughbred race dates		395		381

During 2013, MVG is expected to conduct 52 days of live harness racing.

D. Simulcast Operations

We generate a significant portion of our pari-mutuel wagering revenues by sending signals of races from our racetracks to other facilities and businesses (“export”) and receiving signals from other racetracks (“import”). Revenues are earned through pari-mutuel wagering on signals that we both import and export.

Arlington conducts on-site simulcast wagering only during live racing meets, while Churchill Downs, Calder and Fair Grounds offer year-round simulcast wagering at the racetracks. The OTBs located in Illinois and Louisiana conduct simulcast wagering year-round.

Off-Track Betting Facilities

Eleven of our OTBs are collectively branded “Trackside” to create a common identity for our OTB operations.

Trackside Louisville ceased operating as a simulcast wagering facility during 2013. Historically, Trackside Louisville opened as a simulcasting wagering facility on big event days such as the Kentucky Derby and the Kentucky Oaks and during days the Churchill facility was being prepared for special events. It is an extension of Churchill Downs and is located approximately five miles from the Churchill facility. This 100,000 square-foot property, on approximately 88 acres of land, is a thoroughbred training and stabling annex and will operate only as such going forward. It previously also had audio visual capabilities for pari-mutuel wagering, seating for approximately 3,000 persons, parking, and related facilities for simulcasting races. The Company is currently assessing other opportunities for use of this property and during 2012, we reviewed the useful lives of assets at this facility and commenced accelerated depreciation on certain long-term assets. We have determined that no impairment has occurred for these assets as of December 31, 2012.

Arlington operates ten Trackside OTBs that accept wagers on races at Arlington as well as on races simulcast from other locations. One OTB is located on the Arlington property and another is located in East Moline, Illinois on approximately 122 acres. Arlington also leases an OTB located in Waukegan, Illinois consisting of approximately 25,000 square feet. Arlington operates seven OTBs within existing non-owned Illinois restaurants under license agreements. These seven OTBs are located in Chicago, which was relocated from its previous location in January 2012, and Orland Hills, Villa Park, Rockford, South Elgin, McHenry and Hodgkins and opened in April 2012, July 2011, December 2009, December 2002, June 2003 and December 2007, respectively.

Fair Grounds operates twelve OTBs that accept wagers on races at Fair Grounds as well as on races simulcast from other locations. One OTB is located on the Fair Grounds property. Another is located in Kenner, Louisiana consisting of approximately 4.3 acres.

Table of Contents

Fair Grounds also leases ten OTBs located in these southeast Louisiana communities: Chalmette, consisting of approximately 8,000 square feet of space; Covington, which consists of approximately 7,000 square feet of space; Elmwood, which consists of approximately 15,000 square feet of space; Gretna, which consists of approximately 20,000 square feet of space; Houma, which consists of approximately 10,000 square feet of space; LaPlace, which consists of approximately 7,000 square feet of space; Metairie, which consists of approximately 9,000 square feet of space; Boutte, which consists of approximately 10,000 square feet of space; Thibodaux, which consists of approximately 5,000 square feet of space and Westwego, which opened in January 2013 and consists of approximately 5,000 square feet of space. Video poker is offered at Chalmette, Kenner, Elmwood, Gretna, Houma, LaPlace, Boutte, Metairie, Thibodaux and Westwego.

Kentucky Off-Track Betting, LLC

We are a 25% owner of Kentucky Off-Track Betting, LLC (“KOTB”). KOTB’s purpose is to own and operate facilities for the simulcasting of races and the acceptance of wagers on such races at Kentucky locations other than a racetrack. These OTBs may be located no closer than 75 miles from an existing racetrack without the racetrack’s consent and in no event closer than 50 miles from an existing racetrack. Each OTB must first be approved by the Kentucky Horse Racing Commission (“KHRC”) and the local government where the facility is to be located. KOTB currently owns or leases and operates OTBs in Corbin, Maysville and Jamestown, Kentucky that conduct simulcast wagering year-round.

OTBs developed by KOTB provide additional markets for the intrastate simulcasting of and wagering on Churchill Downs’ live races and interstate simulcasting of and wagering on out-of-state signals. KOTB did not contribute significantly to our operations in 2012 and is not anticipated to have a substantial impact on our operations in the future. Our investment in KOTB is not material to our financial position or results of operations.

E. Advance Deposit Wagering

We accept pari-mutuel wagers through Churchill Downs Technology Initiatives Company, which is doing business as TwinSpires.com. TwinSpires.com’s headquarters is located in Mountain View, California and operates our ADW business, which accepts pari-mutuel wagering from customers residing in certain states who establish and fund an account from which they may place wagers via telephone, mobile device or through the Internet at www.twinspires.com. TwinSpires offers its customers streaming video of live horse races along with race replays and an assortment of racing and handicapping information. TwinSpires also offers all of its customers the ability to automatically qualify for its rewards program, TSC Elite. Industry studies have indicated that advance deposit wagering is the fastest growing segment of the pari-mutuel wagering business, and TwinSpires is a key component to the growth of the Company.

In addition, TwinSpires provides to other entities and earns commissions from white label advance deposit wagering products and services. Under these arrangements, TwinSpires typically provides an advance deposit wagering platform and related operational activities while the other entities typically provide a brand name, marketing and limited customer functions. Fair Grounds also operates its own ADW business for Louisiana residents through a contractual agreement with TwinSpires. Velocity operates an ADW business that is licensed in the British Dependency Isle of Man focused on high wagering-volume international customers and Luckity operates an ADW business that offers over 20 unique online games with outcomes based on and determined by pari-mutuel wagers on live horseraces.

F. Gaming Operations

On October 23, 2012, we completed the acquisition of Riverwalk in Vicksburg, Mississippi for cash consideration of approximately \$145.6 million. The transaction includes the acquisition of a 25,000-square-foot casino, an 80-room hotel, a 5,600-square-foot event center and dining facilities on approximately 22 acres of land.

On December 16, 2010, we completed the acquisition of Harlow’s in Greenville, Mississippi for cash consideration of approximately \$140.4 million. The transaction included the acquisition of a 33,000-square foot casino, a 105-room attached hotel, a 2,600-seat entertainment center and three dining facilities. Harlow’s is located on approximately 78 acres of leased land adjacent to U.S. Highway 82 in Greenville, Mississippi. The property is visible from the highway and is the first gaming facility encountered when crossing the newly constructed Greenville Bridge into Mississippi from Arkansas along U.S. Highway 82. On May 12, 2011, the property sustained flood damage to its 2,600-seat

entertainment center and a portion of its dining facilities. On June 1, 2011, we resumed casino operations with temporary dining facilities. During December 2012 and January 2013, we completed the renovation and improvement projects, which included a new buffet area, steakhouse, business center, spa facility, fitness center, pool and a multi-purpose event center.

On January 22, 2010, we opened a slot facility, Calder Casino, which is adjacent to Calder and offers approximately 1,200 slot machines in a single-level, 104,000 square foot facility and a poker room operation branded “Studz Poker Club”. Calder is the sole thoroughbred racetrack in Miami-Dade County, Florida to offer both live and import simulcast pari-mutuel wagering in addition to a casino facility. The facility offers three dining options, including a buffet dining area, a centrally located bar with a

Table of Contents

separate casual dining area and a “grab and go” dining option.

During October 2008, we opened our permanent 33,000-square-foot slot operations facility, Fair Grounds Slots, adjacent to Fair Grounds, which operates approximately 625 slot machines. The facility includes two concession areas, a bar adjacent to the gaming floor, a renovated simulcast facility and other amenities for gaming and pari-mutuel wagering patrons.

VSI is the operator of approximately 725 video poker machines at ten OTBs operated by Fair Grounds.

We intend to continue to pursue expanded gaming opportunities with the goal of broadening our market, and thereby increasing gaming revenues.

G. Information and Totalizator Services

We maintain one of the world’s largest computerized databases of pedigree and racing information for the thoroughbred horse industry. We provide special reports, statistical information, handicapping information, pedigrees, and other data to organizations, publications and individuals within the thoroughbred industry. This service is accessible through the Internet at www.brisnet.com. In addition, many of the handicapping products are available at our ADW site, www.twinspires.com.

We manufacture and operate pari-mutuel wagering systems for racetracks, OTBs and other pari-mutuel wagering businesses through our subsidiary, United Tote. United Tote provides totalizator services, which accumulate wagers, record sales, calculate payoffs and display wagering data to patrons who wager on horseraces. United Tote has contracts to provide totalizator services to a significant number of third-party racetracks, OTBs and other pari-mutuel wagering businesses, in addition to providing these services at many of our facilities.

H. Sources of Revenue

Our racing revenues include commissions on pari-mutuel wagering at our racetracks and OTBs, plus simulcast host fees earned from other wagering sites. In addition, amounts include ancillary revenues generated by the pari-mutuel facilities including admissions, sponsorships and licensing rights and food and beverage sales. Our gaming revenues are primarily generated from slot machines, video poker, poker card room and table games and ancillary revenues such as hotel and food and beverage sales. Our online revenues are generated by our advance deposit wagering business from wagering through the Internet, telephone or other mobile devices on pari-mutuel events. Finally, our other revenues are primarily generated by United Tote and our other minor subsidiaries.

Financial information about our segments required by this Item is incorporated by reference from the information contained in the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 8. “Financial Statements and Supplementary Data” of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

I. Governmental Regulations

The ownership, operation, and management of our gaming and racing facilities are subject to pervasive regulation under the laws and regulations of each of the jurisdictions in which we operate. Gaming laws are generally based upon declarations of public policy designed to protect gaming consumers and the viability and integrity of the gaming industry. Gaming laws also may be designed to protect and maximize state and local revenues derived through taxes and licensing fees imposed on gaming industry participants as well as to enhance economic development and tourism. To accomplish these public policy goals, gaming laws establish procedures to ensure that participants in the gaming industry meet certain standards of character and fitness. In addition, gaming laws require gaming industry participants to:

- Ensure that unsuitable individuals and organizations have no role in gaming operations;
- Establish procedures designed to prevent cheating and fraudulent practices;
- Establish and maintain responsible accounting practices and procedures;
- Maintain effective controls over their financial practices, including establishment of minimum procedures for internal fiscal affairs and the safeguarding of assets and revenues;
- Maintain systems for reliable record keeping;
- File periodic reports with gaming regulators;
- Ensure that contracts and financial transactions are commercially reasonable, reflect fair market value and are arms-length transactions; and
- Establish programs to promote responsible gaming and inform patrons of the availability of help for problem gaming.

Table of Contents

Typically, a state regulatory environment is established by statute and is administered by a regulatory agency with broad discretion to regulate the affairs of owners, managers, and persons with financial interests in gaming operations. Among other things, gaming authorities in the various jurisdictions in which we operate:

• Adopt rules and regulations under the implementing statutes;

• Interpret and enforce gaming laws;

- Impose disciplinary sanctions for violations, including fines and penalties;

• Review the character and fitness of participants in gaming operations and make determinations regarding their suitability or qualification for licensure;

- Grant licenses for participation in gaming operations;

• Collect and review reports and information submitted by participants in gaming operations;

• Review and approve transactions, such as acquisitions or change-of-control transactions of gaming industry participants, securities offerings and debt transactions engaged in by such participants; and

• Establish and collect fees and taxes.

Any change in the laws or regulations of a gaming jurisdiction could have a material adverse effect on our gaming operations.

Licensing and Suitability Determinations

Gaming laws require us, each of our subsidiaries engaged in gaming operations, certain of our directors, officers and employees, and in some cases, certain of our shareholders, to obtain licenses from gaming authorities. Licenses typically require a determination that the applicant qualifies or is suitable to hold the license. Gaming authorities have very broad discretion in determining whether an applicant qualifies for licensing or should be deemed suitable. Criteria used in determining whether to grant a license to conduct gaming operations, while varying between jurisdictions, generally include consideration of factors such as the good character, honesty and integrity of the applicant; the financial stability, integrity and responsibility of the applicant, including whether the operation is adequately capitalized in the state and exhibits the ability to maintain adequate insurance levels; the quality of the applicant's casino facilities; the amount of revenue to be derived by the applicable state from the operation of the applicant's casino; the applicant's practices with respect to minority hiring and training; and the effect on competition and general impact on the community.

In evaluating individual applicants, gaming authorities consider the individual's business experience and reputation for good character, the individual's criminal history and the character of those with whom the individual associates.

Many gaming jurisdictions limit the number of licenses granted to operate casinos within the state, and some states limit the number of licenses granted to any one gaming operator. Licenses under gaming laws are generally not transferable without approval. Licenses in most of the jurisdictions in which we conduct gaming operations are granted for limited durations and require renewal from time to time. There can be no assurance that any of our licenses will be renewed. The failure to renew any of our licenses could have a material adverse effect on our gaming operations.

In addition to our subsidiaries engaged in gaming operations, gaming authorities may investigate any individual who has a material relationship to or material involvement with, any of these entities to determine whether such individual is suitable or should be licensed as a business associate of a gaming licensee. Our officers, directors and certain key employees must file applications with the gaming authorities and may be required to be licensed, qualify or be found suitable in many jurisdictions. Gaming authorities may deny an application for licensing for any cause which they deem reasonable. Qualification and suitability determinations require submission of detailed personal and financial information followed by a thorough investigation. The applicant must pay all the costs of the investigation. Changes in licensed positions must be reported to gaming authorities and in addition to their authority to deny an application for licensure, qualification or a finding of suitability, gaming authorities have jurisdiction to disapprove a change in a corporate position.

If one or more gaming authorities were to find that an officer, director or key employee fails to qualify or is unsuitable for licensing or unsuitable to continue having a relationship with us, we would be required to sever all relationships

with such person. In addition, gaming authorities may require us to terminate the employment of any person who refuses to file appropriate applications.

Moreover, in many jurisdictions, certain of our shareholders may be required to undergo a suitability investigation similar to that described above. Many jurisdictions require any person who acquires beneficial ownership of more than a certain percentage of our voting securities, typically 5%, to report the acquisition to gaming authorities, and gaming authorities may require such holders to apply for qualification or a finding of suitability. Most gaming authorities, however, allow an “institutional investor” to apply for a waiver. An “institutional investor” is generally defined as an investor acquiring and holding voting securities in the ordinary course of business as an institutional investor, and not for the purpose of causing, directly or indirectly, the election of a member

Table of Contents

of our board of directors, any change in our corporate charter, bylaws, management, policies or operations, or those of any of our gaming affiliates, or the taking of any other action which gaming authorities find to be inconsistent with holding our voting securities for investment purposes only. Even if a waiver is granted, an institutional investor generally may not take any action inconsistent with its status when the waiver was granted without once again becoming subject to the foregoing reporting and application obligations.

Generally, any person who fails or refuses to apply for a finding of suitability or a license within the prescribed period after being advised it is required by gaming authorities may be denied a license or found unsuitable, as applicable.

Any shareholder found unsuitable or denied a license and who holds, directly or indirectly, any beneficial ownership of our voting securities beyond such period of time as may be prescribed by the applicable gaming authorities may be guilty of a criminal offense. Furthermore, we may be subject to disciplinary action if, after we receive notice that a person is unsuitable to be a shareholder or to have any other relationship with us or any of our subsidiaries, we: (i) pay that person any dividend or interest upon our voting securities; (ii) allow that person to exercise, directly or indirectly, any voting right conferred through securities held by that person; (iii) pay remuneration in any form to that person for services rendered or otherwise; or (iv) fail to pursue all lawful efforts to require such unsuitable person to relinquish his voting securities including, if necessary, the immediate purchase of said voting securities for cash at fair market value.

Violations of Gaming Laws

If we or our subsidiaries violate applicable gaming laws, our gaming licenses could be limited, conditioned, suspended or revoked by gaming authorities, and we and any other persons involved could be subject to substantial fines.

Further, a supervisor or conservator can be appointed by gaming authorities to operate our gaming properties, or in some jurisdictions, take title to our gaming assets in the jurisdiction, and under certain circumstances, earnings generated during such appointment could be forfeited to the applicable state or states. Furthermore, violations of laws in one jurisdiction could result in disciplinary action in other jurisdictions. As a result, violations by us of applicable gaming laws could have a material adverse effect on our gaming operations.

Some gaming jurisdictions prohibit certain types of political activity by a gaming licensee, its officers, directors and key employees. A violation of such a prohibition may subject the offender to criminal and/or disciplinary action.

Reporting and Record-keeping Requirements

We are required periodically to submit detailed financial and operating reports and furnish any other information about us and our subsidiaries which gaming authorities may require. Under federal law, we are required to record and submit detailed reports of currency transactions involving greater than \$10,000 at our casinos and racetracks, as well as any suspicious activity that may occur at such facilities. Failure to comply with these requirements could result in fines or cessation of operations. We are required to maintain a current stock ledger which may be examined by gaming authorities at any time. If any securities are held in trust by an agent or by a nominee, the record holder may be required to disclose the identity of the beneficial owner to gaming authorities. A failure to make such disclosure may be grounds for finding the record holder unsuitable. Gaming authorities may require certificates for our securities to bear a legend indicating that the securities are subject to specified gaming laws.

Review and Approval of Transactions

Substantially all material loans, leases, sales of securities and similar financing transactions by us and our subsidiaries must be reported to and in some cases approved by gaming authorities. Neither we nor any of our subsidiaries may make a public offering of securities without the prior approval of certain gaming authorities. Changes in control through merger, consolidation, stock or asset acquisitions, management or consulting agreements, or otherwise are subject to receipt of prior approval of gaming authorities. Entities seeking to acquire control of us or one of our subsidiaries must satisfy gaming authorities with respect to a variety of stringent standards prior to assuming control. Gaming authorities may also require controlling stockholders, officers, directors and other persons having a material relationship or involvement with the entity proposing to acquire control, to be investigated and licensed as part of the approval process relating to the transaction.

License Fees and Gaming Taxes

We pay substantial license fees and taxes in many jurisdictions, including some of the counties and cities in which our operations are conducted, in connection with our casino gaming operations, computed in various ways depending on

the type of gaming or activity involved. Depending upon the particular fee or tax involved, these fees and taxes are payable with varying frequency. License fees and taxes are based upon such factors as a percentage of the gross gaming revenues received; the number of gaming devices and table games operated; or a one-time fee payable upon the initial receipt of license and fees in connection with the renewal of license. In some jurisdictions, gaming tax rates are graduated such that they increase as gross gaming revenues increase. Furthermore, tax rates are subject to change, sometimes with little notice, and such changes could have a material adverse effect on our gaming operations. In addition to taxes specifically unique to gaming, we are required to pay all other applicable taxes.

Table of Contents

Operational Requirements

In most jurisdictions, we are subject to certain requirements and restrictions on how we must conduct our gaming operations. In certain states, we are required to give preference to local suppliers and include minority and women-owned businesses as well as organized labor in construction projects to the maximum extent practicable as well as in general vendor business activity. Similarly, we may be required to give employment preference to minorities, women and in-state residents in certain jurisdictions. In addition, our ability to conduct certain types of games, introduce new games or move existing games within our facilities may be restricted or subject to regulatory review and approval. Some of our operations are subject to restrictions on the number of gaming positions we may have and the maximum wagers allowed to be placed by our customers.

Horseracing and Pari-Mutuel Wagering Regulations

Horseracing is a highly regulated industry. In the U.S., individual states control the operations of racetracks located within their respective jurisdictions with the intent of, among other things, protecting the public from unfair and illegal gambling practices, generating tax revenue, licensing racetracks and operators and preventing organized crime from being involved in the industry. Although the specific form may vary, states that regulate horseracing generally do so through a horseracing commission or other gambling regulatory authority. In general, regulatory authorities perform background checks on all racetrack owners prior to granting them the necessary operating licenses. Horse owners, trainers, jockeys, drivers, stewards, judges and backstretch personnel are also subject to licensing by governmental authorities. State regulation of horse races extends to virtually every aspect of racing and usually extends to details such as the presence and placement of specific race officials, including timers, placing judges, starters and patrol judges. We currently satisfy the applicable licensing requirements of the racing and gambling regulatory authorities in each state where we maintain racetracks and/or carry on business, including, but not limited to, the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation, Division of Pari-Mutuel Wagering (“DPW”), the Illinois Racing Board (“IRB”), the Kentucky Horse Racing Commission (“KHRC”), the Louisiana State Racing Commission (“LSRC”) and the Oregon Racing Commission (“ORC”).

In the United States, interstate pari-mutuel wagering on horseracing is subject to the federal Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 (“IHA”) and its amendment in 2000. As a result of this statute, racetracks can commingle wagers from different racetracks and wagering facilities and broadcast horseracing events to other licensed establishments.

Kentucky’s racetracks, including Churchill Downs, are subject to the licensing and regulation of the KHRC. The KHRC is responsible for overseeing horseracing and regulating the state equine industry. Licenses to conduct live thoroughbred racing meets, to participate in simulcasting and to accept ADW wagers from Kentucky residents are approved annually by the KHRC based upon applications submitted by the racetracks in Kentucky. To some extent, Churchill Downs competes with other racetracks in Kentucky for the award of racing dates, however, the KHRC is required by state law to consider and seek to preserve each racetrack’s usual and customary live racing dates. During October 2012, Churchill Downs received approval to conduct a twelve-day September meet during 2013, in addition to its traditional spring and fall racing meets.

In Florida, licenses to conduct live thoroughbred racing and to participate in simulcast wagering are approved by the DPW. The DPW is responsible for overseeing the network of state offices located at every pari-mutuel wagering facility, as well as issuing the permits necessary to operate a pari-mutuel wagering facility. The DPW also issues annual licenses for thoroughbred, standardbred and quarterhorse races but does not approve the specific live race days. Calder may face direct competition from other Florida racetracks, including Miami-area racetracks, and host more or fewer live racing dates in the future. In recent years, Calder has elected to conduct fewer days of live racing in order to increase purses and maximize the quality of the racing product. Race date requests to the DPW for the 2013-2014 racing season are due on February 28, 2013, and Calder has not yet finalized its submission. In Illinois, licenses to conduct live thoroughbred racing and to participate in simulcast wagering are approved by the IRB. Generally, there is no substantial change from year to year in the number of racing dates awarded to each racetrack, however during January 2013, the IRB appointed Arlington Park the host track for 26 days in 2013, a decrease of 18 days compared to the same period of 2012.

In Louisiana, licenses to conduct live thoroughbred racing and to participate in simulcast wagering are approved by the LSRC. The LSRC is responsible for overseeing the awarding of licenses for the conduct of live racing meets, the

conduct of thoroughbred horseracing, the types of wagering which may be offered by pari-mutuel facilities and the disposition of revenue generated from wagering. Off-track wagering is also regulated by the LSRC. Louisiana law requires live racing at a licensed racetrack for at least 80 days over a 20 week period each year to maintain the license and to conduct gaming.

Additionally, with the addition of slot machines at Fair Grounds, Louisiana law requires live quarter horseracing to be conducted at the racetrack. We conducted eight days of quarter horseracing in 2012 and plan to offer fourteen days of quarter horseracing during 2013.

TwinSpires is licensed in Oregon under a multi-jurisdictional simulcasting and interactive wagering totalizator hub license issued by the ORC and in accordance with Oregon law. TwinSpires also holds ADW licenses in certain other states such as California, Illinois, Idaho, Maryland, Virginia and Washington. Changes in the form of new legislation or regulatory activity at the state or

Table of Contents

federal level could adversely impact the operations, success or growth of our ADW business.

The total number of days on which each racetrack conducts live thoroughbred racing fluctuates annually according to each calendar year and the determination of applicable regulatory activities. A substantial change in the allocation of live racing days at any of our four racetracks could significantly impact our operations and earnings in future years.

Gaming Regulations

The manufacture, distribution, servicing and operation of video draw poker devices in Louisiana are subject to the Louisiana Video Draw Poker Devices Control Law and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder. The manufacture, distribution, servicing and operation of video poker devices and slot machines are maintained by a single gaming control board for the regulation of gaming in Louisiana. This board, created on May 1, 1996, is called the Louisiana Gaming Control Board (the "Louisiana Board") and oversees all licensing for all forms of legalized gaming in Louisiana (including all regulatory enforcement and supervisory authority that exists in the state as to gaming on Native American lands). The Video Gaming Division and the Slots Gaming Division of the Gaming Enforcement Section of the Office of the State Police within the Department of Public Safety and Corrections (the "Division") performs the investigative functions for the Louisiana Board for video poker and slot gaming. The laws and regulations of Louisiana are based on policies of maintaining the health, welfare and safety of the general public and protecting the video gaming industry from elements of organized crime, illegal gambling activities and other harmful elements, as well as protecting the public from illegal and unscrupulous gaming to ensure the fair play of devices. The Louisiana Board also regulates slot machine gaming at racetrack facilities pursuant to the Louisiana Pari-Mutuel Live Racing Facility Economic Redevelopment and Gaming Control Act. In addition, the LSRC also issues licenses required for Fair Grounds to operate slot machines at the racetrack and video poker devices at its OTBs. The failure to comply with the rules and regulations of the Louisiana Board could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The ownership and operation of casino gaming facilities in the State of Mississippi is subject to extensive state and local regulation, but primarily the licensing and regulatory control of the Mississippi Gaming Commission (the "Mississippi Commission"). The laws, regulations and supervisory procedures of the Mississippi Commission are based upon declarations of public policy that are concerned with, among other things: (1) the prevention of unsavory or unsuitable persons from having direct or indirect involvement with gaming at any time or in any capacity; (2) the establishment and maintenance of responsible accounting practices and procedures; (3) the maintenance of effective controls over the financial practices of licensees, including the establishment of minimum procedures for internal fiscal affairs and the safeguarding of assets and revenues, providing for reliable record keeping and requiring the filing of periodic reports with the Mississippi Commission; (4) the prevention of cheating and fraudulent practices; (5) providing a source of state and local revenues through taxation and licensing fees; and (6) ensuring that gaming licensees, to the extent practicable, employ Mississippi residents. The regulations are subject to amendment and interpretation by the Mississippi Commission. Changes in Mississippi laws or regulations may limit or otherwise materially affect the types of gaming that may be conducted and such changes, if enacted, could have an adverse effect on us and our Mississippi gaming operations. The failure to comply with the rules and regulations of the Mississippi Commission could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The ownership and operation of casino gaming facilities in the State of Florida is subject to extensive state and local regulation, primarily by the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation (the "DBPR"), within the executive branch of Florida's state government. The DBPR is charged with the regulation of Florida's pari-mutuel, cardroom and slot gaming industries, as well as collecting and safeguarding associated revenues due to the state. The DBPR has been designated by the Florida legislature as the state compliance agency with the authority to carry out the state's oversight responsibilities in accordance with the provisions outlined in the compact between the Seminole Tribe of Florida and the State of Florida. The laws and regulations of Florida are based on policies of maintaining the health, welfare and safety of the general public and protecting the video gaming industry from elements of organized crime, illegal gambling activities and other harmful elements, as well as protecting the public from illegal and unscrupulous gaming to ensure the fair play of devices. The failure to comply with the rules and regulations of the DPBR could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

J. Competition

We operate in a highly competitive industry with a large number of participants, some of which have financial and other resources that are greater than ours. The industry faces competition from a variety of sources for discretionary consumer spending including spectator sports and other entertainment and gaming options. Competitive gaming activities include traditional and Native American casinos, video lottery terminals, state-sponsored lotteries and other forms of legalized gaming in the U.S. and other jurisdictions. Additionally, Internet-based interactive gaming and wagering, both legal and, we believe, illegal, is growing rapidly and affecting competition in our industry. We anticipate competition in this area will become more intense as new Internet-based ventures enter the industry and as state and federal regulations on Internet-based activities are clarified.

Legalized gaming is currently permitted in various forms in many U.S. states and Canada. Other jurisdictions could legalize gaming in the future, and established gaming jurisdictions could award additional gaming licenses or permit the expansion of

Table of Contents

existing gaming operations. If additional gaming opportunities become available near our racing or gaming operations, such gaming opportunities could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

All of our racetracks face competition in the simulcast market. Approximately 46,000 thoroughbred horse races are conducted annually in the U.S. Of these races, we host approximately 4,000 races each year, or around nine percent of the total. As a content provider, we compete for wagering dollars in the simulcast market with other racetracks conducting races at or near the same times as our races. As a racetrack operator, we also compete for horses with other racetracks running live racing meets at or near the same time as our races. Our ability to compete is substantially dependent on purse size. In recent years, this competition has increased as more states legalize gaming, allowing slot machines at racetracks with mandatory purse contributions. Over 88 percent of pari-mutuel handle is bet at off-track locations, either at other racetracks, OTBs, casinos, or through ADW channels. As a content distributor, we compete for these dollars to be wagered at our racetracks, OTBs, casinos and via our ADW business.

Louisville, Kentucky

Churchill Downs faces competition from free-standing casinos and racetracks which are combined with casinos (“racinos”) in neighboring states. Currently, three Indiana casinos compete for customers in the Louisville market. These casinos include Horseshoe Indiana, located in Elizabeth, Indiana, Belterra, a Pinnacle Entertainment casino located between Louisville and Cincinnati and the resort casino at French Lick, located about 60 miles northwest of Louisville. Additionally, Hoosier Park operates 2,000 slot machines, and Indiana Downs operates 1,900 slot machines. This has resulted in increased purses at those Indiana racetracks.

During 2009, the Ohio voters passed a referendum to allow five casinos in Ohio, and, during 2011, the state legislature passed legislation allowing Ohio’s seven racetracks to apply for video lottery licenses. During 2012, construction is underway on separate casino projects in Cleveland and Cincinnati. We believe that the potential expansion of gaming at Ohio racetracks could provide a competitive advantage to those racetracks and may enable Ohio racetracks to increase their purses.

On October 28, 2011, Aqueduct Racetrack opened a gaming facility with more than 2,400 video lottery terminals and electronic table games. An additional 2,500 gaming machines were added in December 2011 as part of a further expansion of the facility. As a result of the addition of gaming activities, New York purse payments in 2013 will be enhanced as compared to their historical levels. These enhanced purses could affect our ability to attract horses and trainers and could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. These developments may result in Ohio and New York racetracks attracting horses that would otherwise race at Kentucky racetracks, including Churchill Downs, thus negatively affecting the number of starters and purse size which, in turn, may have a negative effect on handle. In addition, we believe the opening of four land-based, free-standing casinos in Ohio may likewise have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Miami, Florida

Calder is surrounded by competitors for consumers’ discretionary income. Calder competes with Gulfstream Park for thoroughbred race fans in the Miami area. This direct competition may adversely and materially impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

On January 22, 2010, Calder Casino commenced operations and features approximately 1,200 slot machines. This gaming operation competes with three established casinos in Broward County just to the north of Miami-Dade County. We also face competition from Native American casinos, such as the Seminole Hard Rock facility, and popular gambling cruises-to-nowhere. Due to the high tax rates in Florida for pari-mutuel gaming facilities, Native American casinos, which are not taxed at the same rates, are generally able to spend more money marketing their facilities to consumers.

On November 9, 2011, we petitioned the Florida Supreme Court to grant discretionary review of Calder Race Course, Inc., vs. Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation and South Florida Racing Association, LLC, and reverse the Florida First Appellate Court’s decision which allows for the opening of a slot machine facility at Hialeah Race Course, located approximately twelve miles from Calder. On April 27, 2012, the Florida Supreme Court declined to consider a review of our petition, upholding the decision of the lower court. Hialeah Race Course

subsequently commenced construction of a casino with approximately 900 slot machines which is expected to open during the summer of 2013. The operation of a slot machine facility at Hialeah Race Course could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Florida legislators continue to debate the expansion of Florida gaming to include Las Vegas-style destination resort casinos. Such casinos may be subject to taxation rates lower than the current pari-mutuel taxation structure. Should such legislation be enacted, it could increase competition and have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

Chicago, Illinois

Arlington competes in the Chicago market against a variety of entertainment options. In addition to other racetracks in the area such as Hawthorne Park and Maywood Park, there are ten riverboat casino operations that draw from the Chicago market including Rivers Casino, which opened in July 2011, in Des Plaines, Illinois. Additionally, Native American gaming operations in Wisconsin may adversely affect Arlington.

New Orleans, Louisiana

Fair Grounds competes in the New Orleans area with two riverboat casinos and one land-based casino. With approximately 625 slot machines, Fair Grounds competes with Harrah's land-based casino, which is the largest and closest competitor to Fair Grounds. Additionally, Fair Grounds faces significant gambling competition along the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Fair Grounds also competes with video poker operations located at various OTBs, truck stops and restaurants in the area.

Greenville, Mississippi

Harlow's competes in Mississippi with a variety of riverboat and land-based casinos. Our principal local competitor is Trop Casino in Greenville. Harlow's also faces regional competition from a casino in Lula, Mississippi and from two locations in Arkansas. Both Arkansas locations offer pari-mutuel wagering on live and simulcast racing and other electronic games of skill such as blackjack, video poker, and electronic roulette. In addition, historical racing machines are offered at one of the Arkansas locations.

Vicksburg, Mississippi

Riverwalk competes in the Vicksburg area and is the newest and the only land-based casino in the local market. Our principal local competitors are Ameristar Casino, which is the largest local competitor, and Rainbow Hotel Casino, which is the closest competitor, in Vicksburg. In addition, Riverwalk faces regional competition from two locations in Natchez Mississippi, including Magnolia Bluff Casino which opened during December 2012 and from Pearl River Resort in Philadelphia, Mississippi.

From time to time, potential competitors have proposed the development of additional casinos. The Mississippi Gaming Control Act does not limit the number of licenses that may be granted, and there are a number of additional sites located in the Gulf Coast region that are in various stages of development. Any significant licensure could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Advance Deposit Wagering

TwinSpires competes with other ADW businesses for both customers and racing content, and TwinSpires also competes with online gaming sites. Our competitors include, but are not limited to, Betfair Limited (d/b/a TVG), the Stronach Group (d/b/a XpressBet), Premier Turf Club, Lien Games, AmWest Entertainment, The New York Racing Association, Connecticut OTB, Penn National Gaming Inc. and Racing2Day LLC. We also own an information services data business that sells handicapping and pedigree information to wagering customers and horsemen in the industry. This data may give us a competitive advantage as we are able to provide promotional products to our ADW customers that other ADW businesses cannot provide. As a data provider, we compete with companies such as Equibase and the Daily Racing Form by selling handicapping data to wagering customers.

In response to increased competition from other gaming options, we continue to seek new sources of revenue. We are focused on product innovation, marketing initiatives and customer relationships. We also seek to offer the widest array of racing content from throughout the world, and where available, we will take advantage of geographical expansion. All of our activities are highly dependent on the regulatory environment and legal developments within federal and individual state jurisdictions.

Totalizator Business

We acquired United Tote through our acquisition of Youbet on June 2, 2010. United Tote provides totalizator services, which accumulate wagers, record sales, calculate payoffs and display wagering data in a secure manner to patrons who wager on horseraces. Our competitors are primarily Sportech and AmTote International, Inc. Our competition outside of North America is more fragmented, with competition also being provided by several international and regional companies. United Tote competes primarily on the basis of the design, performance, reliability and pricing of its products and contract services.

United Tote has contracts to provide totalizator services to a significant number of racetracks, OTBs and other pari-mutuel wagering businesses. Errors by United Tote technology or personnel may subject us to liabilities, including financial penalties under our totalizator service contracts, which could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

K. Legislative Changes

Federal

Wire Act of 1961 - Federal Clarification

On December 23, 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice clarified its position on the Wire Act of 1961 (the “Wire Act”), which had historically been interpreted to outlaw all forms of gambling across states lines. The department's Office of Legal Counsel determined, in a written memorandum, that the Wire Act applied only to a sporting event or contest but did not apply to other forms of Internet gambling, including online betting unrelated to sporting events. The Justice Department opinion could be interpreted to allow Internet gaming on an intrastate basis. Since the issuance of this opinion, there have been actions taken by various state legislatures to either further enable or further limit Internet gaming opportunities for their residents and businesses, and we anticipate that other states may follow. At this point, we do not know to what extent intrastate Internet gaming could affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Senate Hearing on Medication and Performance-Enhancing Drugs in Horses

In July 2012, the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on the use of anti-bleeding medications, painkillers and performance enhancing drugs in racehorses. The Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act was introduced, which is designed to regulate and standardize medication usage within the industry. It is unclear to what extent such federal regulations could impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Other Federal Legislation

During 2011, two major pieces of Internet gaming legislation were introduced in the United States Congress. The first bill, the Internet Gambling Regulation, Consumer Protection and Enforcement Act (“HR 1174”), would have granted the Secretary of the Treasury regulatory and enforcement jurisdiction over Internet gaming. Though wagering on sports was excluded, it would have expanded Internet gaming beyond poker. The second bill, the Internet Gambling Prohibition, Poker Consumer Protection, and Strengthening UIGEA Act of 2011 (“HR 2366”), mirrored many of the safeguard provisions proffered in HR 1174, however it limited Internet gaming to poker only. No action was taken on either proposed bill. Similar legislation related to Internet gaming issues could be introduced during the 2013 Congressional session. It is unclear to what extent such federal regulations could impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Nevada

On February 21, 2013, the Governor of Nevada signed Assembly Bill 114 into law. This legislation legalizes Internet gaming in Nevada, removing a previous statutory restriction requiring federal authorization. The legislation further requires the Nevada Gaming Commission to issue compacting guidelines, which will allow Nevada to enter into Internet gaming agreements with other states. It is unclear to what extent such federal regulations could impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Kentucky

Expanded gaming legislation

On February 19, 2013, House Bill 443 was introduced in the Kentucky House of Representatives. This legislation would amend the Kentucky Constitution to provide up to seven casino locations in the state of Kentucky and would create an Equine Excellence Fund, into which ten percent of gross gaming revenues would be directed. The constitutionally protected Equine Excellence Fund would be distributed annually for purses, breeders' incentives, horsemen services, equine research, regulation, racetrack improvements, and marketing of the equine industry. House Bill 443 would require a three-fifths majority in both chambers of the Kentucky General Assembly and, if passed, would be submitted to voters for ratification no earlier than November 2014. Should the referendum be successful, the General Assembly then would be required to pass enabling legislation to provide the requisite licensing, regulatory and taxation framework. It is unclear to what extent this proposed legislation would impact our existing business, financial condition and results of operations.

Race-day Medication Ban

On June 13, 2012, the KHRC approved a change in state regulations that bans the use of anti-bleeding medication on race-days for graded and listed stakes horse races. The revised regulation must survive a legislative review process, in addition to potential legal challenges before being enacted into law. Should the regulation be enacted, it would be phased in over a three-year period, beginning in 2014. If approved, Kentucky would be the only U.S. state to have enacted such restrictions. At this point, we do not know the effect this legislation could have on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

Historical Racing Machines

On July 20, 2010, the KHRC approved a change in state regulations that would allow racetracks to offer pari-mutuel Historical Racing Machines (“HRMs”), which base their payouts on the results of previously-run races at racetracks across North America. Portions of previously-run races, the length of which is chosen by the player, can be viewed, and winning combinations are presented via video terminals through which the player may place wagers in the pari-mutuel betting pools available via the HRMs. Previously, only Oaklawn Park Racetrack, in Arkansas, offered the HRMs. On September 1, 2011, Kentucky Downs Racetrack opened an HRM facility with approximately 200 HRMs, and during February 2012, the KHRC approved the installation of 75 additional HRMs at such facility. On August 31, 2012, Ellis Park Racetrack opened a HRM facility with 177 HRMs.

Despite the approval of the KHRC, there are questions with regard to the economic viability of the HRMs in a competitive wagering market such as Louisville, as well as the legality of regulations enacted. We do not expect to make any decisions on whether to pursue HRMs until both of these questions are answered. A declaratory judgment action was filed in Franklin Circuit Court on behalf of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and all Kentucky racetracks to ensure proper legal authority. The Franklin Circuit Court entered a declaratory judgment upholding the regulations in their entirety. The intervening adverse party filed a notice of appeal, and the KHRC and the racetracks filed a motion to transfer that appeal directly to the Supreme Court of Kentucky. On April 21, 2011, the Supreme Court of Kentucky denied the request to hear the case before the appeal is heard by the Kentucky Court of Appeals. On September 1, 2011, the intervening adverse party filed an injunction action with the Kentucky Court of Appeals to grant emergency relief that would prevent Kentucky Downs Racetrack from operating its HRMs. The intervening adverse party’s motions were denied by the Kentucky Court of Appeals. On June 15, 2012, the Kentucky Court of Appeals vacated the lower court's decision and remanded the declaratory judgment action back to the Franklin County Circuit Court. On July 16, 2012, the Kentucky racetracks, the KHRC and the Kentucky Department of Revenue filed motions for discretionary review with the Supreme Court of Kentucky asking the court to overturn the Kentucky Court of Appeals' decision and address the merits of the case. On January 11, 2013, the Supreme Court of Kentucky agreed to hear the case.

On February 15, 2013, Senate Bill 204 was introduced which would statutorily permit wagering via HRMs. At this point, we do not know if the proposed legislation will be successful or the impact it will have on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

ADW Regulations

Legislation was introduced on February 8, 2011, to clarify state regulatory authority over ADW companies. The legislation provided jurisdiction over wagering made within the Commonwealth of Kentucky and required a license to accept ADW wagers from Kentucky residents, which TwinSpires obtained during March 2012. During January 2012, the Kentucky House of Representatives passed House Bill 229, which imposed taxes on advanced deposit wagering placed by Kentucky residents, however, House Bill 229 failed to move forward in the Kentucky Senate during the 2012 legislative session. On February 5, 2013, the Kentucky House of Representatives introduced House Bill 189, which contained similar provisions to House Bill 229 and would impose an excise tax of 0.5% of wagering proceeds on all advance deposit wagering placed by Kentucky residents. The state’s general fund would receive 15% of the excise tax, with the remaining 85% to be shared equally between the state’s racetracks and horsemen. On February 12, 2013, House Bill 189 was approved by the House Appropriations and Revenue Committee and on February 15, 2013, it was approved by the House of Representatives. Should this legislation be enacted into law, it could have a negative impact on our Online Business operations.

Illinois

Expanded Gaming Legislation

On May 31, 2012, Senate Bill 1849 was passed by the Illinois General Assembly, which authorized five additional casinos to be constructed in Illinois, as well as provided for slot machines to be installed at racetracks. Specifically, the legislation authorized Arlington to operate up to 1,200 slot or video poker machines and authorizes Quad City Downs, owned by Arlington, to operate up to 900 slot or video poker machines. Existing casinos would have been eligible to increase the number of gaming machines from the current limit of 1,200 machines to 1,600 machines. Five new land-based casinos would have been authorized, one of which could have been located in Chicago with 4,000

gaming machines. Senate Bill 1849 was vetoed by Governor Quinn on August 28, 2012. During January 2013, the Illinois Senate president released his hold on a previous version of gaming legislation, Senate Bill 744, which allowed it to be sent to the Governor. The Governor is expected to veto this legislation. At this point, we do not know how future legislation would affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

ADW Legislation

House Bill 3779 relating to ADW regulation was signed into law by Governor Quinn on August 24, 2012 and extended ADW authorization through December 31, 2012. Among other things, House Bill 3779 provided requirements that, effective August 26, 2012, each ADW license-holder impose a surcharge of up to 0.18% on winning wagers and winnings from wagers placed through advance deposit wagering. The funds received as the result of the surcharge were deposited into standardbred purse accounts. Legislation providing for an extension of ADW operations in Illinois subsequent to the December 31, 2012 sunset date failed to pass the legislature prior to adjournment of the 2012 legislative session. TwinSpires ceased accepting wagers from Illinois residents on January 18, 2013, based upon the request of the Illinois Racing Board. Legislation has been filed that would extend ADW authorization in Illinois until December 31, 2015 and would validate ADW wagers accepted between January 1, 2013 and the enactment of the proposed legislation. If approved, the bill would take effect immediately. TwinSpires expects to resume accepting wagers from Illinois residents when such a bill is passed to extend the licensure and regulation of ADW operations in Illinois. Failure of the Illinois legislature to extend ADW regulations could adversely affect our ADW business in Illinois.

Online Gaming

During the 2012 legislative session, the Illinois Senate amended House Bill 4148 with language that, if enacted, would create a new division of the state lottery to oversee and operate online games, including poker, for registered players within Illinois. The division would also be given authority to enter into interstate and multinational online gaming compacts. As currently written, the lottery would create a single platform on which Internet Gaming would be conducted in Illinois. At a later date, the state could allow private companies licensed to conduct gaming in Illinois to essentially serve as affiliates. It is not clear under what terms the state would allow the private companies to participate. The legislative session adjourned without action on House Bill 4148. We expect similar legislation to be introduced during the 2013 legislative session but at this point, we do not know how future legislation would impact our business, financial condition and results of operation.

Horse Racing Equity Trust Fund

During 2006, the Illinois General Assembly enacted Public Act 94-804, which created the Horse Racing Equity Trust Fund (“HRE Trust Fund”). During November 2008, the Illinois General Assembly passed Public Act 95-1008 to extend Public Act 94-804 for a period of three years beginning December 12, 2008. The HRE Trust Fund was funded by a 3% “surcharge” on revenues of Illinois riverboat casinos that met a certain revenue threshold. The riverboats paid all monies required under Public Acts 94-804 and 95-1008 into a special protest fund account which prevented the monies from being transferred to the HRE Trust Fund. The funds were moved to the HRE Trust Fund and distributed to the racetracks, including Arlington, in December 2009. See Item 3. “Legal Proceedings” of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of ensuing litigation with respect to the Horse Racing Equity Trust Fund.

Horse Racing Equity Fund – Tenth Riverboat License

Under legislation enacted in 1999, the Illinois Horse Racing Equity Fund is scheduled to receive amounts up to 15% of the adjusted gross receipts earned on an annual basis from state tax generated by the tenth riverboat casino license granted in Illinois. The funds will be distributed to racetracks in Illinois and may be utilized for purses as well as racetrack discretionary spending. In addition, the holders of the original nine riverboat licenses who paid monies into the HRE Trust Fund will no longer be required to pay monies into that fund. During December 2008, the Illinois Gaming Board awarded the tenth license to Midwest Gaming LLC to operate a casino in Des Plaines, Illinois. This casino opened during July 2011. The Illinois racing industry will be entitled to receive an amount equal to 15% of the adjusted gross receipts of this casino from the gaming taxes generated by that casino. However, these funds must be appropriated by the state, and the current fiscal year budget contains no such appropriation.

Purse Recapture

Pursuant to the Illinois Horse Racing Act, Arlington and all other Illinois racetracks are permitted to receive a payment commonly known as purse recapture. Generally, in any year that wagering on Illinois horse races at Arlington is less than 75% of wagering both in Illinois and at Arlington on Illinois horse races in 1994, Arlington is permitted to receive 2% of the difference in wagering in the subsequent year. The payment is funded from the Arlington purse account. Under the Illinois Horse Racing Act, the Arlington purse account is to be repaid via an

appropriation by the Illinois General Assembly from the Illinois General Revenue Fund. However, this appropriation has not been made since 2001. Subsequently, Illinois horsemen unsuccessfully petitioned the IRB to prevent Illinois racetracks from receiving this payment in any year that the Illinois General Assembly did not appropriate the repayment to the racetrack's purse accounts from the General Revenue Fund. Further, the Illinois horsemen filed lawsuits seeking, among other things, to block payment to Illinois racetracks, as well as to recover the 2002 and 2003 amounts already paid to the Illinois racetracks. These lawsuits filed by the Illinois horsemen challenging the 2002 and 2003 reimbursements have been resolved in favor of Arlington and the other Illinois racetracks. Several bills were filed in the 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2009 sessions of the Illinois legislature that, in part, would eliminate the statutory right of Arlington and the other Illinois racetracks to continue to receive this payment. None of these bills passed. Since the statute remains in effect, Arlington continues to receive the recapture

Table of Contents

payment from the purse account. If Arlington loses the statutory right to receive this payment, there could be a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Host Days

During January, February and a portion of March each year, when there is no live racing in Illinois, the IRB designates a thoroughbred racetrack as the host track in Illinois, for which the host track receives a higher percentage of earnings from pari-mutuel wagering activity throughout Illinois. The IRB has appointed Arlington the host track in Illinois during January of 2013 for 26 days, which is a decrease of 18 days compared to the same period of 2012. Arlington's future designation as the host track is subject to the annual designation by the IRB. A change in the number of days that Arlington is designated host track could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Ohio

Gaming Legislation

In November 2009, Ohio voters passed a referendum to allow five casinos in Ohio, with opening dates from 2012 through 2013. On June 28, 2011, both houses of the Ohio General Assembly passed House Bill 277 ("HB 277") allowing all seven state racetracks to apply for video lottery licenses. The Governor of Ohio signed HB 277 into law on July 15, 2011. In addition, on June 23, 2011, the Ohio legislature passed legislation allowing the relocation of Ohio racetracks with video lottery terminal licenses. In October 2011, the Ohio Roundtable filed a lawsuit seeking to prevent racetracks from relocating and prohibiting video lottery terminals. In May 2012, the Common Pleas Court ruled against the Ohio Roundtable, indicating it did not have legal standing to sue the State over the 2011 ruling. On June 28, 2012, the Ohio Roundtable filed an appeal against this ruling. Oral arguments on the appeal were heard by the Franklin County Court of Appeals on January 17, 2013. The Court took the arguments under consideration and will issue a verdict at a later date. At this point, we do not know how this legislation or the related litigation could affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

On June 11, 2012, House Bill 386 ("HB 386"), which makes revisions to both Ohio's gaming-related laws pertaining to casinos, video lottery terminals, horseracing and gaming as well as clarifies Ohio gaming regulations became law. In December 2012, the Ohio House approved legislation that significantly limited the business model of Internet cafés operating in the state. The legislation was not considered by the Senate during 2012. On January 30, 2013, House Bill 7 was filed in the Ohio House and is intended to negatively impact the business model of Internet cafés by banning cash payouts and limiting prizes or vouchers redeemable for merchandise to not more than a \$10 value. At this time, we do not know how this legislation or related legislation could affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

New York

Gaming Legislation

During December 2011, the Governor of New York announced his support for a constitutional amendment to expand Las Vegas-style casino gaming on non-Indian lands. Such a change in the state constitution would require two successive sessions of the state legislature followed by a statewide referendum by voters. The earliest a statewide vote could occur would be November 2013.

In March 2012, the Governor of New York and legislative leaders agreed to legalize casino gaming and to seek amendment of the state constitution to allow up to seven new casinos in the state. An expansion of gaming in New York could include expanded incentives for the horse racing industry. This could affect our ability to attract horses and trainers and could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Significant Agreement

In November 2012, a resolution to award United Tote's existing tote contract with the New York Racing Association ("NYRA") to another totalizator company was postponed when the NYRA Board voted to study the issue. United Tote's existing contract with NYRA expires on September 2, 2013. Should United Tote's existing contract with NYRA not be extended, it could have a negative impact on our business, financial conditions and results of operations.

California

Exchange Wagering

On September 23, 2010, the Governor of California signed a bill that approved exchange wagering on horseracing by California residents and on California racetracks. The bill makes California the first state to approve this type of wagering. Exchange wagering differs from pari-mutuel wagering in that it allows customers to propose their own odds on certain types of wagers on horseracing, including betting that a horse may lose, which may be accepted by a second customer.

Table of Contents

The California Horse Racing Board (the "CHRB") heard testimony on exchange wagering during February 2012. At its March 2012 meeting, the CHRB approved draft proposed exchange wagering regulations which were submitted for public comment. In June 2012, the CHRB decided to delay the implementation of exchange wagering stating that the regulations governing exchange wagering needed further examination. On September 20, 2012, the CHRB granted initial approval for rules governing exchange wagering subject to a public comment period. The proposed exchange wagering regulations were approved on November 15, 2012. The regulations are expected to be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law during February 2013 for review and final approval. Should the CHRB regulations reach final approval allowing exchange wagering, this activity may have a negative impact on our current pari-mutuel operations, including our ADW business. Furthermore, California's approval of exchange wagering may set a precedent for other states to approve exchange wagering, creating additional risk of a negative impact on our pari-mutuel wagering business.

Internet Poker

In December 2012, Senate Bill 51 ("SB 51") was introduced in the California Senate. The legislation would allow qualified gaming companies to apply for a five-year gaming license to operate an intrastate Internet gaming website to registered players within California. The legislation limits online gaming to poker only. On February 22, 2013, Senate Bill 678 ("SB 678") was introduced which would also permit Internet poker within the state. The potential effects of SB 51 and SB 678 on our business, financial condition and results of operations cannot be determined at this time.

Sports Betting

In February 2012, Senate Bill 1390 was introduced in the California Legislature. The legislation would have allowed all entities currently licensed to conduct gambling activities to apply to their regulatory agency and request that sports betting be added to their list of authorized gambling options. Indian tribes with existing casinos as well as tribes that did not currently have gaming compacts with the state would have been allowed to offer sports betting on their reservations. The bill was not considered prior to the adjournment of the 2012 legislative session. On February 7, 2013, Senate Bill 190 was introduced which would allow the operator of a gaming establishment, racetrack or satellite wagering facility to conduct wagering on professional and collegiate sports or athletic events upon licensing by the California Gaming Control Commission or California Horse Racing Board. Under the terms of the proposed bill, each licensed entity would remit 7.5% of its gross revenues to the state. The bill also authorizes a federally recognized Indian tribe that is not a gaming establishment or a racetrack to conduct sports wagering consistent with the requirements of the federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988, under terms no more stringent than those applicable to any other operator in the state. The potential effects of Senate Bill 190 on our business, financial condition and results of operations cannot be determined at this time.

Delaware

Gaming Legislation

During June 2012, the Delaware Gaming Competitiveness Act of 2012 ("HB 333") was passed by the Delaware Legislation and signed into law by Governor Markell. HB 333 enables Delaware casinos to offer a full range of legal online gambling options including Internet blackjack, poker and slots which are accessible through each casino's website and controlled centrally by the state lottery. Under the terms of HB 333, Delaware's existing racetracks will be able to offer online games via their websites. The legislation expands locations for National Football League wagering and keno. Individuals must be present in Delaware to play online games. The potential impact of HB 333 on our business, financial condition and results of operations cannot be determined at this time.

New Jersey

Atlantic City Wagering

During February 2012, Assembly Bill 2578 ("AB 2578") was introduced into the New Jersey legislature. AB 2578 allows Atlantic City casinos to offer Internet wagering on all casino-style games to persons present in New Jersey. The New Jersey horseracing industry was excluded from the bill's language and ineligible to participate as Internet providers, subcontractors, or beneficiaries of the anticipated revenue. AB 2578 passed both legislative chambers during 2012. On February 26, 2013, Governor Christie signed AB 2578 into law. The potential impact of AB 2578 on

our business, financial condition and results of operation cannot be determined at this time.

Sports Betting

During 2011, New Jersey voters passed a non-binding referendum permitting sports betting in New Jersey. During 2012, legislation authorizing sports betting in Atlantic City casinos and at racetracks passed the House and Senate legislatures and was signed by Governor Christie. The National Football League, National Basketball Association, National Hockey League and National Collegiate Athletic Association have filed suit against the state to prohibit them from moving forward with the legislation, citing a federal ban against sports betting. On December 21, 2012, a federal judge denied New Jersey's request to have the lawsuit

Table of Contents

dismissed. The judge agreed that expanding legal sports betting into New Jersey would negatively impact the perception of sporting games. The New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement issued final sports betting regulations, but the Division noted that no license would be issued prior to January 2013. The potential impact of sports betting in New Jersey on our business, financial condition and results of operation cannot be determined at this time.

L. Environmental Matters

We are subject to various federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations that govern activities that may have adverse environmental effects, such as discharges to air and water, as well as the management and disposal of solid, animal and hazardous wastes and exposure to hazardous materials. These laws and regulations, which are complex and subject to change, include United States Environmental Protection Agency and state laws and regulations that address the impacts of manure and wastewater generated by Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (“CAFO”) on water quality, including, but not limited to, storm water discharges. CAFO regulations include permit requirements and water quality discharge standards. Enforcement of CAFO regulations has been receiving increased governmental attention. Compliance with these and other environmental laws can, in some circumstances, require significant capital expenditures. For example, we may incur future costs under existing and new laws and regulations pertaining to storm water and wastewater management at our racetracks. Moreover, violations can result in significant penalties and, in some instances, interruption or cessation of operations.

We also are subject to laws and regulations that create liability and cleanup responsibility for releases of hazardous substances into the environment. Under certain of these laws and regulations, a current or previous owner or operator of property may be liable for the costs of remediating hazardous substances or petroleum products on its property, without regard to whether the owner or operator knew of, or caused, the presence of the contaminants, and regardless of whether the practices that resulted in the contamination were legal at the time they occurred. The presence of, or failure to remediate properly, such substances may materially adversely affect the ability to sell or rent such property or to borrow funds using such property as collateral. Additionally, the owner of a property may be subject to claims by third parties based on damages and costs resulting from environmental contamination emanating from the property. Compliance with environmental laws has not materially affected our ability to develop and operate our properties, and we are not otherwise subject to any material compliance costs in connection with federal or state environmental laws.

M. Service Marks and Internet Properties

We hold numerous state and federal service mark registrations on specific names and designs in various categories including the entertainment business, apparel, paper goods, printed matter, housewares and glass. We license the use of these service marks and derive revenue from such license agreements.

N. Employees

As of December 31, 2012, we employed approximately 2,300 full-time employees Company-wide. Due to the seasonal nature of our live racing business, the number of seasonal and part-time persons employed will vary throughout the year. During 2012, average full-time and seasonal employment per pay period was approximately 4,100 individuals Company-wide.

O. Internet Access

Our Annual Reports on Form 10-K, Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, Current Reports on Form 8-K, proxy statements and other Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings, and any amendments to those reports and any other filings that we file with or furnish to the SEC under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 are made available free of charge on our website (www.churchilldownsincorporated.com) as soon as reasonably practicable after we electronically file the materials with the SEC and are also available at the SEC’s website at www.sec.gov.

Table of Contents

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

Risks Related to the Company

In addition to risks and uncertainties in the ordinary course of business that are common to all businesses, important factors that are specific to our industry and Company could materially impact our future performance and results. The factors described below are the most significant risks that could materially impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

General economic trends are unfavorable

The recent, economic downturn and adverse conditions in local, regional, national and global markets, including the current sovereign debt crises, have negatively impacted our operations and may continue to do so for an indeterminate period of time. Although economic conditions improved somewhat in 2012, there remains risk that the recovery will be short-lived, that the recovery may not include the industries or markets in which we operate, or the downturn may resume. Our access to, or cost of, credit may be impacted to the extent global and U.S. credit markets are affected by downward trends. Additionally, our ability to respond to periods of economic contraction may be limited, as certain of our costs remain fixed or even increase, when revenues decline. Accordingly, any persistence of poor economic conditions, or further deterioration, could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our business is sensitive to consumer confidence and reductions in consumers' discretionary spending, which may result from the recent economic conditions, unemployment levels and other changes we cannot accurately predict. Demand for entertainment and leisure activities is sensitive to consumers' disposable incomes, which have been adversely affected by recent economic conditions and the persistence of elevated levels of unemployment. Further declines in the residential real estate market, higher energy and transportation costs, changes in consumer confidence, increases in individual tax rates, and other factors that we cannot accurately predict may reduce the disposable income of our customers. This could result in fewer patrons visiting our racetracks, gaming and wagering facilities and online wagering sites, and may impact our customers' ability to wager with the same frequency and maintain their wagering level profiles. Decreases in consumer discretionary spending could affect us even if it occurs in other markets. For example, reduced wagering levels and profitability at racetracks from which we carry racing content could cause certain racetracks to cancel races or cease operations and therefore reduce the content we could provide to our customers. Accordingly, any significant loss of customers or decline in wagering could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We are vulnerable to additional or increased taxes and fees

We believe that the prospect of raising significant additional revenue through taxes and fees is one of the primary reasons that certain jurisdictions permit legalized gaming. As a result, gaming companies are typically subject to significant taxes and fees in addition to the normal federal, state, provincial and local income taxes, and such taxes and fees may be increased at any time. From time to time, legislators and officials have proposed changes in tax laws, or in the administration of such laws, affecting the gaming industry. Moreover, many states and municipalities, including ones in which we operate, are currently experiencing budgetary pressures that may make it more likely they would seek to impose additional taxes and fees on our operations. It is not possible to determine with certainty the likelihood of any such changes in tax laws or fee increases, or their administration; however, if enacted, such changes could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our credit facilities contain restrictions that limit our flexibility in operating our business

Our credit facilities contain, and any future indebtedness of ours would likely contain, a number of covenants that impose significant operating and financial restrictions on us, including restrictions on our and our subsidiaries' ability to, among other things:

- incur additional debt or issue certain preferred shares;
- pay dividends on or make distributions in respect of our capital stock, repurchase common shares or make other restricted payments;
- make certain investments;
- sell certain assets or consolidate, merge, sell or otherwise dispose of all or substantially all of our assets;

- create liens on certain assets;
- enter into certain transactions with our affiliates; and

21

Table of Contents

designate our subsidiaries as unrestricted subsidiaries.

As a result of these covenants, we are limited in the manner in which we conduct our business, and we may be unable to engage in favorable business activities or finance future operations or capital needs.

We have pledged and will pledge a significant portion of our assets as collateral under our credit facilities. If any of these lenders accelerate the repayment of borrowings, there can be no assurance that we will have sufficient assets to repay our indebtedness and our lenders could proceed against the collateral we have granted them.

Under our credit facilities, we are required to satisfy and maintain specified financial ratios. Our ability to meet those financial ratios can be affected by events beyond our control, and there can be no assurance that we will meet those ratios. A failure to comply with the covenants contained in our credit facilities or our other indebtedness could result in an event of default under the facilities or the existing agreements, which, if not cured or waived, could have a material adverse affect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. In the event of any default under our credit facilities or our other indebtedness, the lenders thereunder:

- will not be required to lend any additional amounts to us;
- could elect to declare all borrowings outstanding, together with accrued and unpaid interest and fees, to be due and payable and terminate all commitments to extend further credit; or
- require us to apply all of our available cash to repay these borrowings.

If the indebtedness under our credit facilities or our other indebtedness were to be accelerated, there can be no assurance that our assets would be sufficient to repay such indebtedness in full.

We may not be able to identify and complete acquisition, expansion or divestiture projects on time, on budget or as planned

We expect to pursue expansion, acquisition and divestiture opportunities, and we regularly evaluate opportunities for development, including acquisitions or other strategic corporate transactions which may expand our business operations.

We could face challenges in identifying development projects that fit our strategic objectives, identifying potential acquisition or divestiture candidates and/or development partners, finding buyers, negotiating projects on acceptable terms, and managing and integrating the acquisition or development projects. The integration of new operations and any other properties we may acquire or develop will require the dedication of management resources that may temporarily divert attention from our day-to-day business. The process of integrating new properties or projects may also interrupt the activities of those businesses, which could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. The divestiture of existing businesses may be affected by our ability to identify potential buyers. Furthermore, current or future regulation may postpone a divestiture pending certain resolutions to federal, state or local legislative issues. We cannot assure that any new properties or developments will be completed or integrated successfully.

Management of new properties or business operations, especially those in new lines of business or different geographic areas, may require that we increase our managerial resources. We cannot assure that we will be able to manage the combined operations effectively or realize any of the anticipated benefits of our acquisitions or developments.

We may experience difficulty in integrating recent or future acquisitions into our operations

We have completed acquisition transactions in the past and we may pursue acquisitions from time to time in the future. The successful integration of newly acquired businesses, including our recent acquisitions of Riverwalk and Bluff, into our operations has required and will continue to require the expenditure of substantial managerial, operating, financial and other resources and may also lead to a diversion of our attention from our ongoing business concerns. We may not be able to successfully integrate new businesses or realize projected revenue gains, cost savings and synergies in connection with those acquisitions on the timetable contemplated, if at all. Furthermore, the costs of integrating businesses we acquire could significantly impact our short-term operating results. These costs could include:

- restructuring charges associated with the acquisitions;
- non-recurring acquisition costs, including accounting and legal fees, investment banking fees and recognition of transaction-related costs or liabilities; and

costs of imposing financial and management controls (such as compliance with Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002) and operating, administrative and information systems.

Although we perform financial, operational and legal diligence on the businesses we purchase, in light of the circumstances of each transaction, an unavoidable level of risk remains regarding the actual condition of these businesses and our ability to continue to operate them successfully and integrate them into our existing operations. In any acquisition we make, we face risks

Table of Contents

which include:

- the risk that the acquired business may not further our business strategy or that we paid more than the business was worth;
- the potential adverse impact on our relationships with partner companies or third-party providers of technology or products;
- the possibility that we have acquired substantial undisclosed liabilities for which we may have no recourse against the sellers or third party insurers;
- costs and complications in maintaining required regulatory approvals or obtaining further regulatory approvals necessary to implement the acquisition in accordance with our strategy;
- the risks of acquiring businesses and/or entering markets in which we have limited or no prior experience;
- the potential loss of key employees or customers;
- the possibility that we may be unable to retain or recruit managers with the necessary skills to manage the acquired businesses; and
- changes to legal and regulatory guidelines, which may negatively affect acquisitions.

If we are unsuccessful in overcoming these risks, it could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may adversely infringe on the intellectual property rights of others

In the course of our business, we may become aware of potentially relevant patents or other intellectual property rights held by other parties. Many of our competitors as well as other companies and individuals have obtained, and may obtain in the future, patents or other intellectual property rights that concern products or services related to the types of products and services we currently offer or may plan to offer in the future. We evaluate the validity and applicability of these intellectual property rights and determine in each case whether we must negotiate licenses to incorporate or use the proprietary technologies in our products. Claims of intellectual property infringement may also require us to enter into costly royalty or license agreements. However, we may not be able to obtain royalty or license agreements on terms acceptable to us or at all. We also may be subject to significant damages or injunctions against the development and sale of our products and services if we become subject to litigation relating to intellectual property infringement.

Our results may be affected by the outcome of litigation within our industry and the protection and validity of our intellectual property rights. Any litigation regarding patents or other intellectual property could be costly and time consuming and could divert our management and key personnel from our business operations. The complexity of the technology involved and the uncertainty of litigation surrounding it has the effect of increasing the risks associated with certain of our product offerings, particularly in the area of advance deposit wagering, or ADW. There can be no assurance that we would not become a party to litigation surrounding our ADW business or that such litigation would not cause us to suffer losses or disruption in our business strategy.

We are susceptible to unauthorized disclosure of our source code

We may not be able to protect our computer source code from being copied if there is an unauthorized disclosure of source code. We take significant measures to protect the secrecy of large portions of our source code. If unauthorized disclosure of a significant portion of our source code occurs, we could potentially lose future trade secret protection for that source code. This could make it easier for third parties to compete with our products by copying functionality; which could adversely affect our revenue and operating margins. Unauthorized disclosure of source code also could increase security risks.

Table of Contents

We depend on key personnel

Our continued success and our ability to maintain our competitive position is largely dependent upon, among other things, the skills and efforts of our senior executives and management team including Robert L. Evans, our Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer. Although we have entered into employment agreements with certain of our senior executives and key personnel, we cannot guarantee that these individuals will remain with us, and their retention is affected by the competitiveness of our terms of employment and our ability to compete effectively against other gaming companies. In addition, certain of our key employees are required to file applications with the gaming authorities in each of the jurisdictions in which we operate and are required to be licensed or found suitable by these gaming authorities. If the gaming authorities were to find a key employee unsuitable for licensing, we may be required to sever the employee relationship. Furthermore, the gaming authorities may require us to terminate the employment of any person who refuses to file appropriate applications. Either result could significantly impair our operations. Our inability to retain key personnel could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Catastrophic events could cause a significant and continued disruption to our operations

A disruption or failure in our systems or operations in the event of a major earthquake, weather event, cyber-attack, terrorist attack or other catastrophic event could interrupt our operations, damage our properties and reduce the number of customers who visit our facilities in the affected areas. For example, Churchill Downs, Harlow's, Riverwalk, Fair Grounds and its related OTBs and Calder could all be adversely affected by flooding or hurricanes. While we maintain insurance coverage that may cover certain of the costs that we incur as a result of some natural disasters, our coverage is subject to deductibles, exclusions and limits on maximum benefits. There can be no assurance that we will be able to fully collect, if at all, on any claims resulting from extreme weather conditions or other disasters. If any of our properties are damaged or if their operations are disrupted or face prolonged closure as a result of natural disasters in the future, or if natural disasters adversely impact general economic or other conditions in the areas in which our properties are located or from which they draw their patrons, the disruption could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Although we have "all risk" property insurance coverage for our operating properties, which covers damage caused by a casualty loss (such as fire, natural disasters, acts of war, or terrorism), each policy has certain exclusions. Our level of property insurance coverage, which is subject to policy maximum limits, may not be adequate to cover all losses in the event of a major casualty. In addition, certain casualty events may not be covered at all under our policies. Therefore, certain acts could expose us to substantial uninsured losses.

We renew our insurance policies on an annual basis. The cost of coverage may become so high that we may need to further reduce our policy limits or agree to certain exclusions from our coverage.

Our debt instruments and other material agreements require us to meet certain standards related to insurance coverage. Failure to satisfy these requirements could result in an event of default under these debt instruments or material agreements.

Work stoppages and other labor problems could negatively impact our future plans

Some of our employees are represented by labor unions. A strike or other work stoppage at one of our properties could have an adverse effect on our business and results of operations. From time to time, we have also experienced attempts to unionize certain of our non-union employees. We cannot provide any assurance that we will not experience additional and more successful union activity in the future.

We process, store and use personal information and other data, which subjects us to governmental regulation and other legal obligations related to privacy, and our actual or perceived failure to comply with such obligations could harm our business

We receive, store and process personal information and other customer data. There are numerous federal, state and local laws regarding privacy and the storing, sharing, use, processing, disclosure and protection of personal information and other data. Any failure or perceived failure by us to comply with our privacy policies, our privacy-related obligations to customers or other third parties, or our privacy-related legal obligations, or any compromise of security that results in the unauthorized release or transfer of personally identifiable information or other player data, may result in governmental enforcement actions, litigation or public statements against us by

consumer advocacy groups or others and could cause our customers to lose trust in us, which could have an adverse effect on our business. While the Company maintains insurance coverage specific to cyber-insurance matters, any failure on our part to maintain adequate safeguards may subject us to significant liabilities. Additionally, if third parties we work with, such as vendors, violate applicable laws or our policies, such violations may also put our customers' information at risk and could in turn have an adverse effect on our business. The Company is also subject to payment card association rules and obligations under its contracts with payment card processors. Under these rules and obligations, if information is compromised, the Company could be liable to payment card issuers for the associated expense and penalties. In addition, if the Company fails to follow payment card industry security standards, even if no customer information is

Table of Contents

compromised, the Company could incur significant fines or experience a significant increase in payment card transaction costs.

In the area of information security and data protection, many states have passed laws requiring notification to customers when there is a security breach for personal data, such as the 2002 amendment to California's Information Practices Act, or requiring the adoption of minimum information security standards that are often vaguely defined and difficult to practically implement. The costs of compliance with these laws may increase in the future as a result of changes in interpretation. Furthermore, any failure on our part to comply with these laws may subject us to significant liabilities.

Improper disclosure of personal data could result in liability and harm to our reputation

We store and process increasingly large amounts of personally identifiable information of our customers, which may include names, addresses, phone numbers, social security numbers, email addresses, contact preferences and payment account information. For example, we store personal information from Twinspires.com account holders, from our gaming customers' rewards accounts and from ticket sales at our racetracks. It is possible our security controls over personal data, our training of employees and vendors on data security, and other practices we follow may not prevent the improper disclosure of personally identifiable information. Improper disclosure of this information could harm our reputation, lead to legal exposure to customers or subject us to liability under laws that protect personal data, resulting in increased costs or loss of revenue.

Our business is subject to online security risk, including security breaches

We store and transmit users' proprietary information, and security breaches could expose us to a risk of loss or misuse of this information, litigation and potential liability. Because the techniques used to obtain unauthorized access, disable or degrade service, or sabotage systems, change frequently and often are not recognized until launched against a target, we may be unable to anticipate these techniques or to implement adequate preventative measures. If an actual or perceived breach of our security occurs, public perception of the effectiveness of our security measures could be harmed and we could lose users and be exposed to litigation or potential liability for us. Although we have developed systems and processes that are designed to protect customer information and prevent data loss and other security breaches, including systems and processes designed to reduce the impact of a security breach at a third party vendor, such measures cannot provide absolute security.

Any violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act or applicable anti-money laundering regulations could have a negative impact on us

We are subject to regulations imposed by the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (the "FCPA"), which generally prohibits U.S. companies and their intermediaries from making improper payments to foreign officials for the purpose of obtaining or retaining business. Any violation of FCPA regulations could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We also deal with significant amounts of cash in our operations and are subject to various reporting and anti-money laundering regulations. Any violation of anti-money laundering laws or regulations by any of our properties could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

A lack of confidence in the integrity of our core businesses could affect our ability to retain our customers and engage with new customers

The integrity of the horseracing, gaming and pari-mutuel wagering industries must be perceived as fair to patrons and the public at large. To prevent cheating or erroneous payouts, the necessary oversight processes must be in place to ensure that such activities cannot be manipulated. A loss of confidence in the fairness of our industries could significantly lower attendance, amounts wagered and reduce revenues.

Risks Related to Our Racing Operations

Our racing operations are highly regulated, and changes in the regulatory environment could adversely affect our business

Our racing business is subject to extensive state and local regulation, and we depend on continued state approval of legalized gaming in states where we operate. Our wagering and racing facilities must meet the licensing requirements of various regulatory authorities, including authorities in Kentucky, Illinois, Louisiana and Florida. To date, we have obtained all governmental licenses, registrations, permits and approvals necessary for the operation of our racetracks.

However, we may be unable to maintain our existing licenses. The failure to attain, loss of or material change in our racing business licenses, registrations, permits or approvals may materially limit the number of races we conduct, and could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition to licensing requirements, state regulatory authorities can have a significant impact on the operation of our business. For example, in Florida, a thoroughbred racetrack conducting a live meet has control over hosting out-of-state racing signals

Table of Contents

and receives commissions on wagers placed at other racetracks throughout the state. When two thoroughbred racetracks operate live meets concurrently, both have the opportunity to be the “host track” for out-of-state signals, and other Florida racetracks must choose a single live racetrack to host their pari-mutuel wagering. Calder is the only live racetrack in Florida for the majority of its racing season and it could be adversely affected if another track conducted a meet with more overlapping dates. Likewise, in Illinois the IRB has the authority to designate racetracks as “host track” for the purpose of receiving host track revenues generated during periods when no racetrack is conducting live races. Racetracks that are designated as “host track” obtain and distribute out of state simulcast signals for the State of Illinois. Under Illinois law, the “host track” is entitled to a larger portion of commissions on the related pari-mutuel wagering. Should Arlington or Calder cease to be as “host tracks” during these periods, the loss of hosting revenue could have an adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. In addition, Arlington is statutorily entitled to recapture as revenues monies that are otherwise payable to Arlington’s purse account. These statutorily or regulatory established revenue sources are subject to change every legislative session, and their reduction or elimination could have an adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We are also subject to a variety of other rules and regulations, including zoning, environmental, construction and land-use laws and regulations governing the serving of alcoholic beverages. If we are not in compliance with these laws, it could have a material, adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Economic trends specific to the horse racing industry are unfavorable

Horseracing and related activities, as well as the gaming services we provide, are similar to other leisure activities in that they represent discretionary expenditures likely to decline during economic downturns. In some cases, even the perception of an impending economic downturn or the continuation of a recessionary climate can be enough to discourage consumers from spending on leisure activities. These economic trends can impact the financial viability of other industry constituents, making collection of amounts owed to us uncertain. For example, during the year ended December 31, 2010, we recognized \$1.1 million of bad debt expense, net of purses, resulting from the bankruptcy filing of New York City Off-Track Betting Corporation (“NYCOTB”). During 2009, NYCOTB filed for Chapter 9 bankruptcy and on January 25, 2011, its Chapter 9 bankruptcy case was dismissed by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, and NYCOTB ceased operations. We will continue to closely monitor participants’ operational viability within the industry and any related collection issues which could potentially have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

Our racing business faces significant competition, and we expect competition levels to increase

All of our racetracks face competition from a variety of sources, including spectator sports and other entertainment and gaming options. Competitive gaming activities include traditional and Native American casinos, video lottery terminals, state-sponsored lotteries and other forms of legalized and non-legalized gaming in the U.S. and other jurisdictions, and we expect the number of competitors to increase. See subheading “J. Competition” in Item 1. “Business” of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of racing industry competition.

All of our racetracks face competition in the simulcast market. Approximately 46,000 thoroughbred horse races are conducted annually in the United States. Of these races, we host approximately 4,000 races each year, or around nine percent of the total. As a content provider, we compete for wagering dollars in the simulcast market with other racetracks conducting races at or near the same times as our races. As a racetrack operator, we also compete with other racetracks running live meets at or near the same time as our horse races. In recent years, this competition has increased as more states have allowed additional, automated gaming activities, such as slot machines, at racetracks with mandatory purse contributions.

Calder Race Course faces direct competition from another thoroughbred racetrack in Miami, Florida. The two racetracks are located approximately 6.5 miles apart. Under Florida law, racetracks are permitted to race throughout the year, subject to an annual notification filed with the State of Florida on February 28th of each year. As a result, Calder and the other racetrack, respectively, may independently elect to host live races on the same days. Historically, hosting live races on the same day as the other track has had a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Competition from web-based businesses presents additional challenges for our racing business. Unlike most online and web-based gaming companies, our racetracks require significant and ongoing capital expenditures for both their

continued operations and expansion. Our racing business also faces significantly greater costs in operating our racing business compared to costs borne by these gaming companies. Our racing business cannot offer the same number of gaming options as online and Internet-based gaming companies. Many online and web-based gaming companies are based off-shore and avoid regulation under U.S. state and federal laws. These companies may divert wagering dollars from pari-mutuel wagering venues, such as our racetracks. Our inability to compete successfully with these competitors could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

The popularity of horse racing is declining

There has been a general decline in the number of people attending and wagering on live horse races at North American racetracks due to a number of factors, including increased competition from other wagering and entertainment alternatives as discussed above. According to Equibase, pari-mutuel handle in the U.S. declined 7.3% between 2010 and 2009, declined 5.7% between 2011 and 2010 and remained fairly flat during 2012, increasing 1.0% compared to the same period in 2011. We believe lower interest in racing may have a negative impact on revenues and profitability in our racing business, as well as our ADW business, which is dependent on racing content provided by our racing business and other track operators. Our business plan anticipates that we will attract new customers to our racetracks, OTBs and ADW operations. A continued decrease in attendance at live events and in on-track wagering, or a continued generalized decline in interest in racing, could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our racing business is geographically concentrated and experiences significant seasonal fluctuations in operating results

We conduct our racing business at four racetracks: Churchill Downs, Calder, Fair Grounds and Arlington. A significant portion of our racing revenues are generated by two events, the Kentucky Derby and the Kentucky Oaks. If a business interruption were to occur and continue for a significant length of time at any of our four racetracks, particularly one occurring at Churchill Downs at a time that would affect the Kentucky Derby or Kentucky Oaks, it could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition, we experience significant fluctuations in quarterly and annual operating results due to seasonality and other factors. We have a limited number of live racing days at our racetracks, and the number of live racing days varies from year to year. The number of live racing days we are able to offer directly affects our results of operations.

A significant decrease in the number of live racing days and/or live races, including the Kentucky Derby and Kentucky Oaks, could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may not be able to attract a sufficient number of horses and trainers to achieve full field horseraces

We believe that patrons prefer to wager on races with a large number of horses, commonly referred to as full fields. A failure to offer races with full fields results in less wagering on our horseraces. Our ability to attract full fields depends on several factors. It depends on our ability to offer and fund competitive purses and it also depends on the overall horse population available for racing. Various factors have led to declines in the horse population in certain areas of the country, including competition from racetracks in other areas, increased costs and changing economic returns for owners and breeders, and the spread of various debilitating and contagious equine diseases such as the neurologic form of Equine Herpes Virus-1 and Strangles. If any of our racetracks is faced with a sustained outbreak of a contagious equine disease, it would have a material impact on our profitability. Finally, if we are unable to attract horse owners to stable and race their horses at our racetracks by offering a competitive environment, including improved facilities, well-maintained racetracks, better conditions for backstretch personnel involved in the care and training of horses stabled at our racetracks and a competitive purse structure, our profitability could also decrease.

We also face increased competition for horses and trainers from racetracks that are licensed to operate slot machines and other electronic gaming machines that provide these racetracks an advantage in generating new additional revenues for race purses and capital improvements. For example, Churchill Downs and Arlington are experiencing heightened competition from racinos in Indiana, Pennsylvania, Delaware and West Virginia whose purses are supplemented by gaming revenues. The opening of the Genting New York Resort at Aqueduct racetrack has enhanced the purse structure at New York racetracks as compared to historical levels. Ohio has authorized four land-based casinos by voter referendum and video lottery terminals at seven Ohio racetracks through executive order. Our failure to attract full fields could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Inclement weather and other conditions may affect our ability to conduct live racing

Since horseracing is conducted outdoors, unfavorable weather conditions, including extremely high and low temperatures, high winds, storms, tornadoes and hurricanes, could cause events to be canceled and/or attendance to be lower, resulting in reduced wagering. Our operations are subject to reduced patronage, disruptions or complete cessation of operations due to weather conditions, natural disasters and other casualties. If a business interruption were

to occur due to inclement weather and continue for a significant length of time at any of our racetracks, it could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We depend on agreements with industry constituents including horsemen and other racetracks

The IHA, as well as various state racing laws, require that we have written agreements with the horsemen at our racetracks in order to simulcast races, and, in some cases, conduct live racing. Certain industry groups negotiate these agreements on behalf of the horsemen (the "Horsemen's Groups"). These agreements provide that we must receive the consent of the Horsemen's

Table of Contents

Groups at the racetrack conducting live races before we may allow third parties to accept wagers on those races. In addition, the agreements between other racetracks and their Horsemen's Groups typically provide that those racetracks must receive consent from the Horsemen's Groups before we can accept wagers on their races. For example, from time to time, the Thoroughbred Owners of California, the Horsemen's Group representing horsemen in California, the Florida Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association, Inc. (the "FHBPA") which represents horsemen in Florida and the Kentucky Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association ("KHBPA") have withheld their consent to send or receive racing signals among racetracks. Further, the IHA and various state laws require that we have written agreements with Horsemen's Groups at our racetracks in order to simulcast races on an export basis. In addition, our simulcasting agreements are generally subject to the consent of these Horsemen's Groups. Failure to receive the consent of these Horsemen's Groups for new and renewing simulcast agreements could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We also have written agreements with the Horsemen's Groups with regards to the proceeds of gaming machines in Louisiana and Florida. Florida law requires Calder to have an agreement with the FHBPA governing the contribution of a portion of revenues from slot machine gaming to purses on live thoroughbred races conducted at Calder and an agreement with the Florida Thoroughbred Breeders and Owners Association (the "FTBOA") governing the contribution of a portion of revenues from slot machines gaming to breeders', stallion, and special racing awards on live thoroughbred races conducted at Calder before Calder can receive a license to conduct slot machine gaming. It is not certain that we will be able to maintain agreements with, or to obtain required consent from, Horsemen's Groups. We currently negotiate formal agreements with the applicable Horsemen's Groups at Fair Grounds, Arlington and Calder on an annual basis. The failure to maintain agreements with, or obtain consents from, our horsemen on satisfactory terms or the refusal by a Horsemen's Group to consent to third parties accepting wagers on our races or our accepting wagers on third parties' races could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition, we have agreements with other racetracks for the distribution of racing content through both the import of other racetracks' signals for wagering at our properties and the export of our racing signal for wagering at other racetracks' facilities. From time to time, we are unable to reach agreements on terms acceptable to us. As a result, we may be unable to distribute our racing content to other locations or to receive other racetracks' racing content for wagering at our racetracks. The inability to distribute our racing content could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Horse racing is an inherently dangerous sport and our racetracks are subject to personal injury litigation

Although we carry jockey accident insurance at each of our racetracks to cover personal jockey injuries which may occur during races or daily workouts, there are certain exclusions to our insurance coverage, and we are still subject to litigation from injured participants. We renew our insurance policies on an annual basis. The cost of coverage may become so high that we may need to further reduce our policy limits or agree to certain exclusions from our coverage. Our results may be affected by the outcome of litigation, as this litigation could be costly and time consuming and could divert our management and key personnel from our business operations.

Ownership and development of real estate requires significant expenditures and is subject to risk

Our racing operations require us to own extensive real estate holdings. All real estate investments are subject to risks including: general economic conditions, such as the availability and cost of financing; local and national real estate conditions, such as an oversupply of residential, office, retail or warehousing space, or a reduction in demand for real estate in the area; governmental regulation, including taxation of property and environmental legislation; and the attractiveness of properties to potential purchasers or tenants. The real estate industry is also capital intensive and sensitive to interest rates. Further, significant expenditures, including property taxes, mortgage payments, maintenance costs, insurance costs and related charges, must be made throughout the period of ownership of real property, which expenditures negatively impact our operating results.

In addition, we are subject to a variety of federal, state and local governmental laws and regulations relating to the use, storage, discharge, emission and disposal of hazardous materials. Environmental laws and regulations could hold us responsible for the cost of cleaning up hazardous materials contaminating real property that we own or operate (or previously owned or operated) or properties at which we have disposed of hazardous materials, even if we did not

cause the contamination. If we fail to comply with environmental laws or if contamination is discovered, a court or government agency could impose severe penalties or restrictions on our operations or assess us with the costs of taking remedial actions.

Our business depends on utilizing and providing totalizator services

Our customers utilize information provided by United Tote and other totalizator companies that accumulates wagers, records sales, calculates payoffs and displays wagering data in a secure manner to patrons who wager on our horseraces. The failure to keep technology current could limit our ability to serve patrons effectively or develop new forms of wagering and/or affect the security of the wagering process, thus affecting patron confidence in our product. A perceived lack of integrity in the wagering

Table of Contents

systems could result in a decline in bettor confidence and could lead to a decline in the amount wagered on horseracing. In addition, a totalizator system failure could cause a considerable loss of revenue if betting machines are unavailable for a significant period of time or during an event with high betting volume.

United Tote also has contracts to provide totalizator services to a significant number of racetracks, OTBs and other pari-mutuel wagering businesses. Its totalizator systems provide wagering data to the industry in a secure manner. Errors by United Tote technology or personnel may subject us to liabilities, including financial penalties under our totalizator service contracts, which could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Risks Related to Our Gaming Business

Our gaming business is highly regulated and changes in the regulatory environment could adversely affect our business

Our gaming operations exist at the discretion of the states where we conduct business, and are subject to extensive state and local regulation. Like all gaming operators in the jurisdictions in which we operate, we must periodically apply to renew our gaming licenses or registrations and have the suitability of certain of our directors, officers and employees approved. While we have obtained all governmental licenses, registrations, permits and approvals necessary for the operation of our gaming facilities, we cannot assure you that we will be able to obtain such renewals or approvals, or that we will be able to obtain future approvals that would allow us to continue to operate or to expand our gaming operations.

Regulatory authorities also have input into important aspects of our operations, including hours of operation, location or relocation of a facility, numbers and types of machines and loss limits. Regulators may also levy substantial fines against or seize our assets or the assets of our subsidiaries or the people involved in violating gaming laws or regulations. Any of these events could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. The high degree of regulation in the gaming industry is a significant obstacle to our growth strategy.

Our gaming business faces significant competition, and we expect competition levels to increase

Our gaming operations operate in a highly competitive industry with a large number of participants, some of which have financial and other resources that are greater than our resources. The gaming industry faces competition from a variety of sources for discretionary consumer spending including spectator sports and other entertainment and gaming options. Our gaming operations also face competition from Native American casinos, video lottery terminals, state-sponsored lotteries and other forms of legalized gaming in the U.S. and other jurisdictions. We do not enjoy the same access to the gaming public or possess the advertising resources that are available to state-sponsored lotteries or other competitors, which may adversely affect our ability to compete effectively with them. Additionally, web-based interactive gaming and wagering is growing rapidly and affecting competition in our industry as federal regulations on web-based activities are clarified. We anticipate that competition will continue to grow in the web-based interactive gaming and wagering channels because of ease of entry. In addition, Florida legislators continue to debate the expansion of Florida gaming to include Las Vegas-style destination resort casinos. Such casinos may be subject to taxation rates lower than the current gaming taxation structure. Should such legislation be enacted, it could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. See subheading “J. Competition” in Item 1. “Business” of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of gaming industry competition.

Our gaming business is geographically concentrated

We conduct our gaming business at four principal locations: Riverwalk in Vicksburg, Mississippi, Harlow’s in Greenville, Mississippi, Calder Casino in Miami Gardens, Florida, and Fair Grounds Slots in New Orleans, Louisiana. We also operate video poker machines throughout Louisiana through our subsidiary, VSI. If a business interruption were to occur and continue for a significant length of time at any of our principal gaming operations, or if economic or regulatory conditions were to become unfavorable in one or more of the regions in which they operate, it could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The development of new gaming venues and the expansion of existing facilities is costly and susceptible to delays, cost overruns and other uncertainties

The Company may decide to develop, construct and open hotels, casinos or other gaming venues in response to opportunities that may arise. Future development projects and acquisitions may require significant capital

commitments, the incurrence of additional debt, the incurrence of contingent liabilities and an increase in amortization expense related to intangible assets, which could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

The concentration and evolution of the slot machine manufacturing industry or other technological conditions could impose additional costs on us

The majority of our gaming revenues are attributable to slot and video poker machines operated by us at our casinos and wagering facilities. It is important for competitive reasons that we offer the most popular and up-to-date machine games with the latest technology to our guests. In recent years, the prices of new machines have escalated faster than the rate of inflation. In recent years, for example, slot machine manufacturers have frequently refused to sell slot machines featuring the most popular games, instead requiring participating lease arrangements in order to acquire the machines. Participation slot machine leasing arrangements typically require the payment of a fixed daily rental. Such agreements may also include a percentage payment of coin-in or net win. Generally, a participating lease is substantially more expensive over the long term than the cost to purchase a new machine. For competitive reasons, we may be forced to purchase new slot machines or enter into participating lease arrangements that are more expensive than the costs associated with the continued operation of our existing slot machines.

We materially rely on a variety of hardware and software products to maximize revenue and efficiency in our operations. Technology in the gaming industry is developing rapidly, and we may need to invest substantial amounts to acquire the most current gaming and hotel technology and equipment in order to remain competitive in the markets in which we operate. We rely on a limited number of vendors to provide video poker and slot machines and any loss of our equipment suppliers could impact our operations. Ensuring the successful implementation and maintenance of any new technology acquired is an additional risk.

Risks Related to Our Online Business

Our ADW business is highly regulated and changes in the regulatory environment could adversely affect our business. TwinSpires, our ADW business, accepts advance deposit wagers from customers of certain states who set up and fund an account from which they may place wagers via telephone, mobile device or through the Internet at TwinSpires.com. The ADW business is heavily regulated, and laws governing advance deposit wagering vary from state to state. Some states have expressly authorized advance deposit wagering by their own residents, some states have expressly prohibited pari-mutuel wagering and/or advance deposit wagering and other states have expressly authorized pari-mutuel wagering but have neither expressly authorized nor expressly prohibited their residents from placing wagers through advance deposit wagering hubs located in different states. We believe that an ADW business may open accounts on behalf of and accept wagering instructions from residents of states where pari-mutuel wagering is legal and where providing wagering instructions to ADW businesses in other states is not expressly prohibited by statute, regulations, or other governmental restrictions. However, state attorneys general, regulators, and other law enforcement officials may interpret state gaming laws, federal statutes, constitutional principles, and doctrines, and the related regulations in a different manner than we do. In the past, certain state attorneys general and other law enforcement officials have expressed concern over the legality of interstate advance deposit wagering.

Our expansion opportunities with respect to advance deposit wagering may be limited unless more states amend their laws or regulations to permit advance deposit wagering. Conversely, if states take affirmative action to make advance deposit wagering expressly unlawful, this could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. For example, previously existing ADW regulation in Illinois expired on December 31, 2012, and we ceased accepting wagers from Illinois residents in January 2013. In addition, the regulatory and legislative processes can be lengthy, costly and uncertain. We may not be successful in lobbying state legislatures or regulatory bodies to obtain or renew required legislation, licenses, registrations, permits and approvals necessary to facilitate the operation or expansion of our ADW business. From time to time, the United States Congress has considered legislation that would either inhibit or restrict Internet gambling in general or inhibit or restrict the use of certain financial instruments, including credit cards, to provide funds for advance deposit wagering.

Furthermore, many states have considered and are considering interactive and Internet gaming legislation and regulations, which may inhibit our ability to do business in such states. Anti-gaming conclusions and recommendations of other governmental or quasi-governmental bodies could form the basis for new laws, regulations, and enforcement policies that could have a material, adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. The extensive regulation by both state and federal authorities of gaming activities also can be significantly affected by changes in the political climate and changes in economic and regulatory policies. Such effects could have

a material, adverse impact to the success of our advance deposit wagering operations.

Our ADW business is subject to a variety of U.S. and foreign laws, many of which are unsettled and still developing and which could subject us to claims or otherwise harm our business

We are subject to a variety of laws in the United States and abroad, including laws regarding gaming, consumer protection and intellectual property that are continuously evolving and developing. The scope and interpretation of the laws that are or may be applicable to us are often uncertain and may be conflicting. For example, laws relating to the liability of providers of online services for activities of their users and other third parties are currently being tested by a number of claims, including actions

Table of Contents

based on invasion of privacy and other torts, unfair competition, copyright and trademark infringement, and other theories. It is also likely that as our business grows and evolves we will become subject to laws and regulations in additional jurisdictions.

If we are not able to comply with these laws or regulations or if we become liable under these laws or regulations, we could be directly harmed, and we may be forced to implement new measures to reduce our exposure to this liability. This may require us to expend substantial resources or to modify our online services, which could harm our business, financial condition and results of operations. In addition, the increased attention focused upon liability issues as a result of lawsuits and legislative proposals could harm our reputation or otherwise impact the growth of our business. It is possible that a number of laws and regulations may be adopted or construed to apply to us in the United States and elsewhere that could restrict the online and mobile industries, including player privacy, advertising, taxation, content suitability, copyright, distribution and antitrust. Furthermore, the growth and development of electronic commerce and virtual goods may prompt calls for more stringent consumer protection laws that may impose additional burdens on companies such as ours conducting business through the Internet and mobile devices. We anticipate that scrutiny and regulation of our industry will increase and we will be required to devote legal and other resources to addressing such regulation. If that were to occur, we may be required to seek licenses, authorizations or approvals from relevant regulators, the granting of which may be dependent on us meeting certain capital and other requirements and we may be subject to additional regulation and oversight, all of which could significantly increase our operating costs. Changes in current laws or regulations or the imposition of new laws and regulations in the United States or elsewhere regarding these activities may lessen the growth of online gaming and impair our business. Our ADW business faces strong competition, and we expect competition levels to increase

Our ADW business is sensitive to changes and improvements to technology and new products and faces strong competition from other web-based interactive gaming and wagering businesses. Our ability to develop, implement and react to new technology and products for our ADW business is a key factor in our ability to compete with other ADW businesses. In addition, we face competition from a new wagering product called exchange wagering, a variation of pari-mutuel wagering in which bettors wager directly against one another, establishing their own odds on a horserace. Both California and New Jersey legislatures have approved exchange wagering. Some of our competitors may have greater resources than we do. In addition, we believe that new competitors may enter the ADW business with relative ease because of the low cost of entry. As a result, we anticipate increased competition in our ADW business. It is difficult to predict the impact of increased competition on our ADW business. See subheading “J. Competition” in Item 1. “Business” of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of ADW industry competition.

A recent clarification on the impact of the Federal Wire Act of 1961 on Internet gaming could increase competition. During 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice clarified its position on the Wire Act of 1961 (the “Wire Act”), which had historically been interpreted to outlaw all forms of gambling across states lines. The department’s Office of Legal Counsel determined that the Wire Act applied only to a sporting event or contest, but did not apply to other forms of Internet gambling, including online betting unrelated to sporting events. The Justice Department indicated that many forms of online gambling could become legal under federal law, which could include legalized poker and generalized gaming including state lottery wagering. As a result, we anticipate increased competition to our ADW business from various other forms of online gaming. It is difficult to predict the level of increased competition and the impact of increased competition on our ADW business.

Our inability to retain our core customer base or our failure to attract new customers could harm our business. We utilize technology and marketing relationships to retain current customers and attract new customers. If we are unable to retain our core customer base through robust content offerings and other popular features, if we lose customers to our competitors, or if we fail to attract new customers, our businesses would fail to grow or would be adversely affected.

System failures or damage from earthquakes, fires, floods, power loss, telecommunications failures, cyber-attack or other unforeseen events could harm our business

Our ADW business depends upon our communications hardware and our computer hardware. We have built certain redundancies into our systems to avoid downtime in the event of outages, system failures or damage; however, certain risks still exist. Thus, our systems remain vulnerable to damage or interruption from floods, fires, power loss,

telecommunication failures, terrorist cyber-attacks, hardware or software error, computer viruses, computer denial-of-service attacks and similar events. Despite any precautions we may take, the occurrence of a natural disaster or other unanticipated problems could result in lengthy interruptions in our services. Any unscheduled interruption in the availability of our website and our services results in an immediate, and possibly substantial, loss of revenue. Interruptions in our services or a breach of customers' secure data could cause current or potential users to believe that our systems are unreliable, leading them to switch to our competitors or to avoid our site, and could permanently harm our reputation and brand. These interruptions also increase the burden on our engineering staff, which,

Table of Contents

in turn, could delay our introduction of new features and services on our website. We have property and business interruption insurance covering damage or interruption of our systems. However, this insurance might not be sufficient to compensate us for all losses that may occur.

Security breaches, computer viruses and computer hacking attacks could harm our business and results of operations. Security breaches, computer malware and computer hacking attacks have become more prevalent in our industry. Many companies, including ours, have been the target of such attacks. Any security breach caused by hacking, which involves efforts to gain unauthorized access to information or systems, or to cause intentional malfunctions or loss or corruption of data, software, hardware or other computer equipment, and the inadvertent transmission of computer viruses could harm our business, financial condition and results of operations. Though it is difficult to determine what harm may directly result from any specific interruption or breach, any failure to maintain performance, reliability, security and availability of our network infrastructure to the satisfaction of our players may harm our reputation and our ability to retain existing players and attract new players.

We carry insurance covering many of these risks, including network security, first party extortion threats and business interruptions, but there are certain exclusions to this coverage and the insurance limits may not be sufficient to fully mitigate all financial damage to the Company. We renew our insurance policies on an annual basis. The cost of coverage may become so high that we may need to further reduce our policy limits or agree to certain exclusions from our coverage.

We may not be able to respond to rapid technological changes in a timely manner, which may cause customer dissatisfaction

The gaming sector is characterized by the rapid development of new technologies and continuous introduction of new products. Our main technological advantage versus potential competitors is our software lead-time in the market and our experience in operating an Internet-based wagering network. However, we may not be able to maintain our competitive technological position against current and potential competitors, especially those with greater financial resources. Our success depends upon new product development and technological advancements, including the development of new wagering platforms and features. While we expend a significant amount of resources on research and development and product enhancement, we may not be able to continue to improve and market our existing products or technologies or develop and market new products in a timely manner. Further technological developments may cause our products or technologies to become obsolete or noncompetitive.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

On October 19, 2011, the Company entered into a ten-year lease agreement for approximately 33,000 square feet of office space in Louisville, Kentucky. The space serves as the Company's new corporate headquarters, which was occupied during the second quarter of 2012.

Additional information concerning property owned by us required by this Item is incorporated by reference to the information contained in the subheadings "C. Live Racing," "D. Simulcast Operations" and "F. Gaming Operations" in Item 1. "Business" of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Our real and personal property (but not including the property of UT Canada, Bluff, MVG, HRTV, KOTB, NASRIN or Kentucky Downs) is encumbered by liens securing our \$375 million revolving line of credit facility. The shares of stock of and ownership interests in certain of our subsidiaries are also pledged to secure this debt facility.

The Kentucky Derby Museum is located on property that is adjacent to, but not owned by, Churchill Downs. The Museum is owned and operated by the Kentucky Derby Museum Corporation, a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Company records an accrual for legal contingencies to the extent that it concludes that it is probable that a liability has been incurred and the amount of the loss can be reasonably estimated. Except as disclosed below, no estimate of the possible loss or range of loss in excess of amounts accrued, if any, can be made at this time regarding the matters specifically described below. We do not believe that the final outcome of these matters will have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

In October of 2012, the Company filed a verified complaint for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief and for declaratory judgment (the "Complaint") against the Illinois Department of Revenue (the "Department"). The Company's complaint was

32

Table of Contents

filed in response to Notices of Deficiency issued by the Department on March 18, 2010 and September 6, 2012. In response to said Notices of Deficiency, the Company, on October 4, 2012, issued a payment in protest in the amount of \$2.9 million (the "Protest Payment") under the State Officers and Employees Money Disposition Act and recorded this amount as an other asset at December 31, 2012. The Company subsequently filed its complaint in November alleging that the Department erroneously included handle, instead of the Company's commissions from handle, in the computation of the Company's sales factor (a computation of the Company's gross receipts from wagering within the State of Illinois) for determining the applicable tax owed. On October 30, 2012, the Company's Motion for Preliminary Injunctive Relief was granted, which prevents the Department from depositing any monies from the Protest Payment into the State of Illinois General Fund and from taking any further action against the Company until the Circuit Court takes final action on the Company's Complaint. If successful with its Complaint, the Company will be entitled to a full or partial refund of the Protest Payment from the Department. This matter remains pending before the Tax and Miscellaneous Remedies Section of the Circuit Court of Cook County.

KENTUCKY DOWNS

On September 5, 2012, Kentucky Downs Management, Inc. ("KDMI") filed a petition for declaration of rights in Kentucky Circuit Court located in Simpson County, Kentucky styled Kentucky Downs Management Inc. v. Churchill Downs Incorporated (Civil Action No. 12-CI-330) (the "Simpson County Case") requesting a declaration that the Company does not have the right to exercise its put right and require Kentucky Downs, LLC ("Kentucky Downs") and/or Kentucky Downs Partners, LLC ("KDP") to purchase the Company's ownership interest in Kentucky Downs. On September 18, 2012, the Company filed a complaint in Kentucky Circuit Court located in Jefferson County, Kentucky, styled Churchill Downs Incorporated v. Kentucky Downs, LLC; Kentucky Downs Partners, LLC; and Kentucky Downs Management Inc. (Civil Action No. 12-CI-04989) (the "Jefferson County Case") claiming that Kentucky Downs and KDP had breached the operating agreement for Kentucky Downs and requesting a declaration that the Company had validly exercised its put right and a judgment compelling Kentucky Downs and/or KDP to purchase the Company's ownership interest in Kentucky Downs pursuant to the terms of the applicable operating agreement. On October 9, 2012, the Company filed a motion to dismiss the Simpson County Case and Kentucky Downs, KDP and KDMI filed a motion to dismiss the Jefferson County Case. A hearing for the motion to dismiss in the Simpson County Case occurred November 30, 2012. At that hearing the Company's motion to dismiss the Simpson County Case was denied. Subsequently, Kentucky Downs, KDMI and KDP's motion to dismiss the Jefferson County Case was granted on January 23, 2013, due to the Simpson County Circuit Court's assertion of jurisdiction over the dispute. The case will now move forward in the Simpson County Circuit Court.

TEXAS PARI-MUTUEL WAGERING

On September 21, 2012, the Company filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas styled Churchill Downs Incorporated; Churchill Downs Technology Initiatives Company d/b/a TwinSpires.com v. Chuck Trout, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Texas Racing Commission; Gary P. Aber, Susan Combs, Ronald F. Ederer, Gloria Hicks, Michael F. Martin, Allan Polunsky, Robert Schmidt, John T. Steen III, Vicki Smith Weinberg, in their official capacity as members of the Texas Racing Commission (Case No.

1:12-cv-00880-LY) challenging the constitutionality of a Texas law requiring residents of Texas that desire to wager on horseraces to wager in person at a Texas race track. In addition to its complaint, on September 21, 2012, the Company filed a motion for preliminary injunction seeking to enjoin the state from taking any action to enforce the law in question. In response, on October 9, 2012, counsel for the state assured both the Company and the court that the state would not enforce the law in question against the Company without prior notice, at which time the court could then consider the motion for preliminary injunction.

HORSERACING EQUITY TRUST FUND

During 2006, the Illinois General Assembly enacted Public Act 94-804, which created the Horse Racing Equity Trust Fund ("HRE Trust Fund"). During November 2008, the Illinois General Assembly passed Public Act 95-1008 to extend Public Act 94-804 for a period of three years beginning December 12, 2008. The HRE Trust Fund was funded by a 3% "surcharge" on revenues of Illinois riverboat casinos that met a certain revenue threshold. The riverboats paid all monies required under Public Acts 94-804 and 95-1008 into a special protest fund account which prevented the monies from being transferred to the HRE Trust Fund. The funds were moved to the HRE Trust Fund and distributed

to the racetracks, including Arlington, in December 2009.

On June 12, 2009, the riverboat casinos filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, against former Governor Rod Blagojevich, Friends of Blagojevich and others, including Arlington (Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Blagojevich, 2009 CV 03585). While the riverboat casinos alleged violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”) against certain of the defendants, Arlington was not named in the RICO count, but rather was named solely in a count requesting that the monies paid by the riverboat casinos pursuant to Public Acts 94-804 and 95-1008 be held in a constructive trust for the riverboat casinos’ benefit and ultimately returned to the casinos. Following several

Table of Contents

lower court motions, on March 2, 2011, a three member panel of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the trial court's dismissal. We requested the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals to rehear the matter en banc and, on April 11, 2011, the Appellate Court issued an order to rehear the matter en banc. That hearing was held on May 10, 2011. On July 8, 2011, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued a thirty-day stay of dissolution of the temporary restraining order ("TRO") to allow the Casinos to request a further stay of dissolution of the TRO pending their petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. On August 5, 2011, the United States Supreme Court denied an application by the casinos to further stay the dissolution of the TRO. On August 9, 2011, the stay of dissolution expired and the TRO dissolved, which terminated the restrictions on the Company's ability to access funds from the HRE Trust Fund held in the escrow account. Public Act 94-804 expired in May 2008 and Public Act 95-1008 expired on July 18, 2011, the date the tenth Illinois riverboat license became operational.

Arlington filed an administrative appeal in the Circuit Court of Cook County on August 18, 2009 (Arlington Park Racecourse LLC v. Illinois Racing Board, 09 CH 28774) challenging the IRB's allocation of funds out of the HRE Trust Fund based upon handle generated by certain ineligible licensees, as contrary to the language of the statute. The Circuit Court affirmed the IRB's decision on November 10, 2010, and Arlington appealed this ruling to the Illinois First District Court of Appeals. On April 23, 2012 the Court of Appeals ultimately affirmed the IRB's decision and Arlington filed a petition for leave to appeal to the Illinois Supreme Court on May 25, 2012. On October 1, 2012, the Illinois Supreme Court denied Arlington's petition for leave to appeal. Hawthorne Racecourse filed a separate administrative appeal on June 11, 2010 (Hawthorne Racecourse, Inc. v. Illinois Racing Board et. al., Case No. 10 CH 24439) challenging the IRB's decision not to credit Hawthorne with handle previously generated by an ineligible licensee for the purpose of calculating the allocation of the HRE Trust Fund monies and the IRB's unwillingness to hold another meeting in 2010 to reconstrue the statutory language in Public Act 95-1008 with respect to distributions. On May 25, 2011, the Circuit Court rejected Hawthorne's arguments and affirmed the IRB's decisions, and Hawthorne appealed the Circuit Court's decision. Arlington filed its response brief on May 30, 2012, and the IRB filed its response brief on June 30, 2012. Hawthorne filed its reply brief on July 27, 2012. Oral arguments on Hawthorne's appeal before the Illinois First District Court of Appeals were heard on November 1, 2012 and during November 2012, the First District Court of Appeals ruled against Hawthorne.

We received \$45.4 million from the HRE Trust Fund, of which \$26.1 million was designated for Arlington purses. We used the remaining \$19.3 million of the proceeds to improve, market, and maintain or otherwise operate the Arlington racing facility in order to conduct live racing.

BALMORAL, MAYWOOD AND ILLINOIS HARNESS HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

On February 14, 2011, Balmoral Racing Club, Inc., Maywood Park Trotting Association, Inc. and the Illinois Harness Horsemen's Association, Inc. filed a lawsuit styled Balmoral Racing Club, Inc., Maywood Park Trotting Association, Inc. and the Illinois Harness Horsemen's Association Inc. vs. Churchill Downs Incorporated, Churchill Downs Technology Initiatives Company d/b/a TwinSpires.com and Youbet.com, LLC (Case No. 11-CV-D1028) in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. The plaintiffs allege that Youbet.com breached a co-branding agreement dated December 2007, as amended on December 21, 2007, and September 26, 2008 (the "Agreement"), which was entered into between certain Illinois racetracks and a predecessor of Youbet.com. The plaintiffs allege that the defendants breached the agreement by virtue of an unauthorized assignment of the Agreement to TwinSpires.com and further allege that Youbet.com and TwinSpires have misappropriated trade secrets in violation of the Illinois Trade Secrets Act. Finally, the plaintiffs allege that the Company and TwinSpires.com tortiously interfered with the Agreement by causing Youbet.com to breach the Agreement. The plaintiffs have alleged damages of at least \$3.6 million, or alternatively, of at least \$0.8 million. On April 1, 2011, the plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction, seeking an order compelling the defendants to turn over all Illinois customer accounts and prohibiting TwinSpires.com from using that list of Illinois customer accounts. On April 18, 2011, the defendants filed an answer and a motion to dismiss certain counts of the plaintiffs' complaint, and Youbet.com asserted a counterclaim seeking certain declaratory relief relating to allegations that plaintiffs Maywood and Balmoral breached the Agreement in 2010, leading to its proper termination by Youbet.com on December 1, 2010. The preliminary injunction hearing took place on July 6, 2011, and, on July 21, 2011, the court denied the preliminary injunction. On March 9, 2012, the parties mediated the case without resolution. The parties filed motions

of summary judgment in November and December 2012, respectively, and replies were filed in January 2013.

OTHER MATTERS

There are no other material pending legal proceedings.

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable.

Table of Contents

PART II

ITEM MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS AND
5. ISSUER PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES

Our common stock is traded on the NASDAQ Global Market under the symbol CHDN. As of February 11, 2013, there were approximately 3,637 shareholders of record.

The following table sets forth the high and low sale prices, as reported by the NASDAQ Global Market, and dividend declaration information for our common stock during the last two years:

	2012 - By Quarter				2011 - By Quarter			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
High Sale	\$60.00	\$63.18						