

TEST TEST TEST.

>>> NEW YORK STATE SECTION 1 O2
PROVIDES NEW YORK STATE FARMING
COMMISSION CONSISTS OF SEVEN
MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE MEMBER
WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF
THE SENATE.

FIVE MEMBERS HAVING BEEN
CONFIRMED BY THE NEW YORK STATE
SENATE AFFORDS THE COMMISSION
THE ABILITY TO ESTABLISH A
QUORUM AND UNDERTAKE ACTION.

THIS PRESENT MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION IS NOW CALLED TO
ORDER.

SECRETARY WILL YOU PLEASE CALL
THE ROLL.

>> HERE.

>> PETER MACHETTI?

NEAR?

HERE.

>> JOHN BECLEMA.

TODD SCHNEID PER

>> MR. SCHNEIDER IS NOT

AVAILABLE TO A PREEXISTING

COMMITMENT.

MR. SECRETARY PLEASE HAVE THE RECORD REFLECT A QUORUM OF QUALIFIED MEMBERS ARE PRESENT THUS ENABLING THE TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS.

PLEASE ALSO NOTE THAT TWO-WAY AUDIO AND VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE TWO MEETING LOCATIONS.

GIVEN THE ABSENCE OF THE CHAIR, WOULD THE MEMBERS LIKE TO SELECT A MEMBER FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRESIDING OVER TODAY'S MEETING?

>> I NOMINATE PETER MACHETTI.

>> SECOND.

>> COMMISSIONER MACHETTI?

>> MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING CONDUCTED ON JULY 25th, 2016 HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO THE MEMBERS IN ADVANCE.

AT THIS TIME I'D LIKE TO ASK THE MEMBERS IF THERE ARE ANY EDITS, CORRECTIONS OR AMENDMENTS.

NOT HEARING ANY, MADAM SECRETARY

PLEASE LET THE RECORD REFLECT
THE MINUTES WERE ACCEPTED AS
CIRCULATED.

THE NEXT ON THE AGENDA IS THE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT BY
MR. WILLIAMS.

>> AT YOUR REQUEST I USUALLY
PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW REGARDING
THE DEVELOPMENT STATUS OF THE
THREE COMMERCIAL CASINO
PROJECTS.

GIVEN THE LENGTH OF TODAY'S
AGENDA I'VE CHOSE ON IT
DISTRIBUTE A WRITTEN VERSION OF
THAT OVERVIEW.

TWO ITEMS HOWEVER I WOULD LIKE
TO DISCUSS.

THE FIRST REGARDS FATALITIES AT
SARATOGA.

BETWEEN MAY 30th AND AUGUST
28th, THERE HAVE BEEN 14 EQUINE
FATALITIES AT THE SARATOGA RACE
COURSE.

WHILE ANY EQUINE FATALITY ON THE
GROUNDS OF A NEW YORK RACETRACK

IS SIGNIFICANT THIS SPIKE IS A
CAUSE FOR GREAT CONCERN FOR THE
COMMISSION STAFF AND THE NEW
YORK RACING ASSOCIATION.

THIS YEAR'S 14 FATALITIES
INCLUDED SIX RACING FATALITIES
THAT OCCUR ON THE TRACK DURING A
RACE OR DUE TO AN INJURY DURING
THE RACE AND FOUR TRAINING
FATALITIES, THOSE THAT OCCUR
WHILE TRAINING ON THE OKLAHOMA
OR MAIN TRACK.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW FINDS ALL TEN
SUFFERED EXERCISE RELATED
MUSCULOSKELETAL INJURIES.

THERE HAS BEEN ONE ACCIDENTAL
DEATH, ONE DEATH FROM INFECTIOUS
DISEASE AND TWO SUDDEN CARDIAC
DEATHS, BOTH OF WHICH OCCURRED
FOLLOWING EXERCISE WHILE HORSES
WERE COOLING OUT.

TO PUT THIS IN PERSPECTIVE, THE
NUMBER OF FATALITIES AT SARATOGA
IN 2016 IS SIMILAR TO 2014,
WHERE THERE WERE 14 FATALITIES,

EIGHT RACING AND SIX TRAINING.

IN 2015, WHERE THERE WERE 13
FATALITIES WITH THREE RACING,
EIGHT TRAINING AND TWO
NON-RACING DEATHS.

AS YOU ARE AWARE A NECROPSY IS
HAD AND IN ADDITION THE TRAINING
RECORDS FOR EACH HORSE ARE
COLLECTED.

THE EQUINE SAFETY REVIEW BOARD
REVIEWS THE MATERIAL AND
CONDUCTS INTERVIEWING USUALLY
WITH ATTENDING VETERINARIANS,
TRAIPER ANSWER JOCKEYS IF THE
INJURY WAS TRAUMATIC.

THE EQUINE SAFETY REVIEW BOARD
IS A COLLECTIVE CHAIRED BY DR.
SCOTT PALMER, THE STATE EQUINE
MEDICAL DIRECTOR.

OTHER MEMBERS THE CHIEF
EXAMINING VETERINARIAN ANTHONY
VITEROSA AND PRESIDENT GLENN
COSACK.

THE PURPOSE OF THE EQUINE SAFETY
REVIEW BOARD IS TO REVIEW

CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MAY
CONTRIBUTE TO EQUINE FATALITIES
AND USES INFORMATION TO EDUCATE
THE STAKEHOLDERS AND DESIGN
SAFETY MEASURES TO PREVENT OR
LIMIT EQUINE FATALITIES IN THE
FUTURE.

WHILE THIS BODY MEETS WITH
REGULARITY OF LATE THEY'VE BEEN
MEETING WEEKLY TO DISCUSS THESE
INCIDENTS.

I NOTE THAT INDEPENDENT OF THE
EQUINE SAFETY REVIEW BOARD NYRA
HAS BEEN ACTIVELY STUDYING THE
BREAK DOWNS AND EVEN BROUGHT IN
RENOWNED RACING SURFACE EXPERT
DR. PETERSON FROM THE UNIVERSITY
OF MAINE TO STUDY THE ISSUE.

I'VE BEEN INFORMED THAT A REVIEW
OF THE TRACK SURFACE INDICES
INCLUDING CUSHION DEPTH,
MOISTURE CONTENT, AND TRAINING
TIMES INDICATE THAT THE 2016
MAIN TRACK SURFACE MEETS
STANDARDS CONSISTENT WITH

PREVIOUS YEARS, THEREBY MAKING
TRACK CONDITION UNLIKELY AS A
CONTRIBUTING FACTOR FOR THE 2016
SARATOGA EQUINE FATALITIES.

CONSISTENT WITH FAST PRACTICE
THE EQUINE SAFETY REVIEW BOARD
WILL PUBLISH A SUMMARY REPORT OF
ITS FINDINGS IN THE UPCOMING
WEEKS.

FINALLY I WOULD BE REMISS IF I
DID NOT PUBLICLY MENTION AN
IMPENDING RETIREMENT.

GARDNER GRONEY, PRESIDENT OF THE
DIRECTOR OF LOTTERY SUBMITTED
HIS PAPERS EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER
21st.

GARDNER HAS SPENT NEARLY 28
YEARS WITH THE DIVISION,
STARTING AS AN ASSISTANT AUDITOR
IN THE AUDITING DEPARTMENT.
HE HAS HELD PROGRESSIVELY
RESPONSIBLE POSITIONS WITHIN THE
FINANCE DEPARTMENT BEFORE TAKING
ON RESPONSIBILITIES AS THE
LOTTERY'S ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

AND THEN BECOMING THE DIRECTOR
OF LOTTERY OPERATIONS BEFORE HE
REACHED MANAGEMENT, AND TOOK
POSITIONS AS EXECUTIVE DEPUTY
DIRECTOR AND THEN DIRECTOR OF
THE LOTTERY DIVISION.

I THINK I SPEAK FOR EVERY
EMPLOYEE AT THE COMMISSION IN
WISHING HIM WELL WITH HIS
RETIREMENT AND ANY FUTURE
ENDEAVORS.

>> THANK YOU.

SO LET'S GO TO RULEMAKING, NEW
YORK STATE RACING PARAMUTUAL
WAGERING BREEDING LAW SECTION
104.19, AUTHORIZES THE
COMMISSION TO PROMULGATE RULES
AND REGULATIONS THAT IT DEEMS
NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT ITS
RESPONSIBILITIES.

THEREFORE THE COMMISSION WILL
FROM TIME TO TIME PROMULGATE
RULES AND RULE AMENDMENTS
PURSUANT TO THE STATE
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ROUTE.

TODAY WE HAVE 16 ITEMS FOR
CONSIDERATION.

MR. WILLIAMS WILL YOU PLEASE
OUTLINE THE FIRST ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION
ADOPTION OF REPEAL THOROUGHBRED
HORSE RACING TRULY DELETE THE
PROVISION FOR EXTRA WEIGHT
ALLOWANCE FOR AN APPRENTICE
JOCKEY WHO CONTINUES TO RIDE FOR
THE JOCKEY'S ORIGINAL CONTRACT
EMPLOYER.

THIS PROVISION HAD EXISTED TO
REWARD STABLES THAT BROUGHT A
YOUNG JOCKEY INTO RACING THROUGH
A DEFAULT SYSTEM OF A JOCKEY
NEEDING A SPONSORING STABLE FOR
HOUSING, FOOD, MEDICAL CARE,
TRAINING AND ELIGIBILITY FOR
JOCKEY LICENSE.

THE PROPOSAL OF THIS RULE WAS
AUTHORIZED THE COMMISSION'S MAY
23rd, 2016 MEETING, THE PROPOSED
POLL WAS PUBLISHED IN THE STATE
REGISTER JUNE 15th, PUBLIC

COMMENT PERIOD EXPIRED AUGUST

1st.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS WERE

RECEIVED.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED

RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT

RULE.

>> COMMISSIONERS ANY QUESTION ON

THE THE DOCUMENT FOR APPEAL OF

THIS JOCKEY RULE?

HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A

MOTION TO ADOPT THESE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

ANYONE?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

WOULD YOU CALL THE NEXT ITEM,

PLEASE.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

IS THE ADOPTION OF RULES FOR EXCLUDED PERSONS AT CASINOS, THE PROPOSED RULES SET FORTH CRITERIA FOR EXCLUSION, THE PROCESS REPLACEMENT ON AN EXCLUDED PERSON'S LIST, THE PROCESS TO PETITION TO REMOVE A NAME FROM THE EXCLUDED PERSON'S LIST, AND THE REQUIREMENTS ONCE A PERSON IS PLACED ON THE EXCLUDED PERSON'S LIST.

THE TEXT OF THE PROPOSED RULE WAS PUBLISHED IN STATE REGISTER JULY 13th, 2016, MEANING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD EXPIRED YESTERDAY.

ONE PUBLIC COMMENT WAS RECEIVED, COMMISSION STAFF CONSIDERED THIS COMMENT AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND ANY AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RULE MAKING.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> DO THE COMMISSIONERS HAVE ANY

QUESTIONS ON THESE OPTION OF
EXCLUDED PERSONS AT THE CASINO
RULES?

>> NO.

>> WHEN WAS THE COMMENT
RECEIVED?

>> YESTERDAY.

>> WHAT WAS THE COMMENT?

>> I DON'T KNOW OFFHAND P ED, DO
YOU REMEMBER WHAT THE COMMENT
WAS?

IT WAS A COMMENT THAT WAS
PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED DURING THE
SOLICITATION FOR PREPROPOSAL
INDUSTRY COMMENT THAT WE HAD
CONSIDERED AND REJECTED.

WE'RE LOOKING UP THAT RIGHT NOW.
THE COMMENT "WE SUGGEST SHALL BE
CHANGED TO MAY WITH THIS
PROVISION IN ORDER TO GIVE
DISCRETION WHO AND SHOULD BE
PLACED ON THE EXCLUSION.

THIS MAY STANDARD IS UTILIZED BY
OTHER WELL-ESTABLISHED GAMING
AGENCIES, THEREFORE "A" SHOULD

READ IF A PERSON MAY BE PLACED
ON THE EXCLUDED PERSON'S LIST IF
THE COMMISSION DETERMINES THEER.
MEETS ONE OR MORE OF THE
FOLLOWING CRITERIA."

THANK YOU.

>> JOHN, ANYTHING FURTHER?

>> NO.

>> MOTION TO ADOPT THESE RULES.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR.

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> THE ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO

RULE SETTING FORTH THE

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS ON

COMMISSIONS ON CASINO GAMBLING

ADDING DEFINITIONS RELEVANT TO

NEW RULES IN THE ONGOING CASINO

RULE MAKING PROCESS AND
CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS IN
CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

IT WAS PROPOSED JULY 13th, 2016,
THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
INCLUDED AUGUST 29th.

ONE PUBLIC COMMENT WAS RECEIVED.
COMMISSION STAFF CONSIDERED THIS
COMMENT AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND
ANY AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED
RULE MAKING.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION
ADOPT THIS PROPOSED RULE MAKING
AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTION ON THE ADOPTION
OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CASINO
DEFINITION RULES?

>> I HAVE ONE QUESTION, A SERIES
OF SEVEN, EIGHT OR NINE ITEMS.

DID WE GET COMMENTS ON ANY OF
THEM?

TO WE HAVE TO PROVE EACH ONE
SEPARATELY?

>> SORRY, I DIDN'T HEAR YOUR
FULL QUESTION, JOHN.

>> A SERIES OF THESE CASINO
RULES WERE PUT OUT, VOTING ON
THEM NOW.

WE RECEIVED COMMENTS ON ANY OF
THEM?

>> WHILE WE RECEIVED COMMENTS I
MENTIONED WE HAVE COMMENTS, THE
FIRST ONE WE HAD A COMMENT, THIS
ONE WE ALSO HAD A COMMENT AS
WELL.

>> I GUESS WE'RE VOTING ON THEM
EACH AS SEPARATE MATTERS, TO WE
HAVE TO DO IT THAT WAY?

>> YES.

IT'S THE WAY WE PROPOSED THE
RULES.

>>.

>> WHAT WAS THE COMMENT?

>> THIS ONE IS DEFINITIONS --
THE COMMENT WAS 5300.1 SUBF,
BANK ROLL IS NOT THE APPROPRIATE
TERM, THE MORE APPROPRIATE TERM
IS A "FILL BANK."

ACCORDINGLY WE SUGGEST THE
SECTION BE REVIALSED TO STATE

"CREDIT SLIP MEANS A FORM USED TO RECORD EITHER THE RETURN OF CHIPS FROM A GAMING TABLE TO THE CAGE OR TRANSFER OF MARKERS AND NEGOTIABLE CHECKS FROM THE GAMING TABLE TO A CAGE OR FILL BANK."

>> SEEMS VERY DETAILED.

WHO SMILTED THAT?

>> THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF MONTRAIN OPERATING COMPANY.

>> WE DECIDED TO?

>> THAT IS CORRECT THEY SUBMITTED THE SAME WHEN WE WENT OUT FOR INDUSTRY COMMENT IN THE PREPROPOSAL, THE PRERULE-MAKING PERIOD HAD THE SAME COMMENT THAT STAFF CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THAT POINT BEFORE IT WAS BROUGHT UP FOR PROPOSAL.

>> THIS IS JUST A TECHNICAL OBJECTION, CORRECT?

>> YES.

>> CORRECT.

>> AND STAFF KNOWS THAT THE ORIGINAL WORDING IS SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR?

>> I'M SORRY.

>> STAFF FEELS THE ORIGINAL WORD SOMETHING SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR, WE DON'T NEED TO AMEND IT AS SUGGESTED AS COMMENT?

>> THAT IS CORRECT, STAFF CONSIDERED THE COMMENT AND REJECTED THE COMMENT IN LINE WITH OTHER COMMENTS WE MIGHT HAVE RECEIVED IN PREPROPOSAL OR THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS.

>> OKAY, THANK YOU.

>> ANYTHING FURTHER?

>> NOPE.

>> MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION? HEAR NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

ADOPTION OF RULES THAT SET FORTH

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE THE

INSPECTION, USE, STORAGE AND

DESTRUCTION OF GAMING EQUIPMENT.

THE PROPOSED RULES ALSO

PRESCRIBE THE PHYSICAL

CHARACTERISTICS FOR PERSON TABLE

GAMING EQUIPMENT ADDRESSING

CHIPS, TOURNAMENT CHIPS AND

PLAQUES, BIG WHEELS, ROULETTE,

MANUAL AND AUTOMATED WHEELS,

CARD READERS AND DEALING SHOES.

NOTICE THE PROPOSED RULE WAS

PUBLISHED IN THE STATE REGISTER

ON JULY 13th, 2016, MAENG THAT

THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

EXPIRED AUGUST 29th.

ONE PUBLIC COMMENT WAS RECEIVED.

COMMISSION STAFF CONSIDERED THIS

COMMENT AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND

ANY AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RULE MAKING.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING
ON AN AMENDED VERSION THAT WAS
PROVIDED TO YOU THIS AFTERNOON
THAT CONTAINED TECHNICAL AND
NONSUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE
COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED
RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE ADOPTION
OF CASINO TABLE GAME EQUIPMENT?

>> THE AMENDMENTS WE RECEIVED
TODAY WERE THEY RELATED TO THE
COMMENT?

>> NO, THEY WERE NOT.

THEY WERE TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS.

>> I THINK I NEED TO GO WITH
WHAT THE COMMENT WAS.

.

>> THE COMMENT ON THIS ONE,
SECTION 5322 B LE, WE REQUEST
EACH VALUE CHIP OF THE
DENOMINATION OF \$2,500, ONLY
REQUIRE TWO COUNTERFEITING

MEASURES.

ONLY TWO ARE REQUIRED IN NEW
JERSEY AND MASSACHUSETTS.

SECTION 53-22.2-D4 AND E4, FOR
PROMOTIONAL GAMING CHIPS THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHIP TO
CONTAIN NY AND THE NAME OF THE
CITY OR COUNTY IN WHICH THE
GAMING FACILITY IS LOCATED BE
REMOVED.

THESE REQUIREMENTS ADD A
NECESSARY DETAIL TO THE FACE OF
THE CHIP WITHOUT ENHANCING
SECURITY.

THERE IS NO SIMILAR REQUIREMENT
IN MASSACHUSETTS FOR PROMOTIONAL
GAMING CHIPS.

MASSACHUSETTS ONLY REQUIRES THAT
THEY BE UNIQUE IN TERMS OF COLOR
OR SIZE, HAVE NO EDGE DESIGN
UNIQUE TO GAMING CHIPS AND BEAR
THE NAME OF THE GAMING LICENSEE
ISSUING THEM AND LANGUAGE THAT
THEY HAVE NO REDEEMABLE VALUE.

SECTION 53.22.4C, WE REQUEST

PATRONS BE ALLOWED TO USE VALUE CHIPS FOR PAYMENT OF FOOD OR BEVERAGE WHILE SEATED AT A GAMING TABLE AND FOR GRATUITIES TO NON-TABLE GAMING EMPLOYEES. THIS IS A COMMONLY PERMITTED PRACTICE THROUGHOUT THE INDUSTRY AND PROVIDES A CONVENIENT MEANS FOR PATRONS TO PURCHASE FOOD AND BEVERAGE.

ALSO WE REQUEST THAT THE GAMING CHIPS BE PERMITTED TO BE ISSUED AT THE CAGE BEING ABLE TO ISSUE VALUE CHIPS AT THE CAGE IS ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT FOR HIGH VALUE PATRONS, OTHER WISE CHIPS AT TABLES WILL BE QUICKLY COMPLETED AND FILLS WILL BE NECESSARY AND PLAY DISRUPTED.

SECTION 5322.18B, AUTOMATIC CARD SHUFFLING DEVICES ARE PERMANENTLY SECURED TO A TABLE. WE SUGGEST THE DEVICES WHICH ARE PERMANENTLY SECURED TO A TABLE NOT BE REQUIRED TO BE STORED IN

A LOCK COMPARTMENT WHEN NOT IN USE.

>> WE'RE IMPOSING ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS THAT THEY DO IN NEW JERSEY AND MASSACHUSETTS?

>> AS A GENERAL SENSE, THE WAY THAT WE DEVELOPED THE CASINO REGULATIONS WAS BY LOOKING AT MANY DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS, THERE ARE DISSIMILARITIES AMONG DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS AND WE TOOK WHAT WE DETERMINED BEST PRACTICES AMONG PREVAILING LOCATIONS.

>> AND WHAT'S THE RATIONALE BEHIND NOT ALLOWING THE USE OF THE CHIPS?

TO PURCHASE THINGS?

>> I'M GOING TO DEFER TO DEEMA. OR SOMEONE ELSE FROM ED'S UPITY.

>> THE MAIN CONCERN THERE --

>> YOU NEED TO SPEAK UP.

>> OTHERWISE THEY'RE NOT GOING TO HEAR YOU IN NEW YORK.

>> THE MAIN CONCERN IS THAT

UNDER FEDERAL LAW AND
REGULATIONS, PEOPLE CAN'T CREATE
THEIR OWN CURRENCIES, SO WE
THOUGHT THE WAY WE HAD
ORIGINALLY HAD IT WOULD BE MORE
IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL
STANDARDS.

>> THAT WAS NOT INCONSISTENT
WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS?

>> CORRECT.

>> OKAY, ANYTHING ELSE?

NOBODY WANTS TO TALK ABOUT THE
BIG WHEEL RULES?

ALL RIGHT.

>> I FORGOT WHAT IT WAS.

>> MAY I HAVE A MOTION ADOPT THE
RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

ANYONE WANT TO SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR THE

LICENSING OF CASINO JUNKET.

THE PROPOSED PART IS ACTIVITY,

LICENSESING, WAIVERS OF

LICENSING AND REPORTED

REQUIREMENTS.

THE PROPOSED RULES WAS PUBLISHED

JULY 13, 2016, THE PUBLIC

COMMENT PERIOD CONCLUDED AUGUST

29th.

ONE COMMENT PUBLIC WAS RECEIVED.

COMMISSION STAFF CONSIDER THIS

COMMENT AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND

ANY AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED

RULE MAKING.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED

RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON ADOPTION OF

THE JUNKET RULES?

>> ONCE AGAIN, WE NEED TO KNOW

THE COMMENT, WHY IT WAS
REJECTED.

>> YOU WANT ME TO READ THE
COMMENT FIRST AND THEN HAVE THAT
COME BACK TO EXPLAIN IT?

>> WHATEVER'S EASIER.

>> SECTION 5308.1, PLEASE
CONFIRM A CHARTER BUS TOUR WOULD
NOT BE CONSIDERED A JUNKET.

SECTION 5308.2A WE BELIEVE THE
PHRASE "AFFILIATE OF A GAMING
FACILITY LICENSEE" IS OVERLY
BROAD.

JUNKET REPRESENTATIVE EMPLOYED
BY AN AFFILIATE OF A GAMING
LICENSEE SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED
TO BE LICENSED IN NEW YORK
UNLESS IT IS PROVIDING SOME TYPE
OF SERVICES TO THE NEW YORK
GAMING FACILITY.

ACCORDINGLY, WE SUGGEST THAT A
"A" BE REQUINN "A JUNKET
REPRESENTATIVE WHO IS EMPLOYED
BY A GAMING FACILITY LICENSEE,
AN APPLICANT FOR A GAMING

FACILITY LICENSEE OR AN
AFFILIATE OF THE GAMING FACILITY
LICENSEE, NEW LANGUAGE, WHICH IS
PROVIDING SERVICES TO GAMING
FACILITY LICENSEE OR APPLICANT,
END OF NEW LANGUAGE, IS REQUIRED
TO BE LICENSED AS, AND MEET THE
QUALIFICATIONS OF, A CASINO KEY
EMPLOYEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART
5304 OF THE SUBCHAPTER, EXCEPT
THAT A JUNKET REPRESENTATIVE
DOES NOT NEED TO FULFILL THEIR
RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS OF A
CASINO KEY EMPLOYEE."

JUST A MOMENT.

ED'S RETURNING.

>> THIS WAS A MATTER OF PHRASING
AND VERBIAGE.

THE LANGUAGE THAT THE COMMENTER
WAS SUGGESTING WE FELT WAS
UNNECESSARY BECAUSE IT'S
MODIFYING THE JUNKET
REPRESENTATIVE AS AN AFFILIATE
OF THE GAMING FACILITY.
WE THOUGHT THE RULE ALREADY

COVERED THE FACT THAT IT WOULD
BE PROVIDING SERVICES TO THE
GAMING FACILITIES, SO THAT
DIDN'T NEED TO BE REPEATED.

>> AND WHAT HAPPENED WITH THE
BUS TOUR?

IS IT CLEAR WHAT A BUS TOUR IS
OR ISN'T?

>> QUESTION, JUST A
CONFIRMATION.

WHAT WAS THE ANSWER TO THAT?

>> PLUS TWO OR NOT A JUNKET AND
THAT'S BEEN COMMUNICATED TO THE
QUESTIONER.

>> I THINK THAT WAS THEIR
CONCERN.

IT WASN'T ALL THAT CLEAR.

YOU KNOW?

>> ANYTHING ELSE, GENTLEMEN?

MAY I HAVE A MOTION ADOPT THE
RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR QUESTION AND

CONSIDERATION IS ADOPTION OF

SULZ OF THE REGISTRATION OF

CASINO LOBBYISTS, THE PROPOSED

RULES ADDRESSED THE APPLICATION

PROCESS FOR LABOR ORGANIZATIONS,

SORRY, I HAVE CASINO LOBBYIST.

FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION IS

THE ADOPTION OF PROPOSED RULES

FOR THE REGISTRATION OF LABOR

ORGANIZATIONS FOR PROPOSED RULES

ADDRESS THE APPLICATION PROCESS

FOR LABOR ORGANIZATION

REGISTRATION, THE APPLICATION

PROCESS FOR A LABOR

ORGANIZATIONS OFFICER, AGENT,

AND PRINCIPLE EMPLOYEE AND

ACCESS TO THE AUTHORIZED

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LABOR

UNION OR AFFILIATE.

PROPOSED RULE WAS PUBLISHED IN
THE STATE REGISTER ON JULY 13th,
MEANING THAT THE PUBLIC COMMENT
PERIOD CONCLUDED AUGUST 29th.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS WERE
RECEIVED.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE
COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED
RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE ADOPTION
OF THIS RULE?

HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO ADOPT THESE?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND.

>> DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION
IS THE ADOPTION OF RULES THAT
PRESCRIBE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE CONDUCT AND OPERATION OF
TABLE GAMES LICENSED GAMING
FACILITIES.

THE PROPOSED PART ADDRESSES THE
FOLLOWING TOPICS.

SUBMISSION OF THE GAMING
FACILITIES LICENSEES, TABLE GAME
STAFFING BRANDS, EQUIPMENT,
SCHEMATICS, LAYOUTS, MINIMUM AND
MAXIMUM TABLE GAME WAGERS AND
NEW TABLE GAME PROPOSALS, A
GAMING FACILITY LICENSEE'S
ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEALER
TRAINING PROGRAM AND
REQUIREMENTS FOR GAMING FACILITY
LICENSEE IN REGARD TO POSTING OF
PAYOUTS IN THE TEXT OF TABLE
GAME RULES.

NOTICE OF THE PROPOSED RULE WAS
PUBLISHED IN THE STATE REGISTER
JULY 13th, 2016, MEANING THAT
THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
EXPIRED ON AUGUST 29th.
ONE PUBLIC COMMENT WAS RECEIVED,
COMMISSION STAFF CONSIDERED THIS

COMMENT AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND
ANY AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RULE MAKING.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING
ON AN AMENDED VERSION THAT WAS
PROVIDED TO YOU THIS AFTERNOON
THAT CONTAINED TECHNICAL
NONSUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS MAINLY
MINOR TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTIONS.
STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION
ADOPT THIS PROPOSED RULE MAKING
AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE ADOPTION
OF THE RULE?

>> JUST CONTINUING WHETHER OR
NOT THE AMENDMENTS WERE RECEIVED
TODAY RELATED AT ALL TO THE
COMMENT AND WHAT THE COMMENT
WAS, AND WHY WE DIDN'T ACCEPT
IT.

>> CONSISTENT WITH THAT PRACTICE
FIRST KNOW THE AMENDMENTS WERE
TYPOGRAPHICAL AND DID NOT
ADDRESS OR CONCERN ANYTHING
RELATIVE TO THE MONTRAIN

COMMENT.

I'LL READ THE COMMENT INTO THE RECORD FOLLOWED BY ED TAKING A LOOK AT IT OF THE WRITING AND COMMENTARY AFTERWARDS.

SECTION 5323.2C, D AND E.

WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THE 30-DAY REVIEW PRIOR TO OPENING.

HOWEVER, WE SUGGEST THAT THE REVIEW PERIOD BE SEVEN DAYS ONCE THE GAMING FACILITY IS OPEN.

5323.5B A MINIMAL THRESHOLD ADDED TO THE AMOUNT OF DISCREPANCY IN QUESTION.

WE SUGGEST A \$25 THRESHOLD.

FURTHERANCE OF THE CHANGE WE ADD LANGUAGE TO THE END OF THE PROVE SIGNIFICANCE STATING "AMOUNTS UNDER \$25 WILL BE NOTED AND COPIES OF THE ERROR CORRECTION FORM WILL BE FORWARDED TO THE INSPECTORS."

ADDING A MINIMUM THRESHOLD FOR IMMEDIATE REPORTING WILL INCREASE EFFICIENCY BY

ELIMINATING THE REPORTING
REQUIREMENT FOR MINOR
DISCREPANCIES.

THIS ADJUSTED REVISION, HOWEVER,
MAINTAINS THE INTEGRITY OF THE
OPPOSITION ENSURING MINOR
DISCREPANCIES ARE NOTED AND
ERRORS AFFORDED TO THE
INSPECTORS.

SECTION 5323.10A3, THE
REQUIREMENT THAT THE DEALER OR
BOX PERSON RECEIVE APPROVAL FROM
A SUPERVISOR BEFORE DISTRIBUTING
CHIPS TO EACH PATRON IS
IMPRACTICAL, UNNECESSARY AND
OVERTLY, OVERLY BURDENSOME.
WE REQUEST THIS REQUIREMENT BE
REMOVED.

SECTION 5323.13A, COMPLETE THE
WORD "2" FROM THE FIRST LINE.

SECTION 5323.17 WE SUGGEST THIS
SECTION BE REVISED TO ALLOW
GAMING FACILITIES TO OFFER
TOURNAMENTS THAT TAKE PLACE ON A
REGULAR BASIS WITHOUT PROVIDING

NOTICE FOR EACH SUCH TOURNAMENT.

THIS WILL PREVENT THE PROVISION
OF UNNECESSARY AND DUPLICATIVE
NOTICES.

SEPARATELY, THE DISCLOSURE
REQUIREMENT NOTED IN SUBSECTION
3 SHOULD BE LIMITED TO
SITUATIONS WHERE THE NUMBER OF
PATRONS INVOLVED IS KNOWN IN
ADVANCE OF THE TOURNAMENT,
FOLLOWING A NEW PROVISION SHOULD
BE ADDED PERMITTING LICENSEES TO
CANCEL ALREADY SCHEDULED
TOURNAMENTS IF THE HOLDING OF
THE TOURNAMENT IS IMPRACTICAL OR
IMPOSSIBLE, I.E. WEATHER EVENT
AFFECTING THE TOURNAMENT.
SUBSECTION 7 SHOULD BE DELETED
IN ITS ENTIRETY.

>> I'LL TAKE THESE ONE BY ONE.

THE FIRST COMMENT WITH RESPECT
TO THE PROPOSED PART 5323
SUGGESTED A SHORTER PERIOD OF
COMMISSION REVIEW.

COMMISSION STAFF AND THE GAMING

DIVISION FELT THAT WE WOULD NEED
THE FLEXIBILITY IN COMPLEX
MATTERS TO HAVE UP TO 30 DAYS.
OVER THE COURSE WE TRY TO
ACCOMPLISH THE REVIEW AS
EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE, BUT
THE FEELING FROM STAFF WAS THAT
WRITING A SHORTER PERIOD OF TIME
INTO THE RULE WOULD NOT BE
PERTINENT.
WITH RESPECT TO THE COMMENT ON
SUBSET -- SECTION 0.5,
SUBDIVISION D, THE COMMENT
SUGGESTS A THRESHOLD FOR
REPORTING GAMING DIVISION STAFF
FELT THAT THE COMMISSION OUGHT
TO KNOW OF ALL DISCREPANCIES IN
CASE ANYTHING WOULD NEED TO BE
INVESTIGATED OR SOME TYPE OF
REMEDATION WOULD BE ORDERED IN
CASE OF THOSE ISSUES.
SO NOT REPORTING ALL
DISCREPANCIES WAS VIEWED BY
STAFF TO BE NOT A PRUDENT COURSE
FOR REGULATION.

WITH RESPECT TO SECTION 10,
SUBDIVISION "A" PARAGRAPH 3, THE
COMMON PRACTICE IS VERBAL
ACKNOWLEDGMENT IS FINE, SO WE
FEEL THE RULE COVERS WHAT IS THE
COMMON PRACTICE ON THE FLOOR.

WITH RESPECT TO SECTION 13
SUBDIVISION "A" WE ACTUALLY
ACCEPTED THAT COMMENT AND
CORRECTED AN EXTRANEIOUS WORD.

WITH RESPECT TO SECTION 17, WE
HAVE CLARIFIED THAT ONGOING
TOURNAMENTS WOULD NOT REQUIRE
INDIVIDUAL REPETITIVE
SUBMISSIONS, SO THERE'S A
STANDARD SUBMISSION THAT'S MADE
FOR A RECURRING TOURNAMENT, YOU
KNOW, ONE APPROVAL WOULD BE
SUFFICIENT.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION?

>> ED, WHAT WAS THE SECTION THEY
WANTED DELETED IN ITS ENTIRETY?

>> I'M JUST GOING TO GRAB THE
TEXT, JOHN, AND COME BACK.

>> SORRY, I DIDN'T HEAR YOU?

>> HE'S GOING TO GET TO THE TEXT
OF THE RULE SO HE CAN BETTER
ANSWER YOUR QUESTION.

>> THAT'S THE ONE RELATED TO
SUPERVISOR APPROVAL LOOKING FOR
THE CHIPS.

THE APPROVAL WAS UNNECESSARY.

>> THEY WERE CONTENT AND IT'S
UNNECESSARY.

ALL FOR COMMENT.

>> CAN YOU TELL ME HOW THE
APPROVAL WORKS?

>> ED'S GETTING HIS MATERIALS,
SIR.

>> UNCLEAR, THAT'S THE PROVISION
THAT'S BEEN REMOVED?
OR IS IT STILL THERE?

>> MY UNDERSTANDING, THE
ASTERISK, WE KEPT IT IN.

>> IF IT'S BEEN REMOVED, JOHN,
YOUR CONCERN IS MOOT.

>> I DON'T KNOW, JUST CONSULTING
WITH STAFF WAS GETTING ME UP TO
SPEED ON THIS ONE SO THE
PARAGRAPH 7 THAT THEY SUGGESTED

BEING REMOVED WAS LANGUAGE THAT
IN OUR SURVEY OF OTHER
JURISDICTIONS IS CONSISTENT WITH
THE PRACTICES IN OTHER
JURISDICTIONS.

WHAT THEY WANT REMOVED IS A
NOTICE INCLUDING A STATEMENT
FROM THE GAMING FACILITY
CONTROLLER IF THE TOURNAMENT
IMPACTS GROSS GAMING REVENUE.

>> THANK YOU, ED.

SO WE DID MAKE SOME CHANGES
BASED ON THE COMMENTS, AND.

>> TYPOGRAPHICAL CHANGES.

>> YES.

>> AND THERE WERE JUST TO BE
CLEAR, THERE WERE OTHER COMMENTS
THAT THIS AND OTHER LICENSEES
MADE FOR POTENTIAL LICENSEE MADE
THAT WERE INTEGRATED INTO THE
PROPOSAL BEFORE IT WAS PROPOSED
FORMALLY.

THESE ARE JUST COMMENTS THAT ONE
FACILITY REITERATED WHEN THEY
WEREN'T INITIALLY INTEGRATED

INTO THE PROPOSAL, ESSENTIALLY
MAKING THE SAME COMMENTS AGAIN.

>> JOHN, QUESTION RELATED TO THE
PROVISION THAT THEY RECOMMENDED
BE REMOVED.

AND HAD BEEN REMOVED OR IT'S NOT
BEEN REMOVED?

>> NOT REMOVED.

>> I THINK YOU GAVE ME THE
IMPRESSION IT HAD BEEN.

>> SORRY.

SO THAT PARAGRAPH 7 IS STAFF'S
RESEARCH INDICATED THAT'S
CONSISTENT WITH THE PRACTICES IN
OTHER JURISDICTIONS AND WOULD
NOT BE PRUDENT TO REMOVE IT.

>> THAT'S THE ONE THAT RELATED
TO THE SUPERVISOR APPROVAL?

>> THAT'S THE ONE THAT RELATED
TO IN THE VARIOUS TOURNAMENTS
HAVING THE --

>> I'M TALKING ABOUT THE
PROVISION PRIOR TO THAT, WHERE I
DON'T KNOW IF IT CAME FROM
MONTRAIN OR NOT THAT RECOMMENDED

WE REMOVE THE PROVISION YOU
NEEDED SUPERVISOR APPROVAL
THROUGH THE DISTRIBUTION.

>> THE ONE THEY SAID WOULD BE
OVERLY BURDENSOME.

>> IS THAT STILL THERE OR HAS
THAT BEEN REMOVED?

THAT'S THE ONE I'M TALKING
ABOUT.

>> I'M JUST TRYING TO FOLLOW
WHICH PROVISION WE'RE TALKING
ABOUT HERE.

>> 5323.10.

>> 10?

>> A3.

>> HE'S GOT IT.

>> THAT WAS JOHN'S QUESTION ON
THE PROVISION THAT THEY
RECOMMEND IT BE REMOVED AND IT
HAS OR HAS NOT?

I THINK THAT WOULD CLARIFY
THINGS FOR ME.

>> THE RULE PROVIDES 10A,
WHENEVER CASH OR PROMOTIONAL
PATRON IS PRESENTING AT A GAME

IN EXCHANGE FOR CHIPS THE DEALER
OR BOX PERSON SHALL NOT
DISTRIBUTE THE CHIPS TO THE
PATRON UNTIL HE OR SHE RECEIVES
APPROVAL FROM A SUPERVISOR.
AND THIS IS A UNIFORM PROVISION
IN LEADING GAMING JURISDICTIONS
AND THE DEALER OR BOX PERSON CAN
JUST GET A VERBAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT
FROM A SUPERVISOR, THERE'S NO
PAPERWORK INVOLVED, SO IT'S A
CONTROL THAT IS VIEWED AS A
PRUDENT CONTROL FOR CHIPS ARE
DISTRIBUTE

>> SHORT ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION
WAS NO, IT'S NOT REMOVED.
IT'S STILL IN THERE.

>> THAT'S THE THING JOHN WAS
ASKING WHETHER IT HAD BEEN.
JUST TO MAKE IT CLEAR.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION?
HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO ADOPT?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM, PLEASE.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR THE

REGISTRATION OF CASINO

LOBBYISTS, THE PROPOSED RULE

ADDRESSES REQUIREMENTS FOR

LOBBYIST RENTAL STRAGS

APPLICATIONS AND NOTICE OF

TERMINATION OF LOBBYIST

SERVICES.

THE TEXT OF THE PROPOSED RULE IS

PUBLISHED IN THE STATE REGISTER

JULY 13, 2016, THE PUBLIC

COMMENT PERIOD CONCLUDED AUGUST

29th.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS WERE

RECEIVED.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSED

RULE MAKING AS A PERMANENT RULE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE ADOPTION
OF THIS?

HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO ADOPT THESE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

PROPOSED RULES FOR GAMING
FACILITY ACCOUNTING CONTROLS,
PREPROPOSAL COMMENTS WERE
SOLICITED FROM THREE GAMING
FACILITY LICENSEES AND THE
APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH CASINO
LICENSE AND INCORPORATED AS THE
STAPH CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.
STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION AUTHORIZE A PROPOSAL
OF THIS RULE-MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED
CASINO ACCOUNTING CONTROLS
RULES?

HEARING NONE MAY I HAVE A MOTION
FOR THE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERED
RULES FOR CAGE AND STANDARDS AND
KIOSKS AT CASINOS, ACRESSES
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CASHIER'S
CAGE, SATELLITE CAGES, COUNT
ROOM, DROP BOXES AND SECURED
DELIVERY STRUCTURES.

THE RULE ALSO PRESCRIBED THE
TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS FOR,
REQUIREMENTS FOR KIOSKS.

PREPROPOSAL COMMENTS WERE
SOLICITED FROM THE THREE GAMING
FACILITY LICENSEES AND THE
APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH CASINO
LICENSE AND INCORPORATED AS
STAFF CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.
PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING
ON AN AMENDED VERSION THAT WAS
PROVIDED TO YOU THIS AFTERNOON
THAT CONTAINS TECHNICAL
NON-SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS.
STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION
AUTHORIZE THE PROPOSAL OF THIS
RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED
CASINO CAGE AND ACCOUNT
STANDARDS CONTROLS RULE HEARING
NONE MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO
PROPOSE --

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

PROPOSED RULES FOR ELECTRONIC

GAMING DEVICES, THE PROPOSED

PARK ADDRESSES THE USE AND

OPERATION OF ELECTRONIC GAMING

DEVICES AND EQUIPMENT.

PRETO POSAL COMMENTS WERE

SOLICITED FROM THE THREE GAMING

FACILITY LICENSEES AND THE

APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH CASINO

LICENSE AND INCORPORATED INTO

THE STAFF CONSIDERED

APPROPRIATE.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION AUTHORIZE THIS

PROPOSAL OF THIS RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED

RULE?

HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A

MOTION TO PROPOSE THESE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

OF PROPOSED RULES FOR GAMING

FACILITY MONITORING AND CONTROL

SYSTEMS AND VALIDATION.

THE PROPOSED PARK DESCRIBES THE

TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR THE

CERTIFICATION OF ONLINE

MONITORING AND CONTROL

VALIDATION SLZ.

COMMENTS WERE SOLICITED FROM

THE THREE GAMING FACILITY

LICENSEES AND THE APPLICANT FOR

THE FOURTH CASINO LICENSE AND

INCORPORATED AS THE STAFF

CONSIDERS APPROPRIATE.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING

ON AN AMENDED VERSION PROVIDED

THIS AFTERNOON THAT CONTAINED

TECHNICAL NONSUBSTANTIVE

AMENDMENTS.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE

COMMISSION AUTHORIZE THE

PROPOSAL OF THIS RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED

RULE?

>> JUST ONE IN GENERAL WITH

RESPECT TO ALL OF THE PROPOSED

RULES.

YOU INDICATED THAT IT

INCORPORATED SOME OF THE

SUGGESTIONS FROM SOME OF THE

OPERATORS.

IF THERE WERE ANY MAJOR

OBJECTIONS, WOULD THAT BE NOTED

FOR US?

>> I DON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION

IN FRONT OF ME.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IN AN

INDICATION WHERE THERE'S A MAJOR

OBJECTION THAT WE DIDN'T

CONSIDER, THEY WOULD HAVE AN

OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE WRITTEN

ON SECTIONS TO THAT, AS WE HAVE

RECEIVED FROM MONTRANE THIS
AFTERNOON RELATIVE TO A NUMBER
OF THE PROPOSALS CONSIDERED FOR
FINAL ADOPTION TODAY.

>> SO ANY OBJECTIONS WOULD BE
CONSIDERED DURING THE COMMENT
PERIOD?

>> YES, THEY HAVE AN ADDITIONAL
COMMENT PERIOD.

THE PREPROPOSAL INDUSTRY COMMENT
PERIOD IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE AN
OUTLET FOR EACH OF THE LICENSEES
OR INTERESTED PARTIES TO ADDRESS
ISSUES THAT WE CONSIDER, THAT
THEY CONSIDER TO BE
OBJECTIONABLE IN A FRAME OF RULE
MAKING AND RESOLVE THEM PROVIDER
TO OUR PROPOSAL.

THEY STILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY
TO LODGE THOSE EXACT SAME
OBJECTIONS DURING THE FORMAL
RULE MAKING PROCESS.

>> OKAY, I JUST WANTED TO BE
SURE ON THE PROCESS, THANK YOU.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION?

MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO PROPOSE

THESE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

PROPOSED RULES FOR SLOT

TOURNAMENTS AND PROGRESSIVE

GAMING DEVICES.

THE PROPOSED PARK DESCRIBES THE

TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR THE

CERTIFICATION OF SLOT

TOURNAMENTS AND PROGRESSIVE

GAMING DEVICES, PROPROPOSAL

COMMENTS SOLICITED FROM THE

THREE GAMING FACILITY LICENSEES

AND THE APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH

CASINO LICENSE AND INCORPORATED

AS STAFF CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING
ON AN AMENDED VERSION PROVIDED
THIS AFTERNOON THAT CONTAINED
TECHNICAL NONSUBSTANTIVE
AMENDMENTS.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION
AUTHORIZE THE PROPOSAL OF THIS
RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS
PROPOSED RULE?

HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO PROPOSE THESE RULES.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM, PLEASE.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION
OF PROPOSED RULES FOR GAMING
FACILITIES GAMING DEVICES, THE
PROPOSED PART ADDRESSES THE

TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR THE
CERTIFICATION OF GAMING DEVICES.
PREPROPOSAL COMMENTS WERE
SOLICITED FROM THE THREE GAMING
FACILITY LICENSEES AND THE
APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH CASINO
LICENSE AND INCORPORATED AS
STAFF CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.
PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU ARE VOTING
ON AN AMENDED VERSION THAT WAS
PROVIDED THIS AFTERNOON THAT
CONTAINS TECHNICAL
NON-SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS.
STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION
AUTHORIZE THE PROPOSAL OF THIS
RULE MAKING.
>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED
RULE?
>> ON ALL OF THE PROPOSED RULES
WHEN DO WE HAVE TO HAVE THEM
BACK?
>> THE PROCESS WOULD BE IF WE
APPROVED THEM RIGHT NOW FOR
PUBLICATION, THEY WILL BE
APPROXIMATELY A TWO-WEEK WINDOW

BEFORE THEY'RE PUBLISHED IN THE
STATE REGISTER.

THERE'S BEEN A START OF
PUBLICATION IN THE STATE
REGISTER OF A 45-DAY PUBLIC
COMMENT PERIOD BEFORE IT RETURNS
TO US, CLOSES, AND THEN THE
COMMISSION CONSIDERS THOSE FOR
FINAL ADOPTION.

>> SO THE TIMING IS GOING TO BE
NOT AN ISSUE FOR THE CASINOS
OPENING?

WE'LL RESOLVE THIS BY THE END OF
THEICAL TAR YEAR?

>> THE RULES THAT ARE BEING
PROPOSED TODAY ARE GOING TO BE
IN A POSITION TO BE ADOPTED AND
FINALIZED AT THE BEGINNING OF
NOVEMBER.

>> OKAY.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION?
HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO PROPOSE THESE?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM, PLEASE.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

OF PROPOSED RULES FOR TABLE

GAMES, THIS PROPOSED PART

ADDRESSES THE RULES AND PAY-OUT

TABLES FOR TABLE GAMES

AUTHORIZED TO BE CONDUCTED AS

LICENSED GAMING FACILITIES.

PREPROPOSAL COMMENTS WERE

SOLICITED FROM THE THREE GAMING

FACILITY LICENSEES AND THE

APPLICANT FOR THE FOURTH CASINO

LICENSE.

INCORPORATED AS STAFF CONSIDERED

APPROPRIATE.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION

AUTHORIZE THE PROPOSAL OF THIS

RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED

RULE?

HEARING NONE MAY I HAVE A MOTION
TO PROPOSE THOSE RULES.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM, PLEASE.

>> FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION
OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE
RULES CONCERNING ADVERTISING AND
PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS ON JOCKEYS
AND THOROUGHBRED RACING,
GENERALLY A JOCKEY MAY WEAR
ADVERTISING AND PROMOTIONAL
MATERIAL WITH PERMISSION OF THE
STEWARDS.
FOG A MEETING, STAFF REVIEWED
THE EXISTING RULES SUA STE
RELATIVE TO ADVERTISING AND
ESSENTIAL CHANGES INCLUDING THE

EXCLUSION FOR PERMISSION,
REQUIREMENTS FOR LOGOS AND
PERMANENTLY DISABILITY JOCKEY'S
FUND SO LONG AS THE LOGOS NOT BE
OVER TEN INCHES AND DISPLAY THE
NAME OF THEIR PANTS AND REAR OF
THEIR HELMET WITH CERTAIN
RESTRICTIONS GIVING THE ATHLETES
INCREASED RECOGNITION.

THE STAFF RECOMMENDS THE
COMMISSION AUTHORIZE THE
PROPOSAL OF THE RULE MAKING.

>> ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED
RULE?

>> HOW DOES THIS RULE COMPARE
WITH RULES IN OTHER STATES?

>> THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH RULES
IN MANY OTHER STATES THAT
ALREADY EXCLUDED THIS TYPE OF
ADVERTISING OR THIS TYPE OF
SPEECH FROM ADVERTISING AND
THEREFORE ALLOWABLE.

WE'RE SIMPLY CATCHING UP TO SOME
OTHER JURISDICTIONS.

>> IF THIS RULE WERE TO BE

ADOPTED, ARE WE MORE RESTRICTIVE
OR LESS RESTRICTIVE THAN OTHER
STATES, SAY KENTUCKY?

>> WE WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH
MANY OF THE OTHER TOP STATES.

RIGHT NOW WE ARE MORE
RESTRICTIVE.

>> SO A JOCKEY WOULD WEAR SOME
ADVERTISING IN KENTUCKY, THAT HE
COULDN'T WEAR IN NEW YORK?

>> REMEMBER, WHAT WE'RE DOING
HERE IS LIMITING THE ABILITY TO
PUT CERTAIN ITEMS WITHOUT
GETTING THOSE APPROVALS FROM THE
STEWARDS.

RIGHT NOW THE STEWARDS HAVE
TOTAL CONTROL OVER WHAT A JOCKEY
MAY WEAR ON HIS SILKS.

WHAT WE'RE LOOKING TO DO IS
SIMPLY CARVE CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS
OUT FOR THE JOCKEY'S NAME ON
THEIR PANTS OR ON THEIR HELMET,
OR LIMITED LOGOS FOR TWO
NATIONWIDE ORGANIZATIONS THAT DO
BENEFICIAL WORK WITH THE

JOCKEYS.

ALL OTHER ADVERTISING WOULD
STILL BE REQUIRED TO BE, RECEIVE
THE PERMISSION OF THE STEWARDS,
WHICH REQUIRES AS WELL THE
PERMISSION OF THE OWNER OF THE
HORSE THAT IS BEING ENTERED.

>> HAVE THE JOCKEYS REQUESTED
THIS AMENDMENT?

>> NO, AS I SAID, WE HAD A
CONVERSATION WITH THEM AND THEY
BROUGHT UP A QUESTION WHERE WE
HAD FINED AN INDIVIDUAL BECAUSE
HE WORE HIS NAME ON HIS PANTS.
STAFF DETERMINED IT WAS
APPROPRIATE TO REVISIT THESE
RULES AND HAVE A MORE COMMON
SENSE APPROACH TO THEM.

>> WHO WAS THE PERSON?

>> THAT WAS LAST YEAR IN THE
TRAVERSE, THE WINNER.

VICTOR ESPOSITO -- ESPINOZA,
CLOSE.

>> OH, NOW WE'RE GOING TO --

>> HE MIGHT DISAGREE.

>> HE HAD HIS NAME ON HIS PANTS,
LIKE, "NO IT."

>> HOW DOES THAT WORK?

DOES THE JOCKEY HAVE TO GO TO
THE STEWARDS, PRESENT THE
APPAREL AND SAY HERE IS THE
EMBLEM AND THIS IS THE SIZE AND
THIS IS WHAT I WANT?

>> YOU'RE TALKING NOT THESE BUT
IN THE GENERAL SENSE?

>> YES.

>> YES, WHAT THEY WOULD BE
REQUIRED TO DO IS FIRST OF ALL
GET APPROVAL OF THE OWNER OF THE
HORSE.

>> I UNDERSTAND.

>> SO THAT WAY IF YOU HAVE AN
INDIVIDUAL OWNER OF THE LARGE
COORS DISTRIBUTOR HE'D HAVE VOO
HE TOE POWER OVER A JOCKEY
SAYING I WANT TO WEAR BUDWEISER
IN THIS RACE.

>> I UNDERSTAND.

>> THE STEWARDS ALSO LOOK TO SEE
IF THERE'S A CONFLICT WITH

PERHAPS THE ENTITY THAT'S
SPONSORING THE RACE, SO THAT MAY
BE KETTLE ONE, WHO MAY BE
SPONSORING A RACE AT THE
TRAVERSE DAY, DOESN'T HAVE
SOMEONE WEARING STOLICNAYA.
GENERAL SENSE PRELIMINARY TO THE
JOCKEY ACTUALLY WEARING THAT ON
HIS SILKS AND TOTAL DISCRETION
OF THE STEWARDS WHETHER THEY
APPROVE OR DENY IT.

>> I THOUGHT PRACTICALLY WHAT TO
THEY DO, HERE IS THE EMBLEL THIS
IS WHAT I WANT?
WITH PERMISSION?

>> I BELIEVE IT'S IN WRITING.

>> OKAY.

>> I'M NOT POSITIVE ON THAT BUT
I WOULD ASSUME THAT IT'S IN
WRITING.

>> ANY OTHER DISCUSSION?

>> BOB, WHO IS FACE ON THE
JOCKEY'S PANTS?

I THOUGHT IT WAS THE JOCKEY.

YOU SAID THE OWNER HAD TO

APPROVE THE STEWARD NEVER

APPROVE, RIGHT?

THEY CAN'T PUT IT UP IN COLORS,

RIGHT?

>> YOU'RE ACTUALLY RAISING A

POINT THAT THE JOCKEYS GUILD HAS

ASKED FOR MORE FULSOME

DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO QUESTIONS

LIKE THAT, WHICH WE AGREED THAT

WE WOULD HAVE AND COMMENCE AFTER

THE FOLLOWING OF THE SARATOGA

MEET, BUT IN LARGE MEASURE, THE

JOCKEY DOES NOT OWN THE SPACE ON

THE PANTS THERE BECAUSE THE

OWNER OF THE HORSE HAS A VETO

OVER WHATEVER IS PLACED ON THOSE

PANTS.

>> I GUESS THAT'S A NEGOTIATION

BETWEEN THEM?

>> YES.

>> AND WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A

DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS

AFTERWARDS?

OR --

>> WE HAVE AGREED TO MEET WITH

THE JOCKEY GUILD TO DISCUSS
DIFFERENT CONCERNS THAT THEY
HAVE RELATIVE TO ADVERTISING IN
GENERAL.

BUT WE WON'T BE TO BE THAT UNTIL
THE CONCLUSION OF THE SARATOGA
MEET.

>> IT SEEMS ON THE SURFACE
THEY'RE NOT -- THEY'RE
CONTRACTED OUT, RIGHT?

>> UM-HUM.

THAT'S CORRECT.

>> NOW THIS RULE ALLOWS THEM TO
PUT THEIR NAMES ON THERE
UNIFORMS, CORRECT?

>> ON THEIR PANTS AND ALSO ON
THEIR HELMET.

>> NOW WOULD THAT BE VISIBLE TO
THE FANS?

>> YES.

THAT'S THE GENERAL IDEA.

THEY COULD USE A FONT THAT WOULD
NOT BE VISIBLE BUT THAT WOULD BE
COUNTER.

>> A FAN WOULD BE ABLE TO READ

THE WORD ESPINOZA AN THE CHAPS?

>> UNLESS THEY MISPRONOUNCE IT
LIKE I DO.

>> OKAY, THANK YOU.

>> YOU'RE WELCOME.

>> ANY QUURT DISCUSSION?

>> HEARING NONE MAY I HAVE A
MOTION TO PROPOSE THOSE RULES?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NEXT ITEM.

>>.

>> ADJUDICATIONS.

>> WE ARE DONE WITH RULE MAKING
BELIEVE IT OR NOT.

>> FOR THIS MONTH.

>> I HAVE A QUESTION.

>> WE GO TO ADJUDICATIONS,

THAT'S THE NEXT ITEM ON THE

AGENDA TODAY I THINK WE HAVE TWO
ITEMS FOR ADJUDICATION.

>> IN THE MATTER OF JOSEPH
CARRUBBA, ON APRIL 6, 2016 THE
COMMISSION ISSUED A SUMMARY
SUSPENSION OF STANDARD TRAINER
JOSEPH CARRUBBA FOLLOWING A POST
RACE POSITIVE FOR COBALT AT
SARATOGA RACEWAY FOR TWO HORSES
HE TRAINED.

AFTER MR. CARRUBBA APPEALED A
HEARING WAS CONDUCTED ON MAY
13th, MAY 5th, AND JUNE 17th OF
THIS YEAR.

.

>> THE DMIGS DETERMINED UPON A
3-1 VOTE, COMMISSIONER MACHETTI
VOTING IN THE NEGATIVE TO
REVERSE THE DECISION AND ORDER A
NEW DISPOSITION BY LOT.

THIS WAS A DIRECT APPLICATION TO
THE BOARD OR EXPEDITED PROCESS
ON AGREED UPON RECORD BECAUSE
THE HORSE WAS KIND OF IN LIMBO
AND SO THIS WAS PREVIOUSLY DONE

AND THERE WAS A SHAKE AND

SOMEONE GOT --

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

>> NEXT ITEM IN BUSINESS REGARDS

OF GAMING FACILITY LICENSE OF

TIOGA DOWNS RACETRACK, TIOGA

DOWNS CASINO RACING AND

ENTERTAINMENT.

>> IF YOU RECOLLECT THE DECEMBER

2015 MEETING AT WHICH THE

COMMISSION LAST CONSIDERED

COMMERCIAL CASINO LICENSE

APPLICATIONS, MR. BURROWS

PROVIDED A LANGUAGE REVIEW WHAT

THE LAW REQUIRES DURING A

ACASINO LICENSING PROCESS AND

WHAT THE LAW DOES NOT ALLOW.

IN THE INTEREST OF REMEDY I

CIRCULATED THE UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT OF THAT DISCUSSION

ALONG WITH A COPY OF THE WRITTEN

REMARKS UPON WHICH THE

DISCUSSION WAS BASED.

EVERYTHING APPLIED TO THE

LICENSE CONSIDERATION LAST

DECEMBER STILL APPLIES TODAY.

>> THANK YOU, MR. WILLIAMS.

WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE
APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION.

>> THE APPLICATION FOR
CONSIDERATION IS TIOGA DOWNS
RACETRACK, LLC, TO BE BUSINESS
AS TIOGA DOWNS CASINO, RACING
AND ENTERTAINMENT.

EACH COMMISSIONER IS PROVIDED
WITH A COPY OF TIOGA DOWN
RACETRACK LLC'S RESPONSE TO THE
BOARD REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS
TO DEVELOP AND OPERATE A GAMING
FACILITY IN NEW YORK STATE, A
MATRIX OF PROPOSED CHANGES OR
AMENDMENTS TO THE SUBCOMMISSION
POST JULY 6, 2015, WHEN THE
APPLICATION WAS RECEIVED, A
SUMMARY OF THE NEW YORK STATE
POLICE INVESTIGATIVE REPORT
REGARDING THE APPLICANT, ITS
AFFILIATED COMPANIES AND
PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL,
A MEMORANDUM IDENTIFYING MINIMUM

LICENSING THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS
AND A PROPOSED LICENSE FORM WITH
CONDITIONS SPECIFIC TO THE
APPLICANT IN THEIR PROPOSAL.

NO LEAD AGENCY STATE
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT
FUNDING STATEMENT WAS CIRCULATED
BECAUSE THE LEAD AGENCY ISSUED A
NEGATIVE DECLARATION, A
DETERMINATION BY A LEAD AGENCY
THAT AN ACTION WILL NOT RESULT
IN SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND
CONSEQUENTLY NO ENVIRN IMPACT
STATEMENT WAS PREPARED.

>> MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO FIND
TIE YO TA DOWNS RACETRACK
LLC DBA TIOGA DOWNS CASINO
RACING AND ENTERTAINMENT PER
SECTIONS 1617 AND SP 18 OF THE
NEW YORK STATE RACING PARAMUTUAL
AND BREEDING LAW.

>> SO MOVED.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THIS
MOTION?

HEARING NONE, SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO FIND THE
APPLICATION AS AMENDED SUBMITTED
TIOGA DOWN RACETRACK LLC BDA
TIOGA DOWNS CASINO RACING AND
ENTERTAINMENT AS MEETING THE
MINIMUM LICENSING THRESHOLDS SET
FORTH IN SECTIONS 1316 OF THE
NEW YORK STATE RACING,
PARAMUTUAL WAGERING AND READING
THEM ALL?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

MAY I HAVE A MOTION TO EXECUTE
THE GAMING FACILITY LICENSE

AWARD FOR TIOGA DOWNS RACETRACK

LLC DBA TIOGA DOWNS CASINO

RACING AND ENTERTAINMENT

PURSUANT TO SECTION 1311 OF THE

NEW YORK STATE RACING AND

BREEDING LAW?

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> ANY DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

HEARING NONE, ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED?

THE MOTION CARRIES.

NOW WE HAVE ANY OLD BUSINESS,

RIGHT?

>> THERE'S NONE ON THE AGENDA.

>> OKAY, AND NEW BUSINESS.

WE HAD SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING

STAFF'S DETERMINATION OF

GRANTING INTERACTIVE FANTASY

SPORTS TEMPORARY REGISTRATION.

THERE'S BEEN A NUMBER GRANTED

AND WE WANTED TO KNOW WHAT WENT

INTO THAT DISTRIBUTION.

>> CERTAINLY.

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE FOUND
IS BRAD FISCHER, WHO YOU ARE
FAMILIAR WITH WHO HANDLES A LOT
OF OUR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND
WORKED CONSISTENTLY IN THE
COMMERCIAL CASINO PROCESS HAS
BEEN NAMED AS THE ACTING
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF
INTERACTIVE FANTASY SPORTS
REGULATION.

MR. FISCHER WOULD LIKE TO
ADDRESS THE PROCESS THAT HE
UNDERTOOK FOR INDIVIDUALS WITHIN
ED'S OFFICE AND OTHERS IN THE
AGENCY UNDER MR. FISCHER.

>> THANK YOU.

I RECEIVED 15 APPLICATIONS THUS
FAR, FIVE OF WHICH HAVE BEEN
APPROVED.

THE PROCESS WAS AN APPLICATION
FOR A TEMPORARY PERMIT CREATED
AT 23 COMPONENTS TO IT, WHICH
FOLLOWED PORTIONS OF THE
STATUTE, AND THOSE CONDITIONS IN
GENERAL MEASURE OF CUSTOMER

PROTECTIONS, PROVISIONS TO
SCREEN OUT PROHIBITED PLAYERS,
SELF-EXCLUDED PLAYERS AND
MINORS, REQUIRED SEGREGATION OF
CUSTOMER FUNDS, PRIVACY
SAFEGUARDS AND INFORMATION ABOUT
PROBLEMS WITH GAMING ASSISTANCE.
IN ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS THAT
HAVE BEEN RECEIVED, THERE'S BEEN
A ITERATIVE PROCESS BETWEEN THE
COMMISSION AND THE APPLYING
PARTY.
OFTENTIMES IT'S GONE FOR A
NUMBER OF ROUNDS WHERE AN
APPLYING PARTY HAS SUBMITTED AND
THERE ARE NUMEROUS EITHER
DEFICIENCIES IN THE EXHIBITS OR
CERTAIN CLARIFYING QUESTIONS
THAT STAFF HAS AND INFORMATION
POSED THEY RECEIVED SUPPLEMENTAL
INFORMATION, THIS MAY GO ON
UPWARDS OF FOUR ROUNDS,
COMMUNICATIONS, UNTIL STAFF HAS
FELT THAT THE APPLICATION
SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENT FOR

THE STATUTE, AND ALSO IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATUTE AND
THE APPLICATION FOR A TEMPORARY
PERMANENT SALE.

AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
QUESTIONS.

>> BRAD, COULD YOU TALK ABOUT
WHO WORKED ON THIS?

>> I, ALONG WITH A NUMBER OF
MEMBERS, THREE OTHER ATTORNEYS
FROM COUNSEL'S OFFICE AND ALSO
WITH THE GENERAL COUNSEL, MR.
BYRNES, IN VETTING THE EXHIBITS
AND COLLABORATIVELY WORKING TO
MAKE SURE THAT THE NEEDS OF THE
STATUTE ARE SATISFIED.

>> JOHN, ANY QUESTIONS TO YOU
GUYS?

>> NO.

>> NO.

>> GOOD.

SO NO OTHER NEW BUSINESS TO
CONSIDER?

>> NONE.

>> LET ME JUST SAY THIS, IF

ANYONE HAD ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT
THE AMOUNT OF WORK BEING DONE ON
THE CASINOS IT'S PRETTY CLEAR
THE STAFF IS DOING A TREMENDOUS
AMOUNT OF WORK AND THEY ARE TO
BE COMMENDED FOR THAT AND ALSO
DOING A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF
WORK ON NEW RESPONSIBILITY THAT
WE NOW HAVE, WHICH IS THE
REGULATION OF THE FANTASY SPORTS
BETTING.

YOU GUYS HAVE DONE AN
OUTSTANDING JOB.

IT IS A LOT OF WORK AND A TON OF
WORK TO BE DONE.

SO THANKS.

SO THAT CONCLUDES TODAY'S
PUBLISHED AGEN DA.

OH, WE HAVE TO DECIDE WHEN WE'RE
GOING TO MEET, RIGHT?

TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THE
26th OF SEPTEMBER?

SO YOU ADVISE, KRISTEN, ABOUT
YOUR AVAILABILITY, EVERYONE?

ON THE 26th.

OKAY, SO THAT CONCLUDES TODAY'S

PUBLISHED AGEN DA.

ANYTHING ELSE FOR CONTRIBUTION?

BEFORE I CONCLUDE I WANT TO

THANK THE MANAGEMENT OF TIPTON

TO ARE ALLOWING US TO CONDUCT

OUR RETIRED RACEHORSE MEETING

AND COMMISSION MEETING AT THIS

OUTSTANDING FACILITY.

HEARING NO OTHER ITEMS FOR

CONSIDERATION THE MEETING OF THE

NEW YORK STATE GAMING COMMISSION

IS ADJOURNED.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.