TEST TEST TEST.

>>> NEW YORK STATE SECTION 102

PROVIDES NEW YORK STATE FAMING

COMMISSION CONSISTS OF SEVEN

MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE MEMBER

WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF

THE SENATE.

FIVE MEMBERS HAVING BEEN

CONFIRMED BY THE NARK 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
RENOUNDED 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 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, 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 REVISED 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, OTHERWISE 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?

>> 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
ORIGINALY 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 NOTION 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 REQUIRED "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.
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
REMEDiation 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 EXTRANEOUS 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 AUTHORIZES 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, ACRESES
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-SUBTANNIVE 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 HAY 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 SOLICITITED 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.

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 emblem 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

DOWN 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.

OFTEN TIMES 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 AGENDA.
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.