Hello.

Can you hear us in New York?

Yes, we can.

We certainly can.

Excellent.

New York State Racing, Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law section 102 provides that the New York State Gaming Commission shall consist of seven members appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Five members having been confirmed by the New York State Senate, affords the Commission an ability to establish a quorum and undertake action. This present meeting of the Commission is now called to order.

Ms. Secretary, will you please call the roll?

Here.

Here.

Here.

Here.

Here.

Here.

Here.

Here.

Mr. Williams and my fellow commissioners and staff colleagues. I welcome you to this meeting and appreciate the opportunity to coordinate this from a remote distance for this first meeting. But I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve and to serve with these commissioners in particular, to the staff. We've had opportunities, Mr. Williams and Mr. Park and I to have meetings in preparation of this meeting and my service so I very much look forward to working with all of you.

While I am new to the Commission and to some of the issues that we will be dealing with, what is new to me is public service and the importance of it and the trust that we all have been placed and granted in our assignment. I'm deeply honored by this nomination and confirmation and I pledge to serve the citizens of New York with purpose and to work with my fellow commissioners on our work so that our services were marked with integrity and transparency. So it's clear we have a lot of work to do this year and in this meeting so I want to get right to it.

So we begin officially with the approval of the minutes from the conduct of our last meeting, Governor Andrew M. Cuomo has designated Mark Gearan as chair of the Gaming Commission.
your meeting on November 4, 2013.
The minutes of the Commission meetings conducted on November 4, 2013, have been provided to members in advance and at this time I'd like to ask members if there are any edits or corrections or amendments.
You don't think so?
>> No.
Next on our agenda is the report of the acting executive director, Mr. Williams.
Thank you.
Today I'd like to discuss three issues of potential interest. First is to apprise you of the Commission's preparation for a commercial casino development.
Second is to briefly discuss a few issues at NYRA. And the third is to discuss the status of the Camelot lottery report that we had previously approved, the RFP, at an earlier meeting.
The Commission has recently taken a number of significant steps regarding the preparation for a commercial casino development.
First, the Office of Counsel has expanded its staff. This past Monday, two new attorneys have joined us.
One, late of the national law firm of Jenner & Block, and the other from the staff of the Brooklyn Law School. A third will be joining the staff next week from the international law firm of Paul Weiss.
Ed, are the new attorneys with you today?
We have two of them with today.
I'd like to introduce them all to the commissioners.
We have Heather McCarn is with us and Jaclyn Vargo.
And their focus initially will be on our efforts to develop our regulation of the commercial casinos in the state.
>> Fantastic.
As Ed mentioned, they're assigned to assist with the refinement of the RFA as well, the request for application initially, and then to develop the regulatory structure and licensing processes for the commercial casino.
And their focus initially will be on our efforts to develop our regulation of the commercial casinos in the state.
>> Thank you.
and also a determination as how local support will be illustrated.

Moving on to NYRA, as you're all aware, the New York Racing Association has received a spate of bad publicity recently with the news of a number of high-profile crimes. The crimes include a horrific alleged rape after racing hours and the theft of memorabilia and office equipment from Aqueduct Racetrack.

I'm reluctant to discuss the specifics of the former, given the criminal case that is pending and the potential for civil litigation. We are, however, working with NYRA management to ensure that there is an appropriate mechanism for notification of incidents and a compilation of events. The latter is important to understand trend development and ensure appropriate attention is given when circumstances warrant.

As to the widespread publicity attendant to the utilization of video lottery gaming revenues at Aqueduct Racetrack, I'm pleased to report at the last meeting of the NYRA Reorganization Board, NYRA detailed various expenditures that are planned for each of the three racetracks.

I think, however, that NYRA can and should do better and thus I'm consulting with both the New York State Franchise Oversight Board and NYRA management regarding increasing the transparency of video lottery gaming expenditures. To this end, we will be discussing with NYRA, making plainly available on the Internet a posting that reflects the various capital investment from video lottery gaming revenues at each racetrack.

Ideally, there would be a place where interested parties would be able to go to find the status of the completed projects, ongoing projects, and planned projects.

As to Camelot, following a competitive process in December of 2013, the Commission awarded Camelot Global Services North America a contract to conduct market research in relation to alternative approaches for the future of the New York Lottery and the creation of a 5-year business plan. This is an extremely broad-based review of lottery operation and is not intended to be a plan for lottery expansion.

While the initial findings were timely delivered to Commission staff, Camelot continues to revise its final report, much of which will be ultimately posted to the Commission's website for public accessibility.

The initial delivery included some findings and a variety of suggested approaches as to sales, marketing, and game development.

The division has already sought to immediately implement several of these recommendations, such as a restructuring of the contract for advertising into separate contracts for media and creative services. This effort is already underway with the development of a draft new proposal for advertising services.

The division is also reviewing recommendations for restructuring the methods of supporting some lottery retailers through a larger use of telephone-based processes.

Such an implementation would afford our marketing
representative staff to focus on greater individual sales execution with our agents that benefit from more personalized service.

Additionally, one recommendation from Camelot was to continue the development of an instant ticket management pilot program, which has been found successful in western and central New York. To that end, lottery has identified some 650 New York City-based retailers for the pilot program.

An initial update on the effectiveness of this program on retail sales in New York City should be completed in another week.

Finally, the Commission has moved to fill many of the vacancies within the lottery division, especially within the marketing branch. These new hires will reduce pressure on existing staff and will assist in the important function of meaningful succession planning.

Mr. Gearan?

>> Thank you very much, Rob, for that helpful report.

Next on our agenda is the appointment of the Gaming Facility Location Board members and I turn to Mr. Williams to outline the procedure.

>> By New York Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law section 109-a, the Commission is required to appoint five individuals to serve as members of the Gaming Facility Location Board.

As you are all aware, in February, the Commission announced the names of our first three appointments. Today, the Commission may take action to formally seat these nominees. You're aware of the statutory requirements and the prohibitions for the Board membership and the manner of identification, vetting, and conflicts steps that we undertook.

>> Great.

W ell, thank you. So with that, may I have a motion to accept the appointment of Paul Francis, Stuart Rabinowitz, and William C. Thompson Jr., to the Gaming Facility Location Board?

A motion?

>> Mr. Chairman, Todd Snyder.

I'll make the motion.

>> Great.

Thank you, Mr. Snyder.

Do I have a second?

>> Great.

Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion?

Okay.

All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

Any opposed?

Great.
The motion carries.

We next turn to the--on our agenda to rule-making,

where there are several matters before us.

New York State's Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and

Breeding Law 104.19 authorizes the Commission to promulgate

rules and regulations that it deems necessary to carry out its

responsibilities.

To that regard, the Commission will, from time to time,

promulgate rules and rule amendments pursuant to the State

Administrative Procedure Act.

And today, we have six rule-making items for

consideration.

So I've asked Rob to outline the proposals.

The first item for consideration today is the

adoption of a proposed rule regarding claimed thoroughbred

horses.

The rule would require the previous trainer of the claimed

horse to provide the new owner within 48 hours after the

claiming race is made official, with an accurate record of all

corticosteroid joint injections administered to the horse within

the 30 days prior to the claiming race.

This notice requirement would allow the new owner and trainer

to make more fully informed decisions about veterinary care.

The rule was recommended by the New York Task Force on Race

Horse Health and Safety and was in effect as an emergency rule

from December 12, 2012, until March 10, 2013, when the

Commission permitted the rule to lapse while trainers adopted to

a different emergency rule which required them to submit a record

every corticosteroid joint injection to the Commission within 48

hours of the injection.

Trainers and their veterinarians now make such re

ports through

the Commission's online reporting system.

That online system now has the capability to allow the previous

trainer, when requested by a claiming trainer, to grant

access to the last 30 days of reported corticosteroid joint

injections for the horse.

Dr. Palmer is with us here and I guess my question

is--my understanding as a former practicing veterinarian that you

are, could you lend some insight to us in terms of the

administrative utilization of the system and that is how easy

is the system to work in?

Is it useful from your perspective?

Be happy to comment on that.

The program is called ESAL, it's an equine steroid reporting

system that's online.

The trainers have been using it.

I think we've got approximately 5,000 reported injections

since the program started.

And this program gives us a database that enables us to

survey the use of medication in these horses and to track those

medication treatments.

It also provides the opportunity to provide this information to

new owners of horses when they claim them because a major

problem we identified in the past horse report was that

horses were being treated for a condition, there had been a

claiming race claim by a new trainer who would identify the
same condition and do the same treatment over again 'cause he had no idea of how they'd been treated before and this happened over and over again to the detriment of the horse. So this process is still early in its development but it's working very well so far and it's being continually updated as time goes on.

Thank you, Dr. Palmer and, Mr. Burns, were there any public comments received?

Yes, the rule was proposed after the last meeting and during the public comment period we received one comment from NYRA. The way we phrased the proposed rule was that the burden is on the previous trainer of the claimed horse to provide the information. NYRA suggested that they provide the information to the Commission and the Commission in turn provide the information to the new trainer and owner. We believe that a change in the language of the rule was not necessary but, as Dr. Palmer just explained, the way it's actually being implemented electronically serves the same concern that NYRA was--of ease of use that NYRA had raised with us, which is since all of these objections are being reported within 48 hours on an ongoing basis, they're already in our system, and the only thing that technically needs to be done is the authorization from the previous trainer that the new trainer can actually look at and access those records. So the way it's being implemented in practice is the way that NYRA suggested it would be for ease of all the horsemen and we didn't think any change in the phrasing of the rule was necessary but we believe that adoption of it will address that concern.

Great.

Thank you, Ed and Dr. Palmer.

To my fellow commissioners, any questions on either the regulation or the process?

Ed, was there any other comment that we're not addressing or is this--

No other comment was received, other than that.

Thank you.

Great.

Well, may I then have a motion to adopt the revised regulation on notice of cortico steroid injections in claimed thoroughbred horses? A motion?

So moved.

Great.

Thank you, Mr. Crotty.

A second?

Second.

Second.

Great.

Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing none.

All in favor?

Aye.

Aye.

Opposed?
The motion carries.
Great.
Next is rule-making regarding shockwave regulation.
Rob?

The next item for Commission consideration is the adoption of a proposed rule to restrict the use of extracorporeal shockwave therapy, radial pulse wave therapy, and similar physiological treatments on thoroughbred racehorses.

Shockwave therapy and similar treatments involve the application of external pressure waves to an area of the horse to promote healing, but the therapy also makes the area numb for several days. This numbness poses a potential danger to thoroughbred racehorses running at high speed and to their exercise riders and jockeys.

Shockwave and other similar therapies are not known to create a similar danger to slower moving horses such as those engaged in standardbred racing. This rule would closely regulate the use of shockwave treatments and other similar therapies so that thoroughbred horses could not be breezed or raced until the resulting numbness wears off.

Great.
Thank you, Rob.

Again, Dr. Palmer, would you care to add anything to Rob's overview?
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I think the overview was very accurate.
This regulation has been in place as a house rule at NYRA for some time.
And I think that it has established a regulatory pattern that's helped to control the administration of this therapy and this rule by the state will provide the ability for the Gaming Commission to regulate it in effective fashion.
Great.
Thank you, Doctor.
And again, Mr. Burns, any comments received, public comments?
No public comments since the rule was published as a proposed rule-making.
Prior to our proposal, we had solicited comments from the thoroughbred tracks in the state and Finger Lakes fully supported it, as did NYRA, and NYRA had noted that they had a house rule that had some aspects of our proposal in it and their interest was that the rule that we eventually would propose and adopt be consistent and in harmony with their practices and it is.

Great.
Commissioners, any questions on the regulation or the process?
None.
Okay.
Well, may I have a motion then to adopt the regulation on shockwave and similar therapies?
I move that the regulation be adopted.

Great.
Thank you.
A second?
Any discussion on the motion?
Well, with that, all in favor, aye?

With that, all in favor, aye?

The motion carries.

The next item for proposed rule-making for standardbred, out-of-competition testing.

Mr. Williams?

Thank you.

The next item for consideration are proposed amendments to our standardbred, out-of-competition testing rule designed to clarify the existing rule, define internal protocols of the Commission, and to add improvements such as those contained in the once-identical thoroughbred out-of-competition rule.

In general, the out-of-competition rule protects race integrity by making it possible to detect the administration of potent doping agents that increase red blood cells, mask pain, or increase a horse's ability to race beyond its natural limits. The rule, which includes a description and prohibition of such doping agents, also makes it possible to detect drug cocktails.

Such doping agents and drug cocktails may be readily administered in sub-clinical doses that are effective because of the drug interactions. Such doping agents and drug cocktails may be readily administered in such a manner as to be undetectable in race day samples.

Staff suggests the standardbred, out-of-competition rule would be improved by incorporating many elements of the thoroughbred out-of-competition rule. The improvements would affirm the limited nature of the collection program by expressly stating that a trainer or owner does not consent to a search of the premises simply by allowing an off-track horse to be sampled, clarify that a trainer or owner must apprise the Commission when he or she is not training the horse to race in New York in order to excuse a horse from sampling, and amend the category of prohibited substances that was criticized by the appellate court.

Thank you, Rob.

Let me again turn to Dr. Palmer for any other additional comments to Rob's overview.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think that out-of-competition testing is a mission-critical aspect of the Commission's ability to move forward and detect the administration of drugs that cannot be identified in the normal race day testing program.

So this is an extremely important rule in both the thoroughbred and the harness and I think this is an appropriate rule to accomplish that.

Ed, any comments you would add?
The only comment I would add is that the previous or currently existing standardbred rule was already upheld by the appellate division in almost its entirety, as Mr. Williams noted. The one issue that the appellate court had taken issue with, we would address in this rule to make sure that that provision is legal according to the courts.

And--

That being the issue of consent?

No.

The only issue was the way we had defined protein and peptide-based drug agents because there were two parts of the rule that appeared that it was permitted in some circumstances and completely banned in others. And the court said those two were irreconcilable.

So the way we're gonna clarify that or propose to clarify that is to say the only--such substances are only banned to the extent that they're producing certain effects in the horse and that way it will remove the conflict that the court perceived in two portions of our rule.

And it gives us the opportunity to add some safeguards to the search issue, if you will, that even though the courts have upheld broader authority on behalf of the Commission, we think are reasonable accommodations to the horse owners and trainers that, for instance, would not make them bring a horse to New York unless we couldn't obtain reasonably a sample in the neighboring jurisdiction where they might be.

So we thought those would be improvements to the existing rule even though the broader authority has already been upheld to be legal.

Any other questions from the commissioners on the regulation or the process?

No?

Well, hearing none, may I have a motion then to propose rule-making for standardbred, out-of-competition testing?

I so move.

Great.

Thank you.

A second?

Second.

Any discussion on the motion?

All in favor, aye?

Aye.

Opposed?

The motion carries.

Our next proposed rule-making for new lottery game "Cash for Life."

The next item for consideration is a draft regulation to govern a new planned multi-state lottery game that select state lotteries from the Mega Millions and Powerball consortia will conduct.

The name of the game will likely be "Cash for Life."

This new game would have drawings on Monday and Thursday.

For each $2 wager, a player must select 5 numbers out of a field of 60 and 1 number out of a field of 4.

Players could also wager by the way of "Quick Picks," which allow the computer system to generate random numbers as
Generally, the jackpot prize would be $1,000 a day for life, with the second prize being $1,000 a week for life. Lower level prizes would be one-time prize payments, ranging between $2 and $2,500.

"Cash for Life" has had a limited success and has experienced slowing sales and declining consumer interest. Based on other "for life" life-based prizes, we anticipate the net effect for aid to education to reach between $8 million and $9 million annually.

Let me ask Gardner Gurney, who's the acting director for the Division of the Lottery, when would we expect to be offering this game?

Mr. Chairman, our plan is to launch this game on May 16, which is a Friday morning and the first drawing would be May 19, which is a Monday.

To the commissioners, any questions on this regulation or the process?

Well, may I have a motion then to propose rule-making for the new "Cash for Life" lottery game?

So moved.

I'm sorry, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, there were two--from the proposal that was sent to the commissioners beforehand, there are just two minor tweaks based on some discussions with some of the other participating states.

They're not substantive in nature but I just wanted to alert the commissioners to that, that we'll clean those up as we prepare it for submission to the Department of State for publication and state register.

One is the name of the extra ball that's drawn. The states will prefer to call it a "Cash ball" instead of "Lucky Ball" as you see in your draft.

And then there's a certain tweak to the nature of a lump sum payment for second prizes if there are a certain excessive number of them.

So we'll clean that up at a staff level and then put that in the submission that's published as a proposed rule-making.

Great.

Yes, Robert shared with me that these were late adjustments.

But thank you, Ed.

So any other questions on regulation or the process from the commissioners?

Great.

Do we have a motion?

Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I'll move the adoption.

Second.
00:28:39:16 >> Great.
00:28:40:26 Any discussion?
00:28:42:11 All in favor, aye?
00:28:45:08 >> Aye.
00:28:46:00 >> Aye.
00:28:46:28 >> Opposed?
00:28:48:10 The motion carries.
00:28:50:11 And our next revised proposal rule-making for controlled therapeutic harness and thoroughbred medications.
00:28:57:27 Rob?
00:28:59:05 >> Yes, before the Commission are proposed revisions to the controlled therapeutic medications rules proposed on 00:29:02:08 November 4, 2013.
00:29:07:17 Staff has reported that the rule-making comment solicitation period result in several advisable recommendations.
00:29:14:27 While most of the revisions are technical in nature, any revisions necessitates publication as revised rule-making, which requires an additional 30-day public comment period.
00:29:25:04 If we adopt these proposed revisions, the Commission would then be in a position to take final action on the collective set of proposed rules at the conclusion of the additional public comment period.
00:29:35:13 It's my understanding that the suggested revisions may be divided between substantive and technical corrections.
00:29:46:10 >> I guess in that regard, Dr. Palmer, would you please address the substantive changes and then, Ed, perhaps you could address the technical changes that Mr. Williams just mentioned.
00:30:00:03 Dr. Palmer?
00:30:01:26 >> Mr. Chairman, the principal substantive change is that the original recommendation by the Racing Medication Testing Consortium and the Association of Racing Commissioners International was to recommend the use of 24 medications, regulated by threshold, and to assign all of the unapproved, they call them, the Non-24 medications, into a category that we regulated with a zero tolerance testing program, meaning that no level of the medication whatsoever would be allowed in the system of the animal.
00:30:35:13 International was to recommend the use of 24 medications, regulated by threshold, and to assign all of the unapproved, they call them, the Non-24 medications, into a category that we regulated with a zero tolerance testing program, meaning that no level of the medication whatsoever would be allowed in the system of the animal.
00:30:39:19 This is--since this was first recommended by those two groups, they have changed course in their recommendations and now they recommend that instead of having a zero tolerance regulation for all of the other 60-some medications in New York, that New York continue and other jurisdictions continue to regulate those substances by their existing rules that are already in place.
00:31:02:29 So there will be no changes recommended for those medications.
00:31:04:06 So while that might seem like a technical thing, it really is a hugely important modification because there are a number of medications in that list of 64 that are perfectly appropriate for use in the horse and, by banning them, it would have created quite an inappropriate response.
00:31:21:15 So that's a very positive change.
00:31:24:10 It does, of course, require though that we resubmit the whole protocol--the rule for another period of
Another specific, a significant change in particular with regard to New York was this section of rules includes a regulation to prohibit the administration of clenbuterol which is a bronchodilator to be given to thoroughbred racehorses within 14 days of a race and that rule was part of a national recommendation and has been very well supported by the thoroughbred horsemen in New York.

The harness horsemen expressed during the public hearings a significant concern about using the same time-restricted rule of 14 days in harness because they race more frequently and for some portion of the year they actually race every week. So that if we made a 14-day rule for clenbuterol for harness, it would, in fact, ban the drug from use in standardbreds.

Now what the Commission has done is we've met and talked about this quite a bit. We have language in this proposed new rule that, although the language is slightly different from thoroughbred to harness, it is—this rule will have exactly the same effect in both breeds. It just simply takes into account the racing protocols for the breeds being different.

For example, in the harness end of things, a horse that—a standardbred who has not qualified to race, meaning that they have not raced within 30 days, will have to abide by the 14-day rule and the harness horsemen have agreed to that. However, if a horse is already qualified and is in active racing, then the horse would then be regulated 96 hours, giving them the opportunity to administer clenbuterol for 2 days after the race and still race their horse the following week.

And there is a lot of scientific research being done on this drug right now and, until such a time as further evidence becomes available when which we can make a more definitive rule, we felt accomplishing the same thing but using slightly different language.

So there's no substantive difference between the rules in thoroughbred and harness, even though the language is very different.

So those are the two major substantive changes in the rule.

Commissioner Crotty had a question first, I believe.

Yes, go ahead, John.

I spoke to those guys, Girago and company, and they'd made a big push about needing, you know, clenbuterol to run on a regular basis and I, you know, I accepted what they were telling me at face value but it still intuitively doesn't make sense to me.

You're a veterinarian, do they need it? 'Cause it seemed like an enhancement.

They had standardbred racing before they had drugs. Now they have drugs. Now they say they need drugs to have standardbred racing. The bridge doesn't work but they were pretty emphatic.
00:34:09:29 that it does.
00:34:11:13 >> I think, Mr. Crotty, the more appropriate question is not
00:34:16:16 "Do they need it?"
00:34:17:23 The question is "Does it work?"
00:34:19:13 And given the protocol that they recommend, where they say they
00:34:22:13 need it, are they actually using a medication as effective in
00:34:25:15 that protocol that they describe?
00:34:27:25 And that's the more appropriate question and that question needs
00:34:30:01 to be answered with some research that's pending
00:34:32:00 right now.
00:34:33:02 But we'll be able to answer that question a little more
00:34:35:00 appropriately as soon as that research is completed.
00:34:36:28 >> So it's been around for some period of time.
00:34:39:22 You're a veterinarian longer than 20 years plus, right?
00:34:42:23 They've been running on this stuff.
00:34:44:29 They're researching it now, we're gonna get a different
00:34:46:28 answer now, 20-plus years later or--?
00:34:49:10 >> The question--a research project is focused on
00:34:51:17 a particular question.
00:34:53:04 The particular question is not does clenbuterol have an effect.
00:34:56:01 I mean, it's a very useful bronchodilator, there's no
00:34:57:28 question about that.
00:34:59:03 >> Sure.
00:35:00:03 >> We also though, over time, come to appreciate that it has
00:35:02:02 an anabolic repartitioning effect that is the point of
00:35:04:19 these regulations, that the rule that we're writing is actually
00:35:07:07 designed to prevent the use of this drug to accomplish a
00:35:09:22 repartitioning effect and this rule will do that.
00:35:13:19 Absolutely will do that.
00:35:15:09 The question of whether or not it's appropriate to give the
00:35:17:19 drug for treatment of airway disease in the manner in which
00:35:21:01 they have described they want to do it is a totally separate
00:35:23:02 question which, again, is one that hasn't been investigated
00:35:25:17 and one is being looked at right now.
00:35:27:23 >> I'm sorry, I'm actually a little confused.
00:35:30:13 So we don't want to authorize the use of clenbuterol
00:35:38:05 for its anabolic effect.
00:35:41:08 Am I getting that right?
00:35:42:16 But we're not sure that it's efficacious?
00:35:45:29 >> No, we're not sure if it--see, for--
00:35:47:23 >> But, I'm sorry, just for 1 second, I want to understand the
00:35:50:00 question as you've laid it out.
00:35:51:29 But we're not sure yet because we haven't had the research yet
00:35:54:10 to determine whether it's efficacious for its use after
00:35:59:24 racing to be a bronchodilator?
00:36:02:28 >> This drug is labeled for use in the horse as a bronchodilator
00:36:06:14 and it was created to treat horses with heaves or
00:36:10:23 a pulmonary emphysema-type condition and, in so doing, the
00:36:15:00 manufacturer recommends giving the drug for 14 days in a row
00:36:17:20 and then stopping because the receptors and the cells
00:36:21:09 get saturated.
00:36:22:10 Effectively, that the medical treatment for a respiratory
00:36:24:11 disease is that you give it 14 days and stop.
00:36:26:11 That is not the protocol that the harness industry is
00:36:29:24 recommend--is suggesting and which they're using it.
00:36:32:06 They're using it with slightly different application and the
00:36:34:17 question is "Is it useful in that application?"
We just don't know the answer to that right now.

So we're creating this rule so that it can be used out of protocol?

Is that what we're saying?

We're creating a rule that allows, for the time being, the harness industry to use this medication.

It does have mucociliary clearance effects known to help clear out mucus to some degree.

The question is "By giving it 2 days, is that enough to really accomplish that?"

We just don't know the answer to that right now.

So we are--for the time that we are making this rule-making the goal is not to determine whether or not it's significant to clear mucus, what we're trying to do is prevent the misuse as an anabolic agent and this drug will do that.

Now, whether the rule needs to be modified further down, the question is if it, you know, the very small dose given for a couple of days is creating anabolic effect.

We don't have the answer to that yet.

So it's inappropriate perhaps to regulate it exactly the same way in both breeds, using the same language, given the different ways that these medications are used.

John had another question, what did they do before the drug existed?

Well, there are alternatives to treatment.

And there are veterinarians who believe that the clenbuterol's very useful for this and there are other veterinarians think there are other drugs that are more useful for it.

So there are alternatives to treat this medical condition besides clenbuterol.

Dr. Palmer, could I ask a question?

Sure.

The first simply is this drug has been in use in harness racing for how long?

Since the '90s.

It's been around for quite a while.

Since the 1990s and it's currently--under its present use, it's allowed to be used today?

Yes.

So the concept here on the rule or the proposed rule is simply to ensure that it can't be used for anabolic purposes but still continue its present ability to be used for what it's been used for since the 1990s, right?

That's correct.

Okay.

Just clarifying, that's all.

Thank you.

So when--who's conducting the study and when do we anticipate it being completed by?

The University of Pennsylvania is conducting the study and I don't know the exact timetable.

I would say within a year.

Okay.

So should we think about the return of that study in the context of the new rule?
Well, I would recommend that under the circumstances the best thing for the industry would be to adopt the rule as proposed and that we can certainly revisit it as new--as in any rule, revisit it as new scientific information becomes available.

Everyone has a lot of things going on and reports come and go. You can include some sort of timeframe within the rule to have it revisited by determination now, right? I mean, if we're waiting for this report, which hopefully will be conclusive one way or the other, it might be interesting to look at this rule when that report comes out in, say, a year's time to sort of figure out whether or not this is the right protocol or use, wouldn't you say?

If the report's gonna determine its effectiveness, why wouldn't you want to be forced to look at it in a year? So I'm not sure exactly what you're recommending.

When we approve a rule it's a rule for forever until you go back in and actively do something. There's a way to approve rules so that they force you to relook at them when certain elements come back up, for instance, a conclusive report from Pennsylvania that talks about the effectiveness of it.

The timing wouldn't be the same. Because the protocol was to get rid of it for 14 days in advance. It was determined that that was not effective, anabolic or not, right?

If you stop 14 days away, you've basically eliminated the ability to achieve an anabolic effect of the drug. Okay, so I think this whole proposal, that aspect of it, is meant to address the misuse of the drug for the anabolic effect, but I think you're raising another interesting question which is "Should it be regulated for other effects?" And that, as I understand, is what Dr. Palmer is saying research is being done at that you might want to look at and revisit down the line. But that research won't bring anything to bear as I understand it on the regulation of the improper anabolic effect that we're trying to look at.

Is that the case? That's true. Did I not state that accurately?

I think the focus here is on the misuse of the drug for anabolic use and this rule will prevent that. And so I believe that your point is valid and I can assure you that we will be looking at this drug in an ongoing fashion.
It's something that we'll be looking at quite closely. But the important thing is that this rule will accomplish the goal, the rational, you know, reason for making this rule is to prevent the use of it as an anabolic agent and it will do that.

So I believe that even though the language is slightly different, given the different training and racing schedules that it brings, it will accomplish the same thing in both breeds, which is, I think, the most important or the core concept here that we need to focus on.

Okay.

Rob, would it make sense for us to keep this current when the research is complete and we could look to Rob to make sure Commissioner Crotty's interest is taken into account.

There's no doubt that we can track the study. The study will actually be very widely disseminated when it's finally released from the University of Pennsylvania and that's something that Dr. Palmer's unit can also monitor as well.

I think so, right?

I mean, if you're going by the best scientific evidence, if something proves different that you'd want to have the ability to go back in.

I mean, I guess you have that ability no matter what--

Correct.

Whenever you want but it would be not bad if we're sort of pending some sort of formation of thought on this, based on what the research says, to sort of force us to take another look at it.

Commissioner, I think you're exactly right.

I can assure you it will do that.

Just as a point of trivia, how did they propose a series of substances that actually turned out to be useful.

And this was the list. That list is actually--had a couple of other drugs
recommended by the American Association of Equine Practitioners.
The RMTC made it very clear that this is a living document that, as new drugs are come along, that they could be added to this list if they were documented to be effective and safe and helpful so that process was--took about a year to get that together. Very controversial and these were the drugs that were settled on as the must-have medications and it's not that all the other medications can't be used. You just--they shouldn't use them in close proximity to the race.

Any other questions or concerns from the Commission?

Okay, well, do we have a motion on the proposal?

Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify too, what's before the Commission for consideration is revised proposals that will then be published in the state register and then after all comment is collected, it'll be before the Commission again for everything to be tied up in one proposed--rule-making.

Say, let me--thank you, Ed.

So this is a motion to propose a revised rule-making for controlled therapeutic harness and thoroughbred medications, to be clear.

Correct.

So I would entertain a motion for that proposal of the revised rule-making.

Yeah, I'd like to.

Can I ask one question, though?

Can we solicit specifically and ask for a couple of trainers or people out there to sort of comment on it in the affirmative that the publishing of the rules wherever they get published and the lack of comments is always problematic. They bring it up each time.

Pick a couple of guys upstate, couple of guys downstate, women, men, whatever, just asking professionals for their opinion and, if you mail it or ask them specifically, if they have none, it would be under--and we don't have to make the list public, but to say, "These are the people we asked for comment and they said nothing."

It would be interesting to solicit that feedback in a very direct way, right?

No, Mr. Crotty, we'll definitely do that and there's no doubt with this bundle of proposed rules, we've already received a number of comments and had a public hearing where people had very strongly expressed views on the topic so we will make sure that every--not only everyone on our contact list will get the revised proposal but specifically everyone who has submitted a comment on the previous proposal, make sure we alert them to the current proposal and gather all of that.

And that's good. I think there's a universe of people, though, that probably are involved with this industry on a day-to-day basis that don't want to write back or don't solicit or don't feel they have a voice, not totally dissimilar to the number of people who
don't vote in elections, though they're fully able to.
It would be good to actively solicit some of their--you know, a couple of Finger Lakes people, a couple of trotter guys, pick a couple of tracks, and a couple of flat guys in the NYRA world. Not necessarily the head of the agency but, you know, numbers 7, 8, and 9 on the training board for backwood or winter meet or--you pick the formula, to get their comments and say, "Hey, we asked them specifically and they came back with x." May be nothing but it would be good to know we were a little bit proactive on it and, if this is a big rule like that, it would be interesting to hear what their feedback was.
In all theories or all walks of government, my experience has been there are professional people on both sides of the issue. And they're always willing to lend their voice to whatever it is. It's not that their point's not valid. I'm just not sure if they're tapping into a real vein or if it's a 20-year career for the pro and con on either side, right?
I saw some of the feedback for some of the earlier Lasix stuff from before and those names are all very similar to the ones with probably the exact same comments.
New dates.
This has come up before and I don't want to take up too much time on it but normally what do we do in terms of pulsing?
Well, a couple of things.
So formally it gets published in a state register so anyone monitoring that, you know, has the opportunity to look at that. The three guys from wherever.
But we also--the acting secretary of the Commission maintains a list of interested parties who reached out to the Commission and said they want to be apprised of developments in, whether it's harness, thoroughbred, both, and other areas as well, and whether, even in the pre-proposal stage, we often solicit comments from that group as well but certainly when we reached the proposal or revised proposal stage, everything is again sent out to that entire mailing list by electronic mail and affords them the opportunity to at least have it.
And out of that list, we'd be making more intimate reach-out to--
Well, I think what Commissioner Crotty's suggesting is that maybe there are people out in the regulated community who haven't even taken the time to get on that mailing list and that the commissioner suggests that perhaps we ought to make an effort to reach out to some-- Pay attention to the state register.
One other thing I would make note of is that the proposed rules are also put onto the Gaming Commission's website.
Okay, so with that as-- We'll certainly endeavor to make that--
You know, you're not looking to create multiple hours' worth of work. If you had a straight list of questions, tacking it on their door, saying, "If you got any feedback on this," would be useful. Again, not looking to create more work than necessary but it would be good to get some other feedback. You had some big names on the list before, obviously that--

>> We'll do something.

Okay, well, thank you, all.

So with that as good dialog, let me then ask for a motion to propose a revised rule-making.

>> Sample already did.

>> Mr. Sample?

Great.

Is there a second?

>> Sure.

>> Second.

Great.

Any discussion?

I think we've had some good--any more discussion?

All in favor, aye?

>> Aye.

>> Opposed?

The motion carries.

Let's now turn to the proposed rule-making regarding altering harness and thoroughbred horses.

The last rule-making for consideration today is a proposal wherein the gelding of a horse would be required to be reported to both the racing secretary and the official horse identifier if the horse is entered into race at any race meeting.

Staff has heard concerns raised by the wagering public about the absence of any rule or procedure which required the timely reporting of first-time geldings in races. As it is generally accepted wisdom that the first-time geldings are likely to run better than they ran before they were gelded, timely information on first-time geldings would be helpful to handicappers.

We note that California, Oklahoma, and Texas all have similar rules.

Mr. Burns, anything to add to the overview?

No, sir.

I didn't--

Any discussion?

Yeah, that's a good question.

May I have a motion then to propose rule-making regarding reporting the gelding of harness and thoroughbred horses?

>> Snyder.

>> So moved, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Snyder is second.

Great.

Any discussion?

All in favor, aye?

>> Aye.

>> None for the record.
The motion carries.

We now--let's turn to our next agenda item

The Commission has three hearing officer reports for consideration today.

I have asked Mr. Williams to outline the cases.

First is in the matter of Graham Lewis.

The first case regards Graham Lewis whose application for occupational harness owner, harness trainer, and harness driver license was denied upon a finding that Mr. Lewis's experience, character, and general fitness are such that his participation in racing or related activities in the State of New York is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity, or with the best interest of racing generally.

Mr. Lewis appealed the denial and a hearing was conducted on July 30, 2013.

The hearing officer recommended that the license denial be upheld.

All members have received a copy of the hearing officer's report and have had an opportunity to review a record of the hearing.

Would anyone like to discuss either the report or the recommendation?

Hearing none, may I have a motion to adopt the hearing officer's report and confirm its findings and the recommendations as submitted?

So moved.

Great.

Second.

Any discussion on the motion?

All in favor, aye?

Aye.

Aye.

Opposed?

The motion carries.

The next adjudication is in the matter of Greg Luther.

The second case regards an appeal by harness driver, Gregory Luther.

The presiding judge at Batavia Downs found Mr. Luther used unauthorized equipment and subsequently threatened the judge.

After being fined $1,000 for these violations, Mr. Luther appealed and a hearing was conducted on October 29, 2013.

The hearing officer found Mr. Luther guilty of various rules infractions but recommended a fine reduction to $500.

Again, all members have received a copy of the hearing officer's report and have had an opportunity to review the record of the hearing.

Would anyone like to discuss the report or the recommendations?
I have a question. How are fine amounts determined?

There is precedent that is available for research both at the track level and by the hearing officer. There are certain enumerated things in statute that are in our regulations that have specific penalties imposed but a lot of it is discretionary and it's something that—

How wide is this discretion?

It depends on the type of infraction but can be wide. And it a lot of times depends on the disciplinary history of the person in question and the nature of the conduct.

In this case, what is the maximum fine that could have been imposed?

I don't believe there's a regulatory maximum. Our statutory maximum is $25,000.

That's awfully broad. Could we consider adopting some regulations with a schedule with narrower limits so we don't give discretion—I think that the testimony in this case was that the initial officer who was investigating this matter based the fine on the financial ability of the person to pay and that's a very difficult determination for them to make without having documentation.

I think it would be helpful if there was a schedule of fines like you have in other situations and other laws that would give them direction with narrower limits on how much—

seems to me that $0 to $25,000 is way too much discretion.

I agree. We will undertake to study that issue and give you a—

report back to you with a sense of the historical range of things in certain categories of violations that come up often to give you a better sense of how that discretion has been exercised historically as well.

But short of that, Ed, I mean, this is a—it's a fair reading of the record, don't you think that the presiding judge simply replaced his discretionary judgment for the officer's discretionary judgment?

It's all that's happening here, right?

There's no other basis for the determination of the $500?

Correct. And you have the discretion to substitute your discretion for the hearing officer's recommendation too.

Thank you but no thank you.

Yeah, okay, got it.

Got it.

Good discussion.

Well, with that, may I have a motion to adopt the hearing officer's report and confirm its findings in recommendations as submitted?

Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'll move accepting the recommendations.

Second.

A second?

Great.

And any discussion on the motion?

All in favor, say "Aye."

Aye.

Opposed?

The motion carries.
Our final is in the matter of Janet Smith.

The third case regards an appeal by tote employee, Janet Smith. Miss Smith was denied license upon a finding that her experience, character, and general fitness are such that her participation in racing or related activities in the State of New York is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity or with the best interests of racing generally.

Following Mrs. Smith's appeal, a hearing was conducted on January 22, 2014. The hearing officer recommended that the license denial be reversed and that the Commission grant Miss Smith a license as a tote employee. All members have received a copy of the hearing officer's report and have had an opportunity to review the record of the hearing.

Thank you, Rob. Would anyone like to discuss either the report or recommendation?

Just one minor point. On the final page of the report, there's listed five findings of fact and I--just speaking for myself, I wouldn't want my vote in favor of accepting this report to accept all five findings of fact, especially number 5, which I think is way too broad.

I tend to agree with Commissioner Poklemba, that finding number 5 isn't necessary to the finding overall in the report and I think the report would get to the same conclusion without it.

Exactly.

Any other discussion?

So Rob, being my first meeting here, do we--would this be a motion as amended?

No, I think you could have a motion and then simply have the record reflect that Commissioners Poklemba and Snyder do not agree with the finding 5 but otherwise concur with the decision.

I don't think it's limited to the two of them.

Those two are verbalizing their concerns but I don't think the concern's limited to the two of them.

I have a similar concern.

Yeah, may I suggest the Chairman then present for consideration then or entertain a motion to adopt the hearing officer report with the exception of item 5 and ask that--entertain a motion to adopt it as amended, which is within the discretion of the Commission to consider?

All right.

Well, may I have a motion to adopt the hearing officer--

Yes, I'm sorry.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

I just want to make sure, does the finding have to conclude that the applicant, Miss Smith, does not lack the character and fitness?

Because if we take out number 5, I don't know if we actually need
a finding by the presiding judge that Miss Smith has the appropriate character and fitness and I don't know if we have that. So I just want to be careful not to take this apart and end up not getting where we want to go. >> Well, I think the other findings, as stated in the report, suggest that the basis on which the licensing unit had initially denied the licensing application is not--was found to be not supported by the record of the proceeding.

>> Got it.

Yup. >> So I think the recommendation of the hearing officer report could stand with recommendations 1 through 4 and then you, as the Commission, as the final arbiter of this decision-making, can modify the hearing officer report to exclude item number 5. >> Okay, very good.

Thank you. >> So the motion that I would entertain is to adopt the hearing officer's report, excepting finding number 5, and confirm its findings and recommendations as submitted.

>> I would so move.

>> Second.

>> Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion that's been made and seconded?

All in favor, say "Aye."

>> Aye.

Opposed?

The motion carries.

We now turn to--nearing our last items on our agenda, new business. I'd entertain any new business brought before the Commission. >> There was one item I had that I thought would be relevant. Recently down in Gulfstream, they have a bet, a Rainbow Pick 6, Rainbow 6, and if there's a single winner the pool's very big. One guy had a ticket.

The ticket had the winner. They disqualified the horse. His ticket was ruled invalid and they had to roll up. The steward's decision was met with-- Dismay?

>> Well, by one person for sure, you know? And more importantly, by the racing press who rightly questioned how these stewards were making the decision. Was it in a vacuum?

What was the concept?

How did they come to their conclusion? There wasn't a lot of visibility into the decision-making, right?

And so in that regard, in New York State, I think it would be interesting if we start taking a look at sort of how our stewards operate in the things that they operate, when they make certain decisions, some sunshine onto the process on how they make those decisions. Specifically, who voted for what, when they vote, was it 2:1, 3:1, 5--you know, whatever the vote numbers were, who was communicating with the stewards at that point? There's been some allegations of outside influence on
the stewards down in Gulfstream and, again, not by me. I don't know if any of it's true, it's just what's been written, out there, where they said, "Well, it was better for the track to have a bigger carryover so as to not award the winner."

It was a disqualification that was, you know, apparently somewhat close and a lot of these matters are somewhat close, either one horse hits another, sometimes it's crystal clear, a lot of times it's a judgment call. How you come to that judgment, I think, is relevant and, you know, understanding at the Commission level how those decisions were made and making those decisions and perhaps the video—I don't know if that's too laborious—or some form of record of those decisions available to the public on a timely basis so that they understand what decisions were made by whom and why they were made.

I throw it out there because it didn't seem like the suggestions were unreasonable.

As Commissioner Crotty said, this has gotten quite a bit of publicity in a lot of the racing press recently so it is certainly an opportune time to examine steward practice and see what we can reform in the concepts of trying to bring a little transparency to the decision-making.

The riders obviously are usually big players in the track. They also had mentioned in one of the stories that there's a fan association which sounds like some sort of collective of bigger gamblers who I think now are protesting Gulfstream. So I think it has an economic impact or could have an economic impact as well.

We actually have a racing fan advisory council that advises the Commission on various things that are of importance to racing patrons.

And that's an issue that we might be able to bring up with them as well for some research and for some examination.

Thank you, Commissioner Crotty.

Well, let me then, if I could, just take a moment as this is my first meeting serving as Chair, I wanted to take before the Commission an issue that I have a particular interest in and concern about.

I think it's quite relevant to the work of our Commission. This starts with my preparation for my confirmation in reviewing the statute for casino gaming and noted with interest the significant role and the importance for the Commission that we all have regarding applicants, the plans they would have for problem gambling.
renew and issue licenses so, given this responsibility, it seems to me that it would make sense for the Commission to be proactive in this arena.

Perhaps conducting a learning forum where we could have colleagues from state governments, New York Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services and other experts from within New York and beyond, who are aware of the gambling industry efforts, to discuss best practices that exist in approaches to prevention and treatment.

During the course of this preparation I was also made aware that March is National Problem Gambling Awareness Month. So appropriate for this focus, appropriate for my first meeting here and my interest here to serve as the Chair.

So I think it's timely for us to discuss this important issue. I've also been made aware through my study, the good news is that this Gaming Commission and Lee Park, in particular, has been very instrumental and the Commission has done very notable work in the development of a Responsible Play Partnership.

And what that is, is a longstanding group that examines all the issues surrounding problem gambling including ensuring that gaming venues comply with all the applicable rules and regulations, that they undertake the proper outreach measures.

Additionally, we're re-evaluating self-exclusion policies across the state to ensure consistency and considering the best ways to advance New York's long-term commitment to prevent and treat compulsive gambling.

The partnership is working to provide real-world tools and resources needed to adequately address the issue and promoting problem gambling prevention and ensure treatment services are available to those New Yorkers who struggle with compulsive gambling.

We have established a working group of members from the Commission, OASAS, and the Council on Problem Gambling that meets quarterly to review existing gaming policies and programs and recommend changes as needed.

Some of the actions I have taken so far has been an increased focus on underage gambling.

We have developed a strategic administrative approach to...
ensuring compliance within existing age restriction laws
for gambling products, including purchase of lottery tickets,
presence in OTV facilities, pari-mutuel wagering
and gaming VLT facilities.
Last year, we launched a component known as the
"Under 18? We check ID.
It's the law," educational initiative which includes
two components.
That's comprehensive training for the employees at lottery
retailers, tracks, VLT facilities and charitable gaming
locales on how to identify underage individuals
and the consequences for preventing underage play.
Additionally, the second component is a campaign to
educate the gambling public of the age restriction laws
in New York State.
We're pleased to report that the "We check ID" program has
garnered a 97% compliance rate across its 18,000 lottery
retailers statewide.
And similarly, we've had strong compliance rates being reported
across the other gaming components as well.
As our commissioners in New York City know, back in November, at
our last meeting, the Commission proposed a series of penalties
to accommodate an enforcement of underage sale and gaming.
The penalty structure is currently pending public comment
and expects to be--you know, once the public comment period
is over, will be formally put forth to the Commission for
formal adoption.
Additionally, the Commission and the Responsible Play Partnership
has looked into the issue of self-exclusion, which allows
people who self-identify as problem gamblers to request that
they be prohibited from entering facilities or prohibited
from participating in gaming activities which are
throughout the state.
The existing policy has been found to be relatively
inconsistent amongst various venues.
Last summer, we brought all the track operators and VLT
operators together and got a conceptual agreement to explore
creating a statewide self-exclusion program.
There is some technical and administrative issues on
the back end that need to be resolved in advance of
the launch of such a program but everybody's on board with doing
it, which is good news.
So that's a big component of what we're working on this year.
There's a number of issues we're doing this month.
As you noted, Chairman, that it is National Problem
Gaming Awareness month.
We've placed the Commission's "It's just a game; play
responsibly" message featuring the OASAS help line on all of
our public promotion screens at 18,000 licensed lottery
retailers statewide.
We've added the "It's just a game; play responsibly" and the
help line--addictions hot line number on all of our draw game
tickets.
And we've linked to the Problem Gambling PSA produced by
the National Council on Problem Gambling from the Gaming
Commission lottery and other RPP member websites.
And that's basically where we are right now. And how about the idea of a convocation, some kind of forum or session?

We can certainly do that. It's something that we can involve OASAS and the New York Council on Problem Gambling. I'm sure they'd be thrilled to assist with that and we'd be happy to take it on.

Great.

Is this something that my fellow commissioners feel would be a good direction for the Commission?

Certainly.

Yeah.

Absolutely.

Yeah, I think we've talked around it in the past but haven't really paid the attention to it that we need to and love to and should.

Who is our main contact at OASAS?

Lee?

At OASAS?

Would probably be the Commissioner Arlene González-Sánchez, as well as--

Her deputy.

Her deputy who is Sean Byrne.

Great.

Well, I appreciate that and thank Lee for the efforts to date.

I think this could be a very good focus and I look forward to working with you, Lee, and the other commissioners on this.

Thank you.

Next is old business--on the agenda.

Is there any old business that needs to be revisited?

Okay, our virtually final task here is scheduling of the next meeting.

It's my understanding that the Commission has contemplated the establishment of a uniform day for our meetings.

That is, the third Wednesday of each month.

Do we have progress towards a firm date establishment?

It's as good as any other.

Yeah.

It's as good as it gets?

Is that what you're saying down in New York?

Someone asked a question.

When would be the date of the next--I guess, we're in April then, right?

Does anybody know what that date is, 'cause we might know--people may know now if they've got an issue or not.

And so we're looking at the third week of April?

Yeah.

If you're looking at, for instance, the third Wednesday--

The third--yeah, it would be--

April 16.

Christians stand to be affected.

That would appear to be the case.
Isn't Good Friday that Friday?

Good Friday is the 18th, yes.

I mean, I'm around but--

Yeah, I can--

Yeah, as long as we're here--

as long as we're--

And certainly I'll try to make my--

Hold on a second.

Is it Passover?

I don't know what that--I can't tell.

You should check that.

That's a big issue.

What were you saying, Crystal--

Well, why don't we review our calendars and we will promptly

get back to the commissioners but that's--

We are searching for a consistent day and to get ahead

of the calendar for the balance of this year.

So we'll get back to you folks.

That concludes today's published agenda.

Do any commissioners have any additional items they'd like to

present for consideration?

Mr. Chairman, one point.

If you're going to do that, that would be immensely helpful to

lay on the calendar for the next period of time that date,

whatever it may be.

It doesn't really matter when it is for the next one but just

knowing what the June, July and next September dates would be

very useful.

There's been some variable--maybe there needs to

be more going forward but pegging a date now for the rest

of the year would be great.

I think for many of us, the more locked in that can be,

so that's what we will endeavor to do for this calendar year.

Lovely.

Thank you.

Great.

Well, hearing no other business or items, this meeting and my

very first meeting of the New York State Gaming Commission

is adjourned.

I thank my fellow commissioners and our able staff here.

They've traveled out to wintry conditions here in Geneva, New

York, for this opportunity but I thank you for all of your public

service on this Commission and our staff colleagues that are

here in this meeting.

Our meeting's adjourned.

Thank you all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Great.

Thank you.

Well done.