COMMISSIONER DOBSON: The Commission recommends that states should conduct periodic reassessments of the various forms of gambling permitted within their borders for the purpose of determining whether the public interests will be better served by limiting or eliminating one or more of those forms.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I’d like to propose -- I’m sorry, were you moving it?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: That is a motion.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: I’ll second it.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I would like to propose two amendments. In the first line, to be consistent with everything -- the rest of our recommendations, I think it ought to say the Commission recommends that states and tribal governments. In the next to the last line, in order to have such reassessments, if indeed they are conducted, to be conducted in the real world, I think it ought to say it would be better served by eliminating or expanding one or more of those forms because the state or tribal government might go either way.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Would you accept those as friendly amendments?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Moore?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Various forms of gambling. What do you mean? Like in Mississippi, would that be casino and you -- do you want to break everything up? Casino and Indian gaming? Is that what would be considered in this?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I think it might go beyond that to whatever forms of gambling are expressed in that state or that
tribal area. Obviously it does include casinos.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair? I have some observations to make about this motion. First of all, the states are passing laws regarding gaming. I don’t believe that there are any states in America that have embarked upon the enactment of laws on the basis of a sunset law, meaning that you enact a law, you enable casino gambling, lotteries, or parimutuel, and you say that it’s going to expire seven or 10 years hence or is reviewed seven or -- three, five, seven, 10 years hence.

What we’re doing is recommending that there be a new foundation for policy making in this regard. This looks like an innocent proposal but it’s not. People who are involving in gaming, and we have seen this across America, put considerable investment in gambling facilities and equipment and in their operations, and people rely on the fact that there is a law so that you can amortize these investments within a reliable framework.

The other is people, many, many people, rely on these operations for jobs, and if you’re going to put people at risk on periodic assessment of public policy, you’re going to create some uncertainty for people who are employed. So Madam Chair, the language served by eliminating or expanding probably should have language like continuing or eliminating, expanding. But on the whole, I really believe that this motion connotates a lot more in terms of public policy change in how these activities are going to be viewed. It’s more than what it looks here, this simple motion as it’s stated here. So I’d be opposed to this motion.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Call for the question. Jim, would you read it as it exists right now so we can be clear? There were
COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I got one of the edits, but I didn’t get the other one down.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: The Commission recommends that states and tribal governments conduct periodic reassessments of the various forms of gambling permitted within their borders for the purpose of determining whether the public interests would be better served by eliminating -- excuse me, by limiting, eliminating, or expanding one or more of those forms.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: All in favor? Opposed?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Nay.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Abstain on the procedural ground.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Madam Chair, what is your desire here? There are several new recommendations here that do indeed consolidate a long list of recommendations you assigned to the research subcommittee. Are we going to take these up with the rest of the recommendations? There are a number of amendments that I intend to propose to some of the recommendations that have already been considered. How do you wish to go about that?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: What I want to do is to finish up all the recommendations before we get into the text of the document, and as far as I know, there are several outstanding issues. One are research issues, and the other are that, Terry, you had some suggested edits to several of the recommendations.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I should pass out any amendments to Chapter 8 recommendations to members?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No. Let’s do Terry’s and then I’ll call on you, and you can distribute them and we’ll take them up.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I’m sorry. For clarification,
Leo, are you saying that separate and apart from the things the research subcommittee did with all of those 8.17 through 8.9000, whatever it was, are you saying separate and apart from that you have other recommendations to -- I’m sorry, other amendments to recommendations we’ve already passed that we haven’t seen yet?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: You recall my mentioning downstairs that the staff clipped several paragraphs from these three of my recommendations last week, so the Commission didn’t have those in front of them. There are several that I gave to Mr. Lanni that he’s considering but we haven’t had an opportunity to talk about. Frankly I thought this was all coming up tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Just for the record, I was about to make a motion, and I discussed this briefly with Commissioner Leone, and I’m not now going to make. I was about to make a motion to say that we should be done with recommendations after the research subcommittee report, however since this is apparently open season, I don’t want to make that because I may find something this afternoon or tomorrow that I find enthralling and necessary and impossible to proceed forward without. So I’m not going to make a motion like that.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: I certainly would have been happy to receive such a motion. Having said that, if we could get to that point by having this come up tomorrow, I would certainly table it so that we have one final recommendation from the research subcommittee that incorporates all of that. Leo, have you discussed your edits with the other members of the research subcommittee? Could I ask you all to do that so you could come to us with one unanimous package?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Sure, I’d be happy to.
CHAIRPERSON JAMES: John, did you hear what I just said on that one?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: No, I didn’t, I’m sorry.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: That’s okay. That’s all right. My recommendation to Leo was that we do table all of the research stuff until tomorrow, and what I would prefer happening is that you come to the table with one unanimous recommendation that all of the members of the research subcommittee have signed off on and we have one package that we can take a look at. But I think that would be more helpful, and I asked that Leo brief the members of the research subcommittee on his additional edits or changes, and that you all review those and come to the full Commission with one set of recommendations, not individual --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: No amendments.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No amendments. You all just come with one. Having said that, Terry, you had some suggested edits?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I don’t have them with me.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Tim, where will commissioners find that?

DR. KELLY: Do these have to do with recommendations, Terry?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Yes, they do. Any other work other than research, which is going to be tabled until tomorrow? Any other discussions points, edits, things to be considered on recommendations? If not, what I’d like to do is to move to the new recommendations that commissioners are bringing forward. I think you had two, is that right, Dick?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Since most of one of them is actually language, I think in the interests of moving us along, I
won’t propose these as recommendations. The other one is partially covered by some existing language.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: That works for me. Commissioner Dobson, I think you had two new recommendations, is that the case?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I think it’s what we just talked about.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: That was it? You didn’t have any other additional? Is there anything else? This is it, folks. Any other? Otherwise, as far as I’m concerned, the only things that are left to come for discussion are research, and we will do that tomorrow with hopefully a unanimous recommendation from the research subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I would necessarily need to reserve the right, in view of what’s happened here, to have some startling insight that I would make a motion about.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: You will always have that right, John.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Did I understand what you just said, Madam Chair, to say we’re not considering any text changes?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Recommendations.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: We’re only talking about recommendations?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Work with me here.

Recommendations.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Thank you. There are some. There were a couple of recommendations that I gave to the staff earlier that I haven’t heard --

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: My understanding is that they were
research related recommendations. They were not research?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Recommendations I gave to Mr. Kelly a couple of hours ago dealing with Chapters 4, 5 and 7.

CHAIRPERSON James: Dr. Kelly, where are the recommendations from Mr. McCarthy on Chapters 4, 5 and 7? Have they been distributed? He said he gave them to you a couple of hours ago.

DR. Kelly: They’re just coming up to the table over here.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: I gave you a dozen copies.

DR. Kelly: Unless I’m misunderstanding, it’s what you gave us this morning?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Yes.

DR. Kelly: Yes. We wanted to break them down chapter-by-chapter rather than commissioner-by-commissioner. So we’ve pulled all of the chapter.

CHAIRPERSON James: What are they? Are they edits, or are they recommendations? Leo, were they recommendations or were they edits to the document?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: The only recommendation -- yes, there were two recommendations. Actually it’s a number of changes.

CHAIRPERSON James: This is a real simple question. Are they edits to recommendations, are they edits to the text of the document?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: It’s a numbering change in the recommendations of Chapter 4, where Mr. Loescher’s recommendation interrupted the sequence of recommendations that the Commission adopted. I simply changed for a little logic the number of those.
CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Then Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: It shouldn’t be a problem.

DR. KELLY: We will incorporate that.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Other than that, I don’t --

there are other -- the only other recommendation, there’s one in

the internet that we discussed.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It’s coming around now. Do you

have that in front of you now? Commissioner McCarthy, would you

like to explain your recommendation and offer it as a motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I certainly can. Should we

give the rest a chance to review it?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Certainly. And you’re offering

this as additional language, not as substitute language for

recommendation?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes, that is correct. This is

not revising any existing recommendation. This is an additional

recommendation. The point of it was that since the last
Commission meeting we received information that the Congress had
added several other exceptions to the statute intended to prohibit
internet gambling, and the intent in this language is to make sure
that what the Commission is recommending is that if we are going
to try to prohibit internet gambling, that we go about it in a
serious way, including those named here, internet service
providers, which I understand are now exempted under the law, and
the other entities that are listed there.

I suspect that if I knew that there were going to be 20
or more exemptions in the Kyle bill, I might have favored taking
the regulatory scheme approach instead of the prohibitory scheme
approach to this. We’re reaching the point where there will be so
many exemptions that it will be -- it’s already an extraordinarily
complex and difficult task to prohibit gambling on the internet.
If you add a number of exemptions, you’re making it an impossible
task.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Have Commissioners had the
opportunity to read this?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Excuse me. I want to be sure
I’m understanding what’s being proposed here. This is in fact,
correct me if I’m wrong, Leo, a substitute for the recommendation
that was already passed known as 5.1?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s correct. That would be
correct.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: It sure as heck reads like that.
Again, I would object solely on the procedural ground, and for
that reason I would abstain, as I said before about all these late
coming recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Right now we haven’t had a second.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I’ll second.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It has been seconded. Discussion.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: What Commissioner McCarthy had
proposed and I will support it, the motion, is that the Kyle bill
would contain no exceptions or exemptions from the prohibition of
internet wagering, and in fact it would be tightened up to remove
those exemptions.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: May I make a brief comment?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I guess some of us aren’t familiar
with how Congress works. I mean, you’re going to have continuing
negotiations, compromises, modifications, exceptions. That’s how
bills are created into law. Whether we like it or not, I think it’s safe to say we can make a recommendation right now that they stop amending the Kyle bill, all I can say is good luck. It’s not going to happen if you ever want it to pass.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I have a little familiarity with how legislative bodies work.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Not in a federal level.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: They’re pretty much the same.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: The operative term there is pretty much.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: So I think it’s the Commission’s responsibility to state what we think should exist in the law. The discussion, the deliberation over these competing bills in the House and the Senate, will go on for some time. It may -- either may or may not be enacted this year or next year, so I think the Commission’s opinion is -- you’ll recall that the Attorney General’s office, the US Attorney General’s office, in its testimony a year ago suggested it really didn’t want to take a position until this commission spoke on the issue, so I would not assume that because we’re familiar with the usual ways that congressional or state legislative houses work, that our opinion wouldn’t have any weight.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I don’t dispute that. For the record, we have taken our position. We did it at the meeting in Washington, DC. I, too, will abstain from this.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Can I ask two other questions about this?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: First, was it intended that this
would replace not only 5.1 but also 5.2 and 5.5, subjects which this appears to be intended to possibly address?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: No. I think Mr. Bible is correct.

COMMISSIONER Bible: This would replace 5.1.

COMMISSIONER Loescher: Madam Chair, there seems to be two ideas into this new language. The first sentence seems to be broad-sweeping, and then the second sentence deals with credit cards and money transfers and all that business which 5.1 speaks to now. What’s the intent here? Is it a broad brush dealing with these new exemptions? If so, then maybe it ought to have a separate paragraph. What’s the purpose here?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: It speaks for itself. It’s an attempt to not exempt a number of entities that are an integral parts of international or Internet transactions.

COMMISSIONER Loescher: Madam Chair, then I need to get back to the same colloquy I had with Mr. Bible before, last time around, that this doesn’t effect --

COMMISSIONER Bible: We have a specific recommendation that would allow the bingo to be operated as it currently is in telephonic communications. We link site-to-site. It would not be able to offer via the internet to players.

COMMISSIONER Loescher: Madam Chair, the broad sweeping language would not supplant that?

COMMISSIONER Bible: I don’t believe so.

COMMISSIONER Loescher: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER Wilhelm: One of the questions of intent, 5.1 as it was already passed by the commission includes the following sentence at the end: Because it crosses state lines (it
meaning the internet) it is difficult for states to adequately
monitor and regulate such gambling. Was it intentional to omit
that sentence?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: No. I have no reluctance to
adding that sentence.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Are you offering that as an
amendment to the motion?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Are you ready for the question?

Further discussion? Leo, would you read that as it exists with
the amended language?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Amended language? The only
amendment I heard was the sentence added at the end that John
Wilhelm just mentioned. So it’s the language I’ve got there, and
add to that because it crosses states lines, it is difficult for
states to adequately monitor and regulate such gambling.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It has been moved and seconded, and
you accepted that as a friendly amendment. All in favor?

Opposed? Any abstentions?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Abstain.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Abstain.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: So that’s three abstentions. Terry,
are you ready for your four edits?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I am. Maybe five. On 3.1, three
of mine have to do with the aspect that I think when you look at
all of the recommendations, we leave the through process of
comments to the text rather than to the recommendations. If you
open your book to 3.1, the machine, I’ve just been told, is
broken, the copy machine. It’s 3.1 in your recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Are you there? Page two, Terry?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: The first, 3.15 is the first one we need to look at. It’s in tab 20. These are the recommendations. In 3.15 as I recall it of the second line is that we ask organizations voluntarily adopt rather than adopt.

That the way I remember that particular subject.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Mine says voluntarily adopt.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It’s been corrected. The copy that I have didn’t have voluntarily in it.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Mine does, so somebody produced one that has voluntarily in it.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: That’s the way I recall it.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: The confusion may be that there’s two different sets of recommendations behind tab 20. The very last set is the one that we’ve supposedly adopted. The set right before that tab 20 are all of the ones that were ever submitted. That group does say voluntarily.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It should be in there.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair, it’s the last set of recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Right.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Can we move on to 4.19? Again, I think here when you get down to the findings, to me, belong in the text where it begins the absence of. The very last line under 4.19(2) where it begins the absence of such efforts will present costly consequences to families, communities, others associated and effected by problem gamblers. I have no problem with that statement, but I think it should be in the text, not in the
recommendations.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Your suggesting is to remove that and put it into the text?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Into the text.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: As the author of that language, I don’t have a problem.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: I don’t think we need a vote on that.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Do you have 5.1? We have a new 5.1, so you’re right, we don’t need to do that. The last one is 8.15. That’s gone, deleted because it was redundant. It must have been deleted. Was that an inadvertent omission?

DR. KELLY: That was an inadvertent omission. It was put back in the supplementary materials that we sent out on the 28th, so you probably do need to -- then we also need to renumber because 8.15 doesn’t exist.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think it’s redundant because it’s with 4.19. If you read 4.19 I think you’ll find 8.15 is redundant.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner McCarthy.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The two sections cited by Terry are two different things. This is purely a research recommendation. The first is requesting the state to enact a statute, or if they already have a statutory authority, by administrative regulation, add those half-dozen items as conditions of licensure. Each state may do one, or the other, or neither. So there’s no reason to drop the research recommendation
because some states may want to do the research and not do the
other.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Leo, I think that’s a point well
taken, however since 8.15 is, as you just said, a research
recommendation, it would appear to me that the subjects of public
awareness, education, prevention, and treatment ought not be in
here since this is a research recommendation. Is that right?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: No. We’re on -- what Terry is
suggesting to drop is in the research chapter.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I understand that. My point is
that if it is to be, as you recommend, retained because it is a
research recommendation, then shouldn’t it say that they should
authorize and fund research and not say authorize and fund public
awareness, education, prevention, and treatment programs, if
indeed this is a research recommendation?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: That is in 4.19.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s in there.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: John Wilhelm is correct.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: So it would say fund research
programs for those, etcetera.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Would you all restate that so that
we can be sure you got it?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes. In 8.15, the Commission
recommends to the governor, state legislature, and regulatory
bodies of each state that they should authorize and fund research
programs for those who are or are likely to become problem or
pathological gamblers in their resident population.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: We’ll just do that by acclamation.
I don’t think there’s any --
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Leo, may I ask a blanket question that I should have asked in our last meeting about that many of these research recommendations that we’ve already adopted, some of them address tribal governments along with state governments and some do not. Shouldn’t we conform all of them to address tribal governments?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes, we should.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Perhaps the staff could see to that if there’s no objection.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Hearing none. It is my understanding then that at this point we have now finished off all of the recommendations except the research. Is that correct? Edits to recommendations, new recommendations?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Baring bolts of insight.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Baring bolts of insight. And they better be good ones, too. Baring that, that’s done. What I’d like to do at this point, if there is no objection, is to go ahead and take a lunch break, and when we come back we will go immediately to the text. We will take up the research tomorrow. I would ask that the research subcommittee meet and that you come to us with one package that we can take a look at tomorrow. Commissioner McCarthy?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Madam Chair, if we have finished our work and come to you with research recommendations --

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Sooner, so be it.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: -- by late this afternoon, is that acceptable?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Absolutely. The sooner the better. Let me ask Commissioners to do this. You have in front of you
those substantive edits that were sent to the Commission ahead of
time. There have been additional ones that have come in. I would
ask you not to leave for lunch until you have all of the
substantive edits from the staff so that you can review them at
lunch and that will speed up our work.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Madam Chair, do we have one for
executive?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chair, in terms of your
request to the commissioners to try to review and absorb these
things, there’s a number of the chapter proposed edits that were
passed out this morning that contain in some cases duplicative
material that are edits about the convenience gambling stuff. It
seems to me that in the -- and I recognize why the staff tried to
order these by chapters, it makes perfect sense and I don’t
quarrel with that, but I think that by dividing it up, it may be
even harder to understand what I was trying to get at than
necessary, and it is hard to understand what I was trying to get
at any way in terms of following the text.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: So you would prefer to take yours
in total?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Just for the edification of the
commissioners. I’ve asked Eric to pass out a document which I
just want to describe briefly because I’ve already made this
confusing enough. The document that I’ve asked Eric to pass out
is the document that we originally gave to the staff, and it has a
cover memo which is intended to be a little bit of a guidepost, if
you will. If I may, let me briefly state the overall objective of
this whole packet that’s behind the cover memo.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Can I just, as a point of order,
just bring us back to order so that we can -- John, I think what
you’re saying is important and we should all be listening.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Again, I’ve asked Eric to pass
out a cover -- a memo from me with all of this stuff, edits I’m
proposing related to convenience gambling behind it, and I think
it might be somewhat less difficult, I don’t want to say easy, to
follow what I’m trying to do here, but if I may just try to
describe the intent.

As I believe the Commissioners know, I have been, along
with several other Commissioners, an advocate of the notion that
the report should reflect the dubious value of so-called
convenience gaming. In fact when we passed the recommendation on
this subject two weeks ago, somewhat to Jim’s astonishment, I
proposed to make the recommendation on convenience gambling more
harsh, which the Commission sought fit to adopt.

So I want to emphasize that the package of edits that I
have suggested with respect to convenience gambling is in no way,
shape or form intended to dilute or weaken what we’ve done.
Rather, in reading the many different sections of the draft
chapters that address convenience gambling I found two problems.
One, it seemed to me that they were very duplicative and
fragmentary, distributed unnecessarily amongst a variety of
chapters. So I think they should be to the extent possible, and
it may not be totally possible, that the language about
convenience gambling should be put in one place.

In particular, I believe that by lumping the Internet,
and this is the principle structural point I’m trying to make
here, I believe that by lumping the internet and the convenience
gambling issue into one chapter called technology, that we are
confusing that chapter almost totally, and we are unnecessarily
detracting from the Commission’s agreed upon focus on internet
gambling.

So I think that what’s now called technology should be
called internet gambling and it should stand alone because it’s
such an important topic for the future. And I believe the
convenience gambling stuff should be taken elsewhere, as I have
suggested, and consolidated. So that’s one of the two purposes of
these edits.

The other one is that there’s a great deal of just
factual misinformation in the drafts. As one example, the term
video lottery terminal is used in the drafts as though it were
interchangeable with other kinds of electronic devices, and it
isn’t. A video lottery terminal is one highly specific form of
electronic gambling device operated by a limited number of state
lotteries. The term is used as though it’s the same as slot
machine or video poker terminal or other electronic gambling
device.

So the two purposes of all of these edits again are not
to weaken what we’ve said about convenience gambling, not at all.
Rather to structurally move convenience gambling away from the
internet and retitle that chapter, and secondly, try to correct
what I believe is both duplication and inaccuracy with respect to
the drafts on that point. I know it’s hard to follow, but I --

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: John, let me suggest this then.

That when we come back from lunch, because I think your’s are sort
of over arching and go through several chapters, that we take that
up first. Then the reason that it’s important for staff purposes
to go through one chapter at a time is because they literally are
going to leave and input the data, and we should have a final by
the end of the day. So if we take that first, that ought to take
care of that, and then we will start working through the document.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: John, I have just one question.
Were these -- was this whole revision the result of bolt?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Unlike some of the economic
issues, this is not something I’m passionate about. I just -- I
frankly don’t want to be associated with something that has so
many inaccuracies and inconsistencies in it.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: We will reconvene in one hour, and
again, I would ask Commissioners to organize, gather up all of the
documents, organize them so that we can go through them quickly.

Dr. Kelly?

DR. KELLY: Madam Chair, would it help to review what
was just handed out?

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No.

(Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.)