CHAIR JAMES: Okay. Let’s go through 7, gambling’s impact on people and places. 7.1.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chairman, I move 7.1.

CHAIR JAMES: Well, let me read it, and then we’ll act on it. The Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments that when considering the legalization of gambling or the repeal of gambling that is already legal, they should recognize that at the level of specific communities, especially economically depressed communities, casino gambling has demonstrated the ability to generate economic development through the creation of quality jobs.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: I’ll second.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: May I make one --

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved, seconded.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: To the author, may I make -- are you the author of this, Bob?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: No, but I like it.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: May I make one very simple suggestion that I think would only strengthen what I understand to be the main objective here? Which is, just to delete the words "at the level of specific communities especially" and just insert the word "in." So that we are saying they should recognize that in economically depressed communities. That is the point we’re accenting here.

I am not sure what "at the level of specific communities" -- I think we want to say economically depressed communities. If that is the main objective, if I might suggest just deleting those words.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I would respectfully disagree. It is certainly true that this recommendation, at least as I
drafted it, was designed to accentuate that the case is best made
in economically depressed communities. But on the other hand, it
wasn’t designed to be limited only to economically depressed
communities.

The purpose of the phrase "at the level of specific
communities" is to -- it was an attempt, and it may not be
artful, but it was an attempt to take into account the point that
Richard and others have made, but I particularly recall Richard
making this point a number of times, that it is one thing to say
that the economic development impact resulting from the creation
of quality jobs is beneficial in a particular community, but we
don’t have data to say whether it’s beneficial over a wider area.
So that may not be the right way to do that, but that was the
goal of the phrase "at the level of specific communities."

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I guess what I have been trying
to avoid, and I do appreciate the explanation, I guess what I
have been trying to avoid is decisions to legalize gambling
cannot be limited to the host communities, which I think we may
collectively agree generally will be beneficiaries on balance.

If we do not continue to try to relate to feeder
communities which may provide most of the players to the host
community in which the casino, tribal or non-tribal, is located,
we do not understand how to try to calculate the costs and the
benefits of the legalized gambling.

I know this has come up a number of times in different
chapters when we have pursued this. We have this inclination to
look only at the host community. That is only a part of the
problem here. So I have raised it a couple of times in
discussions today.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Madam Chairman?
CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Dobson?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Going back to a point that Commissioner Wilhelm made earlier about our efforts to address both the positive and negative impacts of these recommendations in the areas that they addressed, I am really bothered by 7.1 because of its directionality. It does not include the possible negative impacts of gambling.

I would like to suggest a substitute recommendation as follows. The Commission recommends that state, local, and tribal governments recognize that destination casino style gambling has demonstrated a greater ability to create jobs than has other forms of gambling, including lotteries, internet gambling, and non-casino electronic gambling devices.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: That sounds like a modification of 7.2

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Well, it really is. It is a combination of 1 and 2. It really puts them together.

CHAIR JAMES: John, since you are the holder of this motion --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Well, I didn’t make the motion. I did draft the language. We can vote on Jim’s suggestion. I don’t think it’s -- I would not look upon it as a substitute for this one.

7.1, in my mind, was an attempt to narrowly make the statement not about net benefits. I have come around to the notion that the only thing our record says about net economic benefits is in depressed communities. Our record at the NRC and others, NORC, others, do support that notion.

But I have tried to draw this one not on the basis of net economic benefits, but rather on the notion that economic
development through the creation of quality jobs is possible this way. That is not a comment on the net benefits, nor is it a comment on the regional benefits either.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: John, address the last clause there then. Casino gambling has demonstrated the ability to generate economic development through the creation of quality jobs. That's positive. That is the bottom line to that statement.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: No. I think the record is clear that casino gambling has in fact demonstrated the ability to generate economic development through the creation of quality jobs. That is not the same thing as saying, and I have stopped short of saying on purpose because I don't think we have a consensus on this, that the net economic benefits, when you consider all of the positives and all of what Richard calls the externalities, are positive. I don't believe we have a consensus on that, so I haven't tried to say it.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Well as I would read this statement, what you are in effect saying is some place like Biloxi or some place like Gulfport has had a benefit in terms of economic development through the creation of jobs when they legalize gambling, if I understand the language.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes. Now again, our report will say in many different places that there are all these other costs that need to be considered and I accept that.

CHAIR JAMES: Let me ask this. What is before us right now is 7.1. There was an attempt to amend it by taking out "at the level of specific communities especially" and put in "in." I did not hear support for that. So the language stands "at the
level of specific communities especially." So that is the motion that is before us.

Jim, you have offered your language as an amendment to this.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Or a substitute.

CHAIR JAMES: Or as a substitute. Well, if it's a substitute, we have to vote up or down on the motion that's on the floor.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I am a little confused about what's on the floor.

CHAIR JAMES: 7.1.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: No, I mean this one is on the floor.

CHAIR JAMES: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Not an amendment.

CHAIR JAMES: Not Jim's at this point.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: There was no appetite for they should recognize that especially in economically depressed communities --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Actually it never went to a vote. I'm not sure I even made a motion.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: That phrase?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I was trying to raise it for discussion and see how my friend to my right might view it.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I don't think it changes the meaning, and I think it clarifies.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I would accept the formulation Richard just made, which was a little bit different from Leo's. If it says they should recognize that especially in economically depressed communities --
COMMISSIONER LEONE: Casino gambling has demonstrated.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I would accept that. You knocked out "especially" too.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: No, I didn’t.

CHAIR JAMES: Yes, you did.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I didn’t mean to.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Let’s make this Leo’s amendment then, and I’ll second.

CHAIR JAMES: Right now it reads that they should recognize that especially economically depressed --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Especially in economically depressed communities.

CHAIR JAMES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I don’t know who made the motion. As the drafter, it is acceptable to me.

CHAIR JAMES: Who made the motion?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: We don’t need it. The author has accepted the language.

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Loescher, do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: It’s a wonderful amendment.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We’re going to have a love feast here pretty soon, Bob.

CHAIR JAMES: We are going to do future research tonight too.

With that, Dr. Dobson, have you decided whether you want to offer yours as an amendment to this?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Well, I don’t want to waste the time of the Commission. You all heard what I read. If that does
not contribute to where we want to go, then I will withdraw it. But I am not sure where we are at this moment.

CHAIR JAMES: Where we are right now, let me read the language that we are about to, I think, call for a vote on. "The Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments that when considering the legalization of gambling or the repeal of gambling that is already legal, they should recognize that especially in economically depressed communities, casino gambling has demonstrated the ability to generate economic development through the creation of quality jobs."

That is how it exists right now.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay. All in favor. Opposed? Abstentions?
The ayes have it.

7.2. The Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments that when considering the legalization of gambling or the repeal of gambling that is already legal, they should recognize that lotteries, Internet gambling, and non-casino electronic gambling devices do not create a concentration of good quality jobs and do not generate significant economic development.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I move it.

CHAIR JAMES: Second?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Second.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m asking Mr. Wilhelm the question, do electronic gambling devices inside casinos generate a lot of jobs?
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Well yes, in so far as casinos as a whole do, sure, because electronic gambling devices are a critical component of most casinos.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: You’re talking about electronic devices that are employed in a convenient setting?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes, by non-casino electronic gambling devices, I was trying to cover the waterfront of convenience gambling and truck stops and all that other kind of stuff that I think the record shows don’t create very many jobs, if any.

CHAIR JAMES: All right. We have the motion before us. Was there a --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I seconded.

CHAIR JAMES: There was a motion and it was seconded. Any further question?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’ll move the question.

CHAIR JAMES: Good. All in favor?

Any opposed? Any abstentions?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chairman, the next one, 7.3, somewhere either in my office or the Commission’s, a phrase got dropped here. The meaning therefore got altered I think in a way that I don’t think we are looking for.

I can’t remember exactly where I was, but I think this would fix it, if 7.3 says "The Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments that," and to be consistent with the structure up above, insert after that, "(when considering the legalization of casino gambling.)" Because I didn’t mean this to say that we’re recommending that casino development should be targeted. I only meant to say that when people are considering
the legalization of casino gambling, then they ought to target it to certain areas.

I don’t want to put the Commission in a position of recommending casino development.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Can you repeat that, what your insert is?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes. "The Commission recommends
to state, local, and tribal governments that, when considering the legalization" — or I guess it should be "when they are considering the legalization of casino gambling. Casino development should be targeted for locations," et cetera.

The goal was to make it clear that we are not recommending that they have casino development. We are just recommending that if they are going to do that, they should consider these factors.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Need a second?

CHAIR JAMES: Yes. It does need a second.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’ll second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and seconded.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I move the question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor, Commission 7.3?

Opposed? Abstentions?

The ayes have it.

7.4. The Commission recommends to state, local and tribal governments that studies of gambling’s economic impact and studies contemplating the legalization of gambling or the repeal of gambling that is already legal should include an analysis of gambling industry job quality, specifically income, medical benefits, and retirement benefits relative to the quality of
other jobs available in comparable industries within the labor market.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Move.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and seconded.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I move the question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

Any opposed? Any abstentions?

7.5. "The Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments that when planning for gambling related economic development, communities with legal gambling or that are considering the legalization of gambling should recognize that destination resorts create more and better quality jobs." I think that should be "than casinos catering to local clientele."

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Move.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: There is a second. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chairman, just one question.

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Loescher?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: About the word "resorts." You know, some gaming facilities like MGM grew up slowly and grew bigger. It’s huge now.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Five thousand rooms is hard to call small and intimate.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: But what I am trying to say is that what you are saying is destination resorts. Destination facilities, the resorts, the word "resorts" is kind of a broad
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and encompassing thing that connotes all kinds of development and
what not. I think what we are seeing is a sentiment that gaming
has its place in America, in certain geographic locations, and
that might be a good way to go to support those places that are
already developed. But I just wonder about the word "resorts,"
whether it’s --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I didn’t make this motion, but it
would seem to me that if you have a resort atmosphere, you have a
lot of other amenities, which include more positions.

Wasn’t this your proposal, John?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: And that it’s expanding the
potential for positions than a facility that would not have all
the amenities, for example, restaurants, retail, entertainment
venues, which do constitute my understanding of the word
"resort."

CHAIR JAMES: The working definition that we have been
using in the document up until this point is, for the purposes of
this document, "destination resorts" can be defined as those
tribal or commercial casinos that offer restaurants, retail, recreation, entertainment and/or hotels in addition to a number
of variety of gaming opportunities. I don’t know if that helps
or hurts.

Commissioner Leone?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I mean Commissioner Loescher’s
point is a reasonable one in the sense that from a sort of -- I
guess I’ll put it -- when Warren Beatty first went to Las Vegas
and decided to build a casino, it probably looked like a folly
and not a destination resort. So in the nature of the
entrepreneurial enterprise, if somebody wants to get started
small and eventually create another Las Vegas, it may not look right at the beginning. I understand that is what he’s saying.

But I think the way this is written, because this is hortatory as a recommendation, we are basically saying that when communities or states or tribes are thinking of moving in the direction of gambling, they should have a vision of -- the preferred vision is of a destination resort which will produce jobs and other economic benefits.

So I don’t think it -- I think Bob has got a reasonable point here, but I don’t think this really steps all over the concept of starting small.

CHAIR JAMES: Bob, I don’t think that it does either. It just highlights the fact that if you are considering that, you may want to look at the fact that if you throw in --

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chairman, I am persuaded by all of the fine points here, so I am going to vote for this.

CHAIR JAMES: Well, given that --

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Hey, Bob, you got a put in on the best --

CHAIR JAMES: Given that, is there a call for the question?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

Any opposed? Any abstentions?

The motion carries.

7.6. The Commission recommends to state, local -- I think Terry wrote this one.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’m writing the amendment.

CHAIR JAMES: -- to state, local, and tribal governments that communities with legal gambling or that are
considering the legalization of gambling should look to labor
unions as a means for protecting job quality.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Madam Chair, I drafted this. I
would like to withdraw it at this time.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR James: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER Wilhelm: I’ll move it.

CHAIR James: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER Bible: I’ll second.

CHAIR James: It has been moved and seconded.

COMMISSIONER Lanni: I propose an amendment. It would
be following the term "unions," I would insert "and enlightened
management" as a means. That is a term that my good friend, John
Wilhelm, has used before, "enlightened management."

CHAIR James: "And enlightened management?"

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Do you want to give a
particular number?

COMMISSIONER Loescher: I second the motion.

CHAIR James: As long as we’re doing this, Jim, do you
think we ought to add an amendment that says "and they should all
be members of Focus on the Family too?"

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER Dobson: You make that proposal.

CHAIR James: So what we have before us now is "The
Commission recommends to state, local, and tribal governments
that communities with legal gambling or that are considering the
legalization of gambling should look to labor unions and
enlightened management as a means for protecting job quality."

COMMISSIONER Wilhelm: Terry, how about "cooperation
between labor unions and enlightened management?"
CHAIR JAMES: "Should look to cooperation between labor unions?"

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I'm not bothered by that.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: How about "enlightened labor unions and management?"

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I draw the line at that.

CHAIR JAMES: Now we have "cooperation with labor unions and enlightened management."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: We can drop "enlightened" I think at that point. Just "labor unions and management."

CHAIR JAMES: We want management enlightened here.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: We know that's not always possible.

CHAIR JAMES: So as I hear it now, "cooperation between labor unions and management as a means for protecting job quality."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Is that acceptable?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Then maybe this is too.

CHAIR JAMES: Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: A call for the question. All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions?

The ayes have it.

7.7. "The Commission recommends to state, local, and federal law enforcement agencies that criminal justice authorities at all levels should collect information on crimes committed by problem and pathological gamblers, including type of crime and amount of money involved. Further, bankruptcy
information related to gambling should be collected in a
standardized manner."

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I just -- on the next several,
this and the next several, I just wondered why they -- I
understand what they relate to, why they aren’t in research.
Because particularly the next ones, are kind of repeated.

CHAIR JAMES: Would you like to table that until our
discussion on future research tomorrow?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: There’s so much in research I
think we would make sense to look at these in the context of what
else we are going to recommend.

CHAIR JAMES: So that would be 7.7, 7.8?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Just those two.

CHAIR JAMES: Just those two? We will consider those
in the morning, along with future research.

7.9. "The Commission recommends to states with casinos
that because the easy availability of ATMs and credit machines on
casino floors encourages some gamblers to wager and lose much
more than they intended, states should ban ATM and credit
machines from casino floors."

That was an attempt to capture the consensus language
that we had. Is anyone willing to make that motion?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: So moved.

CHAIR JAMES: Second?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and seconded.

Discussion? We had a lengthy discussion about this one.

Commissioner Lanni?
COMMISSIONER LANNI: In spite of common belief, when you say that to "wager and lose," actually people do have an opportunity to win. So I am not so sure that that is proper to say. "To wager" I think, "more than they intended." I am not so sure you say "much." I think it's "more."

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Yes. "To wager more than they intended."

CHAIR JAMES: "To wager more than they intended?"

COMMISSIONER LANNI: "Some gamblers" should stay in there, "to wager more than they intended."

CHAIR JAMES: It now reads, "The Commission recommends to states with casinos that because the easy availability of ATMs and credit machines on casino floors encourages some gamblers to wager more than they intended, states should ban ATM and credit machines from casino floors."

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Question, please. Are there any other types of gambling facilities that also have credit machines or ATMs on their premises?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Sure. Probably every 7-11 where you have a lottery terminal has some kind of a cash withdrawal terminal.

CHAIR JAMES: That came up during the discussion, Leo, which was why it was confined to casino floors.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: What’s a credit machine?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: This seems limited to casino floors.

CHAIR JAMES: It is.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Bill has just said that at a number of convenience stops, they also have credit card machines and ATM.
COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Yes, so you can make a withdrawal from -- either have it chalked up to your credit card or through an ATM transaction, have a debit taken against your bank account and you can go buy milk or you can go buy groceries or you can go buy lottery tickets.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: I am simply trying to expand the application of it to other gambling facilities that also have credit card machines.

CHAIR JAMES: I think when we had that discussion, we were not able to get consensus on that point.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: I remember the discussion now. Because in that kind of more mixed environment, they could be using the credit card machines to buy other products.

CHAIR JAMES: To get money to buy milk.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: I see. Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER Lanni: Question. What is a credit machine?

COMMISSIONER Leone: A parent.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER Lanni: That's uncollectible. I have never heard the term "credit machine" before. I don't know what they are.

CHAIR JAMES: I have no idea. So can we drop "credit machine?" "Should ban ATMs?"

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: No. You want to include some kind of a -- an ATM would be, at least in my mind, an ATM is a device that allows you to hit your debit card out of your account. What I think you also want to get is a cash issuing device that creates a charge against your credit card.
CHAIR JAMES: So would it be more appropriately a "credit card machine?"

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Probably just a cash dispensing device that’s activated by either a debit or a credit card.

CHAIR JAMES: Should ban ATM and what was that line?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: A cash dispensing device that is activated by either a debit or a credit card.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Isn’t a credit machine just a machine that all it does is give you cash? An ATM you can make a deposit, you can deposit your check, you can do a lot of things, your banking.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Didn’t we once use the language "credit card machines?"

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Well, it’s cash advances we’re talking about.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: There are situations where devices themselves could be activated and you would never see cash. You would see credits or you would see chips or you would see something of that nature.

CHAIR JAMES: The language that Bill recommended which may take care of that is, "states should ban cash dispensing devices activated by debit or credit cards."

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: So it should be "cash dispensing and other devices."

CHAIR JAMES: "Cash dispensing" --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: "And other devices."

CHAIR JAMES: "And other."

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: "That are activated by ATM and credit cards."

CHAIR JAMES: Devices.
COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Well, some of these machines are going to issue you cash. You activate them by either your credit card or your debit cards. Other of these devices may allow you to get credit on say a slot machine, or to get chips at a table or something of that nature. I think you want to talk about the totality of it all. So the language needs to be tightened up.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: But there are credits for clubs associated with the slot machines. We’re not talking about that.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: No. I’m not talking about that. I mean I think you are just talking about something that goes against your bank account or creates a credit for which you are responsible.

CHAIR JAMES: Any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Well you’ve got debit machines.

CHAIR JAMES: "Activated by debit or credit cards" is how it reads right now.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: What if you said "ATM type machines." Would that mean anything to anybody?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I think Bill’s language is about as best as --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: There are so many iterations out there. You’ll have machines that are traditional like in a bank. You can put in a debit card and it issues you cash or you can put in a credit card and it issues you, a device. Of course one goes against your account. One creates a credit charge.

There are also devices or gaming devices that you potentially could put in either a debit card or a credit card and create credits and never see cash. It just goes against either account. There are hand held devices that you can do the same thing and you’ll get issued chips.
So it’s any kind of a device really within the casino floor that creates a charge against either your debit or your credit card, something of that nature. It needs to be broadened.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Well, how do we deal with the aspect of allowing machines -- it was discussed in a meeting that when you have a need for any kind of a resort, for example, your people don’t necessarily travel with that cash. They are going to need it for the retail for the others.

When you say the casino floor, how is that defined?

CHAIR JAMES: Terry, you may remember during the discussion, I, for one, raised the issue that you only got my vote by putting in "casino floor" because I wanted the ability to go shopping.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I wasn’t at that meeting, unfortunately.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay, yes. I am with you, Bud.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I just didn’t know what the definition of "casino floor" --

CHAIR JAMES: Because we talked about that. I think there was some concern that we make it clear that we were only talking about the casino floor, that someone should be able to leave the casino, walk out into the hotel lobby or into the shopping area and use a cash machine.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: This is really the gaming floor, wasn’t it?

CHAIR JAMES: Right.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: This would be on the gaming floor?

CHAIR JAMES: I don’t know if that is a term of art which describes?
COMMISSIONER BIBLE:  It is not. Casino floor is not a 
--

COMMISSIONER LANNI:  No. Oh no, there is no definition 
for specifically casino floor.

COMMISSIONER MOORE:  How about gaming floor?

COMMISSIONER LANNI:  I think it would have to be 
defined by the individual jurisdictions as to what that is. For 
us to try to define it would be very difficult.

Some, in frankness, you take some smaller properties 
and it is difficult to distinguish between the casino floor and 
the front desk registration, because they are right next to each 
other. I can think of a couple in Las Vegas. I think we have to 
leave this to the good thought process of the appropriate 
authorities considering it.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE:  How about in gambling areas?

COMMISSIONER LANNI:  Anything we put in, I just think 
that as long -- I can support this as long as we understand that 
we are not trying to say that the floor, like this is on one 
floor. If there was a gambling device 15,000 feet over there, 
that that would be considered to be --

CHAIR JAMES:  Oh yes. That was certainly not the 
intention. Any language that we can come up with that would help 
clarify that.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM:  Can I ask a general question 
about many of these?

CHAIR JAMES:  You sure can.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM:  Including this one. Would I be 
right in assuming that when these things reach their final form, 
they won’t refer only to states? For example, they probably 
refer to tribal?
CHAIR JAMES: Yes. We talked about the fact that we need to come up with consistent language all the way through on that.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: And it’s not the intent of this Commission to suggest that other forms of gambling that have these machines in place, it’s just too impossible to recommend that they not?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Do horse-racing tracks have these machines?

CHAIR JAMES: Yes. They do.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: There’s no logical reason why this shouldn’t apply to that circumstance. What about any other form of gambling?

I appreciate the argument on convenience stop gambling.

CHAIR JAMES: You may remember that we talked about lotteries and the fact that someone could go into an ATM convenience store and spend far more than they should because they have an ATM machine right there.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: It feels like we have been over this ground.

CHAIR JAMES: We have indeed.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: But what other forms of gaming? So you are suggesting Native American, pari-mutuel, and commercial?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Yes.

CHAIR JAMES: Pari-mutuel and commercial.

Who offered this, Dr. Kelly?

MR. KELLY: Bob Loescher, I think.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: No way.
COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I can tell you that I made the motion and Bill seconded it. When we talked about not having the machines on the floor, you said that I could support it.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: We won’t take a motion to second. You are going back to some meeting ago.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: I indicated then, I supported not having credit card devices or ATM devices on the gaming premises or within the immediate area where gambling is conducted.

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Moore seconded it at this meeting right now. The reason I ask is because we have had several changes. I need to see if the maker of the motion and the person who seconded it would be open to the suggested language changes, which at this point include Native American, pari-mutuel and commercial.

"This Commission recommends to states, and tribal governments with casinos that because of the easy availability of ATMs and credit machines on casino floors encourages some gamblers to wager" -- we took out "and lose much" -- "more than they intended, states should ban" -- and I am not sure where the Native, pari-mutuel and commercial goes.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Shouldn’t that go right after "states" in the next to the last line, and not put it up in the first line? "The Commission recommends that casinos, because of the easy availability" blah, blah, blah, and down at the bottom, "states and tribal governments should ban."

CHAIR JAMES: And pari-mutuels.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: And pari-mutuels. Should go down in that line and not twice, as we have now got it.
CHAIR JAMES: Right. And there was also a suggestion that we change the language from "should ban ATM and cash dispensing and other devices activated by debit or credit cards."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think when you bring in pari-mutuel, then you say casinos, that makes it casino floor for pari-mutuel, and have no meaning whatsoever.

CHAIR JAMES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: What if in place of "casino floor" we put "the immediate areas where gambling takes place?"

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Right. I think that does it.

CHAIR JAMES: Jim, are you okay with that?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Yes. That is fine.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: And that, frankly, even includes some of the convenience stores in that regard. Some of these are reasonably large. If they have the gambling in one section, maybe they shouldn’t have the machine right where that is. It should be in an area far away from that. So maybe we shouldn’t include it. Maybe where possible -- they are pretty large though.

Think about the grocery stores in Las Vegas, you wouldn’t want to have -- which I don’t think they should have them there, but it’s a separate issue.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: My Wells Fargo Bank in Lucky is right next to the slot machines.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Right. That is what I am saying. You could encourage them -- I think it could be broader, where you can allow convenience stores and others not to have them in the immediate vicinity where the gambling takes place.
CHAIR JAMES: I am going to ask Executive Director Kelly if he would read the language as it currently exists, and see if we can go for the question.

MR. KELLY: Okay. This is what I have. "The Commission recommends regarding casinos" or "to casinos," I guess, "that because of the easy availability of ATMs and credit machines on casino floors encourages some gamblers to wager more than they intended, states, tribal governments, and pari-mutuel facilities should ban cash dispensing and other devices activated by debit or credit cards from the immediate area where gambling takes place."

CHAIR JAMES: I have a problem with "recommending to casinos."

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: And my problem is with that convoluted sentence, because we have referred to casinos three times. We don't need to do it all the way through. It could be eliminated from the top.

CHAIR JAMES: I think we have the general sense of where the Commission wants to go. Commissioner Kelly, I will ask you to work on the language and bring it -- Director Kelly, that you would work on language and will bring that one back tomorrow for review. Can we pass?

Ten. "The Commission recommends to states with casinos that states should require casinos to send" --

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: We didn't vote.

CHAIR JAMES: We tabled it.

"That we would send regular financial statements to their preferred customers, including amounts wagered and lost over specific time periods, much like a credit card statement. States should also require this information to be shared with the
state in aggregate form, no identifying information, so that policy makers can gage the extent and average personal cost of gambling over time."

Is anyone willing to offer that as a motion?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I move that we accept this.

CHAIR JAMES: Is anyone willing to offer that as a motion?

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I want to read it first.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: May I at least explain the background for why this motion was --

CHAIR JAMES: While we’re waiting for a second, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: When we talked about this, we were concerned about the fact that a problem, pathological gamblers have a tendency to underestimate their losses and to deny what is actually taking place, and especially their spouses frequently do not know that the resources of the family are being squandered, and that families or the people who are involved in this kind of activity should get a statement that really forces them to deal with their own circumstances.

CHAIR JAMES: That was the rationale behind that. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: For purposes of discussion, I will make a second.

CHAIR JAMES: There is a second. It has been moved and seconded. Discussion?

We had a great deal of discussion on this one.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: When did we have it? When?
CHAIR JAMES: When did we discuss this? It was at the April 7th meeting? It was on April 8th.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Seventh and eighth.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: We talked about it at great length. That’s what potential consensus means. I think we worked our way through this thing.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I apologize. My mind is blank, as it often is, on the subject of -- on what we discussed about this.

I am a little confused about what numbers it is that would be reported. If I, and I’m handicapped here because I don’t gamble other than by waking up in the morning and things like that, but if I sit in front of a slot machine and I stick my player card in there so you can track me, the casino owner, and I play the same five dollars for eight hours, what number is it that is going to be reported? Is it five dollars? Is it $50,000 because I played the same five dollars 10,000 times? What number is it?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It’s the $50,000 in that instance. It’s the amount that you have wagered.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Would it be appropriate to receive both your wins and losses on that report?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Well, the same thing applies.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Is it going to say that I bet $50,000 and I won $48,000?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I think that would be interesting information.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Well, the first question then the family member is going to ask you is where the hell is the 48?
I am not trying to be cavalier about this. I really don’t know if there is a -- and I don’t know enough about how these systems work. I don’t know if there is a real number that can be reported.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: How about the net amount.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: May I say something about that? The fact of life is that we do not know, for example, on table games, what the person has wagered and what they have actually lost. There are estimates with great human failings which we very frankly proved to Congress when they were considering non-resident alien withholding on the basis that we proved to the Congress of the United States that you could not ascertain specifically what a person has lost.

You know what markers they have signed, but people move in a casino from table to table. They play one place. They don’t get reported there. They play some place else. We have estimates, but that’s all we really have, are estimates. That would be very difficult, actually impossible for us to send statements to table game players as to what they have wagered, because we have no idea when they sit down and put $500 on the table, and to use John’s idea, may have played a total of $75,000 in bets with that, winning a little, losing, what have you, back and forth. It’s absolutely meaningless information.

I think frankly, we have never proven that the amount a person wages or loses necessarily determines if they have a problem or pathological issues. I think that is still open for future research.

With all due respect to the proposer, I think this is inane.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair?
CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Loescher?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: I have great difficulty supporting this thing as well, because it is an invasion of privacy and I don’t want the state of Alaska to know anything about me if I don’t have to tell them, or the state of Nevada or state of New Jersey.

The other thing is that you know, we have this zeal to deal with pathological and problem gamblers. I agree that we should deal with that problem and provide for it. But I think this is really over-reaching to try to get to a problem like that. I would be opposed to this idea.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: You notice the words "no identifying information," Bob?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair, I don’t care what people say. Once you start collecting data, you put yourself at risk. With Big Brother, big government, you know, figuring out ways to do things lately with these computers these days, I don’t trust them, any of them.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: You may have to switch parties, I think, the two of you.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: You are making an assumption about what party he’s in.

CHAIR JAMES: I was about to say, I haven’t made any presumptions about where Bob may be.

What’s your pleasure?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: A call for the question or you want to continue to work on it a little bit?
COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I am just trying to address Terry’s concerns about how this would be done. What if we go back to the language that we used earlier in the day, and say "where feasible."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I wouldn’t favor that either. I happen to agree. I thought George Orwell was dead, but this is 1984 all over again. It is a true invasion of privacy. We don’t have the information available. Numbers can be created. I agree with Bob. There is no way to maintain the privacy for individuals.

Individuals who request this, and they do request it from time to time, we give them estimates for whatever purposes that they want if they ask for it. But just to send it out to all individuals. First of all, we don’t have a record. The other factor is, that’s what I think people don’t understand that have not worked in one of these facilities. We have many people who come in and they don’t identify themselves. If they don’t reach the Federal reporting requirement or the Nevada exemption of title 31, we don’t have information on those individuals. So how do we send it off to somebody who has walked in off the street?

We get 50,000 people a day coming through our single facility in Las Vegas, and on a weekend, 100,000. We may have to raise the Federal income tax maybe to 60 percent to cover this one. I mean we would be staffing up to send things out to people we don’t even know that they exist. It’s just truly impractical.

I support every aspect of dealing with pathological and problem gambling. The other issues we never take into account, that the vast majority of people, based upon our research through NORC and the NRC, have no problem with gambling. There is a
significant number, and a small percentage, but a significant number that do. I support every aspect of that. I have been very consistent on that.

But when we are getting into invasion of personal privacy, proposing something that is absolutely impractical and impossible for casinos to deal with, I just can’t support it.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Terry, this is a legitimate question. It’s not argumentative. Explain to me how the slot club works and the records that are kept with regard to that program.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I suspect they differ from property to property, from company to company. But basically, in the slot area you have a -- if you are a member of the club, and not everyone is, but if you are a member of the club you gain points and points are redeemable for prizes or for cash. We have the amount played. That’s the issue. It’s not the amount won or lost. We don’t maintain that information. The information that’s important is the level, amount of money put into the machine. Based upon that, they gain points. It has nothing to do with the win/lost figures. So what we have is amounts played.

CHAIR JAMES: Jim, may I suggest that you -- who was the maker of this motion?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It certainly wasn’t me.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I think it was me.

CHAIR JAMES: That you may want to work to see if there is any practical way that you can come up with any language. If not, then we just pull it.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think the question has been called.

CHAIR JAMES: Oh. Was the question called on this?
COMMISSIONER LANNI: It has been.

CHAIR JAMES: It was called. We have to vote since the question was called.

All in favor?

All opposed?

Any abstentions?

Two abstentions, okay.

7.11.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Am I to interpret that that last vote, that the ayes had it? Is that correct?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JAMES: No. But I don't blame you for trying.

"The Commission recommends that casinos be required to place severe restrictions and limitations on all in-house credit extensions in order to deter problem and pathological gamblers who would otherwise use such credit to their own detriment. Amounts lent must be commensurate with applicant's demonstrated ability to absorb such losses."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

7.12. "The Commission recommends that third party check cashing practices be prohibited at all gambling facilities."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

"The Commission recommends that ATM machines that grant credit should not be allowed on gambling premises or within 200 feet of a gambling floor or device within adjoining facilities."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think we have addressed this.

CHAIR JAMES: I think we have. That one is gone.
"The Commission recommends that states should conduct an examination of lost limit policies in gambling establishments, and require implementation based on those findings. Such examinations should be conducted by outside objective entities."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

"The Commission recommends that federal, state, and local and tribal governments exercise fiscal responsibility in regard to all contracts for treatment services through private and non-profit providers. The Commission recommends that all contracts for treatment service, with the exception of limited experimental pilot efforts, include specific performance measures, including measurable reduction and recidivism rates."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

7.16. You all want out of this room badly, don’t you?

"The Commission recommends that for gambling operations that draw customers from other states, those revenues should be allocated to independent entities in those other states commensurate with the percentage of customers, revenues, supplied by those states."

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chairman, in January, February, and March, Alaska sends more people to Las Vegas than --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JAMES: And you want your fair share. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I don’t think we are ready for this one yet, but sometime in the future we may be.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay.
Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

"The Commission recommends that gambling operations should be required to bear the cost created by their existence."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Does that include Frank’s salary?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: That’s the next one. Frank’s salary is the next one.

CHAIR JAMES: That’s coming up here.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I was wondering if that was a cost created by the existence of casinos, Frank.

CHAIR JAMES: "The Commission recommends that the American Gaming Association" — "further the Commission recognizes" — yada yada yada.

Oh well, everybody doesn’t have it. I should read it.

"The Commission recommends that the American Gaming Association should be commended for its efforts so far to develop and promote voluntary guidelines for casinos on pathological gambling and should be encouraged to continue such efforts. Further, the Commission recognizes that he AGA has acted responsibly in beginning to address the need for casinos to develop policy guidelines on pathological gambling by publishing voluntary responsible gaming guidelines."

Is there a motion? Hearing none, the recommendation dies.

"The Commission recommends to states with casino gambling that they should adopt workable self and exclusion laws for the benefit of problem and pathological gamblers. Casinos should be required to employ computerized player tracking
information for this purpose. Irrevocable election for
self-exclusion should be one option."

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: This has been dealt with.
CHAIR JAMES: I think it has.

7.20. "The Commission recommends that surveys of
prisoners should be undertaken to determine the prevalence of
problem and pathological gambling among prison populations, as
well as to determine the number and extent of crimes that have
been committed by such individuals for the purpose of obtaining
money for gambling."

May I suggest we add that to research?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It’s in research.
CHAIR JAMES: It’s there.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Is it there already?
CHAIR JAMES: Twenty one. "The Commission recommends
to all states with any form of gambling that states should set
the mandatory legal age for gambling to 21."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: We have done that already.
CHAIR JAMES: Been there. Done that.

"The Commission recommends that all gambling operations
adopt language from the AGA material on the matter of unattended
children and minors."

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chairman, I move the
motion.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Where is the language?

CHAIR JAMES: Well, I think we would have to look at
that language and determine. It’s in the orange package.
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: It is in the material that was
given to us today.

CHAIR JAMES: Would you like to table that one, look at
it tonight and add it in the morning? It is in the orange
packet.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I think we should.

CHAIR JAMES: "The Commission recommends that students
should be warned of the dangers of gambling beginning at the
elementary level and continuing through college."

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: So moved.

CHAIR JAMES: It is moved. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been seconded. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I certainly would support the
objective of this, but shouldn’t it say something about how this
comes about? I mean are we laying this on teachers? Is there
some other scheme here to do this? Is someone responsible for
it?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: This kind of virtuous statement
is to be applauded, but it doesn’t really state or objectives in
a way that those reading these recommendations would understand
how they are going to be carried out or what we do about it.

I would pass on this one, Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Call for the question.

CHAIR JAMES: Do you want to discuss this? You call
for the question?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Yes.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay. All in favor?

Opposed?

Ayes, and one abstention. The ayes have it.
Twenty four, I think should be taken up with our research in the morning.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Okay, Madam Chair, may I ask my question?

CHAIR JAMES: Now you may ask your question, Commissioner Dobson.

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I think the Commission, frankly, ought to be congratulated for its work today through this very grueling exercise. I accept the deliberative process that involves wins and losses.

But of all the things that happened today, there was one item that I am very, very disappointed about, and it involved the failure to get a second. I don’t understand it, because this item is one that if there was a consensus that I sensed for the past year, it has been on this particular item. It involves 3.35.

CHAIR JAMES: Would you allow Commissioners time to turn to that?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Yes. More than anything else, I am asking my fellow Commissioners why this one didn’t garner support, because I would have thought this one would have had a unanimous vote. I didn’t mumble. It’s written right there. 3.35.

"The Commission recommends that states with lotteries reduce their sales dependence on low income." Instead of less educated, Leo has suggested "low income communities, minorities and heavy players in a variety of ways, including limiting advertising and the number of sales outlets in low income areas."

We have discussed this repeatedly, and we have had a lot of --
COMMISSIONER LANNI: Is this a motion?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: This is a motion, yes.

CHAIR JAMES: To reconsider?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: There is a second.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Move the question.

CHAIR JAMES: Question. All in favor?

All opposed?

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: Where were you when I needed you?

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I have got 14 more.

CHAIR JAMES: Let me also commend the Commissioners as well as our audience participants and those who have been following these proceedings at home.

I would encourage -- we have one more piece of business. I would ask for your attention while we finish this.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I just want to say that anyone who had been watching this at home all day, there are some addictions that are worse than gambling.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think anyone who has been watching this all day at home should probably commit themselves to some institution.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Immediately go for treatment.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JAMES: We have tabled, and I again would ask your indulgence and your attention for just a few more minutes, because I think this will make our work tomorrow ever so much easier. There were several motions that were tabled today with the intent of Commissioners trying to see if they could work through language or make the decision just to pull it. If we
work on these overnight tomorrow, that should go much more quickly.

I have asked Commissioner Kelly if he would go through the numbers so that we all -- oh, just Director -- so that he would go through the numbers so that all of us would be sure that we understand which items have been tabled, and who has taken on the responsibility to work on those overnight.

John?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Just two procedural questions. One, when I read through the various research recommendations, I was struck by the fact that in that section, as much or more as in any other section, there is a great deal of overlap and so forth. I wondered, and it may not be feasible in terms of time, but I wondered if either staff or Commissioners that have some familiarity in that area might be able to help us somewhat, order in the conversation as opposed to going over the same things in different ways. I don’t know if that’s feasible, but if there is some way to do that, it would be great.

Then the only other procedural question I had is this. I noted that during the day today impressively someone on the staff came up with the revised version of what we have been dubbing the "McCarthy" package, which is very helpful. I wondered to what extent either tomorrow or in the very near future, we will be able to come up with the recommendations that we have adopted in the form in which we have adopted them?

CHAIR JAMES: Absolutely. That is going to be the first priority of the staff immediately at the close of the meeting tomorrow. That document should be out and in Commissioners’ hands within 48 hours.
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Great. That’s wonderful. Thank you.

CHAIR JAMES: Having said that, Commissioner --

MR. KELLY: Director Kelly.

CHAIR JAMES: Tim.

MR. KELLY: Just FYI, you might be interested to know that you covered 119 recommendations today. Thirty six of those were passed. Sixty two were dropped. Twenty-one were tabled.

Let me just review those that were tabled with the idea that a Commissioner would address them. First off this is 3.6, Commissioner Bible. I am just going to review the ones that Commissioners were assigned to unless you want me to go through them all.

CHAIR JAMES: You have got to go through them all.

MR. KELLY: All right. We start with 3.3. 3.3 was tabled. It was stated that that will come up later. This dealt with states policies towards their lotteries.

CHAIR JAMES: Just the numbers.

MR. KELLY: 3.6, Commissioner Bible. 3.8 will be revisited. 3.10 to be coupled with 3.50, which will be addressed by Dr. Dobson. 3.11 is Dr. Dobson. 3.12, Commissioner Lanni and Commissioner Wilhelm. 3.15, Commissioner McCarthy and Dobson. 3.28, Commissioner Leone. 3.29, Commissioner Dobson. 3.47, Commissioner Leone. 3.50, Commissioner Dobson.

4.1 and 4.2 deferred to the research section. 4.15, Commissioner Bible. 4.19, Commissioner McCarthy. That’s actually completed.

5.4, Commissioner Bible. 6.20, Commissioner James, Chairman James. 6.21, staff. 7.7 and 7.8, tabled until the
research discussion. 7.9, myself, I will be working on that. Then lastly, 7.22, tabled until tomorrow.

    COMMISSIONER LEONE: Just one question, Tim. I thought 3.44 was something I was supposed to --

    MR. KELLY: I might have misspoke.

    COMMISSIONER LEONE: Okay. Folded into 3.3.

    CHAIR JAMES: Are there any other questions about this?

    COMMISSIONER DOBSON: 3.28, Tim?

    MR. KELLY: Hang on just one second. It could be that I left one out. 7.24 as well?

    CHAIR JAMES: 7.8?

    MR. KELLY: No. 7.24 was dropped, not taken. So I think this is a comprehensive list. That’s it.

    CHAIR JAMES: That’s it. With that, the Commission will stand in recess until tomorrow morning at -- what time do we get started in the morning, Director Kelly? Is it 8:30 or 9:00?

    MR. KELLY: 8:30.

    CHAIR JAMES: 8:30.

    (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went briefly off the record at 6:47 p.m.)

    COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Since we are going to take up in the morning is the research, I think close to the first thing, is the research section, Doug Seay has some language he wanted to hand each member of the Commission which makes a modest and not a substantive change in three of the -- pardon me, four of the federal research recommendations that I authored. If he could give them to you now before you leave, you will have the opportunity to look at them tonight.
CHAIR JAMES: I would just ask Commissioners to make sure they get that from Doug Seay before leaving. I think he is making copies right now.

With that, we will convene until 8:30 tomorrow morning.