CHAIR JAMES: Please come back to your chairs.

We have 74 recommendations in this section.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: At 30 seconds each, we’ll be done.

CHAIR JAMES: I hope that the Commissioners are familiar with them. I don’t think that it’s necessary for me to read them today, since we -- only those who are in this room are participating with us, so that means that you have a copy, we have a copy, and we’ll just move through them as quickly or as thoroughly as we can.

With that, Commissioner McCarthy?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, if we could start with 8.1. The first thing that I want to suggest to all of you is that you’re only voting on the first paragraph. The rest of the language has been -- it has been brought to my attention by three members of the Commission -- is descriptive text. And while most of that will be submitted for inclusion in the report,
and you’ll have an opportunity to object to it then, it is not before you for a vote today.

I do want to point out, however, in regard to 8.1, that Mr. Lanni brought to my attention that he strongly disagrees with the estimates that I used in the second paragraph of three million adult pathological gamblers and seven million adult problem gamblers.

So we’ll see where we go with those estimates and what numbers, if any, are used. At least at this time you are not voting on that.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: You’re speaking to the material that was distributed under the yellow -- the revised?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Is that 8.1 you have in front of you?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The language just -- Madam Chair, if I may, just to make sure everybody is looking at the same thing, 8.1, that Congress encourage the appropriate institutes within the National Institutes of Health to convene a
multidisciplinary advisory panel for a fixed term that
will help to establish a broad framework for research
on problem and pathological gambling within its range
of expertise.

Now, you may remember earlier there was a
recommendation that a center on problem and
pathological gambling be created. The reason that it
was revised to this version is that after consulting
with people in NIH, and searching out every source I
could to find out what the words of art were to
increase the probability this research would actually
be undertaken, what I found was Congress has been
actively discouraging the creation of more centers and
more structure within the NIH.

That’s why I changed it to an advisory
panel for a fixed term, so we could have someone set
the framework for the research early on, and then it
would lapse. I didn’t, obviously, go so fine as to
put in the detail about whether it had been two years
or three years. But I avoided making it a permanent
center for that reason.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Do they have
permanent centers at this point for certain areas of study and review?

COMMISSIONER MccARTHY: Not ordinarily. Very rarely. There are some 18 institutes within the National Institutes of Health, and at least four or five of them that I can identify, including the Neurosciences Institute, have some bearing upon the problem and pathological research that would be undertaken.

So that the point was to try to bring together the disciplines that are within those individual institutes to get them to talk to each other so that there could be, you know, a broad approach taken.

And I know we’re not voting on this now, but if you’ll look at the language of the third paragraph, it talks about understanding how gambling disorders interact with other mental disorders, something that has been brought up by industry researchers several times during the course of the last 22-1/2 months. And there are other factors, other impacts on what shapes a problem and
pathological gambler that individual institutes bring to this.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: How does this typically work? Would the National Institutes of Health seek an appropriation? Does this get reviewed by a money committee? What’s the process to make this recommendation become effective?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes. They would seek an appropriation, if they could justify it. You know, they could probably create this advisory panel. I’m not sure that they need an additional appropriation, but you will see in other research recommendations in here where a lot of the research, of course, is not done by the individual institute itself, but they invite applications from researchers across the country. And then they will grant funds to those individual researchers; then they must come up with the funding.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Do you have any idea as to cost on a recommendation like this?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Not yet.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: But you will develop
some estimates?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Say --

COMMISSIONER Bible: You are going to? So when you say "not yet," I assume then you are going to develop them?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: See, that would turn on how the advisory panel frames the research that would be required. And Congress is obviously going to, you know, have the final say in limiting whatever funds are put into this.

COMMISSIONER Bible: And I’m struck by the comprehensive nature of the recommendations you make. And I guess what struck me, since I used to serve as a budget director, is, first, there is no sense of priority among the various recommendations. And there’s no sense of price structure.

Now, I don’t know by approving all of those if we’re recommending a research program of $5 million or $500 million. I don’t have any sense.

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: And I think you recognize the impossibility of my being able to estimate a set of research programs which haven’t even
been discussed within the National Institutes of Health or the National Institute of Justice, and the others that are recommending until they get it.

The areas were selected because they were frequently discussed by members of this Commission or raised in the testimony before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Do you have any sense, then, of priorities? And I’m thinking a broad category, you know, to this group is more important in this group.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I roughly arranged these proposals in what I personally thought was the sequence of priorities.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: But there are -- obviously, different members of the Commission are going to have different views on what the sequence should be.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m certainly open to changes.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Yeah. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chair?

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Wilhelm?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Just a point of information, have we lost Jim for the rest of the --

CHAIR JAMES: Yes. I think -- I don’t know if he’s going to come back.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: He indicated to me he was not going to be --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: -- be available.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: That’s too bad.

I am trying to be respectful of Commissioners’ time constraints here. And I want to make clear that I very much support the overall thrust of these research recommendations, and I realize there’s a risk of being misperceived in raising the issues that I want to raise about these. And if I am misperceived, so be it. But I want to emphasize that I support the overall thrust of these.

And I think that, speaking both as a member of the Research Subcommittee and as a member of the Commission, I believe that the Commission owes an
enormous debt of gratitude to Leo for the extraordinary amount of effort and time and thought that he has put into this.

I have four areas of concern about these. The first Leo has addressed at least in summary form already in his comments this morning, and that is sort of what I would call the editorial concern. I would concur with the implication of his comment about the first paragraph, for example, of 8.1 is against the other three.

I think that the recommendations ought to be short and to the point, and the other observations ought to be, to the extent possible, in the text as he suggests.

My second concern, which I think is merely an editing question, has to do with what appears to me to be an extraordinary amount of overlap between and among these recommendations, not so much the ones Leo drafted but all of the ones the rest of us lobbed in there.

And we could, I suppose, go item by item like we did yesterday, but I would hope that there
might be some sort of shortcut way to deal with the overlap between and among these.

I’ve tried to list these points in order of ascending importance. My third point is that on a lot of the specifics of some of these recommendations, using 8.1 as an example, the notion of encouraging the appropriate institutes within the NIH to convene a multidisciplinary advisory panel, that sounds logical to me, but -- and it’s -- we’re the beneficiary in that regard of the extra time and effort Leo has put into this.

On the other hand, we neither have a record for that recommendation, nor do we have even any discussion in the Research Subcommittee. Up until recently, the Research Subcommittee was able to find the time, under Leo’s leadership, to discuss all of these things, and usually, almost always, come to a conclusion.

So using this one as an example, it’s not that I disagree with it. I don’t disagree with it. I simply know nothing about it. I have known nothing about what it means to say that we should encourage
the appropriate institutes within the NIH to convene a multidisciplinary advisory panel. If Leo says that’s a good idea, I’m inclined to think it’s a good idea. But I don’t know the first thing about it.

It reminds me a little bit yesterday of some of the things that Bob Loescher brought up yesterday with respect to the Indian gambling recommendations. The ones that came out of the blue yesterday, I didn’t think they were right or wrong. I just didn’t know enough about them. And I have the same problem here, and I’m very concerned about that.

I don’t -- you know, if somebody says to me, "Well, John, why did you support the notion that we should encourage appropriate institutes within the NIH to convene a multidisciplinary advisory panel as opposed to some other approach?" I would have to say, "Gee, I don’t have the vaguest idea why I supported that."

So I am troubled not by the notion that those are -- these type of things are wrong, but, rather, by the notion that I don’t know anything about them, nor do we have a record, nor even any discussion
in the subcommittee on them.

Finally, I have a question about -- really, a strategic question about these recommendations. There is no expressed sense of priority here, and I worry, and I may be wrong about this. It’s simply a worry that by recommending so many things in the area of research that we end up achieving nothing.

And in connection with that, I don’t know whether or not it’s a good idea to make these -- and, again, it’s a question, it’s not a position -- and I don’t know whether it’s a good idea to make these recommendations so highly specific as to their mechanics that we run the risk of not achieving the objective.

If someone says, "No, that’s the wrong institute. It’s the wrong department. It’s the wrong approach to get at what it was you wanted to get at.”

So all of those are questions. And, again, I don’t want to be perceived as not supporting the thrust of what’s been done here because I do.

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Lanni?
COMMISSIONER LANNI: I, too, want to echo John’s comments. I very much support research. I am somewhat -- disheartened might be the word -- that -- I had assumed that this is a series of recommendations that would have gone before the Research Subcommittee, and that they would have dealt with it.

I don’t know where the source is of each of these points of information. In conversations with Leo, I understand that he had a series of conversations with specialists outside of the research committee and outside this Commission. I’d kind of like to know the list of who those people are. Many of these people may well be looking for additional funding for their own projects.

So I’m disappointed the Research Committee did not discuss it, and I think that’s something that I would recommend that we remand this to the Research Committee for review and recommendations as to what we would approve.

Just as yesterday, it seemed to me that I thought that the Indian Gaming Subcommittee had agreed upon all of the matters, well, then it turned out
there were other recommendations coming forth outside of that area. So if at all possible time-wise, I think it should be remanded.

I would further ask that when the text is provided in the language for the individual chapters that we’re going to be looking at that there be citings as to what the factual information is, because I will have difficulty in a shortened period of time questioning some of the sources that may exist.

I mean, the first one is the one that Leo had indicated that I took umbrage at, which I did, the conservative estimates of three million pathological gamblers and seven million adult gamblers. I didn’t receive a satisfactory answer as to the source of that, and we need to have sources because we can’t go to a meeting on the 2nd and 3rd and read things and then say, "Well, what’s the source for us to evaluate it?"

We need sources. It just can’t be reconfirmation of numbers or recombination of numbers. We need sources, and I really will be very disappointed if we don’t have those sources.
So my view is I very much support the research. I think the points that John raised are important also. The specificity could limit us, and I would recommend that it be sent back to the Research committee.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: I think that suggestion makes a lot of sense, and that the Research Committee take a look at the -- all of the proposals and maybe create a broad array, maybe a triage as to, you know, items -- A's -- that we want to see, and put everything in within that umbrella, and item B and item C.

It seems to me -- and I -- and I suspect Richard would sympathize with the position as you see it in a budget capacity when you have somebody that comes before you and they have a list of 400 things they want to do, and some of them are something they really want to do and some are just kind of things that they'd like to do, and just develop some sense of notion and priority because I -- quite frankly, I don't think I'd want to be in a position of recommending $500 million worth of research. I agree
with you. I think there’s a lot more research to be done, but I think there is probably some level --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Where did that number come from?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: $500 million? That’s just kind of my threshold for -- no, I haven’t seen any numbers. That’s my threshold for pain, I guess, in terms of what -- it just seems to me that a lot of advisory committees meet and they come up with a whole series of recommendations.

And if there is such a large package that none of the items actually go forward and the whole package falls because of its weight -- and I think that we need to take a look and figure out what is most critical, most important, and zero in on those as being our recommendations.

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Leone?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Well, I think that what Commissioner McCarthy has done, and taken the extra time to do, is to provide a road map for how you would build an ongoing comprehensive capacity to look at these questions, and, indeed, how one would do that
within the existing research institutions in the federal government, because if these are not unconventional thoughts about how one would go forward in these areas, they’re what happens in the institutes and other places all the time.

And we have to be -- I recognize there’s redundancy in the recommendations, and that that’s also added to by some of the Commissioner recommendations. I’m sure I’ve contributed to that.

On the other hand -- and I have no objection to further refinement by the Research Subcommittee, but I think we have to give them a little clearer guidance. And I think the core of the logic of these recommendations is quite sound.

It is about the steps one would take to begin to develop an ongoing capacity in the United States to look at a whole set of questions that we have looked at and where we have frequently lamented the lack of knowledge and the lack of specificity. And we’re always talking about who said that, and let’s not add to that.

So I think I’m speaking for all of us that
I don’t think any of us wants to abandon a pretty rigorous and structured approach. Now, in doing that, Bill was right. We’re going to be -- we’re going to wind up doing something that budgeters won’t like, and that is being unspecific about the cost.

But I think the cost of this kind of activity is just literally unknowable at this time, because until you get the attention of the right kinds of experts and the right kinds of agencies, and getting their attention costs money, logically, you won’t begin to have the process underway that tells you, "Well, this is an avenue worth pursuing. This is folly. This is one where there’s actually quite a bit of information coming from another source."

And so I think we have to have a certain amount of good will about these recommendations, and I applaud Leo’s attempt to be specific. And we can’t kind of have it both ways. We can’t say he’s got too much in here and he’s too specific, and not only that, he doesn’t tell us enough, and we don’t know what it costs.

I mean, the nature of what he’s doing is
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he is really -- he didn’t -- none of this is invented. This is the way your government and mine looks at these big social and economic questions. They establish centers. They have peer review panels. They pull together multidisciplinary groups.

And because we’re starting from such a low base, here I will applaud the work the industry -- the American Gaming Association and others have done to create some ongoing research capacity. But everybody agrees, I’m sure they would agree, that the best way to do this is nationally and independent and have that supplementing their activity.

And so I think -- I don’t want to send it back to the committee without the instructions to preserve the heart of it.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: No. And that’s what I was suggesting is that there’s probably a heart and core, and there may be some elements that are -- that you’d like to do but aren’t completely necessary to do. And I think you stand a much greater chance of selling a package if it’s kind of directed, if it’s very focused, if it very clearly indicates where you
want to go, and that there are some things that may fall out.

Because I personally agree that, you know, certainly everybody in a public policy position is going to benefit by research that’s done in this area by having a greater understanding of the industry, greater knowledge of all of the activities and problems that we’ve talked about.

But it just seems to me that if you send something forward that is -- then maybe we would go through this process today and take the list of 70 and combine it into four or five areas, and compress it somewhat. That you’d stand a more reasonable chance of success than coming forward with 60 or 70 recommendations.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I think Richard’s comments are very well taken. I personally have no desire to attempt to figure out the cost of these things. I don’t have a clue how we could possibly even begin to approximate that. I don’t think that’s relevant. I am a little bit concerned about the strategic question, but not the cost question.
CHAIR JAMES: I think it would be very helpful to us, Leo, if you could, with the rest of the committee, look at the some 74 recommendations on future research that we have in front of us, combine them, eliminate the redundant ones, and come back to us in June with a package of future research recommendations.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: If I can get a commitment from Dr. Dobson and Mr. Wilhelm to meet with me for a couple of days. Certainly, I’ll commit myself to doing that.

CHAIR JAMES: Well, I think we can leave it to you to see that --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Well, the problem is that with the pressure every member of the Commission is on, with rather hectic schedules, I have attempted to run this by my two Research Subcommittee colleagues. Remember now that 85, 90 percent of the language you’re looking at here you had in front of you four weeks ago --

CHAIR JAMES: Right.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: -- at the previous
Commission meeting. There was very little change to -- the change is because I talked to two people within the NIH that review these recommendations for research. The language and how we went about asking it was changed. That’s the primary change. The essence, the objective of the policy research that’s being recommended, that was in front of you four weeks ago.

So this is not -- I mean, I get a sense from this conversation this is the first time some of you are even looking at this.

CHAIR JAMES: I think with one caveat, and that is that there are many recommendations here that did not emanate from you but came from other Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I appreciate that.

But --

CHAIR JAMES: And what we’re asking --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Not only have I asked John and Jim at least three times each to give me their specific recommendations on what should be in the research, but I’ve asked most members of this
Commission that I could get hold of. I think I phoned everyone on this Commission and asked opinions of them on one or more sections of this research, opinions on what else should be included. I have worked very hard to reach out to the members of the Commission.

CHAIR JAMES: You have, indeed. And I guess what I’m asking you to do right now, Leo, is something a little bit different from maybe what you are focusing it on, and that is to -- the recommendations that they did send out, the ones that are --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Well, they were, for the most part, incorporated. Or certain areas of research were excluded. That people had very strong reasoning why they should be excluded.

CHAIR JAMES: In that first 17, most of that should be taken care of. And I guess what we’re asking of you at this point is now that we have them all in one place, if in your review with the subcommittee, if you could go back and look at that and make sure that all of that has happened.
Otherwise, we will have to sit here and do that right now.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Well, could I suggest, just for the consideration of the Commission and particularly Leo, a slightly different approach. The fact is that, if I’m reading this right, that Leo has, with considerable effort, formulated 8.1 through 8.17. Now, true, we have some new versions of some of those today, but basically 8.1 through 8.17, this is what Leo has come up with. And, again, I support the thrust of those.

However, there is 8.18 through --

CHAIR JAMES: 74.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: -- 8.74, which apparently were submitted by individual Commissioners. Rather than putting the burden on Leo to somehow decide whether all of those things have been adequately dealt with --

CHAIR JAMES: You.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: -- I would reverse that. Well, Jim and I. You know, Leo’s schedule is difficult. My schedule is difficult. I think we have
already been told in advance that Jim is not available between now and June 2nd. I believe that’s the case, although he’s not here to speak for it.

But it seems to me we ought to reverse the burden of that. I think that individual Commissioners ought to tell Leo and the subcommittee whether anything that they were concerned about is not in here. To me, that’s a much more sensible process.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Makes sense.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Because somebody submitted all of these things.

Now, we learned yesterday that half of us can’t remember what we submitted in the first place or whether we submitted it, including myself. So I would say that if any of us feel that there is something missing in 1 through 17, we ought to tell Leo.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Another --

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Lanni?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Another factor could be we could go through 18 through 17 to see if there is a significant or a majority that want to include that, and then have that sent back to the subcommittee.
to incorporate in the 17 and come back with a proposal.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Well, when are we going to do that?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: May I suggest that perhaps we at least move expeditiously through the first 17 to find out if someone strongly opposes these, or if there is some missing --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: That’s a good idea.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: -- factors that --

CHAIR JAMES: Yes, we’re going to do that.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Absolutely.

CHAIR JAMES: Any other summary or overall comments before we move to the discussion? 8.1, and there is a new 8.1 that is in the supplemental. We have that here.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The thrust of this, of course, is that because I think members of the Commission, after the last almost two years, apart from members of the industry and, you know, some scattered researchers who have been looking at problem and pathological gambling, we now appreciate what we
know but maybe even more what we don’t know in the area of research.

The point is this proposal is to get a focus for at least two or three years, so that the federal -- the agency that the Federal Government will assign most of the work we’re talking about here that I have defined here in the descriptive text will be organized in some rational fashion.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: May I make a suggestion?

CHAIR JAMES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: If we were to say that the first paragraph and the last paragraph constitute the recommendation and its general justification, and that the other language is part of what we’ll argue about in the -- you want to use three million, seven million; Terry wants to use --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Oh, no. I’m --

COMMISSIONER LEONE: -- uncounted millions.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m amenable on that issue, on prevalence.
COMMISSIONER LANNI: I would just like to use the numbers that we actually have.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Let’s focus on the recommendation, and that’s the first paragraph. And the last paragraph could be added to that as a further explanation for the record.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: No. I think that’s a good approach. Otherwise, we’ll never get through.

CHAIR JAMES: The recommendation that is before us is the first paragraph, the last paragraph. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I move it.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’ll second it, and I would ask that there be consideration for removal of a second line for a fixed term, or at least an explanation of why there isn’t for a fixed term.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m sorry. What was your question?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’m reading line 2 of your 8.1.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Oh. That’s so --
we weren’t trying to create a permanent structure.
Congress is loathe to create permanent centers on
specific subject areas.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Without being
argumentative, I just think that we get too specific.
I’d like to see this more general. If we say we’re
suggesting that the national --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: So you think the
fixed term should come out?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I do.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s fine. It’s
out.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and
seconded. Question?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

All opposed?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER LANNI: And that’s the first
and the last paragraph.

CHAIR JAMES: That’s the first and the
last paragraph.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chair, I --

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Wilhelm?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: -- I feel compelled
to abstain from this because I don’t feel able to vote
on something I don’t have the vaguest understanding
of, nor have had any discussion about. I don’t oppose
it. I just don’t know what it means to say that we
think this should be an appropriate institute within
the NIH to convene a multidisciplinary advisory panel.

I’m sure Leo is right. I just am not
comfortable taking a public position on something I
don’t understand. So for that reason, I’d like to --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: What sort of process
do we need --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: -- be recorded as
abstaining.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: -- where you can
become comfortable? Because I have some of the same
feelings. I don’t know if NIH or --

CHAIR JAMES: We thought we had a process
when we were asking the subcommittee to review this
again and come back with -- and give them the
opportunity to look at it. But I didn’t see that
there was a will to do that, and so we are --

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Could I say
something? And this probably won’t make you
comfortable. But, in fact, this is just a description
of the process by which a variety of federal
institutes and research organizations get into an area
of research.

They impanel a group of usually high
profile, relatively prestigious people, through the
professions, and they develop a research agenda. Then
they still have to get funding for it, normally, and
then there’s competition and proposals come in to do
the research. They may, as part of this, if you go
further in it, there’s the notion that they might
create some centers or piggyback on some existing
centers. I mean, this is pretty boilerplate.

You can take the language out, but --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: For instance, in this
case, why would NIH be more appropriate than National
Research Council? Don’t know.
COMMISSIONER LEONE: Well, they do perform different functions.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: May I make a suggestion?

CHAIR JAMES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Maybe this will help Bill and John being more comfortable. What if we -- what, if Leo would agree, National Institutes of Health, NIH, and then or another appropriate agency?

CHAIR JAMES: Just as a point of order, the motion has already passed with one abstention.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I’m not --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: If you look at the other area, we get into other institutes and --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I was trying to find a way to have them --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Well, for this particular subject area that we’re dealing with, NIH is the only -- for these issues. Now, for other issues, there are other institutes. If Bill --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m sorry.
COMMISSIONER LANNI: No, I interrupted you.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I was going to say if Bill said, "Why not NRC?" -- NRC would be fine with me. But the NRC’s mandate is not to do original research. It’s to do -- to synthesize existing research and make some recommendations based on that. That’s what they did in the critical review we authorized them to do and Congress --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: But your recommendation here is that they don’t conduct research, but they establish a framework for the research to be conducted. They set the --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes. But then --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: -- and bounds of the research.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: But then, the point is that the several institutes that would be part of the advisory panel would be those that ultimately would be giving out the money to researchers to do it, but it would fit within the framework that they established. It has to have some
logic to it.

Otherwise, different researchers around the country would want to do what they think is important, what they think -- you know, so there’s a lot of latitude given to researchers to get into this, but you want it within some general framework.

What if a researcher doesn’t want to study the interconnection between a gambling disorder and other kinds of mental disorders? We have to make sure that that’s done. So you want to give at least some general framework direction to this.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: I mean, may I --

CHAIR JAMES: Please. Go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Maybe it’s just my lack of understanding of the process. But we just invested $700,000 or $800,000 in NRC to gain some knowledge of the gambling area. They would seem to me to be the logical ones to start --

COMMISSIONER LEONE: But they don’t perform this function. They don’t commission original research. There are places in the -- for example, the National Institute on Aging commissions most of the
research on Social Security, retirement, pension stuff.

They just -- it might be -- Leo, you might want to consider as we go through this that we use appropriate agency rather than a specific agency, because I don’t think it makes sense to take -- and it’s a waste of your time --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I know.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: -- to educate the
Commission on how research is parceled up in the Federal Government. I mean, and it might be changed in the next year or five years. So I don’t think -- I’m not sure that’s critical.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Here’s what I was afraid of. I was concerned that if you left it totally undirected that the likelihood of this research being started would be significantly reduced. So I certainly didn’t know what would be the appropriate agencies to do this.

I asked people -- the NRC panel was praised by, you know, most members of this Commission. I went to Howard Schaeffer. I went to six other
members of that panel asking them, "Who does this kind of research in the Federal Government?" Then, I ended up going to people within the Federal Government and asking them if this made sense. What other agencies were there?

Example -- when it came to the very contentious issue of trying to estimate the benefits and the costs of an investment in a gambling facility in a community -- do you remember, we just -- I mean, we never agreed to that.

I found out that the NRC had commissioned a paper to Professor Kurt Zorn at Indiana University, an economist, and he went at it in the most intellectually honest way. So the NRC got that done.

Then I phoned Carol Petrie at the NRC, and I said, "Could you do this? Could the NRC undertake this study?" She said, "No. Our charter is not original research." I said, "Can you come up with the best answer you can?"

She gave me the answer, which I investigated, and it made a lot of sense -- the National Science Foundation, because they do a lot of
economic research, and yet they could bring the multi-disciplinary approach to this that I think would satisfy all sides, pro industry, anti-industry, and those people in the middle trying to find out what’s going on. That’s the way I’ve gone about trying to identify what were the most likely, most sensible places to get this information.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: As you went about the process, was there general unanimity that this is the appropriate federal agency? Or if you called Agency A, did they say, "No, we want to do it," and Agency B say, "We want to do it," and you made a choice between A and B?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: No. There is -- the research structure within the Federal Government is now fairly well established. The National Institutes of Health have within it those individual institutes that are doing research on other disorders that we’re connected with, that gambling disorders are connected with -- in NIDA, the National Institute on Drug Abuse; NIAAA, National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse.
So all of these cousins to this disorder we’ve been dealing with are part of the National Institutes of Health. That’s why it made sense for at least this area that I’m trying to get to here that’s described in the descriptive text that we’re not voting on today. That’s why it was put in the NIH.

But in other cases -- for instance, looking at job quality in the industry, that wouldn’t belong in NIH. That’s recommended for the Department of Labor because that’s the agency that has been doing all of this research for many years.

If we could move to 8.2, I’d appreciate it.

CHAIR JAMES: I think all of us would.

8.2.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: What I think we’re all agreeing --

CHAIR JAMES: Excuse me just a minute. This is 8.2. The question before us is: are you offering this as a motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Move for its adoption.

COMMISSIONER Wilhelm: I'll second it.

CHAIR James: There is a second.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER McCarthy: Now, the purpose of this is very straightforward. We need national prevalence studies to be undertaken. This agency has been assigned by Congress the task of doing prevalence studies for different kinds of substance abuse -- alcohol abuse, illicit drug abuse.

The suggestion is that we add a gambling component to the research procedure that's already in place.

CHAIR James: With that, are there any questions about 8.2 that you have in front of you?

COMMISSIONER Lanni: I'm going to propose an amendment.

CHAIR James: Okay.

COMMISSIONER Lanni: Following the word after the -- in parentheses, S-A-M-H-S-A, I want to add "or other appropriate agency."
CHAIR JAMES: Would the maker and the seconder of the motion accept that?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I accept the amendment.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: It’s certainly an irrelevant amendment, but --

CHAIR JAMES: Okay. With that, are there any other questions about this? Questions of clarification?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Call for the question.

CHAIR JAMES: Oh, okay. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

(No response.)

8.3. Are you offering 8.3 as a motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes, I am.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: And we have a new version today, right?
CHAIR JAMES: There is a new version in your yellow packet. Make sure you look at that one.

I would give Commissioners time to just review it quickly. Are there any questions about this or discussion? Yes, it has been moved and second.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Call for the question.

CHAIR JAMES: Oh, yes. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: 8.4 and --

CHAIR JAMES: I would ask Commissioners to refer to the document behind the yellow 8.4.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yeah. Please remove the introductory language which was obviously part of my direction to staff, so the language that says "replace first paragraph with this language."

And then also, the second paragraph will -- as a matter of fact, we’re not going to consider the second
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paragraph. That’s descriptive text. It would --

CHAIR JAMES: So the second paragraph is deleted. So all we’re considering right now is the --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The language in the first paragraph.

CHAIR JAMES: -- the language in the first paragraph.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: And, again, the reason why that was changed was to adapt to what the actual procedure is, how you submit -- you know, how you try to become a part of the existing research structure.

In this instance, there is -- this one -- let’s see, this one -- we’re on 8.4. We did 8.3. Yeah. This one deals with youth research.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I apologize, but I’m going to propose an amendment. On line 4, after the gambling, comma, I think it should be "legal and illegal forms of gambling."

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I accept the amendment.

CHAIR JAMES: Seconder?
COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Leo, is there a typo in the second line? It doesn’t make sense. To issue a revision of the special research program announce for a research application.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Announcement.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Oh, I see. Okay.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Thanks, John.

Question?

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

(No response.)

8.5.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: That’s new language also.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: And, again, the A, B, C, D is not new language. As a matter of fact, it’s briefer than what was there. But in 8.5, the same --

CHAIR JAMES: Excuse me just a minute.
COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m sorry.

CHAIR JAMES: Can I ask you to identify which part of this is being offered as the motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: All of it.

CHAIR JAMES: All of it.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s all part of the motion.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay. Is there --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: It must be.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and seconded. Are there any questions concerning this?

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: What does it mean where you invite them --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Okay. That’s --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: -- for applications for supplemental funds?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Okay. Two years ago, Congress authorized applications for research in this area, in the gambling area. And, you know, it’s -- if you want them to -- and they’ve expended the
funds appropriately. If they want to invite researchers to touch in these four areas, Congress has to give them more funds to do so. And, of course, they’ll have to justify, they’ll have to make the case.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: So this is -- we’re requesting that Congress invite NIH to make a request for supplemental funding?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Right. That’s correct. That’s the way this is done.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: And then NIH accepts this as a study.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s correct.

CHAIR JAMES: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I propose an amendment to line 3, after the word add "legal" -- I would include "legal and illegal gambling components."

CHAIR JAMES: Accepted? Any other questions about this?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair?

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Loescher?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: I’m having a hard
time following. There’s the colon and then going to C and D. Announcement for research applications on pathologic gambling should include the following areas: analysis of the development of gambling difficulties associated with electronic gambling machines and the risk factors that accompany this evolution for customers most likely drawn to this form of gambling. What is it we’re after here?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: If -- and, again, we’re not acting on the text. But if you could turn to what I distributed four weeks ago, you would see the explanation from Dr. Richard Rosenthal, an NRC panelist, and he said he speaks for other people -- professionals who provide treatment to explain the phenomenon they are beginning to observe among the patients they are treating.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: But we would have heard similar testimony in Las Vegas from Dr. Hunter, at least I believe this panel did, who indicated that that’s his experience.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Let me see if I can just quickly -- all right. According to Dr.
Richard Rosenthal, an NRC panelist, he says, "Slot and video poker machine players get in trouble much faster, typically seek help three years after they’ve started gambling, compared to more traditional forms of gambling where the length of time from when they begin playing to when they seek help is usually in the average of 20 years perhaps."

That while there has been research on the effects of the more traditional kinds of gaming, there has been no research on electronic gambling machines, and that they are changing constantly and there is little understanding of the response of many players to those kinds of machines. That was Dr. Rosenthal’s --

CHAIR JAMES: My sense is that there really isn’t a question about the substance of it, just the language and how it’s --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Oh, I’m sorry.

Excuse me, Bob. I didn’t --

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Well, Madam Chair, I --

CHAIR JAMES: The analysis of the -- I’m
sorry, Bob.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Madam Chair, I’m just having a hard time, you know. I agreed that the professor probably said this, but I have grandchildren that use Gameboys. I have grandchildren that sit in front of computers all day, and there’s no difference between that and this. So I kind of wonder what we are after here, if there’s really a true phenomenon that we should be concerned about.

COMMISSIONER MCCARTHY: Neither your grandchildren nor mine put money into the machines or chips that --

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: I put money into the machines.

(Laughter.)

It costs me a small fortune.

(Laughter.)

Have you ever tried Blue’s Clues? I’ll tell you, that’s --

(Laughter.)

Madam Chair, I don’t know enough about this to be -- know whether I should vote or not on
COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s the reason for the research.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: It’s an appropriate area for research.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I move the question.

CHAIR JAMES: The question has been called. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: I abstain.

CHAIR JAMES: Two abstentions. Okay.

Let’s see. 8.6.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: New language.

It’s on a single sheet like this. It’s in the yellow packet.

CHAIR JAMES: Yellow packet. 8.6.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: All right. This was Dr. Schaeffer’s very strong recommendation.
You’ll recall we had some discussion on this four weeks ago, or the last Commission meeting, as to the numbers being used. And I have used here past year numbers.

This is to get at that entire population of gamblers below the pathological threshold, but who are at risk in some way, to study them for the three reasons enumerated there in the last paragraph, which is not what we’re voting on, the three reasons.

We’re only voting on -- well, we should really include the short second paragraph as well to understand this. So the first two paragraphs is what we should be voting on because that’s Dr. Schaeffer’s argument, primary argument here.

We need to know whether gamblers below the pathological threshold are either going to move towards diminishing risk or may progress towards a pathological state. It has everything to do with figuring out whether they need to be treated or how you treat them.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I would be prepared to vote because I know the motion hasn’t been made
yet. I would ask you two questions. One, did Howard Schaeffer also suggest -- Dr. Schaeffer suggest that you use the 5.3 million, the 7.2 million?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I gave him this language. I showed him this language.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It’s the only instance so far where we are, once again, drawing a conclusion as to the number of people. And there are varying sources in here. I don’t see what that adds to this, and I will not be prepared to vote for it if you leave that in. I have no problem --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: What explanation is it we give a member a Congress who will be looking at this? Suppose we are talking only about 200,000 people.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I don’t know what the number is.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: They have many more urgent problems that they would have to pay attention to.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: You are reaching numbers which I’d like to know -- you have the source
in here, the --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The 5.3 million is Dr. Schaeffer’s study. The 7.2 million is the NORC study. That’s the range I put down. Do you remember originally --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: But that isn’t the range. I mean, it’s a range of references from two sources.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Of their estimates. That’s correct.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: But it --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Leo, those are the numbers from those two sources of problem gamblers, excluding pathological gamblers?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Is it problem and at risk?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Well, you don’t say that.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: For the past year.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: But you don’t say
that. See --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Earlier what --
probably at least four of the NRC panelists with whom
I spoke individually said, "You introduce too many
terms into this description of populations we’re
talking about, and it simply confuses the clarity
we’re trying to get in the research that’s done across
the country."

We are trying to use only two terms --
pathological and problem. So that’s why -- you know,
because Level 2 did, in fact, include that, those at
risk below the pathological threshold.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: I think in the
interest of getting support for what I think is a good
recommendation that most people support, this is not
necessarily the place where we settle how and if the
Commission wants to go on record about what the most
reliable estimates are that are available.

I think the overall report and other
things that are said make a strong case for the
further research. We know that a large number of
people are involved. Part of the research is --
COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m going to abbreviate this. I’m going to remove the language that refers to 5.3 million to 7.2 million.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: So for research applications to commence a study of the American adult problem gamblers below the pathological gambler threshold.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I would second that.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: It was easy. I just didn’t understand you.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I would second the motion. We have a difficult time understanding each other, but we still respect each other.

CHAIR JAMES: Call for the question.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

All opposed?

(No response.)
Any abstentions?

CHAIR JAMES: One abstention.

8.7.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That is the single sheet that you have in front of you. This language has not -- the first paragraph is the recommendation. That has not changed since the last Commission meeting.

CHAIR JAMES: My suggestion, Leo, would be that the only thing that is being considered as a motion right now would be, therefore --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: The first paragraph.

CHAIR JAMES: -- the first three lines.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That's correct.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I would propose an amendment. After the word "administration," "or other appropriate agency."

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: They're the only agency in the Federal Government that does this.
COMMISSIONER LANNI:  At this time.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY:  Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANNI:  I second the motion and call the question.

CHAIR JAMES:  All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

(No response.)

Motion passes.

8.6 -- I’m sorry, 8.8.  No, we don’t want to go back.  8.8.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE:  So moved.

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

COMMISSIONER MOORE:  Second.

CHAIR JAMES:  It has been seconded.  Any questions about this for clarification or understanding?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY:  No.  Move the question, Madam Chair.
CHAIR JAMES: Oh. The question has been called. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

All opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We already -- no, I am not abstaining. We already voted on this, but I just have a question so I understand it. What is the -- I never saw this before and I apologize for not raising it earlier. What is the meaning of the phrase "displacement of native inhabitants"?

CHAIR JAMES: Which one are you on?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: 8.8, the one we just approved. B, the second line --

COMMISSIONER MccARTHY: That was taken out of the Zorn study, and I think that was simply -- that deals with -- maybe when infrastructure is built, their property might be condemned, or it would probably include substitution of businesses.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Okay. Well, I
didn’t want to belabor it.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: May I -- Madam Chair, forgive me. I had intended -- and I think you would -- several members of the Commission would want this. I had intended to add a couple of words here, same words in both A and B, and the words are simply "benefits associated with different kinds of legalized gambling," etceteras. So after --

CHAIR JAMES: Is there --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: -- on the first line, after "with," "different kinds of."

CHAIR JAMES: 8.8.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: And the same in B, "costs associated with different kinds of" --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I would support that.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Unanimous consent.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Good.

CHAIR JAMES: 8.9.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Again, we’re dealing just on the first paragraph, in the first paragraph. Didn’t try to name an agency here, but the
note was simply this might be a place where it could
go, but it wasn’t one that was being specifically
asked, because there could be -- there might be other
places.

Commissioner Lanni: But it said --

Commissioner McCarthy: 8.9 is trying to
ascertain, if there are any, any cause of certain
kinds of crimes with property values or violent crime
rates.

Commissioner Lanni: Are you in 8.9?

Chair James: Wait, wait. 8.9.

Commissioner Wilhelm: Yes, that’s what
he’s on.

Commissioner McCarthy: Okay.

Commissioner Wilhelm: Has this been
moved?

Chair James: No, it has not. The
language that we’re looking at for a motion would
start with, "The Commission recommends that Congress,"
ends with, "does not include the note." Leo, are you
--

Commissioner McCarthy: That’s correct.
It’s only the first paragraph we’re --

CHAIR JAMES: Are you prepared to offer that as a motion?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I do.

CHAIR JAMES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I’ll second it and propose an amendment.

CHAIR JAMES: And the amendment?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: It would read, "The Commission recommends that Congress direct the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) or other appropriate agency to research what effect legal gambling has on property" --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Or another appropriate agency.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Or other appropriate agency. The same language we’re using in the other ones.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: All right.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: To research what effect legal gambling has on property and/or --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Did you get the
second one?

CHAIR JAMES: What effect?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: He’s got two, Leo.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: What was your second amendment?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: What effect, rather than whether legal gambling raises property --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: In place of the word "whether," "what effect"?

CHAIR JAMES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Legal gambling.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s fine.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: And then the word "has" in place of the word "raises," is that what you said, Terry?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Yes. And there is -- I left out one, I apologize. Again, my regular legal and illegal. I’m consistent --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: As on.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: And I want legal and
illegal. Wherever there’s legal, I’m going to recommend illegal.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: You know, I’m a little bit concerned about this. Let’s discuss this for just a minute.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Our charter in this Commission is to try to understand the implications of legal gambling on American society, as to the economic and social impacts. I don’t know how much of this institute’s time would be taken if we divert them off into illegal gambling.

That has been a massive subject they have been researching for many, many years. I’d be a little bit concerned that what limited funds there might be for this study might be diluted by getting into the area of illegal gambling. I don’t know. Just a thought.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Well, I think this would be a particularly appropriate institute to take a look at the relationship between legal and illegal and whether or not the legal, in effect, suppresses
some of the illegal activities.

You know, we heard from the lottery people -- we heard the arguments from the lottery people that lotteries drove the numbers off the streets, the number game. I mean, this would be an appropriate institute to take a look at that.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I move the question.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: This is the amendment on the amendment, right?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Well, I thought he -- before he --

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Oh. You accepted the amendment.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: We accepted the amendment.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Okay. Fine.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: We’re adding illegal gambling?

CHAIR JAMES: Legal and illegal.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Right.

CHAIR JAMES: We’re also "adding other appropriate agency." We’re also adding "what effect
has on."

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Right.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chair, I know we’re in a terrible hurry here, but could we take a very short break, please?

CHAIR JAMES: Before you vote on this?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yes, Madam Chair.

CHAIR JAMES: Any abstentions?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Oh. No, no. Not before we vote. I’m sorry.

CHAIR JAMES: Oh, okay. Any abstentions?

(No response.)

Okay. We will take a break.

CHAIR JAMES: I call the meeting back to order.

Commissioner McCarthy?

COMMISSIONER MCCARTHY: Madam Chair, I believe we are on 8.10.
CHAIR JAMES: We are indeed.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: It’s a nice brief paragraph.

CHAIR JAMES: It is. Do I hear --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Madam Chair?

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Lanni?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I would propose, if there is unanimous support, that we approve the remaining 8.10 through 8.17 unanimously, as long as wherever there is legal forms of gambling included that illegal gambling be, and that other appropriate agencies be added to each of them. If that’s the case, I would propose we approve all of them at once.

COMMISSIONER LOESCHER: Second the motion.

CHAIR JAMES: The motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: Question.

CHAIR JAMES: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

Any abstentions?
COMMISSIONER LANNI: I have one further motion. I would propose that we take the general research items numbered -- Leo, you have to listen to this.

CHAIR JAMES: Leo, listen up.

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I propose that the general research proposals 8.18 through 8.74 be remanded to the Research Committee for recommendations, to see where they should be included or excluded, where they are redundant, which they are --

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: I’m sorry.

8.18 --

COMMISSIONER LANNI: The rest of the recommendations from individual Commissioners I request be remanded to the Research Committee to delete those that are already covered in the first 17 and come back with proposals as to what we do with the remaining.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Second.

CHAIR JAMES: It has been moved and
seconded. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

Any opposed?

(No response.)

That is the process that we will use for

the --

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I’d just like to

get --

CHAIR JAMES: Any abstentions? Sorry.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: No.

CHAIR JAMES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: But I’d like to just

request again, because I think that’s a -- I’d like to

request again for purposes of efficiency that those

Commissioners who submitted some of those things who

think they’re not covered should say so. Otherwise,

we’re liable to ditch them.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Would you send a

letter to each Commissioner to that effect?

CHAIR JAMES: I will do that.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Especially I see

we have identified the source of each of these
recommendations.

CHAIR JAMES: Wherever we could.

Sometimes we were not able to do that.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Well, then maybe we just drop those.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: One other point. I know that all of us appreciate Commissioner Lanni’s efforts to be efficient with his last motion. But Commissioner McCarthy points out that there may be some of these items 11 through 17 where legal and illegal is not particularly relevant. For example, we’re probably not going to ask people to examine --

CHAIR JAMES: No. He said only where relevant, I believe.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: And I believe 8.14 was included in your action yesterday to require states to conduct prevalence and incidence studies. Isn’t 8.14 covered in the material presented yesterday?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Okay.

CHAIR JAMES: We do have a pair of sunglasses. Excuse me. Anybody want to claim they’re
yours? They’re up here.

Commissioner Lanni?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think we had three to five items that are still -- were moved over to the Research section from the earlier --

CHAIR JAMES: My assumption is that they would review those. Do you remember those, Leo?

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: That’s fine.

CHAIR JAMES: Yes. There were several that were referred to be more appropriately handled in this section.

Let me just say a couple of things about where we are in the process right now. Having been through this, I have asked the staff that within the next 48 hours they turn around for Commissioners a completed list of all of the recommendations that were approved.

It would be, I think, also important for Commissioners to check, because it was significant with some people that they be recorded as having abstained. I think it’s important to have that record, so that when you see it you should know what
the vote was, when we had a roll call vote, and where there were abstentions, for the record.

I would ask Commissioners to review that. And with a great deal of restraint, as you review that document, I would ask you to look to see if there are any major holes. Having been through this two-day process or day and a half process, and having approved some, not approved others, dropped some, added a few, I just want you to review it in total to make sure that the package is as you would have it.

If there is one, maybe two, no more than two, major holes that you see, I would suggest that you get that to me immediately after having received that document, and I will make a determination based on that information that you send to me what could or should be included for our discussion along with the text in San Francisco.

And I would please remind Commissioners as we go through this final process of drafting recommendations and editing that the temptation is to continue tweaking and adding, and I will ask your restraint.
At this point, it would have to be major policy issues. And, of course, we’re always ready to entertain editing comments that you may have in terms of spelling, grammatical, typing, and that sort of thing.

Having said that, please understand that the staff will have to at some point put this bed to document -- this document to bed. It’s late.

With that, is there any other business to come before the Commission? Commissioner Lanni?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: One last thing, Madam Chair, is I distributed -- staff provided me with a copy of the New Jersey limitations/prohibitions on contributions. And since Commissioner Dobson is not here, I would propose that we wait until the next meeting to vote on that, since I may need his vote.

CHAIR JAMES: That’s fine.

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: You may.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JAMES: Commissioner Wilhelm?

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: I don’t seek by this comment to open Pandora’s Box, but you had
observed previously, Kay, that the Commission might be
better served in terms of hopefully having some sort
of impact somewhere by having a limited number of
recommendations.

So while I realize that we may run the
risk of regenerating debate by any kind of edit from
what’s been approved, nevertheless, I think it would
be prudent for staff to take a look at the question of
whether or not some of these recommendations could
either be consolidated without doing injury to
everyone’s sense of linguistic fine-tuning, or at
least grouped perhaps in some way that would give them
more punch.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Huddled together so
they look smaller.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Yeah.

CHAIR JAMES: The other thing that I would
remind Commissioners, particularly as you go through
the last round of edits, is that -- to remember that
each Commissioner will be asked to include a personal
statement that will be a part of the body of the
document, where they can say whatever they like.

I would ask for consistency purposes, though, that we have a limit, whether it’s two pages, three pages, or whatever, so that it will not be edited in any way, it would not be changed in any way.

It would simply be typeset as you brought it in, photoed and put into the document.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: You ought to have a deadline on that.

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Well, how can you have a deadline until you’ve seen the report?

CHAIR JAMES: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Well, but, I mean, the report -- we’ve only got a few days after the report is out, so I think we should discuss -- I think we should have in mind a date --

COMMISSIONER BIBLE: Well, at some point, the report is going to get put to bed. I don’t know if you’ve determined that date. I assume it’s after California.

CHAIR JAMES: It’s going to be as soon after California as we can --
COMMISSIONER BIBLE: So probably four days or five days after California.

COMMISSIONER LEONE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: If you’ve already covered this, I apologize. But in terms of process, we have one more meeting, right?

CHAIR JAMES: That’s correct.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: And when is it that we’re going to have an opportunity to read the proposed text?

CHAIR JAMES: That’s going to be delivered to you.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Between now and June 2nd?

CHAIR JAMES: Right. Yes.


CHAIR JAMES: Any other questions? With that, the meeting is adjourned.