

**WASHINGTON STATE  
GAMBLING COMMISSION MEETING  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2012  
APPROVED MINUTES**

**Chair John Ellis** called the Gambling Commission meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. at the Great Wolf Lodge in Grand Mound and introduced the members present.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**     **Chair John Ellis**, Seattle  
                                  **Vice-Chair Mike Amos**, Selah  
                                  **Commissioner Michael Reichert**, Maple Valley (*arrived at 1:45 p.m.*)  
                                  **Commissioner Kelsey Gray**, Spokane/Seattle  
                                  **Commissioner Margarita Prentice**, Renton  
                                  **Senator Jerome Delvin**, Pasco

**STAFF:**                   **Rick Day**, Director  
                                  **David Trujillo**, Deputy Director  
                                  **Mark Harris**, Assistant Director – Field Operations  
                                  **Amy Hunter**, Administrator – Communications & Legal  
                                  **Callie Castillo**, Assistant Attorney General  
                                  **Gail Grate**, Executive Assistant

**Chair Ellis** drew attention to a change to the agenda that draws a distinction between the public meeting portions, which are portions that are subject to the Open Public Meetings Act, versus the portions of the agenda that are subject to the Administrative Procedure Act, such as rule making petitions, and therefore not covered by the Open Public Meetings Act. That is a distinction that has not always been observed in particular; although, the non-observance has usually allowed more open public meeting coverage than was dictated by the Statutes and Rules.

**Agenda Review/Director's Report**

**Director Rick Day** briefly reviewed the agenda, noting there were no staff requested changes. He noted that the next meeting is presently anticipated as being another one-day meeting on Thursday, October 11, starting at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will be at the Clarion Hotel in Yakima. Director Day noted there was no correspondence. He mentioned that the original plan had been to have former Commissioner Rojecki at this meeting to provide him with a formal thank you for all his service to the Commission, but he was unable to attend. Because the October meeting is in Yakima, the Commission hopes to have the opportunity to formally thank former Commissioner Rojecki at the November meeting in Tumwater.

Director Day explained that the next discussion topic came out of a previous case the Commission was considering that had significant tax delinquencies and liens involved. At the

time, there were a lot of questions from the Commissioners as to how the licensee was able to continue to qualify for a gambling license and why no other action had been taken earlier. Part of the discussion at the time was how Commission rules might support further action in that area. Mr. Schuster is here to let the Commission know what the recommendation from staff would be regarding how it might move forward more effectively in the area of taxes and delinquencies.

### **Potential Delinquent Tax Consideration for Suitability** *(PowerPoint Presentation)*

**Keith Schuster**, Program Manager for the Financial Investigations Unit, Financial Reporting Section, and Organizations Unit, adding that he was the oldest surviving member of the Financial Investigations Unit (FIU) – with 14 years - so he has some institutional memory of some of the issues that have been dealt with over the years. He explained the presentation covers some of the initiatives and history of the tax liens and is divided into four parts: pre-licensing, post-licensing, some background and time frames, and a recommendation. During pre-licensing investigations staff are guided by WAC 230-03-085, and may recommend the applicant be denied because of their threat to effective regulation for failure to pay federal, state, or local taxes. During the pre-licensing investigation, staff looks at a number of documents, including the applicant's disclosures and source of funds information, their financial statement forms, their financial statements, and business or personal tax returns. In Section P of the Financial Statement Form, the question asks if the applicant has any court-ordered payments. Under general information, there is a question asking if the applicant is delinquent or past due on any federal debts or other financial obligations. Staff is trying to assess the risk.

During post-licensing investigations, staff are guided by WACs 230-03-085 and 230-06-090, which indicate the licensee has an obligation to report all civil or administrative actions filed against it, including tax liens and judgments. Mr. Schuster said he uses the word "risk" a lot in his job (regulatory risk) and when he teaches. Staff looks at the risk and the financial condition of the applicant and also the licensee. When it is determined that there is a certain amount of risk, staff tend to look at other sources of information, including source of funds information, financial statements, bank records, and any kind of ties to the licensee. Staff are guided by RCW 9.46.075 that says it is incumbent upon the licensee or the applicant to prove by clear and convincing evidence that they qualify for licensure, and WAC 230-03-085 that talks about willful disregard. The Commission does have the authority to revoke or suspend. That authority has been used for card room employee licenses without sending court ordered fees that have shown a willful disregard for the court orders. The FIU has a long history of assisting local jurisdictions with their gambling tax issues. Mr. Schuster discussed a case that happened in August 2010; the specific case actually started closer to 2008, continued into 2009, and finally wrapped itself up. That case had over \$1.2 million of payroll and federal taxes against it. The case ended up with the license being revoked. In August of 2010, staff started looking at a series of different licensees. At the time, there were about seven licensees that were being monitoring for some of these tax issues. In May of last year, the FIU met with Director Day and provided an update about the cases it had been monitoring and proposed a plan of action to continue monitoring the cases but also work with the Department of Revenue, which staff routinely does anyway. Mr. Schuster explained that when he looked back in his files, he noticed

correspondence between the Department of Revenue and the Gambling Commission going back to at least 1999, so there has been a good relationship with them and staff have worked with them over the years.

There was a lot of self-reporting by the licensees years ago during their quarterly activity reporting. To help facilitate it over the years, some of the forms have been changed, but staff thought going back to self-reporting would help the licensees. The renewal license includes questions asking about local, state, or federal tax liens filed against the organization. These are self-reported liens by the licensees. Staff used that as a source document to put into the gambling database and then updated the gambling information database with the help of the Information Technology (IT) staff. Once that source document has been input into the database, staff can run reports at will.

**Chair Ellis** asked if, based on Mr. Schuster's years of experience, he had any sense as to what the level of self-reporting is; the percentage of licensees that self-report tax liens and other actions against them as they should. **Mr. Schuster** replied there has been lots of pressure on the economy, as well as in the industry in particular, but there are currently about 1,530 organizational licenses that are both for profit and nonprofit. The latest report he saw showed a very small number of tax lien problems, about 24 self-reported liens, which surprised him, as he thought it would be a higher number. **Chair Ellis** asked how the tools are that are now available to be able to pick up tax liens that are not self-reported, or administrative actions, or lawsuits that are filed against firms. **Mr. Schuster** replied staff have developed some protocols and are working with the Department of Revenue.

In November of last year, staff met with the Department of Revenue and asked them if they would be willing to share database information as co-regulatory partners. By the Department of Revenue pushing information to the Gambling Commission with the shared licensees, staff can now pull up a database report that shows exactly what licensees have Department of Revenue liens against them. That is just one database with information from the Department of Revenue, but it does show a lot. The actual number is about 54 licensees that have some liens filed against them. There is a difference in timing because of the self-reporting. The Department of Revenue database is updated daily and is virtually real time, so very good information can be obtained through that database sharing. From February 2012 to April 2012, the IT staffs of both agencies worked together, and in April the database went live. The Department of Revenue pushes the tax lien to the Gambling Commission, which updates the gambling information database daily and staff can pull the information either through a report or through an inquiry. Anyone at the Commission can see the information, even if they are in the field. There is an icon on the screen that shows the amount and information for that licensee. At a certain dollar amount – \$25,000 was chosen as a starting point for a risk – FIU staff start looking into those licensees a little bit more. Only six licensees with Department of Revenue have liens of \$25,000 or more, so the magnitude of the issue really is not that much. Mr. Schuster reviewed what an inquiry would look like using the DOR icon.

**Chair Ellis** asked, as a matter of course, when reviewing a file and staff are focused on a licensee, if they contact the applicable local jurisdiction to find out how the licensee's local tax payments are. **Mr. Schuster** replied that was part of the action plan and is a big part of the program. One of the things that staff talk about a lot is 360 degree communication with everybody. The simple fact that the information has been pushed to the Gambling Commission does not mean it is reality; sometimes the licensee may not even know they have a lien. **Mr. Schuster** has had cases where the licensee does not even know that a lien has been filed against them. It could happen very quickly. For the most part, most licensees know if they are having financial pressure on them, but not all of them may know they have actually had a lien filed against them. Staff verify whether there is an actual lien, then call the decision maker for the licensee and we ask them if they know they have a lien against them. There is not much of a case history for this, but of those licensees that staff contacted, all of them did know about the lien and that there were some problems. Once staff get verification, they try to find out if the licensees are working with that taxing jurisdiction, if they are in an agreement with them, and if they are in compliance with that agreement. If it is, staff recommend writing up a case report for information purposes only. As long as they are in compliance, that is as far as it goes.

Part of the action plan that staff is recommending today is to continue with this course of action and run and monitor this list monthly. It helps to assess any risk and to set up the communication lines within the agency to let the field agents and others know there are some risk factors out there. The files are assigned to agents within FIU and each one is tracked individually. The licensees will be contacted and it will be reported in the case report system whether it is an information case report or a recommendation for something further. If something is recommended that goes further than an information only case report, it is always consistent with current practices; for instance, how much is owed, whether a payment plan is in place, have they complied with it, and any other kind of past regulatory history. The objective of today's presentation was to follow-up on questions that were asked by the Commission a couple years ago as a result of one case, and to let the Commission know about what is being done, and recommend continuing with running the reports, assigning the amounts, and continuing with the database. **Mr. Schuster** said he was on the Rules Team and, at this point, they do not anticipate any recommendations for rule changes.

**Chair Ellis** recalled **Mr. Schuster** mentioned a case that had about \$1.2 million in unpaid state and federal taxes, and asked if there was also a lot of local tax that was unpaid. **Mr. Schuster** affirmed. **Chair Ellis** asked how the local jurisdictions were doing at enforcing their local gambling taxes. It sounded like they may be a little quicker to move than the IRS or even the Department of Revenue. **Mr. Schuster** replied he did not know if he would say that, but he thought it was a two-edged sword. The licensees know that their gambling license is essentially the bread and butter for their business. The jurisdictions that are trying to collect the gambling taxes know that if they petition the Gambling Commission, the actions go pretty fast. That action in the Financial Investigations Unit does not last very long. Staff confirm it, write up a case report, and then send it to the Communications and Legal Department quickly. At that particular time, their license is at risk. The local jurisdictions also know they may or may not receive the money. They want to work with the licensees, but at what point do the local

jurisdictions have to say it is not working. So, at that time, the jurisdictions petition the Gambling Commission, and the Commission acts by supporting their efforts.

**Chair Ellis** asked if staff was looking for a formal motion approving these recommendations. **Director Day** replied the best situation would be a formal motion approving the recommendation so that staff know to march forward in that vein. The second best, of course, would be a group nod that the recommendation is okay.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Prentice** to accept the staff recommendations. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

#### **Approval of Minutes – August 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Regular Commission Meeting**

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any comments or corrections to the minutes; there were none.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Prentice** to approve the minutes from the August 9-10, 2012, Commission meeting as submitted. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

#### **New Licenses and Class III Certifications**

**Deputy Director Trujillo** reported there were no unusual items to bring to your attention and staff recommend the Commission approve all new licenses and Class III certifications listed on pages 1 through 18. He added that each month the Commission has seen a house-banked card room report behind this list, and introduced Ms. Cheryl Devers who has been tasked with keeping that list updated. Ms. Devers also gave a presentation on the online application process at the study session this morning.

**Chair Ellis** thanked Deputy Director Trujillo for pointing out Ms. Devers. He indicated that the Commissioners find the list of operating and not operating house-banked card rooms to be very useful information. He asked if there were any questions; there were none.

**Commissioner Amos** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Gray** to approve the new licenses and Class III certifications listed on pages 1 through 18. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

#### **Defaults:**

**Ms. Amy Hunter** reported both default orders are against individuals and neither employee is currently working.

a) Delia A. Jones, Class III Employee, Revocation

**Ms. Hunter** reported the Tulalip Tribal Gaming Agency has already revoked Delia Jones' license based on the theft of an energy drink from the casino team's dining room. The Director issued charges to her by certified mail and regular mail. The certified mail came back as

undeliverable, but the one sent by regular mail did not come back, so staff presumes Ms. Jones received it. The charges notified her that failure to respond would result in staff requesting a default order. A reminder phone call is usually made before the notice of hearing is due. When staff called, they were not able to reach her. Ms. Jones has waived her right to a hearing and the Commission may enter this final order in default. Staff would recommend that the Commission revoke Ms. Jones' certification.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He asked if Delia A. Jones or anyone representing Ms. Jones was present. No one stepped forward.

**Commissioner Amos** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Gray** that the Gambling Commission revoke the Class III Certification for Delia A. Jones. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

b) **Edward D. Muri**, Card Room Employee, Revocation

**Ms. Hunter** reported that Edward Muri was terminated from the Silver Dollar Casino in Renton. Although Mr. Muri's card room employee license was valid at the time the charges were issued, his license has now expired. Staff is requesting his license be revoked based on his taking about \$150 in chips when he was working as a dealer at the Silver Dollar Casino. All of this was captured on surveillance. In this case, Assistant Director Tina Griffin issued charges to him by certified mail and regular mail. Mr. Muri did personally sign for the certified mail, so staff knows he received the charges. When staff made the reminder telephone call, they were not able to reach him. Because Mr. Muri did not respond to the charges, staff would recommend that his card room employee license be revoked.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He asked if Edward D. Muri or anyone representing Mr. Muri was present. No one stepped forward.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Amos** that the Commission revoke Edward Muri's Card Room Employee License. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

### **Rule Up For Final Action**

**Staff Proposed Rule Change** – Members-only raffles – 2012 Legislation

a) Amendatory Section: **WAC 230-06-020** Restrictions on alcohol as prizes

**Ms. Hunter** reported this rule would implement a law that was passed during the 2012 legislative session. It deals with members-only raffles where the prize is an unopened container of liquor, which could only be done as an unlicensed activity prior to the law change. After the law change, this can now be done as a licensed activity, so if an organization wants to exceed the \$5,000 threshold, they can do so by getting a license from the Commission. No comments have been received and staff would recommend adoption with an effective date 31 days from filing, since the law already went into effect a few months ago. Ms. Hunter noted a typo on the

effective date: thirty-one days from filing would be closer to the middle of October, as opposed to October 7.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He called for public comment; there was none.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Amos** that the Commission approve WAC 230-06-020, the restriction on alcohol as prizes, with an effect date of 31 days from filing. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with four aye votes.*

### **Rules Up For Discussion**

**Petition from the Public: Recreational Gaming Association (RGA)** – Permanently Increasing Texas Hold'em Wager Limits from \$40 to \$100

- a) Amendatory Section: **WAC 230-15-135** Wagering limits for nonhouse-banked card games
- b) Repealed Section: **WAC 230-15-189** Pilot program on wagering limits for Texas Hold'em poker

**Assistant Director Mark Harris** reported this rule proposal will increase the Texas Hold'em wager limits from \$40 to \$100 and repeal WAC 230-15-189 because the pilot program expires at the end of December. The proposal comes after an 18-month pilot program that increased the wager limits from \$40 to \$100 for Texas Hold'em poker and ran from October 2010 to May 2012. The higher limits are in place until the end of December or until the Commission takes action. The pilot program was used to test the regulatory and economic impacts of higher wager limits and to help determine whether there was a demand for the higher wager limits for the game of Texas Hold'em. Staff presented a final report at the May 2012 Commission meeting, which was also included in this month's agenda packet. It was noted at the May meeting that if the Commission were to receive a petition requesting to make the limits permanent, staff would recommend filing that petition. Increasing the wager limits is consistent with the Commission's statutory authority and RCW 9.46.070. There are no regulatory concerns, and the resource impact would be minimal. Staff has received two pieces of correspondence supporting the increased wager limits from the public, which were included in the agenda packet.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He asked if a representative of the RGA would like to speak to this petition.

**Mr. George Teeny**, representing the RGA on this petition, reported he has several businesses in southwest Washington, in LaCenter specifically. He asked if the Commissioners had any questions.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He thanked Mr. Teeny for his participation in the working group that produced this petition.

## **Rules Up For Discussion And Possible Filing**

**Petition from the Public: James Williams** – Selling nonconsecutively numbered raffle tickets during the same event at the same location

a) Amendatory Section: **WAC 230-11-010** Number tickets consecutively

**Assistant Director Harris** reported the petition, a volunteer that assists nonprofit organizations with raffles and fundraisers, is requesting to allow charitable and nonprofit organizations to sell raffle tickets that are not consecutively numbered for raffles that take place during the same event at a same location, such as meetings or conferences. The intent is to allow them to use up leftover feeder-style tickets at the end of a role that was used at a previous event instead of throwing them away. This could result in some gaps in the ticket numbering. The requirement that there be no duplicate numbered tickets is still in place and the change would not impact discount pricing plans or bundled tickets, which are required to be consecutively numbered. WAC 230-11-010 requires tickets to be consecutively numbered, which means the numbers must successively follow each other without interruption. The use of consecutively numbered tickets is important for accounting and auditing purposes for larger raffles where hundreds or even thousands of tickets are sold over a period of time and the winners do not have to be present to win.

Staff has worked with the petitioner to develop language to accomplish the intent of his rule change. The petitioner has stated he supports the WAC changes presented in the rule summary. Staff has minimal regulatory concerns if consecutively numbered tickets are not used for raffles that take place during the same event and at the same location and if a ticket distribution log is used. Staff anticipates the resource impact would be minimal as the change would not affect a substantial number of licensees. Even with the change, it is anticipated that some licensees would continue using the consecutively numbered tickets. Staff received seven pieces of correspondence supporting the change and one opposing the change. Staff recommends filing the petition for further discussion.

**Chair Ellis** asked what the concern was from the writer of the letter that opposed the rule change. **Assistant Director Harris** replied it was a concern there would not be proper accounting for tickets if the tickets were not consecutively numbered; that there would be no mechanism in place if a person did not sell all the tickets and there was a gap within the numbers. With the use of the ticket distribution log, there would be a mechanism for staff to look back at the previous raffles to see what tickets were sold there, which would lead to what tickets were left from the end of the roll that were sold at the next raffle. Staff would have to do a little bit more work if they wanted to look back and verify, but once a log is used, that mechanism would be in place and staff could go back and actually see what tickets were sold and were not sold and what should have moved forward to the next raffle.

**Chair Ellis** welcomed Commissioner Reichert, who had just joined the meeting.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He asked if Mr. Williams would like to address the Commission on his proposed rule change.

**Mr. James Williams**, the petitioner, explained that the way the present rule reads is that it allows nonconsecutive letters and numbers to be used on raffles, but numbers have to be consecutive. So the rule change would just allow them to use nonconsecutive numbers at raffles at events where the people that win have to be present to win. It would allow them to use partial rolls of tickets. For example, he would not sell that many tickets at a raffle, but if that gets down smaller, the way the rule reads now, he would have to stop selling if he did not have a roll of the same color with the next consecutive number. These are raffle ticket packages that have 100 in them. For example if he sold 75, and 25 are left, those 25 would probably have to be destroyed because he would not have the next 100 tickets. They would be sold at another raffle for some other purpose, so they would end up throwing raffle tickets away if they adhered to the rule the way it is currently written. So if they have it being nonconsecutive numbers, with the record keeping he can keep track of the number of tickets that are sold, and the number of tickets, and therefore the amount of money that he has at the end of the raffle. And that is more important to him; not so much whether it is consecutive, but the accountability so that he can keep track of the number of raffle tickets that he has, the number he has sold, and that he has gotten the money for the number of tickets that he has sold. Not necessarily whether they are consecutive. And what is important to this rule is that it does not impact and it does not change any of the need not to be present to win raffles. Those still require the full names and addresses, and they still require numbers, and they should stay that way. This is only for events – like they have a fundraiser for Rocky Mountain Elks, Friends of NRA, Ducks Unlimited – that evening, that is when they would use the nonconsecutive numbers.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions; there were none. He asked if there was any public comment; no one stepped forward.

**Commissioner Amos** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Gray** that the Commission file WAC 230-11-010 for further discussion. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with five aye votes.*

**Petition from the Public: Linda Bullard, Hawk's Prairie Casino** – Paying out player-supported jackpot prizes

a) Amendatory Section: **WAC 230-15-405** Paying out prizes on a player-supported jackpot

**Deputy Director Trujillo** reported that the petitioner is proposing to amend the second section of the existing rule; specifically, to increase the amount from \$2,500 to \$5,000 that an operator may pay a player-supported jackpot prize winner in cash or chips. Ms. Bullard is making the request so the operators may pay players a larger amount without that prize winner having to wait for a check to be issued. Section 3 of the rule requires that prizes not awarded in cash must be paid within 24 hours with a check. Staff has few regulatory concerns with this petition. One letter of support was received, that simply said he supported the petition. Staff recommends filing the petition for further discussion.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any questions. **Commissioner Gray** asked if they were talking about increasing the amount from \$2,500 to \$5,000 that could be paid out at that time. **Chair Ellis** added without the need for issuing a check. **Commissioner Gray** agreed it would meet the 24-hour rule then because it would be paid out immediately. **Deputy Director Trujillo** affirmed.

**Chair Ellis** called for public comment; there was none.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Prentice** that the Commission file for further discussion the petition from Linda Bullard having to do with WAC 230-15-405, paying out prizes on player-supported jackpot. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with five aye votes.*

**Staff Proposed Rule Change**- Individuals accessing criminal history records information in our files

- a) Amendatory Section: **WAC 230-21-001** Purpose
- b) New Section: **WAC 230-21-030** Inspecting criminal history record information

**Deputy Director Trujillo** reported staff was proposing this package to bring the rules in line with Engrossed Senate Bill 6296, which became effective June 7, 2012. Specifically, new language was added to WAC 230-21-001 that says "... and the Criminal Records Privacy Act, chapter 10.97 RCW." In addition staff is proposing to add a new section, WAC 230-21-030, which includes protocols so that a person knows how to inspect their own criminal history record information that is retained on file with the Gambling Commission. Engrossed Senate Bill 6296 allows the Commission to charge a fee for fingerprinting and copying, which is important because it was added into that protocol rule. In addition, because there are privacy concerns, the Commission would be requiring anyone who came to the office to look at their criminal history record information to present two forms of identification; one of those being a picture ID. In the alternative, if the person does not have two pieces of ID, staff would request they do fingerprints. This rule gives staff a mechanism to be able to charge for those fingerprints. Applicants or licensees do not routinely request this information; about two times in the last six or seven years. This is a staff petition and is being proposed despite the rules moratorium because it will bring the Commission in line with Engrossed Senate Bill 6296. Staff would recommend filing for further discussion.

**Commissioner Amos** asked if those people who end up going to have their fingerprints taken have to go to the State Patrol or local law enforcement. **Deputy Director Trujillo** replied that staff actually have that ability within our own office, which makes it very easy. If an applicant or licensee came to the Lacey office without two pieces of ID, staff would take their prints there and send them off to the State Patrol. That way staff are certain the results received back are for that person and are not depending upon an outside party to roll a person's fingerprints. Staff would not know for sure whose fingerprints those were. **Commissioner Amos** asked if the agency has an automated fingerprint identification system or if it was just ink on paper. **Deputy**

**Director Trujillo** replied the agency does have an electronic fingerprint system. He did not know if they were electronically sent to the State Patrol or if they are printed and mailed to the State Patrol, but it would be one of those two methods. **Commissioner Amos** asked what the cost was. **Deputy Director Trujillo** replied it was about \$34.

**Chair Ellis** asked if there were any other questions; there were none. He asked if there was any public comment; no one stepped forward.

**Commissioner Gray** made a motion seconded by **Commissioner Prentice** that the Commission file for further discussion amendatory rule, WAC 230-21-001, and add new section, WAC 230-21-030, inspecting criminal history record information, to bring the Commission in line with Engrossed Senate Bill 6296. *The vote was taken; the motion passed with five aye votes.*

#### **Other Business/General Discussion/Comments from the Public**

**Chair Ellis** called for public comment. There was none.

#### **Executive Session to Discuss Pending Investigations, Tribal Negotiations, and Litigation**

**Chair Ellis** called for a break at 2:00 p.m., explaining that after the break, the Commission would go into an executive session for approximately one hour to discuss pending investigations, tribal negotiations, and litigation. At the end of that time, the public meeting would be reconvened solely for the purposes of adjourning. At 2:20 p.m. the Commission went into executive session.

#### **Adjourn**

**Chair Ellis** adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

Gail Grate, Executive Assistant