

Unidentified Male: Commission shall consist of seven members appointed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Five members have not been confirmed by the New York State Senate affords the commission an ability to establish a forum and undertake action. This present meeting of the commission is now called to order. Miss Secretary, will you please call the roll?

Unidentified Female: _____ [Indiscernible].

Unidentified Male: Here.

Unidentified Female: _____ [Indiscernible].

Unidentified Male: Here.

Unidentified Female: _____ [Indiscernible]

Unidentified Male: Here.

Unidentified Female: _____ [Indiscernible]

Unidentified Male: Here.

Unidentified Female: Todd Snyder [PH].

Unidentified Male: Here.

Unidentified Male: Miss Secretary, please have the record reflect that a quorum of qualified members are present, thus enabling the transaction of business. Given the absence of a designated chair, would the members like to select a member for the purposes of presiding over today's meeting?

Unidentified Male: I would like to nominate Todd Snyder.

Group: Second. [Laughter]

Unidentified Male: You are very popular.

Unidentified Male: A moment of great consensus.

Unidentified Male: Minutes of the commission meetings conducted on November 23, 2015 have been provided to the members in advance. At this time, I would like to ask the members if there are any edits, corrections, or amendments. Hearing none, Madam Secretary, please let the record reflect the minutes were accepted.

We start the agenda with rulemaking. New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law, section 104.19 authorizes the commission to promulgate rules and regulations that it deems necessary to carry out its responsibilities. In that regard, the commission will, from time to time, promulgate rules and rule amendments pursuant to the state administrative procedure act. We have two items for consideration today. Rob, would you mind outlining the first item?

Unidentified Male: Certainly, as item 3A for commission consideration is adoption of a proposed regulation regarding altering the sex of the horse for harness in thoroughbred. This proposal would require that any alteration to the sex of the horse from that recorded on the certificate of full registration, eligibility certificate, or other official registration certificate be reported to both the racing secretary and the official horse identifier if the horse is entered into a race at any race meeting. As you may recollect, the genesis of this proposal was founded and concerns raised by the wagering public about the absence of any rule or procedure which required the timely reporting of first-time geldings in races. As it is generally accepted wisdom that first-time geldings are likely to run better than they ran before they were gelded, timely information on first-time geldings would be helpful to handicappers. California, Oklahoma, and Texas all have similar rules.

The public comment for this rule proposal expires at the close of business today. To date, only one public comment has been received. _____ [00:02:54] Downs [PH] has written that they are strongly in favor of this proposal. Staff recommends adoption of this rule subject to no substantive comment being received by the close of business today.

Unidentified Male: Are there any questions on the adoption of the gelding reporting requirements from the commissioners? May I have a motion to adopt this rule?

Unidentified Male: So moved

Unidentified Male: To adopt.

Unidentified Male: A second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Rob, would you call the next – sorry.

Unidentified Male: Because of the rule adoption, or the rule proposal that we had, some tracks are actually conforming to it at an early basis.

Unidentified Male: This now requires that action to occur, and not leave it as the discretion of each racetrack.

Unidentified Male: Rob, the next item.

Unidentified Male: Certainly, as item 3B for the commission's consideration is adoption of emergency rulemaking and proposed rulemaking for Jockey Injury Compensation Fund assessments and plan for 2016. The Jockey Injury Compensation Fund is a statutorily created, not-for-profit corporation, charged with securing worker's compensation insurance for the benefit of all jockeys, apprentice jockeys, and exercise persons licensed to participate in New York thoroughbred racing. In order for JICF to pay costs of worker's compensation insurance that the law requires, and to carry out its duties under the New York worker's

compensation law, JICF shall ascertain the total funding necessary and establish the sums that are to be paid by all owners and trainers licensed, or required to be licensed, to obtain the total funding amount required annually.

The statute requires JICF to submit to the commission, no later than November 15th of each year, an annual amendment of its plan of operation relating to the assessment of costs of insurance for subsequent year. The commission then reviews and, if appropriate, approves the plan. The statutory deadline was not met this year. Instead, the JICF wrote to the commission on November 16th, asserting that the JICF was not able to submit a written plan that is fair, equitable, and in the best interests of racing by the statutory deadline.

Upon information and belief, the JICF had talked to secure insurance in the private market. This is the second consecutive year that JICF did not meet the statutory deadline for submitting a plan. In 2015, JICF was provided additional time to seek quotes from a private insurer. The JICF was unable to secure a private policy, and thus, eventually submitted a plan with coverage from the state insurance fund that the commission approved.

The law specifically contemplates the failure of the JICF to submit an adequate plan. The law provides that in the absence of an approved plan, the commission shall adopt and promulgate such reasonable rules as are necessary or advisable to effectuate the law. Staff believes that it is prudent to have a standing default provision set forth in commission rules. Thus, for commission consideration are emergency rules and proposed new rules that would set forth general plans for JICF assessments, the fund insurance premiums for 2016, and other related matters. An emergency rulemaking would be required to ensure that worker's compensation coverage remained in place, uninterrupted.

To the knowledge of the commission staff, the only current worker's compensation insurance quotation for the JICF for 2016 has been quoted by the New York State insurance fund. Staff utilizes quote to establish rates for the proposed 2016 plan. The staff proposal bases assessments on a combination of _____ [00:06:42] assessments, per-day stall fees, and per-claim assessments to account for the state insurance fund premium cost and to incentivize trainers and owners to control claims.

We believe this to be fair, equitable, and in the best interest of racing. If adopted as an emergency rule, the 2016 assessments would remain effective for the year, or by statute, until such time as the JICF submits a superseding plan approved by the commission. This morning, the Jockey Insurance Compensation Fund filed with the commission a proposed plan and assessment for 2016. The proposed JICF plan is markedly different in cost structure than that being considered in our rulemaking and will, if approved, maintain the rates imposed by the JICF in its 2015 plan.

Staff will commence reviewing their proposal this afternoon or tomorrow morning. If approved, as I mentioned, it would supplant the actions being considered here today. Regardless, the staff recommends the proposal of these emergency and proposed rules.

Unidentified Male: The governing statute racing law section 221.8b provides that the commission shall, after notice and hearing, adopt and promulgate such reasonable rules as are necessary or advisable to effectuate the statutory provisions.

The commission specifically provided notice to the chairman and outside counsel of the Jockey Injury Compensation Fund. Is there anyone from the JICF who would like to be heard here today?

Unidentified Male: Their outside counsel suggested that the conversations that I have had with them this morning, relative to the plan that they submitted, would suffice to their comment.

Unidentified Male: Very good. Commissioners, any discussion? I think we should take the emergency rulemaking first and then the proposed rulemaking after that. If there are any questions about the emergency rulemaking for the JICF assessments and plan for 2016 at this time. If not, may I have motion to adopt the emergency rules?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Are there any questions regarding the rulemaking for the proposed – I am sorry – are there any questions regarding the proposed rulemaking as opposed to the emergency rulemaking? May I have a motion on the proposed rulemaking?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. The next item on the agenda regards adjudications. The commission has four hearing officer reports –

Unidentified Male: We have three.

Unidentified Male: Three, thank you, sorry. Three – three hearing officer reports for consideration today. Mr. Williams, would you mind outlining the first case?

Unidentified Male: Certainly. The first case is in the matter of Kevin Clark [PH]. On June 11, 2015, the Bureau of Licensing declined to license Kevin Clark as a stable employee. The denial was based on a violation of a commission rule against drug use on track grounds while Mr. Clark's application was pending. Specifically, Mr. Clark tested positive for marijuana metabolites. After Mr. Clark appealed, a hearing was conducted on July 23, 2015, at which Mr. Clark failed to appear. The hearing officer's report and recommendations were delivered to the commission secretary on November 17, 2015. The hearing officer

recommended that the license denial be upheld on the grounds of a violation of the rule against drug use and the applicant's criminal history.

This matter is now ready for final agency determination. At a meeting conducted pursuant to the judicial, or quasi-judicial, proceedings exemption of the New York public officer's law, section 108.1, the commission considered this matter.

Unidentified Male: The commission duly deliberated and considered this matter and determined upon a 5-0 vote to sustain the hearing officer's report and recommendations. To Williams, the next matter.

Unidentified Male: In the matter of Victor Valderrama [PH]. On August 5, 2015, the Bureau of Licensing declined to issue a license to Victor Valderrama as a stable employee. The denial was based on the conclusion that his experience, character, and general fitness are such that the participation of him would be inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity and with the best interest of racing, generally.

Specifically, Mr. Valderrama had failed to disclose criminal convictions on his license application and failed to disclose to the commission an arrest subsequent to the filing of his application. After Mr. Valderrama appealed, a hearing was conducted on September 17th. The hearing officer's report and recommendations were delivered to the commission secretary on November 18th. The hearing officer recommended that the license denial be upheld. This matter is now ready for final agency determination.

Unidentified Male: The commission duly deliberated and considered this matter and determined upon a 5-0 vote to sustain the hearing officer's report and recommendations. In the matter of –

Unidentified Male: On July 28, 2015, the Bureau of Licensing issued a notice of license suspension of the lottery sales agent license of Delight Distribution [PH], which is located at 3768 74th Street in Jackson Heights, Queens. The notice informed Delight Distribution that the suspension was for failure to comply with commission instructions regarding to licensed activity and for fraud, deceit, misrepresentation or conduct prejudicial to the confidence in the state lottery, in that the licensee misrepresented ownership.

On August 12, 2015, amendment to the notice of license suspension added as a ground for suspension, failure to remit funds owed to the lottery. The notice stated that the suspension would become a revocation unless Delight Distribution requested a hearing.

After requests by Delight Distribution, a hearing was conducted on October 1st. The hearing officer submitted a report to the commission secretary on November 18th. The hearing officer recommended that the license be revoked and that the suspension of the license until revocation be upheld on the grounds that the sales agent falsified ownership of the licensee, thereby engaged in conduct that was fraudulent, deceitful, and undermined public confidence in the lottery. This matter is now ready for final agency determination.

Unidentified Male: The commission duly deliberated and considered this matter and determined, upon a 5-0 vote, to sustain the hearing officer's report and recommendation. I think we can move on to –

Unidentified Male: People had some questions regarding the issuance _____ [00:13:26], and staff was going to talk to the district director to determine the procedures to the _____ [00:13:38].

Unidentified Male: Is that right, Rob?

Unidentified Male: I will certainly do that, yes.

Unidentified Male: Excellent; thanks John [PH]. Consideration of gaming facility licenses. Given the level of interest in the casino licensing process, I think it is appropriate to start this portion of our agenda with a plain language overview on what the law requires regarding the commercial casino licensing process, and more importantly, what the law does not allow. Ed, could we ask you to please provide us with a plain language overview?

Unidentified Male: I will. I would like to take a moment to describe for you, and for the public, what your statutory duties are in regard to licensing gaming facilities pursuant to article 13 of the Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law. It would also be useful, I think, to clarify what is not your role or responsibility in regard to these licensing decisions. Misperceptions abound amongst some casino opponents, some public officials, and some in the media, in regard to what your role is today in considering these decisions.

The legislature established a two-layered process for the consideration of potential casino gaming facilities in New York State. You appointed a Gaming Facility Location Board in 2014 as the law required you to do. The Gaming Facility Location Board, in a competitive process, received 17 applications in 2014 in three statutorily defined upstate regions for casino gaming facilities. Those regions were the Catskill Hudson Valley regions, the Capital Region, and the Eastern Southern Tier region.

The Gaming Facility Location Board deemed 16 of those applications responsive and applied statutory evaluation criteria to select three applicants for your consideration for licensure.

It is important to note that your role is not to reevaluate all of the applications, compare applicants, or to consider or reconsider the selection criteria the Gaming Facility Location Board considered and applied. Your role is not to substitute your judgment for that of the Gaming Facility Location Board. Your role is not to decide whether you think the Gaming Facility Location Board made the correct selections. Your role is not to exercise any review of the selection decisions the Gaming Facility Location Board made.

You may or may not have different views of which applicants the Gaming Facility Location Board should have selected. That is of no matter, because the law did not give to this commission the authority to select applicants for gaming facility licensure consideration. The law gave the Gaming Facility Location Board the sole power and authority to make those selections.

You are not appellate body exercising review of the Gaming Facility Location Board's processes or decision-making. Rather, your charge is to consider only the applicants that the Gaming Facility Location Board selected and presented to you. With respect to each of those applicants, the legislature has charged you with determining whether each applicant is qualified for licensure, is not disqualified for licensure, and has met statutory minimum qualifications for licensure.

If you conclude that those criteria are present for an applicant, you have the power to grant a gaming facility license to such applicant. I would like to review now, with you, those statutory criteria.

Before issuing a gaming facility license to an applicant, the commission must determine that the applicant is suitable for licensure and not disqualified, as set forth in sections 13.17 and 13.18 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law. These sections require the commission to consider an applicant's

overall reputation, which includes, without limitation, integrity, honesty, good character and reputation, financial stability, integrity and background, business practices and business ability to establish and maintain a successful gaming facility, compliance with gaming licensing requirements in other jurisdictions, involvement in litigation regarding business practices, suitability of affiliates, close associates and financial resources, and disqualifying criteria.

The law hinges suitability on, and directs the commission to review, whether an applicant, or any individual associated with an applicant, was convicted of a felony or other crime involving public integrity, embezzlement, theft, fraud, or perjury, committed prior acts that form a pattern of misconduct, has affiliates or close affiliates that would not qualify for a license, or whose relationship with the applicant poses injurious threat to the interests to the state, has pursued economic gain in an occupational matter that is in violation of criminal or civil public policy, is identified as a career offender or member of a career offender cartel, has flagrantly defied any legislative or other investigatory body engaged in the investigation of crimes related to gaming, official corruption, or organized crime activity, or has failed to make required child support payments, repay public assistance benefit overpayments, or repay any debt owed to the state.

Once the commission determines that an applicant is suitable and not disqualified, the commission must then review the applicant's entire application and evaluate whether the applicant meets the minimum license thresholds set forth in section 13.16 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law.

This statute requires that no applicant shall be eligible to receive a gaming license unless the applicant meets the following criteria and clearly states as part of an application that the applicant shall:

1. In accordance with the design plans submitted with the licensee's application to the board, invest not less than the required capital under article 13 into the gaming facility.
2. The applicant shall owner-acquire within 60 days after a license has been awarded, the land where the gaming facility is proposed to be constructed; provided, however, that ownership of the land shall include a tenancy for a term of years under a lease that extends not less than 60 years beyond the term of the gaming license issued under article 13.
3. The applicant shall meet the license deposit requirement.
4. The applicant shall demonstrate that it is able to pay and shall commit to paying the gaming licensing fee.
5. The applicant shall demonstrate to the commission how the applicant proposed to address problem gambling concerns, workforce development and community development, and host a nearby municipality impact and mitigation issues.
6. The applicant shall identify the infrastructure costs to the host municipality incurred in direct relation to the construction and operation of the gaming facility and commit to a community mitigation plan for the host municipality.
7. The applicant shall identify the service costs of the host municipality incurred for emergency services in direct relation to the operation of the gaming facility and commit to a community mitigation plan for the host municipality.

8. The applicant shall pay to the commission an application fee of one million dollars to defray the costs associated with the processing of the application and investigation of the applicant; provided, however, that if the costs of the investigation exceed the initial application fee, the applicant shall pay the additional amount to the commission within 30 days after notification of insufficient fees, or the application shall be rejected, and further provided, that should the cost of such investigation not exceed the fee remitted, any unexpended portion shall be returned to the applicant.

9. The applicant shall comply with state building and fire prevention codes.

10. The applicant shall formulate for board approval and abide by an affirmative action program of equal opportunity, whereby the applicant establishes specific goals for the utilization of minorities, women, and veterans on construction jobs.

Additionally, the commission cannot award a license to an applicant until the commission, as an involved agency, has complied with the state environmental quality review act. SEQR requires that the commission adopt the lead agency's findings, or make its own findings with respect to an applicant's environmental impact statement, if one has been issued. If the lead agency has issued a negative declaration, there are no findings the commission is required to make in regard to SEQR.

Unidentified Male: Thanks, Ed. Mr. Williams, will you please call the first application for consideration?

Unidentified Male: Certainly, the first application for consideration is Capital Region Gaming, LLC, doing business as Rivers Casino and Resort at Mohawk Harbor. Each commission has been provided with a copy of Capital Region's response to the Gaming Facility Location Board's request for applications to develop and operate a gaming facility in New York State, a matrix of proposed changes or amendments to their submission post February 27, 2015, a summary of the New York State police investigative report regarding the applicants, its affiliated companies and principal management personnel, and two supplemental memoranda; a memorandum identifying minimum licensing threshold requirements, a license form with conditions specific to the applicant and their proposal, and an involved agency state environmental quality review act, statement of findings for gaming facility license applicant Capital Region Gaming, LLC.

Unidentified Male: Commissioners, may I have a motion to find Capital Region Gaming, LLC, doing business as Rivers Casino and Resort at Mohawk Harbor, suitable for gaming facility licensing per standards contained within sections 13.17 and 13.18 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law.

Unidentified Male: I so move.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Commissioners, may I have a motion to find the application as amended submitted by Capital Region Gaming, LLC, doing business as Rivers Casino and Resort at Mohawk Harbor, as meeting the minimum licensing threshold set forth in section 13.16 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law.

Unidentified Male: I so move.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. May I have a motion to adopt the lead agencies SEQR finding statements, certifying that the requirements of title 6, New York Code Rules and Regulations part 6.17, have been met and consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations who, among the reasonable alternatives available, the action is one that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. May I have such a motion?

Unidentified Male: So move.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Commissioners, may I have a motion to execute the gaming facility license award for Capital Region Gaming, LLC, doing business as Rivers Casino and Resort at Mohawk Harbor, pursuant to section 13.11 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding law?

Unidentified Male: I so move.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Williams, the next up.

Unidentified Male: The second application for consideration is Lago Resort and Casino, LLC, doing business as Lago Resort and Casino. Each commissioner has been provided a copy of Lago Resort and Casino LLC's response to the Gaming Facility Location Board's request for applications to develop and operate a gaming facility in New York State, a matrix of proposed changes or amendments to their submission post February 27, 2015, a summary of the New York State police investigative report regarding the applicant, its affiliated

companies and principal management personnel, and two supplemental memoranda; a memorandum identifying minimum licensing threshold requirements and a license form with conditions specific to the applicant and their proposal. No lead agency SEQR findings statement was circulated, because the lead agency issued a negative declaration. A negative declaration is a determination by the lead agency that inaction will not result in significant adverse environmental impact, and consequently, no environmental impact statement was prepared.

Unidentified Male: Commissioners, may I have a motion to find Lago Resort and Casino, LLC, doing business as Lago Resort and Casino, suitable for gaming facility licensing per standards contained in sections 13.17 and 13.18 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Group: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor, say, "Aye."

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. May I have a motion to find the application as amended submitted by Lago Resort and Casino, LLC, doing business as Lago Resort and Casino, meets the minimum licensing threshold set forth in section 13.16 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law? May I have such a motion?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second?

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on that motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. May I have a motion to execute the gaming facility license award for Lago Resort and Casino, LLC, doing business as Lago Resort and Casino, pursuant to section to 13.11?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? That motion carries. Rob, would you mind calling the next applicant?

Unidentified Male: Certainly, the final application for consideration is Montreign Operating Company, LLC, doing business as Montreign Resort Casino. Each commissioner has been provided with a copy of Montreign Operating Company, LLC's response to the Gaming Facility Location Board's request for applications to develop and operate a gaming facility in New York State, a matrix of proposed changes or amendments to their submission post February 27, 2015, a summary of the New York State policy investigative report regarding the applicant, its affiliated companies and principal management personnel, and two supplemental memoranda; a memorandum identifying minimum license threshold requirements, a license form with conditions specific to the applicant and their proposal, and an involved agency's state environmental quality review act, statement of findings for gaming facility license applicant Montreign Operating Company, LLC.

Unidentified Male: Commissioners, may I have a motion to find Montreign Operating Company, LLC, doing business as Montreign Resort Casino, suitable for gaming facility licensing per standards contained in section 13.17 and 13.18 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: May I have a second?

Group: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. May I have a motion to find the application as amended, submitted by Montreign Operating Company, LLC, doing business as Montreign Resort Casino, meets the minimum licensing threshold set forth in section 13.16 of the New York State Racing Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law? May I have such a motion?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on that motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. May I have motion to adopt the lead agencies SEQR findings? Statements certifying that the requirements of title 6 of the New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations, part 6.17 have been met and consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations. From among the reasonable alternatives available, the action is one that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. May I have such a motion?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. Commissioners, may I have motion to execute the gaming facility license award for Montreign Operating Company, LLC, doing business as Montreign Resort Casino, pursuant to section 13.11?

Unidentified Male: So moved.

Unidentified Male: Second.

Unidentified Male: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Unidentified Male: Any opposed? The motion carries. The next item on the agenda is old business. I note there are two items. Mr. Williams, would you present the first item?

Unidentified Male: Certainly. Last month, the staff issued a report in regard to allegations advanced by the people for the ethical treatment of animals in regard to the practices of KDE Equine, LLC et al. At the conclusion of the meeting, staff requested that the rule graphs contained within the report be released to receive public comment in advance of rulemaking consideration. While we have received some comments anecdotally, staff requests an additional month to specifically contact those entities that are likely to be affected, or have concerns with the various proposals. I would suggest that any substantive comments regarding the report or proposals be withheld until the conclusion at next month's meeting.

Unidentified Male: I think it is fine, and unless the commissioners feel otherwise –

Unidentified Male: You were going to have Dr. Palmer here.

Unidentified Male: Yeah, Dr. Palmer will be here at the January meeting.

Unidentified Male: So we can ask him some questions, and maybe he can give us some answers.

Unidentified Male: Thank you.

Unidentified Male: Rob, the next item.

Unidentified Male: Also, last month, commissioners requested staff conduct research into the use of the whip or crop in jurisdictions across the United States. I want to thank the National Jockey's Field for providing information relative to crop use and identifying how different jurisdictions are now considering its use. I am also aware that Ed Staff [PH] has been undertaking research in this and expects to soon be circulating a memorandum relative to this research, but the research is not yet complete.

Unidentified Male: You circulated something, though, did you not?

Unidentified Male: I might have circulated the materials that the Jockey Club provided.

Unidentified Male: So when do you think, in a month or so?

Unidentified Male: Oh, yeah. Before the next meeting, for sure.

Unidentified Male: Okay.

Unidentified Male: Commission, is there any other old business to consider? We have no items scheduled under new business. Does anyone have any other new business to consider? Hearing none, I think Chris is going to work on scheduling.

Unidentified Male: January 26th.

Unidentified Male: The 26th, you are good for the 26th?

Unidentified Male: Okay. That concludes today's published agenda. Do any commissioners have items they would like to present for consideration? Mr. _____ [00:34:27], do you have other items you would to present?

Unidentified Male: I would like everyone to have a happy and safe holiday.

Unidentified Male: Indeed, indeed. Happy holidays everyone.