

**GAMING POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2399 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 220

SACRAMENTO, CA 95852-4231

(916) 263-0700 · FAX (916) 263-0499

[WWW.CGCC.CA.GOV](http://WWW.CGCC.CA.GOV)

---

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 28, 2025  
GAMING POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN PERSON AND BY TELE/VIDEO CONFERENCE**

---

**OPEN SESSION**

1. Welcome and Call to Order

Executive Director Lisa Wardall called the October 28, 2025 meeting of the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC) to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call of Members

Roll call of the GPAC Members was taken. Trevor Dewar, David Fried, Michael Hill, Emmanuel Macalino, Sosha Marasigan-Quintero, Linda Ng, Leonard Powell, John Stacy and Kirill Yermanov were present. Michael Koniski was absent.

3. Review and Approval of August 29, 2025 Meeting Minutes

John Stacy moved to approve the August 29, 2025 meeting minutes. Michael Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote of the members present.

4. Update and Discussion of Current Projects:

A. Third-Party Providers of Proposition Player Services – Internal Controls (Sub-Committee Members: Kirill Yermanov and Michael Hill)

Subcommittee member Kirill Yermanov provided an update to the GPAC members indicating that on August 28, 2025 they sent out a survey to 23 licensed Third-Party Providers of Proposition Player Services, (TPPPPS) to learn what types of internal controls, if any, they have in place to prevent or deter theft. Kirill stated that they only received responses from three TPPPPS. Those that responded indicated that they have some type of internal controls in place with the most common being surveillance, reconciliation of chip balances, statistical tracking, segregation of duties, access controls and whistleblower policies. Each respondent confirmed that they maintain some sort of written internal control procedures manual such as an

employee handbook. Kirill indicated that although the survey responses show that these TPPPPS have some form of internal controls in place the overall small response rate to the survey makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the entire TPPPPS industry. Kirill stated that there is a regulatory gap that needs to be addressed about requiring some form of internal controls for TPPPPS, such as prohibiting employees from wearing clothing with pockets which would provide better protection against theft for the industry.

Subcommittee member Michael Hill spoke about a “no-pocket” policy that his company requires with regards to TPPPPS employee attire. However, he also indicated that he did not support having a regulation that specifies rules for proper attire for TPPPPS employees because he does not think that it would have much impact in reducing theft.

David Fried stated that he thought there should be some minimum standards for securing property and preventing theft.

Emmanuel Macalino indicated that he thought there should be some oversight. He emphasized that oversight should be a minimum standard because the TPPPPS are responsible for and have a vested interest in their own property and assets.

Leonard Powell indicated that he thinks TPPPPS should be regulated as stringently as the cardrooms because of the level of control they have over the money.

David inquired whether the City of San Jose is the only jurisdiction that receives tax revenue from gross receipts of TPPPPS businesses. Michael Hill responded that the three separate jurisdictions that he has conducted business in have all collected tax on gross receipts.

David, Michael Hill, and Emmanuel discussed best practices guidelines for TPPPPS providers.

Linda Ng inquired on whether TPPPPS employees are bonded and on the dollar amount of the thefts.

John Stacy indicated that there needs to be some sort of framework for instructions on reporting requirements for thefts.

Lisa suggested that based on the discussions GPAC may want to pursue this project from an educational perspective on best practices. Michael Hill, John and Emmanuel agreed that a bullet point document on best practices would be beneficial.

Leonard stated that an educational approach is great but not enough and that there should be a regulatory approach that is binding.

David suggested starting with a guideline for best practices and after that has been completed GPAC can review and determine if some of those guidelines should be required in regulation.

Kirill offered to develop guidelines for best practices for review and discussion by GPAC at the next meeting.

5. New Discussion Items:

Lisa indicated that no new discussion items were agendaized for this meeting.

6. Discussion of New Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

B. Proposals by GPAC Members or Public

Lisa indicated that there was a mistake on the agenda and Item 6.B. should be listed as 6.A. She asked GPAC if they had any suggestions for new items on the next GPAC agenda. There were no suggestions from GPAC members or the public.

7. Next Meeting Date

Lisa announced that she would like to schedule the next meeting in December and Niecesha will be in contact with the GPAC members to assess their availability.

8. Public Comment

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Lisa adjourned the meeting at 1:53 p.m.