

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

**MINUTES OF JUNE 30, 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 June 30, 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, Michael Koniski, Emmanuel Macalino, Linda Ng, Leonard Powell and Kirill Yermanov were present. Sosha Marasigan-Quintero and John Stacy joined the meeting at 1:06 p.m.

3. Review and Approval of February 5, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Michael Hill moved to approve the April 8, 2025 meeting minutes. Kirill Yermanov seconded the motion, which was approved by a roll call vote with Trevor Dewar, Michael Hill, Michael Koniski, Emmanuel Macalino, Linda Ng, Leonard Powell, and Kirill Yermanov voting yes. David Fried abstained.

4. Update and Discussion of Current Projects:

A. Review and Examine Tier III Definition and Regulatory Burdens Project
(Sub-Committee Members: Emmanuel Macalino and John Stacy)

Lisa provided a brief outline to remind GPAC members about the project.

Emmanuel indicated that he did not have any new information but was hoping to get additional feedback from the GPAC members regarding the 12-month grace period proposal.

Sosha Marasigan Quintero and John Stacy joined the meeting.

David commented that he supports raising the tier threshold by two tables instead of delaying the compliance obligations for a year.

Kirill stated that GPAC should look beyond the number of tables when setting rules that a cardroom must follow indicating that each cardroom's community is different and local jurisdictions are often best positioned to understand and address the specific risk and needs of their communities. Kirill suggested emphasizing in regulation that the local jurisdiction can impose tougher or stricter requirements for their cardrooms.

David shared that when a cardroom applies for additional tables, they're required to go through a local review which would be the appropriate juncture for the local authorities to request additional internal controls, steps, or measures that the local jurisdiction feels is needed.

Leonard Powell indicated that he thinks it is a mistake to punt the regulatory requirements to the local jurisdiction and that he supports a uniform statewide approach.

Michael Koniski indicated that he agrees with David and supports raising the tier threshold by two tables instead of delaying the compliance obligations for a year.

Emmanuel indicated that his cardroom is currently going through this process, and the two additional tables are only being used during the busiest times. He indicated that he believes it would be disfavor to smaller cardrooms to overregulate the increase of two tables.

Michael Koniski indicated that he agreed with Emmanuel.

John Stacy spoke on his recent experience of working with the local jurisdiction on a table increase indicating that the local oversight was concerned with fire safety, adequate parking, and maximum capacity. He also mentioned that pushing regulations any further than already exists is overkill.

Lisa indicated that in Business and Professions Code section 19803 the Act contemplates that the local jurisdictions may impose more stringent controls and conditions.

Linda asked about how much of an investment it would be for a cardroom to increase their tables by an additional two.

Michael Hill inquired about the fees allocation and asked if the Commission could explore having MICS tiers be based on revenue instead of number of tables. He stated that it became easier for his TPPP company to maintain and predict fees based on revenue as opposed to badge counts.

David provided an explanation as to why the MICS were based on size of the cardroom operation as opposed to revenue.

There were discussions explaining Assembly Bill 341, chaptered in 2023, that allows for a two table increase every four years up to a total of 10 tables.

There was a consensus when Lisa asked if GPAC wanted to redefine the number of tables that make up tiers one, two and three in the MICS and is no longer considering a grace period. Lisa stated that this did not require GPAC drafting regulatory language and that she would take it back to the Commission's Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Division.

B. Cybersecurity Regulations Educational Project (Sub-Committee Members: Michael Koniski and David Fried)

Lisa provided an explanation of the cybersecurity project indicating that Michael Koniski and David Fried had provided GPAC with an educational information document that was reviewed and discussed at the April meeting. At that meeting it was decided to leave this project as an open agenda item for further discussion.

Michael Koniski explained that his understanding of the user device definition referenced on page four of the document would include any device on the property that is at risk for cyber-attack.

Emmanuel indicated that he recently secured a cybersecurity insurance policy for his cardroom and found the information document provided by Michael and David to be helpful in that process.

David indicated that the purpose of the document was to create an informational piece that the Commission could disseminate through the quarterly newsletter or by other means to the industry.

John Stacy moved to hand-off the cybersecurity project to the Commission to finalize and disseminate to the industry. Linda Ng seconded the motion. The motion passed in a roll call vote with Trevor Dewar, David Fried, Michael Hill, Michael Koniski, Emmanuel Macalino, Sosha Marasigan-Quintero, Linda Ng, John Stacy and Kirill Yermanov voting yes and Leonard Powell voting no.

5. New Discussion Items:

A. Current Status of Problem Gambling Addiction Programs and Available Resources

Lisa indicated that this item was added to the agenda at the request of Leonard Powell.

Lenard explained that the reason for his request was for GPAC to consider if they should examine whether current regulatory policies adequately address the psychological and behavioral health risk associated with increased gambling access.

Sasha informed GPAC that she is from the Office of Problem Gambling (OPG) and she volunteered to do a presentation for GPAC on OPG at the next meeting.

Robert Lindo provided public comment.

B. CGCC March 18, 2025 30-Second Survey Feedback

Lisa explained that as part of the Commission's Strategic Plan, which is to foster constructive and respectful stakeholder engagement objectives and leverage stakeholder communication and feedback, the Commission sent out a 30-second survey in March to subscribers of the Commission's email list. The survey asked the following questions and received the following responses concerning GPAC:

1. Have you heard of the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee?

Response: 29 people responded to the survey. Of those seven had not heard of GPAC.

2. How would you rate GPAC's effectiveness in addressing industry concerns?

Response: 25 responders answered the question regarding GPAC's effectiveness with an average rating of 3 on a scale of 1-10.

3. The mission of GPAC is to provide advisory recommendations to the California Gambling Control Commission concerning matters of controlled gaming regulatory policy and other relevant gambling related issues. What is a controlled gaming regulatory policy or gambling related issue (non-Indian gaming) that you would like GPAC to consider and why?

Response: 12 people provided responses and most included items that are outside of the scope of GPAC, such as Bureau regulations or tribal matters.

Lisa indicated that one of the comments received from the survey suggested improving communications so that the Commissioners have a better understanding of business challenges. Lisa asked GPAC for their input on how to accomplish this.

David stated that his client's cardroom will reach out to newly appointed Commissioners and arrange for them to come tour the cardroom and shadow employees to help them have a better understanding of the cardroom business. He suggested having Commissioners and staff arrange visits with cardrooms more frequently to familiarize themselves with the industry.

Lisa mentioned that the Commission was going out and doing tours of cardrooms and tribal casinos, however, Covid and some state budget restrictions had halted that.

She indicated that the Commission has recently started back up with reaching out to the industry to start doing tours again.

Micheal Koniski suggested a lunch with the Commission.

Linda indicated that it would be beneficial for her if she could have the opportunity to tour a cardroom and Sasha indicated that staff at OPG would also be interested in a tour. David, John, and Michael Koniski all responded that their cardrooms would be able to arrange a tour for them.

C. Third-Party Providers of Proposition Player Services – Internal Controls

Lisa indicated that this item was placed on the agenda at the request of Kirill.

Kirill stated that the intent of this agenda item is for discussion of ideas for MICS that would impact TPPPS and provide safeguards against theft. Kirill introduced Officer Angelo Delossantos of the San Jose Police Department, Division of Gambling Control, to speak on a recent incident that occurred in his district.

Officer Delossantos stated that the regulatory requirements for TPPPS seemed to be limited to licensing, contracts, incident reporting and financial reporting. He further explained that an incident occurred where a TPPPS employee had taken over \$30,000 in chips at the table during her shift. He asked how the risk can be minimized, stating that there is a lack of regulatory oversight for TPPPS employees.

John inquired if the intent of these MICS would be to address the opening and closing procedures of the bank.

Officer Delossanto replied in addition to bank procedures there should potentially be rules regulating employees working at the tables.

Sasha suggested including in the proposal a recommendation that these individuals be referred to the CalGETS program for treatment.

Michael Hill volunteered to work with Kirill as a sub-committee member on the project.

Lisa indicated that this item would remain on future agendas as an ongoing project for GPAC with Kiril and Micheal Hill as sub-committee members.

6. Discussion of New Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

A. Proposals by GPAC Members or Public

None.

7. Next Meeting Date

Lisa indicated that she would like to schedule the next meeting in August and that Niecesha will be in contact with the members to survey availability.

8. Public Comment

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Lisa adjourned the meeting at 2:41 p.m.