

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 AUGUST 29, 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 August 29, 2025 meeting of the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC) to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Roll Call of Members

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

Lisa introduced Nicole Learned to GPAC informing them the Nicole joined the Commission as the Deputy Director of the Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Division on June 9, 2025.

3. Review and Approval of June 30, 2025 Meeting Minutes

David Fried moved to approve the June 30, 2025 meeting minutes. Michael Koniski seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote of the members present.

4. California Problem Gambling Treatment Services Program, Overview & Update – Presentation by Sosha Marasigan-Quintero, Principal, Behavioral Health Promotion Section, California Department of Public Health

Sosha provided a presentation on the Office of Problem Gambling, (OPG) to the GPAC members. Sosha explained that OPG provides prevention education and no-cost treatment to help Californians struggling with or impacted by problem gambling. Sosha indicated that OPG has an annual budget of \$8.5 million and is funded by the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund, cardroom fees, and the California Lottery. Sosha provided an explanation on the funded programs that are provided by OPG.

David inquired about the percentage of calls related to sports betting and online gambling and their age demographics. Sosha responded that they are seeing younger people, 30 years and less, and although OPG does not have specific numbers for calls related to sports betting and online gambling, their providers are informing them that they are getting more references to it. Sosha also indicated that OPG will be seeking information to identify specific types of gambling information on upcoming surveys.

Michael Hill asked if OPG is seeing a lot of cross over where individuals are experiencing problems with many forms of gambling. Sosha indicated that OPG has learned that problem gambling usually starts with the lottery and then progresses to more diversified gambling. Sosha mentioned that OPG is working on developing a new problem gambling survey and it would be helpful if it could be presented to GPAC for their input.

Leonard inquired about the sustainability of OPG's budget with the new emerging gambling markets. Sosha responded that OPG is looking into ways to diversify and expand their funding sources, stating that the funding from cardroom fees has been flat for 22 years.

Linda asked how OPG plans to reach out to all the different Asian (AAPI) populaces. Sosha responded that OPG would work to create partnerships at the community level to recruit providers within their specific communities.

Emmanuel inquired if there are any resources that cities can use to create their own programs to educate their young citizens. Sosha mentioned the FNL program and collaboration between OPG and the City of Madera. She suggested speaking with Emmanuel offline to determine how best to assist his local community.

Lisa thanked Sosha for her presentation and informed her that discussion of OPG's survey questions can be put on a future GPAC agenda for their input.

5. 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 indicated that at the June 30, 2025 meeting discussion on this item settled with the group concluding on a permanent redefinition of tiers 1-3 (increasing each by two). At that meeting she had stated that this did not require GPAC drafting regulatory language and that she would take this back to the Commission's Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Division. Subsequent to that, Emmanuel contacted Lisa to confirm if something needed to be sent to the Commission or if further research was needed.

Lisa indicated that at this point, there are two ways to proceed. 1) GPAC can present their recommendation to the Commissioners at a publicly noticed Bagley Keene

meeting, or 2) GPAC can request that the CGCC Executive Director take the project and fold it into the Commission's regulatory workload.

Emmanuel indicated that he would like the opportunity to present this project to the Commission. David and John Stacy indicated they agreed with Emmanuel.

Leonard inquired about who would be doing the presentation to the Commission and if GPAC would be able to hear and critique the presentation first. David responded that he had no recollection of a subcommittee providing their presentation to GPAC on an approved project before presenting it to the Commission. Leonard also inquired on who has the authority to make the change being presented by GPAC and Lisa responded that the Commission has authority because it would be a change to the Commission's regulations.

Lisa indicated that she would work with the subcommittee members to determine whether this will be scheduled on a regular licensing meeting agenda or a GPAC agenda for Commission consideration.

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

Michael Hill informed GPAC that he and Kirill have met to discuss the typical daily floor operations of a TPPPS. He indicated that the project concern is policing potential theft without any regulatory controls for TPPPS. They had determined through their discussions that it would be beneficial for the project to gather community input, so they worked with Commission staff to draft a survey and send it out to Third Party Providers. They are currently waiting for responses from that survey. Michael indicated that types of survey questions they were hoping to have answers to were:

- What practices do TPPPS have in place to proactively prevent theft?
- How often does theft occur?
- Have the TPPPS ever contracted with a CPA or independent third party to review their practices?

Michael indicated from his company's perspective that the best way to identify theft is through surveillance. Michael also indicated that Kirill has explained that these thefts cause a ripple down effect that impacts the taxable revenue to the local municipalities.

Emmanuel suggested when they draft proposed internal controls for the industry that they look at what already exist so not to conflict with what is in place.

Michael indicated he and Kirill are still working to determine whether this project will require regulations or an educational approach and that they hope to have more information from the survey responses.

6. New Discussion Items:

7. Discussion of New Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

A. Proposals by GPAC Members or Public

Lisa asked GPAC if they had any suggestions for new items on the next GPAC agenda. There were no suggestions from the GPAC members.

8. Next Meeting Date

Lisa announced that next meeting will be in October and Niecesha will be in contact with the GPAC members to assess their availability.

9. Public Comment

David inquired about the status of the rulemaking for duplicate licensing and multiple owner licensing.

ADJOURNMENT

Lisa adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.