

Florida Gaming Control Commission

September 20, 2022



September 20, 2022

In The Matter Of:
Florida Gaming Control Commission
Public Meeting
Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Vol. 1
(Pages 1-163)

DATE: Tuesday, September 20, 2022
TIME: 10:00 a.m. - 2:37 p.m.
LOCATION: Zoom

STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:

Paige E. Kelleher,
Stenograph Shorthand Machine Stenographer

PRESENT:

JOHN MACIVER, CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL YAWORSKY, VICE CHAIRMAN
JULIE I. BROWN, COMMISSIONER
CHUCK DRAGO, COMMISSIONER
JOHN D'AQUILA, COMMISSIONER

PARTICIPANTS:

ROSS MARSHMAN, ESQUIRE
LOUIS TROMBETTA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
ELIZABETH STINSON
CHRISTINE HUTTON
CAROL HEROLD
ROSS HOLZMAN
LISA MUSTAIN
Suzie WHITMIRE

Job No.: 273157

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: All right. Let the record
2 show that all the members are present and we'll call the
3 September 20th meeting of the Florida Gaming and Control
4 Commission to order. I'm going to go ahead and throw
5 this up on the screen.

6 Commissioner Drago, would you go ahead and
7 lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

8 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Yes, I would. Please
9 rise in joining in the Pledge.

10 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

11 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Thank you. All right. I
12 am going to put out an initial housekeeping request. If
13 you are not a Commissioner or you're not currently
14 presenting, please go down to the bottom of your screen
15 where it says microphone and go ahead and mute your
16 microphone for us. And with that, I will go ahead and
17 jump right into the agenda.

18 Thanks to our executive director who
19 makes the lift a little bit lighter for us today,
20 because pretty much all of this is presentation by staff
21 for us to then be able to pontificate about.

22 So Mr. Trombetta, if you'd like to jump
23 into item number one, a discussion of our long-range
24 performance plan or the draft thereof.

25 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Thank you,

1 Commissioners. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 What I have done here for this meeting is
3 a little bit different than the previous ones. The
4 first two agenda items really will be with respect to
5 two documents that me or my staff has prepared. We're
6 interested in kind of getting some feedback and thoughts
7 moving forward to help us kind of effectuate some of our
8 internal processes. So there's nothing on this agenda
9 that should involve, you know, making final orders in
10 terms of decisions that would affect someone's
11 substantial interest. So we don't have any license --
12 you know, nothing licensing or nothing dealing with
13 anyone in the industry. So hopefully the agenda will
14 move smoothly; it's just kind of for purposes of our
15 organization.

16 The first two items cover two documents
17 that we have worked on. The second two items contain
18 essentially some substantive matter in response to some
19 feedback that was requested at the previous meeting.
20 And then the final item on the agenda is just some kind
21 of housekeeping items that I want to prepare and move on
22 with you-all.

23 So with the Chair's permission, the first
24 document is the long-range performance plan. I have --
25 so me, Christine and Lisa, have sort of worked on

1 getting this initial draft to this point of where it is.
2 There are a few items that, frankly, I need Commission
3 feedback on so that we can best move forward. I'll go
4 through them and then kind of go one by one and go
5 through everything.

6 So I would like to cover the mission
7 statements, the goals, the objectives, and then touch on
8 the transic condition statements which begins on -- the
9 page numbers are on the document or the view I am
10 looking at -- the section as it's called right now.
11 Division of Gaming Enforcement -- to get some thoughts
12 on sort of what the Commissioners and the Commission's
13 goals are for our law enforcement unit. So with that
14 being said, that's where I would like to go on this
15 first document.

16 If we can start with the mission
17 statements. There's also been a fifth concept, so
18 there's been some feedback from -- that there is a fifth
19 concept that Commissioner Drago has relayed to me. But
20 if you want, Chair, I'm not sure how you would best like
21 me to through each one of these issues. I can turn it
22 back over to you to solicit discussion. I can try and
23 do it. How would you like to progress?

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Let's just go ahead and
25 jump into that first issue and then we will open it up

1 for discussion and we can step on from there.

2 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: All right. For the
3 mission statement, we have a fifth one that I can add to
4 the document right here so that we can solicit -- so it
5 can be discussed.

6 So essentially the plan here was to
7 provide a balance between the two missions, the
8 regulatory side and the criminal side. So all of the
9 four concepts here kind of -- are aimed to do that. The
10 first concept is to regulate licensed gaming fairly and
11 enforce criminal gambling prohibitions throughout the
12 state. The second one is to regulate unlawful gaming
13 and address unlawful gambling throughout the state. The
14 third one is to investigate and target illegal gambling
15 while regulating licensed gaming. The fourth one is to
16 support safe gaming activities by regulating lawful
17 activities -- while investigating unlawful activity.
18 And then the final one, is to preserve and protect the
19 integrity of gaming activities through fair regulation,
20 licensing, and affective criminal investigations. So
21 those are sort of the five concepts.

22 Mr. Chair, please feel free to discuss
23 and let me know what your thoughts are on any of these
24 concepts.

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Can you read for us again

1 the last statement you made that would have been concept
2 number five?

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Sure. The last one is to
4 preserve and protect the integrity of gaming activities
5 through fair regulation, licensing, and effective
6 criminal investigation.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So Commissioners, to me,
8 all of these sound like different ways of kind of saying
9 the same thing, which I think, is something that we have
10 been saying all along. And I appreciate the fact that
11 it's been heard, that we want the people who are trying
12 to stay within the bounds of the law to get as much
13 assistance from us as much as they possibly can. And
14 the people who aren't trying to follow the law, well, to
15 be stopped by us. So I appreciate that that message is
16 coming through in all the ways that I hear this being
17 said.

18 To me -- and I'll just put it out
19 there -- the most succinct and thorough sounds like that
20 fifth one, which is not written down which I just heard.
21 The only difference being I would add the words and
22 enforcement to the end of it. With that, I'll open the
23 floor up to open discussion.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I agree
25 100 percent. I thought the fifth concept more more

1 eloquently encapsulated than all of the other four
2 concepts together. So I would support the fifth one.
3 Thank you, Commissioner Drago, for that effort.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Commissioner, I agree
5 as well. I originally, not having seen or heard five,
6 thought concept four was the best. But I believe that
7 five, as Commissioner Brown pointed out, presents more
8 of an eloquent fashion.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Commissioners, I
10 agree. Thank you, Commissioner Drago, I think that's a
11 great succinct way to put together our mission.

12 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Chairman? Just a
13 couple comments on that. I didn't really have any
14 strong problems with any of the concepts. Some are
15 better than others, obviously. But I think it's
16 important -- and I think we all agree our mission is to
17 maintain the integrity of the industry and gambling in
18 the state while making sure that we are doing what we're
19 supposed to be doing, regulating licensing, but also now
20 adding this criminal investigation portion to it. So I
21 think we need to make it as succinct as possible and as
22 few words as possible, but we have a lot to say here.
23 So I think it captures our main mission if we have to
24 narrow it down to one thing, and that's to preserve the
25 integrity of the gaming in this country. So I hope it

1 works for everyone.

2 And Mr. Chairman, I didn't understand
3 what you said, you wanted to add -- - I'm sorry, I
4 didn't hear it.

5 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Just to the end of the
6 statement, add the word enforcement. So it's fair
7 regulation, licensing, effective criminal investigation,
8 and enforcement. So as part of our investigatory
9 measures also adding the enforcement aspect of that.

10 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: That's up to everybody,
11 obviously.

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think that it is a
13 thorough, concise, and accurate mission statement.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I move that we accept
15 concept number five as presented on the screen.

16 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I'll second it.

17 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Hearing no objection, show
18 that adopted as our mission statement for the Florida
19 Gaming Control Commission.

20 Do you want to move through the document,
21 Mr. Trombetta?

22 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 Next, within the same table -- I've
25 written down four goals and I separated them. You can

1 see them in the third row, the parentheses kind of
2 capture -- those will be removed in the final draft --
3 but that kind of captures the intent of each goal. Goal
4 one is regulation. Goal two is citizen safety. Goal
5 three is state revenue. Goal four is criminal -- these
6 are sort of the big picture goals, and then we will
7 focus our objectives on meeting these goals.

8 So I would like some feedback, just on
9 your thoughts, of the goals and if there are other kinds
10 of items beyond regulations, safety, revenue and
11 criminal activity you would like us to address, or where
12 you would kind of like to go with these goals.

13 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, for the sake
14 of us being able to move through the document, I'm going
15 to move through with a presumption of no objections to
16 what we're seeing and as we scroll through, if there is
17 anything any Commissioner would like to discuss as we're
18 going through, just catch my attention so I can stop and
19 open that up for discussion.

20 Otherwise, I will just let Mr. Trombetta
21 bring us along through the document, present what we
22 have, and we'll stop him as any Commissioner feels
23 necessary. Any discussion with these goals, this will
24 be the last time that I specifically stop for an issue
25 though. Discussion on the goals? I hear none.

1 Mr. Trombetta, if you want to continue to
2 move forward.

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: That works. On the next
4 page it has our objectives for each goal. So we provide
5 further detail on these objectives later on in the
6 document, but I think it would be best to kind of
7 consider them right now.

8 So as it relates to goal one, our goal
9 for regulation is to reduce the time needed to process
10 license applications, to provide maximum amount of
11 license applications online. Our second goal, citizen
12 safety, just to respond to citizens contact and
13 complaints, to alert law enforcement of potential
14 illegal activities. Our third goal --

15 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I just want to clarify on
16 2(a) you have gaming enforcement and it says respond to
17 citizens contact and complaints, alert law enforcement
18 of potential illegal activity. Are we measuring that in
19 some way? I mean, is there some type of measurement
20 that we want to respond to so many, or we have some goal
21 to alert to so many agencies or anything like that? Are
22 there going to be measurements built into that of some
23 type?

24 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. There will be
25 measurements built into it, and we don't have, like, a

1 fixed goal of, you know -- just for example, hitting
2 100 percent. We are measuring it and we will be
3 measuring it on a percentage basis so we can track it.
4 Obviously the goal would be to do as best we can on
5 this. The first year, what you will see in the
6 documents is that it projects five years out. And as
7 we're new at this, you will see that we have some
8 projections for, like, some of these areas for reducing
9 the time needed to process license applications. So we
10 have that one because the Division of PMW was previously
11 tracking that. So we have our current standard and we
12 have what's expected five years out.

13 For some of the newer ones, we don't have
14 exact projections. We just have a plan for measuring it
15 and kind of adjusting as we go forward.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I kind of see how it got
17 there. I'm inclined, Commissioners, to strike objective
18 2b. And let me explain my thinking there. I think that
19 we do have to have measurable outputs, so responding to
20 citizens' complaints and seeing the percentage of
21 response that we have, I think is important. I think
22 the alert law enforcement of potential illegal activity
23 may be a vestage of when we didn't have our own law
24 enforcement arm. Now that we do have our law
25 enforcement arm, I think there certainly is going to be

1 a role where we are going to work with other agencies,
2 but I think that role as we get started is going to be
3 more informal than formal. And I don't think it should
4 be a part of our mission that distracts us from the core
5 of actually investigating and detecting in our own
6 right.

7 So making that a measurable objective
8 that we're making referrals to other law enforcement
9 agencies, I think we would be well to strike at this
10 point.

11 I like the other objectives that are in
12 there. I specifically like the objectives that are
13 under the gaming enforcement, 4a, b and c sections. But
14 I think we might stop tracking the alert law enforcement
15 of potential illegal activity. In short, I think it's a
16 distraction from our core message if we try to make that
17 something that we are considering its own independent
18 objective.

19 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I understand that and it
20 makes sense. I would be interested though in knowing
21 how many cases we refer to outside agencies. I don't
22 know that we want to make it a goal that we're going to
23 do so many or that type of thing. I agree with the
24 Chairman there, but if we could have a way to track how
25 many we send out or refer to outside agencies. It's

1 just a matter of analysis in determining what our role
2 is around this state as it relates to these criminal
3 investigations. So maybe this isn't the right place,
4 but somewhere along the line, I think it would be good
5 to know how many cases we refer out.

6 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I 100 percent agree. And I
7 probably glossed over that a little bit when I simply
8 said that process will be a little bit more informal at
9 this stage. I do think we will be referring those cases
10 out. I think that's critical. And of course we have to
11 track what we're doing. To your point
12 Commissioner Drago, this isn't the document where we
13 memorialize that through.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Mr. Trombetta, can I
15 get clarity on 2a? When we're using the phrase -- and
16 this goes into the discussion of the new role of the
17 gaming commission with law enforcement capacity, but
18 when we say respond to citizen contact and complaints,
19 is that a metric generalizing the substantive we're
20 doing something about this complaint we received, or is
21 this just a measure of us simply responding that we've
22 received your complaint or inquiry? What are we
23 measuring there?

24 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So, yeah, the thought
25 process is we would be measuring our actual responses.

1 So it would be people that contact us in some way,
2 whether it's a formal complaint or e-mail or something
3 like that, and we would be tracking the numbers so we
4 could compare the number of complaints or contact we
5 received to those that we have responded to; not
6 necessarily closed or resolved, it's just responded.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: A tally mark on that
8 would be just saying thank you, we received your
9 complaint?

10 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Beyond the automatic --
11 so right now, for example, if someone submits a
12 complaint through the web portal, they're going to get
13 an automatic thank you for submitting it. That isn't
14 necessarily what we're tracking, it would be contact
15 beyond that.

16 Vice Chair, I hope that sort of answers the
17 question.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: It sort of does, but
19 it's probably too much to do on this call. I'm not
20 sure, for example, when we say respond -- again, it may
21 need to be a little clearer on what we're measuring
22 there. For example, there is a complaint that comes
23 forward to the Commission, they get a reply and that
24 does not count. But it seems to indicate further action
25 of the agency does at some point merit a tally mark in

1 that section. Does that happen with each additional
2 step on the same case if there's multiple actions on a
3 complaint? Are each of those counted or is it somehow
4 cumulatively scored to get to a point where it's
5 counted? I'm not entirely clear on that.

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: If the Commission would
7 like, we would be happy to clarify that.

8 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: My thoughts are isn't our
9 response to complaints always going to be 100 percent?

10 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I would think so.

11 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So I think I agree with
12 Commissioner Yaworsky. I'm not sure what we're
13 measuring here because we should, of course, respond to
14 every single complaint. Perhaps something like the
15 timeliness of their response or that type of thing, or
16 how long it takes to complete the response. In other
17 words, to get back to them with the final disposition or
18 something that's measurable. I think we're always going
19 to be 100 percent or it should be.

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Let me jump in. I have a
21 problem with 2a and also a problem with 2b as well,
22 because I think under 4c and 4b, that kind of captures
23 that's what we're looking for. But 2a, we talk about
24 further in the document public integrity that we aim to
25 support robust inspection programs, public education

1 campaigns, and license education programs. Is that
2 something currently that we have tracked the number of
3 inspection programs or outreach or education programs?
4 Or is that something that can also fall within that
5 concept of public safety and public integrity under 2a?

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So we currently do -- the
7 division of PMW does track their investigations. I'm
8 trying to find the language you're referring to,
9 Commissioner Brown.

10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: It does haven't a page
11 number, but it's underneath the language of the
12 governor's priorities under public integrity and it
13 talks about that specific -- which would kind of tie
14 into citizen -- if we're receiving complaints, you know,
15 what are the number of complaints that we received, but
16 what are the number of inspection programs or education
17 programs that we have conducted during the year.

18 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: We actually could include
19 one about tracking the number of investigations. I
20 don't know if that education or licensing -- that might
21 be a little bit tougher because there are a few
22 different ways that that happens and some are not fully
23 in our control, like, if you have a problem gambling.
24 But if you would like us, we could address the
25 inspection idea.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I would be interested in
2 seeing that and also how that ties into how many
3 complaints we've received, but what has our outreach
4 been to even educate the citizens about our presence.
5 And then going back to 4c also, the specific objective
6 talks about state partners, but I would also include
7 local as well.

8 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Mr. Chair, if you
9 don't mind, if I could -- for 2a just to kind of -- for
10 clarity -- how does the Commission feel about me and my
11 staff more narrowly defining what the response would be?

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Certainly so. I think for
13 the purpose of this document, we probably want to just
14 add to that word respond; respond and track, respond and
15 evaluate someone who's kind of got their thumb on this a
16 little bit more. But what we're trying to say is we're
17 going to collect data from those responses and basically
18 track what we're doing. So it's just probably respond
19 to and evaluate citizens' contact and complaints;
20 something along those lines.

21 And yes, as far as how that tracking and
22 how that reporting is going to flush out, I don't think
23 that's part of our long-range program plan. But from
24 what I'm hearing from all of the Commissioners, I think
25 there's going to be a desire for some robust tracking of

1 this so that we can see a lot of, for lack of a better
2 term, cross tabs on. You know, how many of these
3 resulted in a criminal investigation? How many were
4 unfounded? How many were a referral to another agency
5 that deals with that problem? Those are the sort of
6 things I think the Commissioners want to be able to
7 check and see what's happening.

8 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Trombetta, one more.
9 I have a problem with the response I think is my
10 problem. Because does that just means we're going to
11 give them a call and say we got your message, you know,
12 adios. It should be at least 100 percent all the time.
13 So it's kind of not something that you can really
14 measure. I guess you could, but then you've got -- it
15 should never fall below 100 percent. And I'm assuming
16 these are external complaints; correct? They're not
17 self-initiated or internal complaints by our own
18 investigators, et cetera?

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir.
20 Commissioner Drago, I know other agencies will do it
21 terms of a response and they will define it as a
22 complaint or contact to, like, an investigator or to
23 somebody that then will provide an actual response. So
24 say we get a complaint and it gets assigned to somebody
25 to respond to, yes, you can potentially track both the

1 assignment and whether a second response was out; that's
2 an option for getting options up there.

3 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Mr. Trombetta, just to
4 comment on Commissioner Drago's point, would effectively
5 respond to citizens' contacts and complaints address
6 that point? That's really a question for
7 Commissioner Drago.

8 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I think for me anyway the
9 problem is, you know, we will respond to your complaint
10 should be enough. But to track it indicates that we
11 don't think we're going to respond all the time.
12 Therefore, we need to track it to make sure how many
13 times we missed responding. I'm not quite sure what
14 that's going to show. And that shows we only respond
15 50 percent of the time, yes, we have a huge problem.
16 This should be something that's pretty wrote and
17 expected to be done on every single complaint. I think
18 if we -- that's why I say to measure our response time,
19 how long it takes us to respond to a person's
20 complaint would give us an indication of our failings,
21 where we're missing the boat where we don't respond
22 quick enough and figure out what reasons. Just saying
23 respond, we will respond, that's kind of difficult to
24 see the value in that from my perspective; that's all.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I was just going to say

1 there are primary objectives. And the primary objective
2 obviously goes without saying that we will promptly
3 respond to any customer that calls us, but I think it's
4 more about what are we doing? What efforts are we doing
5 to promote public safety? What efforts are we doing to
6 promote public transparency and integrity? I think that
7 is the key objective rather than just respond to citizen
8 complaints. So that is something that is typically in
9 the DBPR because they have so many different types of
10 complaints. And so much substance. That's kind of I
11 think -- I think it mirrors the language in the DBPR,
12 but our initiative is a little bit different in that --
13 you know, we have to educate the public, too.

14 I mean, obviously, this is going to be
15 something that we track. How many complaints do we
16 have? But I don't know if this is really the objective
17 that we're looking for.

18 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Chairman, can I
19 suggest that we maybe table this one? Let's see if
20 Mr. Trombetta has enough feedback from us to maybe
21 rework this a little bit and come back with this. There
22 still seems to be a lot of questions and confusion about
23 it.

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think that's perfect.
25 Let's table this and let's continue to move through the

1 document. We can revisit this maybe when we get towards
2 the end and maybe staff will have come up with another
3 way to verbalize it.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: One more question -- a
5 minor suggestion and consideration on points 1b and 1a.
6 So 1b, promote efficient license applications online,
7 would that be more acceptable way of presenting that
8 instead of providing the maximum amount as it's written?
9 That was more of a wordsmith suggestion. It's similar
10 to how private enterprise do that every day.

11 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you
12 Commissioner D'Aquila and Mr. Chair so as Commissioner
13 Brown just said, agency objectives are kind of generally
14 more broadly stated. And then if you look at the
15 outcome and performance projection table, which is on
16 the page that follows, it gets into a little bit more of
17 the detail. So for both 1a and 1b, if you look at the
18 outcome row -- so looking at 1a, the objective is to
19 reduce the time process for online applications. We if
20 look at the outcome, we have a more detailed explanation
21 of what we're looking at. We're looking at the
22 advantage process of the application. Same thing with
23 1b -- yes, sir.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I think it's similar
25 to what Commissioner D'Aquila was just talking about,

1 providing the maximum amount of license applications
2 online. I would wordsmith that to something else. I
3 think it's very unclear what provides the maximum means.
4 But also on 1a, reduce the time needed to process a
5 license application. It seems like that's an objective.
6 And then the projection that we have on the table I'm
7 looking at, has no reduction over the next five years.
8 So it would be -- if we're going to use that as a
9 standard, it would seem to be a standard we're not
10 actually improving upon.

11 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: If I can respond. I
12 agree because my second point on 1a is isn't it
13 efficient the word we're looking for versus reduce?
14 Don't we need to efficiently handle license
15 applications?

16 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: If I can say one thing.
17 Yeah, you do. I agree. But when I think when you talk
18 about reduce and that type of thing, you're looking at
19 something that you're going to measure; right? So I
20 don't know how to measure effectively or efficiently
21 those for an objective, but you can certainly measure
22 reduce or those kinds of words as long as you put some
23 percentage in there to follow objectives. That's my
24 thought.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORKSY: If I might, maybe

1 objective 1a and 1b are just -- specifically 1a has been
2 where my interest has been. Maybe 1a is no longer --
3 the folks who are working this day to day -- but if
4 we're at a point where we can't reduce the time it takes
5 for whatever -- there's just physical constraints of how
6 long something can move, so maybe that should not be
7 included or it should be reworded into something that we
8 could measure and improve because it's just not possible
9 to get it below six days. Or if there's some sort of
10 automation or technology that can be introduced, which
11 is a different discussion about a new system to manage
12 workflow, maybe we could. But I would just encourage --
13 I don't have a specific change right now, but I would
14 maybe encourage some other measurement or metric there
15 that we could improve upon.

16 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if I may
17 please respond?

18 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Please do.

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: An idea just came into my
20 head to rework the language to address -- I mean, I
21 think the goal internally here is to get licenses to
22 people that apply quickly, and we can track it as a
23 number of days. I suggest that maybe I work with staff
24 to try to reword 1a and reword 1b; 1a to focus on the
25 time that we take to issues licenses and then we can

1 track it without using the word reduce.

2 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think that's wholly
3 appropriate. And I think what you might want to start
4 tracking instead of the number of days for all
5 applications, to Commissioner Yaworsky and
6 Commissioner D'Aquila's point, if we reach sort of an
7 equilibrium at how long it takes to do those, then maybe
8 what we start tracking is the numbers of outliers we
9 have. And our goal should be to keep the number of
10 outliers that are beyond that six days or beyond
11 whatever that equilibrium point, we keep those outliers
12 to a minimum. So we try and keep those numbers down
13 rather than tracking across the board to an average that
14 doesn't change. That's it from my input.

15 Commissioners, if nothing else,
16 Mr. Trombetta, take all this input to heart and then
17 staff can craft a way to reflect that. I think we'll
18 want to take another look and see where we go from
19 there. But it might be time to move on through the
20 document.

21 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, any feedback
22 on objectives 3 and 4? I know Commissioner Brown had
23 feedback on four -- at least one of the ones on four.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
25 For 4c, I would include -- the objective is supporting

1 information sharing among state partners to prevent
2 illegal gambling activities. It should also include the
3 word local. We've talked about that at our prior
4 meetings as well. So I would just include that language
5 under 4c. It would actually probably help with the
6 evaluating the number of cases that we're partnering
7 with too, which is the outcome.

8 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, as we
9 continue to scroll through, again, if anything catches
10 your attention and you want to have a discussion about
11 it, catch my attention. But once you caught my
12 attention, again, I'm going to leave it an open floor so
13 any Commissioner can jump in whenever you want. If that
14 becomes unmanageable and anybody has the desire to have
15 recognition go through the Chair and let me know and I
16 can shift to that format, too. But I think this kind of
17 works well for these kind of workshoping through this.
18 If everybody has an open floor once we stop for
19 discussion, so with that, Mr. Trombetta.

20 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: In terms of
21 Commissioner Brown's comments, I am okay with adding the
22 word local to this if there's no objection from any
23 other Commissioners.

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: State and local partners.
25 I think we can also save motions, votes, and edits until

1 the end unless anything actually becomes a disagreement
2 among the Commissioners, in which case, we'll table that
3 as a separate vote. I think we can roll through the
4 whole document. At the end we'll take a motion to
5 accept, edit as proposed, and move from there. If there
6 is anything like I said is a decret issue that we want
7 to set aside for its own vote, Commissioners, let me
8 know and we will table that vote separately. That way
9 we don't have to stop for every word change and do a
10 motion, a second and a vote for every word change in the
11 document.

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, thank you
13 for that clarification. Before we move on from the
14 goals though, goal number 3a -- and I would be curious
15 if Commissioner D'Aquila has any thoughts on this --
16 with regard to streamlining the reporting process for
17 securing state revenues. Obviously, everything is
18 staying 100 percent of those businesses filings are
19 electronic tax filings. I don't know if that's really
20 the measurement that we -- or the outcome that we're
21 looking for streamlining purposes. I don't know if any
22 Commissioners have other thoughts on it. I just didn't
23 think that was appropriate in here since we have 100
24 percent already.

25 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: When you say

1 streamlining, are you referring to automation or human
2 efficiency?

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if I may,
4 we're referring to essentially making sure that people
5 can pay for and conduct business online is the goal
6 here. We have been able to achieve 100 percent in terms
7 of electronic tax filings. But that reference here for
8 streamline was really about moving things online.

9 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So to follow up with
10 Commissioner Brown, we have everything completely
11 streamlined and online now? There is nowhere else to go
12 with it, so everybody is 100 percent online?

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commissioner Drago,
14 again, this has to do with tax payments. So it's so
15 people can pay their taxes owed to the state completely
16 online.

17 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Are they required to
18 pay online now? Is there an explanation in the tax
19 world, most states including the federal government,
20 often require an explanation if you're not filing
21 online.

22 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I'm going to let
23 Joe Dillmore respond.

24 MR. DILLMORE: So the electronic funds payment
25 is required above a certain amount, \$50,000, but all of

1 our pari-mutual regulated facilities are using it, But
2 also filing their subsequent reports detailing what
3 amount was owed through our online portal. That part is
4 not actually required, but they all are 100 percent
5 participating in that.

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: My question is really
7 what additional measure could we do to streamline the
8 reporting or securing state revenue? Is there another
9 type of metric that we can evaluate that would be
10 noteworthy or something that we're not currently doing
11 or aspirational?

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: At a baseline, are we
13 capturing all state dollars, but what we are supposed to
14 be capturing? Is that what we should be trying to
15 measure, is maximizing state revenues, making sure that
16 we're not missing dollars that we're not supposed to
17 miss, or are we actually getting everything. Are the
18 100 percent electronic filed tax reports 100 percent
19 accurate? Do we audit those?

20 MR. DILLMORE: Mr. Chair, that's a measure
21 that we have used in the past, the percentage of
22 compliance with the tax liability. So we could
23 definitely take a look at replacing that one with the
24 amount collected versus liability calculated.

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Or if no amount collected,

1 percentage of accuracy of the amount collected. I think
2 Mr. D'Aquila will probably say this a lot more
3 eloquently than I am, but I am not even looking for are
4 we getting the most dollars. I am looking at are we
5 getting the most percentage of the dollars we're
6 supposed to get.

7 MR. DILLMORE: I didn't state that very good.
8 That would be divided by the liability which will give
9 you the percentage. That's a much better way to say it
10 I guess.

11 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Do we also look at it
12 over time? Do we look at trend lines? Do we look at
13 comparisons to the group for just normalcy of the filing
14 in selecting those that might be audited or inquired
15 further?

16 MR. DILLMORE: We actually track the
17 liabilities and the tax changes by facility each month.
18 These are licensed ones so there's a finite number to
19 those. We actually have, you know, many baselines of
20 how much money is collected by slots or by card room or
21 even by peri mutual. You know, we can definitely look
22 at those every month and are able to tell is anything
23 out of the ordinary that happens, it's either way low or
24 way high based on their payments and liabilities.

25 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: So the automation of

1 the professionals of your staff, your team, is to spend
2 more time analyzing and potentially enhancing or
3 ensuring fairness with regard to taxation versus
4 gathering. Is that a fair statement?

5 MR. DILLMORE: Could you repeat that again,
6 please.

7 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: So now that you're
8 fully automated, that automation enables more of your
9 team, more of your human resources, to use analytical
10 skills to determine what requires more follow up, what
11 might be unusual under the notion that we're looking for
12 more consistent, fair, accurate taxation as it pertains
13 to this, which is efficiency; right?

14 MR. DILLMORE: Yes, in part. We definitely
15 look at all of the document filings every month and
16 having that baseline data would help us point out to
17 something that was out of the ordinary. Because of the
18 technology, especially on the onsite monitoring systems
19 like slot facilities, the people that can look at and
20 review the daily data that we have, we do have kind of
21 an idea of what their liability is as their reports come
22 in. So as we monitor and reconcile daily when their
23 reports come in, we take a look at any abnormality among
24 them from each facility.

25 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: So when a person files

1 their personal tax return, it alerts that this gets
2 turned around and red flagged. As long as your team in
3 looking at this data know what might be a red flag per
4 se to say analogy. Is that a fair statement?

5 MR. DILLMORE: Yes, sir.

6 MR. TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if I can make a
7 suggestion?

8 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Sure.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: It sounds like based on
10 the feedback we amend objective 3a to focus more on some
11 type of accuracy or percentage-based measure of the
12 amount of state revenue versus what we were supposed to
13 collect.

14 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Sounds like what I'm
15 hearing, too.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, would that
17 require us to change then, like, the objective of the
18 streamline reporting process?

19 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Yes. The wording of 3a
20 would have to be changed to reflect what it is that we
21 are trying to accomplish, which is not really
22 streamlining the process, but maximizing of accuracy in
23 the reporting process.

24 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I am going to borrow
25 this from the Internal Revenue Service, it's accuracy

1 and fairness.

2 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think we're continuing to
3 move through.

4 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Before moving on, any
5 other feedback on any of the objections for 4a, b or c?

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Trombetta, under 4b,
7 it looks like you want input on the outcome about
8 maintaining the number of cases FGCC involved in that
9 leads to information being filed. I just wanted to
10 throw out there to see what the other Commissioners
11 have. I don't know what you're looking for other than
12 just knowing how many cases were either involved with
13 that ultimately get prosecuted or are just being filed
14 or are investigated. I just -- could you elaborate,
15 please.

16 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commissioner Brown is
17 referring to something that is three pages down where we
18 talk about the outcomes that we're looking for for this
19 goal. I had a note in my draft here. So for 4b, the
20 goal is to support the prosecution of criminal gambling
21 cases, the outcome to maintain the number of cases that
22 the Florida Gaming Control Commission was involved in
23 that lead to information being filed. My question is --
24 and this is really for some of the lawyers -- as to
25 whether we want to tie it to the information or we want

1 to tie it to something else in terms of tracking.

2 So it kind of goes back to what we were
3 talking about with the complaint. It's the same idea.
4 How do we want to track the number of cases that we are
5 involved in? Is it from cases opened? Is it cases that
6 lead to formal charges? Is it cases that go to trial?
7 That is the feedback I was looking for about the
8 tracking.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: No, I don't think it's too
10 much. I think you should be tracking all of that. We
11 should be able to take a look and see of the
12 investigations started, how many of those don't lead to
13 an investigation. How many of those do lead to
14 information being filed. How many of those were
15 referred to another agency. I mean, we should know that
16 about pretty much every case. And depending on what
17 case management software we're looking at, that
18 shouldn't be all that hard to track all of those
19 different things.

20 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: If I might. Yeah, I
21 agree completely with the Chairman. And in addition to
22 that, I have a question. Because in the outcome it says
23 maintain the number of cases, and I am not sure what
24 that means. Does that mean we want to keep the same
25 number each time? Do we want to increase the number of

1 case filings each year? What does maintain mean in this
2 outcome?

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: It's just poor wording.
4 It's just keeping number tracking. We can change that.

5 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Yeah, I would just
6 suggest that we're more affirmative on some of these
7 things and what we're trying to accomplish, such as we
8 want to increase the number of cases filed by the
9 prosecutor each year. Or maybe we want to reduce the
10 crime in an area. Whatever it may be, but the outcome
11 should be some measurable objective where we can easily
12 see what we are trying to accomplish. I think in this
13 particular case we would want to increase the number of
14 case filings each year.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I wonder about --
16 this is a thought -- it seems as we go through this work
17 of prosecuting these cases and investigating these
18 cases, there may be years where there could be a huge
19 case or huge cases that take up a lot of time and they
20 could suck up room for other, lesser, prosecutions. I
21 just wonder if it's wise to tie the number of cases
22 versus perhaps hours worked on cases or some other more
23 objective measure. I'm just not certain about tying to
24 a specific number of cases per se. So I wonder if
25 that's the best way to go about to measure the work

1 being done.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I was going to add also,
3 couldn't we have more than one outcome under each
4 objective? To the Chair's point about the number of --
5 the amount of information that we would like to see,
6 couldn't we have additional or are we limited in the
7 LRPB (sic) with just one outcome?

8 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if we can
9 respond. We are not limited to one outcome. We can
10 have more than one. Just so we're all on the same page,
11 we are able to track other numbers. So we have a whole
12 separate thing for PMW where do track a whole bunch of
13 stuff that is not necessarily identified in this
14 document.

15 But to your point, Commissioner Brown, we
16 absolutely can have more than one outcome for each of
17 these objectives.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: To me, it seems like we
19 need it based on the discussion we're having and what we
20 would like to see in the long-range performance plan.
21 I'm not specifically talking about this 4b, but it does
22 sound like to the Chair's point, we want more
23 information on the cases, the investigation, the amount
24 of hours involved, the end result.

25 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So if we reword this one,

1 use the word maintain -- I guess I am trying to get some
2 feedback so we can move forward with it. So the big
3 picture here is the blurb is due September 30th, so I am
4 trying to work with you-all as best we can here to get
5 as close to a final decision on this stuff or as final
6 as possible. It's going to be hard to -- you know, if
7 we leave things off or decide to revisit them -- it's
8 going to be difficult to revisit it before it's due.

9 So Commissioner Brown, not to put you on
10 the spot here, but I mean, what would you like me to add
11 to 4b? What other thing would you like as an outcome?

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: First, we're not going to
13 use the word maintain for 4b or 4c. I guess we're going
14 to track or use another word. But I would love to know
15 what the end result is for the number of cases that
16 we're investigating. How many led to prosecution and
17 how many led to conviction, I think. And then to
18 Vice Chair Yaworsky's comment, whatever he is seeking I
19 think also should be included for an outcome.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I would focus on the
21 amount of time or man hours or some sort of median
22 number of number of hours toward working a case or
23 something that is easily measurable that demonstrate
24 successful work product.

25 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I just want to clarify,

1 because what I hear you saying is, just because we put
2 one item in these outcomes doesn't mean that's all we
3 have to track, this is for the benefit of the long-range
4 performance plan. We can keep it minimally if we want,
5 but then we can get all these other things that the
6 Commissioners are asking for outside of the long-range
7 performance plan; correct?

8 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: That is correct, sir.

9 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I don't know if that is
10 what the Commission wants or not or if that fulfills
11 what we're trying to do, or if they want it all in the
12 long-range performance plan or how we want to the that.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I would generally
14 encourage keeping it fairly simple; simple outputs for a
15 bunch of reasons. Number one, it's a document that's
16 public facing immediately. It's also one that is
17 reviewed by the legislature. It's also one that is once
18 you establish there is a bit of a tedious process to
19 change it and you have to go through an open meeting and
20 then also the legislature, and also the methods are
21 supposed to be audited periodically by the Inspector
22 General. So whatever algorithm is being used within the
23 agency, if you do it on a periodic basis to ensure it's
24 accurate and then that's reported to, I believe, OPV but
25 definitely the legislature.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I agree. I think
2 simplicity is key. But I think the key objective is we
3 want to know what happened to the cases. We want to
4 know how many investigations that the Commission was
5 involved in and where it led, and how many were
6 prosecuted, and what was the end result. That is a
7 pretty key objective in supporting the prosecuting of
8 illegal gambling.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, can I try to
10 sum up and offer a suggestion on this one, too?

11 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Sure.

12 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So I would like to maybe
13 have two outcomes for 4b. One in which we identify the
14 number of -- maybe we do it as one with the hours worked
15 and two, in terms of a percentage of the number of
16 cases -- and I am going to play with the language -- but
17 the number of cases that the gaming enforcement division
18 worked on compared to those like -- you know, like the
19 percentage -- compared to those that led to some type of
20 formal charges. We would have two outcomes. One would
21 give us a total so we could see the amount of work that
22 we did in this area, taking into account that some cases
23 may involve more work than others and might tie up the
24 schedule. So if we're just doing a number, it might not
25 be a true representation of what the gaming division --

1 the law enforcement division is doing.

2 And then the other outcome would be sort
3 of a percentage or ratio for the number of cases tied to
4 some type of result. You know, some type of formal
5 charges or -- if you help me out with the result that
6 you are looking for that would help. What do you think
7 of those two suggestions?

8 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think one, the total
9 number of hours worked per case is probably a good thing
10 to track. And then separately, the number of hours
11 worked per indictment or per information is probably
12 also an appropriate thing to track. So if you're
13 putting in hours and hours and hours and hours and hours
14 and hours, is it worthwhile for the number of charges
15 you're actually getting filed, it might be something
16 worth seeing. Again, this is all going to have to be
17 narratively explained later.

18 I think Vice Chair Yaworsky made the
19 point earlier, some cases are going to be more complex
20 than others. You're going to spend a lot more time on a
21 complex case that's going to result in one big charge or
22 ten big charges rather than the small number of hours
23 that go into a lot of smaller charges.

24 So the idea of measuring these outcomes
25 and measuring what are not square peg round hole

1 outcomes is always going to be challenging. I think
2 what you're coming up with is probably a good way to
3 address it at this stage.

4 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: And as to the Vice Chair's
6 point, people are going to audit these. People are
7 going to look at these. This is one part of the whole
8 of what justifies whether or not the legislature decides
9 they're going to fund our operations. So we need to
10 make sure that we're putting the right thing down. And
11 we also have to keep in mind that this is one part of
12 the whole, as well.

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 Anything else on any of these objectives or the outcome
15 tables and the following pages?

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, the floor is
17 open.

18 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: None for me.

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: How about moving to the
20 governor's priorities. Anything on that page?

21 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Nope.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Hearing none.

23 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: And then, Mr. Chair, with
24 your permission, can we move to the transic condition
25 statements. And I kind of broke them into an intro and

1 then to subsections. So the first subsection deals with
2 regulation and the second one deals with law
3 enforcement.

4 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I have a very minor point
5 under statutory authority. Obviously, we're not the
6 Department of Lottery and we do not regulate the
7 lottery, but Chapter 24 is one of the chapters that is
8 specifically referenced in our authorizing statute, so
9 we probably need to include that in that list.

10 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Anything else
11 on that intro paragraph?

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Are we still contained in
13 Chapter 61(d) or have we been moved over yet in the
14 administrative code?

15 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I am going to go to phone
16 a friend. Liz, are you on the call? I believe you are.
17 Liz, can you give us an update on the ruling?

18 MS. STINSON: Hi. Yes, so currently we are in
19 the process of transferring those rules over from 61(d)
20 to 75. We have been working with the Department of
21 State and almost done with the document that we need to
22 transfer that 61(d) information over to Chapter 75.

23 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Maybe just include a
24 parenthetical or a footnote to that point. For the
25 court reporter, that was Elizabeth Stinson.

1 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Thank you, sir.
2 Any comments or feedback on the regulation section? So
3 this would be stuff about PMW compact oversight or the
4 revenue table charts.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I just have a question
6 on PMW primary responsibilities including the safety and
7 welfare of racing animals which we're going to be
8 talking about HISA later at this meeting. Does this
9 continue to be one of our primary responsibilities with
10 the implementation OF HISA?

11 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, it will be. We're
12 still going to be responsible for ensuring the safety
13 and welfare of racing animals both at the racetrack
14 and -- sort of think of it -- we'll get into it when we
15 talk to HISA, but the bottom line is yes, we will still
16 have a duty to ensure the safety and welfare of a lot of
17 these racing animals.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do we want to note
19 anything in this LRPB about the new regulation? Because
20 it does have an effect on the Commission.

21 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: The point is well taken.
22 We could probably include, again, just a footnote where
23 we touch upon that ensuring the safety and welfare of
24 racing animals because that still is a function of the
25 peri-mutual wager division; a footnote that indicates

1 that some of this responsibility may either be MOU and
2 will remain with us or maybe transfer to HISA.

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: We can do that. Thank
4 you. The final section here is the LRPB, has to do with
5 gaming enforcement. So I purposefully did not fill this
6 out because obviously a lot of it was going to be based
7 on some of the discussions that we've had just. So just
8 getting feedback on the mission statement and some of
9 the goals I think will help.

10 Is there anything here -- I was hoping to
11 kind of open this up to the Commission to get your
12 feedback. Carl is here, the director, just to be able
13 to kind of walk through it. If you want to give me
14 general thoughts on what you would like this section to
15 say, I will try to do my best to try and incorporate
16 everything.

17 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So one thing that I have
18 noticed that, of course, with a type two transfer is we
19 have a lot of activity that carries over from our former
20 functions at the DBPR. This being new, we have to, I
21 think, walk before we can run. And I realize this is a
22 five-year projection, but I'm really, really inclined to
23 keep our enforcement mission as simply stated as
24 possible. There's a lot of stuff that we can do.
25 There's a lot of stuff that we can be responsible for.

1 But ultimately, I think the Division of Gaming
2 Enforcement is supposed to be the primary detection and
3 enforcement mechanism for gaming enforcement.

4 So however we want to eloquently and
5 professionally say we chase bad guys and ruin their day
6 is what I think needs to go in that section.

7 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I agree. I think you
8 need to keep it general because it's going to be a very
9 dynamic changing, expanding thing over the next several
10 years.

11 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: And this goes back (a) a
12 little bit to when we were talking about the objectives
13 at the front end of the document. I think informally,
14 yes, we are a central information point. We are going
15 to be ultimately the expert agency that other agencies
16 are going to refer to. We formally are going to advise,
17 we are going to share information, we're going to refer
18 cases. And, again, what I want to focus on is a lot of
19 that will be informal. That will be us working with
20 other agencies, like, law enforcement work with each
21 other all the time. As far as what we are tasked with
22 and what our role is when we take ownership over, that
23 is being the primary criminal investigative agency for
24 gaming in Florida. Again, we detect criminal activity
25 and put together cases so that they can be changed.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I was just going to add
2 to that, do we want to talk about the programs that we
3 are -- in this section -- the educational programs that
4 we're partnering with or the different types of programs
5 with the local and state partners? Because we just have
6 that blurb in the beginning of the document, but we
7 don't elaborate anywhere what we are doing or what we're
8 striving to do in the long range.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: For my part, I am weary of
10 putting emphasis on that role. So to what degree, we
11 might mention that. Again, the thing that I want our
12 folks to have an obligation to and the thing I want them
13 to have ownership over is -- and this is just me
14 speaking, so Commissioners disagree if you do want to --
15 the thing I want them to do is keep a simple mindset and
16 stay focused on investigation, detection of criminal
17 activity and prosecution. Go out there, that's the
18 mission.

19 The other things are things that we will
20 do, but they are not part of the core mission, and I
21 don't think they should be a distraction from the core
22 mission to the extent that we embrace ownership over
23 being responsible for that as a mission.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: In the document it talks
25 about priority of us -- so robust inspection programs,

1 public education campaigns, licensee education programs,
2 but nowhere else in the document does it elaborate or --
3 and is it -- one of the core initiatives and priorities
4 at the beginning of the document. So it has to be
5 covered somewhere.

6 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I'm hearing that
7 discrepancy, Commissioner, loud and clear. I'm looking
8 for input from other Commissioners and staff on how we
9 resolve or marry that function.

10 Again, my preference is to try and --
11 minimize is the wrong term -- but not distract from our
12 core mission. We can elaborate on those functions.
13 Again, I would hope that we can do so in such a way that
14 is not over impact. And again, Commissioners, I'm
15 wholly differential here.

16 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I agree with the way the
17 Chair laid it out. I think we need to be pretty basic
18 and stick to the core mission in this. It may expand
19 over time, of course, but we need to keep it -- and I
20 think some of the Commissioners have already said
21 this same thing -- but keep it pretty basic right to the
22 mission. This is what we're here for. This is what
23 we're expected to do period for now. I think we ought
24 to leave it at that.

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Perhaps at the tail end of

1 describing our core mission, Mr. Trombetta, what we do
2 is we include a paragraph that addresses those earlier
3 points, but address them additionally with the
4 Commission that it maintains relationships with state
5 and local entities, holds itself out for a resource for
6 information. I'm sorry, I have to refer back to the
7 beginning of the document for what else we have to
8 cover.

9 But again, I would say in addition to the
10 core mission of investigation, we do these things. But
11 let's just sort of delineate that that's not part of the
12 central function of the gaming enforcement division.

13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That sounds good. I
14 think the way you described it -- it just needs to be
15 covered somewhere because it's one of the core missions
16 in the beginning.

17 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if I can, I am
18 going to go on mute for, like, 30 seconds just to ask my
19 staff something.

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Sure.

21 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you. I just
22 checked the language in that governor's priority, we can
23 edit that. So in other words, the reference to the
24 public education campaign and licensee education
25 programs, that language does not necessarily have to be

1 in this document if that is causing an issue. In other
2 words, I don't want to set us up to do something that
3 we're not necessarily ready to achieve.

4 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I'm comfortable with either
5 approach, and I want to defer to the rest of the
6 Commission here. We can either A, strike that language
7 earlier in the document because some of the lawyers on
8 the Commission are saying hey, you say this in your
9 introduction and you never came back to it in your
10 brief; and I agree with that sentiment. Or if we think
11 that that does need to be included, then we can keep it
12 in there. But again, when we mention it later in the
13 descriptive area where we're talking about it, we would
14 have to delineate and minimize it. Commissioners, I'm
15 good either way.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I am as well. Is there
17 something in the statute that requires us to enforce
18 these or to hold this type of campaigns -- in a new
19 statute?

20 MR. DILLMORE: Mr. Chair, I'm happy to address
21 that. There isn't. The only thing really would be
22 sometimes a potential memo of understanding with HISA or
23 provide training opportunities for horse trainers;
24 that's the only one I can think of. I'm not aware of
25 anything in Chapter 550, 551 or Chapter 16 now, that

1 would require information to provide educational
2 programs for licensees, for example.

3 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Shooting very, very broadly
4 from the hip, my recollection of my reading of the
5 statute is that very broad sense it says go forth and
6 enforce, and then we are delineating what enforce means.
7 One way of that enforcement would be these programs.
8 But to the extent that they are, especially at the early
9 walk before you can run stage, a distraction from our
10 core mission. I would much rather have our focus be on
11 that core mission.

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think this is something
13 that we should include in our next LRPB just because
14 it's going to be hard to one, measure, and then
15 elaborate.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Great. Commissioners, any
17 further discussion?

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I was also going to
19 add additional funding to these programs that we don't
20 have.

21 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, if I could,
22 for clarity. What is the decision on what you would
23 like me to do? Would you like me to strike --

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I believe we're striking the
25 language linking to the governor's priorities.

1 Commissioners, am I correct in that assessment?

2 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: That's what I prefer, but
3 I am not sure if that's the consensus yet.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: That's what I prefer.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think at this stage, we
6 have to go with that based on the lack of funding.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Mr. Vice Chairman?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I'm going to go with
9 the group on this one.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: All right. Mr. Trombetta,
11 I think we can continue to move forward.

12 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. So the
13 following sections in this document are performance
14 venders and standards. These tie back to things that
15 are tracked. For example, the first one that we just
16 showed you on the screen, these are other things that
17 are tracked. For example, peri-mutual wagering. So I
18 think maybe if we just kind of go through these next
19 sections as you guys feel there's comments or feedback.
20 You know, my biggest area of concern was with the things
21 that we covered because I think the rest of the document
22 will kind of match some the those.

23 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Just for the sake of
24 procedure, Mr. Trombetta, you will have the floor to
25 walk us through the document. And if any Commissioner

1 sees something, a point of discussion they want to
2 address, get my attention, and I'll open the floor for
3 discussion.

4 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, sir. Yeah, so
5 the first one that we're looking at here is just
6 performance measures and seeing those related to PMW.
7 And as you can see, we're already keeping per item
8 four -- conducted, peri-mutual wagering collected per
9 dollar of revenue units expenditures. So we keep more
10 than what we have already provided, just as an example.

11 The next one, Exhibit 2, these have to do
12 with 551, so slots. So these are performance measures
13 kept for slots. And then the following areas, the
14 preapproved performance measures -- so, actually, I'm
15 going to turn this over to Christine for a little bit.

16 Christine, what is the importance of
17 these or what are we looking at here?

18 MS. HUTTON: These are going to be changes in
19 the measures, if we have any measures, that need to be
20 revised. Currently right now, these are the same
21 measures that were in DBPR, so if we're going to do any
22 changes to it, we would need to complete these exhibits.

23 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. So as this
24 document moving forward -- just for clarity for
25 everybody on the phone, we will completing this document

1 to match as the blurb itself changes; is that correct?

2 MS. HUTTON: Yes.

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: The next section,
4 Exhibit 4, performance measures limiting liability. Am
5 I to understand that these are ones -- so this first one
6 is the peri-mutual wager that hasn't been completed; is
7 that correct?

8 MS. HUTTON: Yes.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: We have completed a lot
10 of these, but these will be edited as we move forward.

11 MS. HUTTON: Well, my understanding is these
12 have already been edited from PMW's program. They have
13 already updated these so they should be go to go unless
14 somebody sees something that needs to be edited.

15 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Does anybody have any
16 questions or comments on any of these things,
17 performance measures in Exhibit 4? Moving on to
18 Exhibit 5 --

19 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Reading quickly through
20 these and trying to marry it to the conversation that we
21 had a little bit earlier, if there is anything in here
22 that is residual and would be changed by our earlier
23 discussion of things that we wanted to change the
24 measurement, we just need to make sure this section also
25 reflects any of those earlier conversations.

1 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Exhibit 5,
2 these are additional, kind of, items that attribute to
3 how we measure these items. Again, the first one is --
4 related, the sone one is slots related. And then we get
5 to this large table column document.

6 Christine, can you explain what this is?

7 MS. HUTTON: Yes. This is a unit call
8 summary. This is data that's generated from fiscal year
9 '21, '22. And as you can see, the majority of the data
10 that we have was in the DBPR side which was PMW. And I
11 already had a conversation with OPB and DBPR, I will
12 double check and confirm, that data should probably be
13 on their end because it was in '21, '22. We have the
14 executive director which is all we had on our side
15 during '21, '22 so that's what this is representing
16 here. This is another document, which is PMW, but
17 again, like I said, that piece of it should probably be
18 put on DBPRs portal and their upload, not ours since we
19 didn't have PMW in '21 and '22.

20 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: For the court reporter,
21 that's Christine Hutton who is helping me with this
22 document. Okay. Continuing on -- and this kind of
23 explains what this data --

24 MS. HUTTON: Yes. This is like a report that
25 comes -- it's generated from LASPDS and it just

1 basically summarizes the sections. This is not
2 something that we put together, but as you can see,
3 basically the only section that has any data right now
4 is section four where it says audit four. The
5 difference of that is basically that money, that
6 \$832,000, is what was put in general revenue. Which I
7 made a note down there, that difference was processed
8 from general revenue. It wasn't going to be calculated
9 in here because general revenue doesn't get picked up in
10 here. So it's just a meer note of what that difference
11 is.

12 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: And then the following
13 section are the glossary and terms. Are there any
14 comments or feedback on this session?

15 So Mr. Chair, that's all I have. I think
16 the feedback that you've provided is going to help us
17 complete this document.

18 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: We're at a little bit of a
19 crossroads here. Commissioners, do we want to go back
20 and revisit the tabled items if do we feel there is
21 enough instruction given to staff to try and address
22 those tabled items? Then my suggestion would be that we
23 have a motion to authorize staff to do a final draft of
24 the LRPB consistent with the input that we've provided,
25 and that that final draft would be shown to each

1 Commissioner and that we authorize its adoption unless
2 upon Commissioners' review of the document they feel
3 that it's inconsistent with what we've asked for today,
4 in which case will have to schedule an emergency meeting
5 to address those items.

6 If we have not addressed those tabled
7 items to your satisfaction and you want to provide more
8 input to staff, we can do that at this time as well,
9 just let me know.

10 Seeing no further input, then I would ask
11 for a motion to direct staff to prepare a final draft
12 for submission unless any Commissioner finds that it is
13 not consistent with what we've instructed today.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's sounds great,
15 thank you. Second.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Any objection?

17 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Chair, just one
18 question for Mr. Trombetta. Does he feel like he's got
19 all the information he needs in order to be able to
20 fulfill this motion?

21 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I think I do. Let me
22 just ask Lisa and Christina. Okay. Yeah, we do. I
23 took pretty good notes and honestly, the feedback you
24 provided, I appreciate it. I think we're going to be
25 able to move forward with it.

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Not to add to the motion,
2 but for clarification, Mr. Trombetta, this is due on the
3 30th, the Commissioners will need to see sooner rather
4 than later a final draft they can review and ensure is
5 consistent with the motion today. So that if there is
6 any discrepancy we'll have time to schedule an emergency
7 meeting. I'm not going to heavy-handedly put a deadline
8 on that and trust your judgment on getting it to us
9 sooner rather than later.

10 With that, I see no objection and show
11 that motion is adopted.

12 Agenda item number two, Mr. Trombetta,
13 would you like to discuss our legislative budget
14 request?

15 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Thank you. So
16 the second agenda item is a draft of our issues that
17 we've identified to make part of our legislative budget
18 request. There are 20-something items; 22 last I
19 looked. Yes, 22 items. I'll defer to you, Mr. Chair,
20 on how you would like to go through this. We can also
21 just go item by item.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think that will be wholly
23 appropriate. And much like our discussion of the LRPB,
24 because this is sort of a workshop for Commissioners, I
25 will leave the floor with Mr. Trombetta to walk through

1 the document. Interrupt at any point that you have a
2 question or a desire for further discussion, and I will
3 open up the floor for open discussion among all the
4 Commissioners at that point.

5 Mr. Trombetta, you have the floor. Walk us
6 through.

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
8 For purposes of a little background, my team put
9 together these LRPB issues and items that we will be
10 asking for additional budget and appropriation and
11 authorization to use money in a fiscal year that starts
12 in July.

13 We have put together 22 items and we put
14 together justification and a little bit of explanation,
15 and we're in a position where ultimately the Commission,
16 by statute, is required to provide the LRPB annually.
17 So whatever feedback you-all have or recommend is what
18 we're going to try to effectuate.

19 With that being said, the first item that
20 we've asked for are additional positions for executive
21 director and support services. So we've asked for
22 essentially four additional positions in this executive
23 office is how it's working; two deputy executive
24 directors, one communications director, and one deputy
25 general counsel.

1 Now being candid, the deputy general
2 counsel will be working in the general counsel office
3 just for the purpose of helping with workload. I
4 took -- I included it in an executive direction area,
5 but it will likely move into the general counsel office.

6 The plan is for the deputy executive
7 director to kind of work with me to help effectuate your
8 mission and our mission. The communications director is
9 a position we did not have in our initial appropriation.
10 We were provided an external affairs person, like, an
11 alleged affairs or small affairs person. A
12 communications director was identified as a needed
13 position, so we asked for that. And general counsel, if
14 an additional attorney to help -- I think was a law
15 enforcement-focused attorney. So this would be somebody
16 with a criminal background or a background in criminal
17 law that can help with law enforcement to do their daily
18 job, you know, make decisions and help them kind of
19 effectuate some of the legal issues. The total is
20 \$475,760. Any discussion? I see none, so I will move
21 to item two. So this is a competitive pay adjustment.

22 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Trombetta, I'm sorry
23 I was muted and I was yelling. Apparently, you can't
24 hear me when I am muted. Just one question about the
25 communications director. How do you see him or her

1 fitting into the organization? You say, I think, in
2 your LRPB that this will be a communication person for
3 the Commission, et cetera. So how do you see this
4 person fitting into the organization?

5 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. I think the
6 position will be located in the executive office. They
7 will be responding to public records requests, they
8 would help get our message out there. They would also
9 be helping with some of the complaints and just getting
10 back to people. I would like this position to be able
11 to help manage some of the complaint portal, too. Right
12 now when we get a complaint, we send it through our
13 filtering. And right now the filtering is being done by
14 one of several employees, depending on who looks at it.
15 And I would like the communications director to kind of
16 take that process on as well.

17 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So in effect, this person
18 will be the spokesperson for the Commission?

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I don't know about
20 spokesperson. They would be coordinating the message
21 that the Commission would like to get out. In other
22 words, if a media requests comment on something that's
23 going on, the communications director would be the one
24 coordinating the response.

25 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: So it's going to be

1 both inbound and outbound communications? And outbound
2 having somewhat of a public relations role? Could you
3 clarify that?

4 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Sort of. Frankly, I
5 think that the spokesperson for the Commission, frankly,
6 are some of the Commissioners on the phone. But I think
7 the communications person would be able to do that where
8 it was requested, but I wouldn't want that duty to be
9 completely taken over by the communications person.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: No, certainly not. The
11 Commission as a whole, of course, is the agency and the
12 Commissioners independently speak for this Commission as
13 well. The communications director would be our
14 facilitator for engaging with the press. And probably
15 at some point in time, we're going to want to have some
16 sort of social media campaign and they're going to be
17 the person that's going to oversee things like that.
18 And yes, that's the person who should probably craft the
19 nuts and bolts responses that are coming out of our
20 agency for communications for complainants or
21 stakeholders. It's the person who helps us say the
22 things the way we want to say them.

23 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And then would that
24 person also be someone who edits, not just press
25 releases, but other things like the LRPB? Would that

1 office or that person be that facilitator?

2 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I'll let Mr. Trombetta
3 answer that, but I think I would suggest that most
4 agencies, yes, the communications director is going to
5 have eyes on any major document that goes out of the
6 agency and is going to advise both the executive
7 director and ultimately the Commission on those things.

8 Mr. Trombetta?

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Not to restate what he just said, but I think the answer
11 is yes, they would be involved in the LRPB. I don't
12 know if they would be single-handedly responsible for
13 it. I think they would be seeing it and working with
14 other members that are helping put that together.

15 Item two is the pay adjustment for the
16 general counsel's office. We are struggling to hire
17 attorneys because our pay rate is a little low. This is
18 a request for \$160,000 to increase the salary rate so we
19 can track candidates for some of our open attorney
20 positions.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Mr. Trombetta, I am
22 so sorry to go back to one again. This just popped in
23 my head. Is there -- do we have staff available or we
24 are contemplating staff to support the communications
25 director in their effort -- it really is an all

1 encompassing position where they do touch every aspect
2 of what the agency is saying. Is there support staff?
3 Typically, agencies have either a press secretary
4 underneath that or some sort of administrative-type
5 staff to help kind of curate and triage the amount of
6 information that's coming in and going out of the
7 agency. I am just curious if we've thought about that
8 or are we planning on that for the future or where are
9 we?

10 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: The thought process is
11 that we kind of get this person in and see how they can
12 manage the workload and kind of go from there. We did
13 not request it at this time, but it's something that
14 we -- to your point, I know it would be uncommon to have
15 a single person be the entire communications department,
16 but I think as we're just starting and getting our feet
17 under us, get a director and see how much work there was
18 and if there is a need for additional positions. Sorry,
19 about that --

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Before we move on, any
21 Commissioners, anybody opposed to a break at this time?
22 Does anybody need a break at this time? I am going to
23 say let's take five minutes unless there's an objection.

24 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I would say a break would
25 be good at this time.

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Let's go ahead and take ten
2 and let's be back at 11:50.

3 (Off the record for a break.)

4 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, I'm going to
5 go ahead and let us start moving forward with the note
6 4, the executive director that we might have to go back
7 and revisit. I don't see the vice chair yet, but he
8 might be taking an extra minute to get back from the
9 break. If he wants to -- here we go. If he want to
10 recover the materials that we covered, I'm going to
11 defer to that desire. But, Mr. Trombetta, I believe we
12 were on item number two.

13 MR. TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 So we were just wrapping up -- in my mind
15 we were wrapping up. Item two was a pay increase for
16 the general counsel's office. As I mentioned before the
17 break, we have had some attempt struggles to bring in
18 attorneys at this rate, and this was a request to
19 increase the rate salary dollars for that area.

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Just for everybody's
21 understanding, how many rounds of advertisement did we
22 go through with no response?

23 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I have Ross here with me,
24 Ross Marshman. I don't know the exact number, but I
25 think it's at least three or four and we had zero

1 applications for senior attorney.

2 MR. MARSHMAN: Good morning.

3 Director Trombetta is largely correct. There was the
4 first round of senior ads that had no response of
5 applicants. We requested certain positions and lowered
6 the rate to be competitive among attorney positions,
7 which we call junior attorneys, and there were no
8 responsive applicants for that either. We ran a third
9 round of applications and we received three applicants
10 and those are kind of working their way through the
11 system now. But I would not describe our prospects of
12 hiring additional attorneys as being very bright given
13 the low response rate we've had to our advertisement so
14 far.

15 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Just for clarification, are
16 we still -- it's probably right here in the document if
17 I just read it so, I apologize -- but are we still
18 targeting higher paid junior attorneys who are eager and
19 have a little fire in the belly, or are we now
20 refocusing again on trying to hire senior attorneys? Do
21 you hear my preference in there?

22 MR. MARSHMAN: I believe so, Mr. Chairman.
23 We're trying to hire the young, energetic attorneys at
24 the highest rate that we can offer without significantly
25 infringing on our salary to pay other positions as well.

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: And before we offend the
2 people over at EEOC, new attorneys.

3 MR. MARSHMAN: Correct.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I have a question, if
5 I may. Were these salary structures set? How long ago
6 were they set?

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Lou Trombetta, again.
8 I'm not exactly sure when they were set, but this was
9 based on our budget that was allocated for the current
10 fiscal year, which happened essentially at the end of
11 last session.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I think for clarity,
13 one of the things that might be helpful to keep in mind
14 throughout the discussion is that the pay bands that
15 exist within state -- or within Florida -- are rigid and
16 they typically -- they're very rarely updated in a
17 significant way over -- for the past several years;
18 there may be minor adjustments. But typically, what you
19 find is the pay band established is not in a competitive
20 state compared to the private sector, or even other
21 government entities outside of the state system.

22 So what happens is, the way that that's
23 accounted for is something that's referred to as rate,
24 which is an additive to -- and I'm sure someone on Lou's
25 staff can explain this better -- but it's essentially a

1 rate bucket that every agency has that allows for
2 additional pay per position for a number of reasons,
3 based on seniority or other things. But the most
4 important reason is to make these positions more
5 competitive with the private sector; if that's helpful
6 in the discussion.

7 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: That's very helpful,
8 thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: A lot of these positions
10 were based on DBPRs, correct, salaries? And the salary
11 rate for the attorneys, they are on the lowest end of
12 all state agencies.

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So to compound matters,
14 these rates are not factoring in current inflation or
15 the 3 percent national unemployment rate that we have.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Trombetta, I think
17 this is derived in the summer of 2021.

18 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: That sounds about right
19 Commission Brown. Thank you. So the total amount is
20 \$163,000.

21 Moving on to item three, which is a
22 desktop refresh. So as it gets more to the technology
23 side, I am going to turn it over to Suzie Whitmire, who
24 is a CIO. How about I try, but then you jump in.

25 So item three is the desktop refresh.

1 The plan here is to purchase more equipment and come up
2 with a refresh schedule. So jumping on what
3 Commissioner Brown just said, a lot of our budget issues
4 prior to this one were based on setup and DPBR. So we
5 are trying to, through Suzie's judgment and expertise,
6 provide a better refresh schedule and rate for the
7 equipment for all gaming commission employees.
8 Anything to add, Suzie?

9 MS. WHITMIRE: Just that we have some really
10 old machines going back to 2007. None of our machines,
11 except for what's been bought this year, can run
12 Windows 11, which poses a security issue. So this is to
13 really get the PMW staff that's got the oldest
14 equipment, and then set up one-third so we're always
15 staying ahead of the technology curve. The DBPR does
16 not have a refresh schedule, so this would be unique to
17 us, but not unique to other agencies.

18 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: And the total here is
19 \$163,000.

20 Okay. Moving on to item four. I am just
21 going to turn this one right over to Suzie.

22 MS. WHITMIRE: Our goal is to be in the cloud
23 because on trend, which has been the norm for DBPR, is
24 more costly in the long-term because you're always
25 replacing hardware. So this is an ask for us to

1 establish our cloud environment and to start moving all
2 of our resources out. There is some money this year
3 that will be used, but a lot of it will be recurring and
4 doesn't exist in the next budget. So this will be to
5 continue to pay for cloud services as we move forward
6 with Office365 and all the stuff for law enforcement,
7 which will be in the government cloud, which protects
8 the -- data. So this is a request for cloud funding.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Moving to number
10 five, which is payment to DBPR for VERSA right support.
11 So DBPR provides a software for an application called
12 VERSA. VERSA is used by the regulatory division -- PMW
13 division of PMW, and it uses VERSA to essentially
14 maintain and license the databases, that we need to
15 continue to be operational.

16 Suzie, this is an additional payment to
17 DBPR for the continued use of VERSA?

18 MS. WHITMIRE: Correct. VERSA-Rec,
19 VERSAOnline and OnBase. And this would be our payment
20 to them to continue on their system until we had a
21 system to move on to.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So on this item, I just
23 want to make a couple of comments. In the business
24 needs section, it indicates implementation of our own
25 system hopefully by late 2024. I'm going to display

1 some of my own cynical frustration with Chapter 287 in
2 the Florida Statute, which I sometimes wonder is a cure
3 that's worse than the disease. Sometimes it seems like
4 we spend millions of dollars in litigation to avoid
5 \$1,000 apparent graft, and it seems to slow everything
6 down quite a bit.

7 That 2024 deadline is not ideal. I
8 cannot understate -- I'm sorry, let me rephrase. I
9 cannot overstate the confidence that I have in our CIO.
10 She does a tremendous job, and I have been incredibly
11 pleased with how we've been going forward. So this
12 isn't second-guessing, but I would request that the plan
13 for implementation of that 2024 date be provided to the
14 Commission in detail so that we can put as many heads
15 together as possible to try and trim as much fat off of
16 that delay as possible.

17 I think getting on our own system where
18 we are not relying upon another agency's infrastructure
19 is a critical need for us. Again, I realize that you're
20 working within the parameters that you have to work in,
21 but let us help you streamline that as much as possible.

22 MS. WHITMIRE: And we do have a timeline. A
23 lot of it is IT procurement and contract negotiation
24 that happens, but I can provide a timeline for why we
25 got to 2024. And 2024 is assuming that at least there's

1 some funding is this next fiscal year.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chair, can I --

3 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I have a question,
4 Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commission Brown, I think
6 you jumped up first.

7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Commissioner D'Aquila,
8 unless you're, like, jumping at the bit -- okay. Just a
9 question about the actual cost pending on waiting for
10 the DBPR. This particular item is -- these are known
11 costs from VERSAReg; right, and OnBase?

12 MS. WHITMIRE: So I have requested multiple
13 times from the DBPR what they will charge us for VERSA
14 moving forward. I've been unable to secure the number.
15 So what I did was take the \$600,000-plus that are in our
16 current LBR or our funding, and subtract things that I
17 know are not VERSAReg, and came up with an estimate of
18 \$498,000. It may be less. But we're currently looking
19 for an itemized bill that shows how much it costs for us
20 to purchase VERSA from them, but I have not gotten it.
21 So I put in a number and knew that if we could get a
22 quote we would change it. But we did a best-guess
23 estimate based upon what we knew of the costs that were
24 related to the half-million dollars that we paid them
25 this year to them.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I also want
2 to echo the comments about your work and the upmost
3 confidence in your efforts. I know you share the same
4 sentiment of getting this expedited sooner rather than
5 2024. So I definitely want to echo that. And I have
6 faith in you, and hope that we can move this along and
7 get some funding.

8 MS. WHITMIRE: So we'll talk more about the
9 funding of that particular -- the replacement in another
10 issue. But this is to continue payment until we move
11 off of their system. So independent of the actual new
12 system, this is to make sure we have a licensing system
13 until we don't need them.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: But this isn't DBPRs
15 manpower efforts to support any type of work issues
16 related to these systems?

17 MS. WHITMIRE: Yes. This would cover all
18 things related to VERSAREg, VERSAOnline and OnBase.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. The DBPR is going
20 to be continuing to help the gaming commission for the
21 next fiscal year?

22 MS. WHITMORE: No. This is not for IT support
23 beyond VERSAREg and OnBase.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: These are just the
25 licensing costs?

1 MS. WHITMIRE: This is the expectation that
2 all other IT services will be provided by FGCC IT.
3 That's why I subtracted them to come up with that
4 number. The next one --

5 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commissioner D'Aquila?

6 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I have a question.
7 Ms. Whitmire, did I understand correctly the move over
8 will be directly to the cloud -- 100 percent cloud from
9 an existing network from DBPR, or are we doing the
10 network first and then cloud after?

11 MS. WHITMIRE: So everything that can be moved
12 to the cloud will be moved to the cloud. There is
13 infrastructure that cannot be moved to the cloud. Our
14 firewall, to make the decision, because of our law
15 enforcement partners, they have to have a physical
16 firewall as well as a virtual firewall, but everything
17 as far as where we store materials, it will all be part
18 of the cloud solution. There are some physical remnants
19 that are left because the network is physical -- our
20 connections are physical -- but anything that can go to
21 the cloud, we will moved to the cloud where it makes
22 sense for the agency.

23 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: And maybe more secure
24 in many respects. Is the cloud more secure for the type
25 of data, our investigation data, than the network or

1 vice versa?

2 MS. WHITMIRE: So we went with -- we're
3 looking at Microsoft Azure cloud, and that is fed rec
4 certified and is one of the very few providers that have
5 a long-term CJIS approval. So in the cloud, we should
6 be very secure. They meet all of the requirements of
7 the law. Our network will also -- as well as anything
8 we put on it -- so we're taking a look at everything
9 from IT to the CJIS-level of protection. We want to
10 make sure that it takes everything because our data is
11 very attractive. So being on new hardware, being one
12 software, being in the cloud, those are all ways to make
13 sure that doing our up most so we're on target.

14 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Last question. Are we
15 utilizing a thin client as some of your PC solutions in
16 the new setup (sic)?

17 MS. WHITMIRE: Oh, we will be using Office365
18 and we will be using Defender, as well as InTune; a
19 bunch of tools to do a lot of stuff more -- less on the
20 desktop and more in the cloud. There are pieces that
21 will also be on the desktop too, but that's our goal to
22 definitely be more cloud oriented.

23 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Ms. Whitmire, just
25 real quick. I just want to confirm that with the

1 decisions about stuff to go on the cloud versus the
2 stuff to be in the system globally, are we in full
3 compliance with the spirit of a cloud-first strategy?

4 MS. WHITMIRE: Yes, sir. That is exactly
5 why -- we're kind of not exempt from not being in the
6 cloud because other agencies have legacy resources, we
7 don't. So our primarily goal is to be cloud first to
8 meet the spirit and the letter of the law.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Okay. For the record
11 everyone, there is no cloud, it's just someone else's
12 computer.

13 MS. WHITMIRE: It's just a data center that
14 you don't control; yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Moving on to item number 6.

16 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
17 yes, six, IT infrastructure cost, Suzie?

18 MS. WHITMIRE: This year's budget had a large
19 number of non-recurring dollars. They also were based
20 upon DBPRs' infrastructure and how they built their
21 infrastructure, including a lot of long-term solutions.
22 We are finding that the cost of running our organization
23 is much higher than what they estimated when you try to
24 do things that allow mobility and protection and new
25 solutions that are not on trend and not old.

1 So what this is is a budget to actually
2 allow us to have resiliency so that we have a circuit,
3 so that if one goes down, we have a secondary circuit
4 that will automatically kick in and we can continue to
5 be in contact with our law enforcement brethren. It
6 allows us to have a phone system that is Teams-based and
7 resilient so that you can have it on any device that you
8 need to have it on. It will cost -- it gives us an
9 express route to the cloud, which is a more expensive
10 way to do things quicker in and out of the cloud. We
11 couldn't afford it this year because we had the
12 non-recurring dollars, but in order to continue to
13 maintain that, we need to have some additional dollars.

14 We've learned really quickly here that we
15 have a lot of people that move around the state in --
16 our facilities around the state -- and being able to
17 have LRPB solution that allows them to work from
18 anywhere is important. So there's dollars in here for
19 VPN solutions.

20 Just the way that we can connect to our
21 remote offices has to be more modernized. Right now
22 they're on old devices, on 3G networks. So a lot of
23 these things that we're asking for money is really a
24 continuation of initiatives that we're doing this year
25 to put in place where we have non-reoccurring, these are

1 moving into recurring dollars. And this should set us
2 up to have the dollars to be able to do the work we're
3 doing.

4 If we didn't get funding for this,
5 100 percent of IT's budget plus some would go straight
6 into circuits. We still don't have enough money to do
7 what we need to do, so this is a very important issue
8 for us.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Item seven, essentially
10 this piggybacks on the concept of trying to cut it down
11 before 2024. So this is our attempt to get money to go
12 down the road of new a licensing system.

13 MS. WHITMIRE: Correct. So this would be the
14 first deliverable or our first payment to our vendor,
15 whoever we select. We would want to be able to -- in
16 the last half of the year next year -- be able to have
17 our contract and start the gap analysis that goes
18 between where we're at now and where we need to be. And
19 we don't know enough of know what the full cost is going
20 to be, but we will by the next LBR session. So this was
21 an attempt to at least get us working this session on
22 some money that would help us move forward quicker and
23 get the solution in place.

24 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: To add a caveat to this.
25 Prior to this meeting, we had a meeting with OPB at

1 their request. This was an item that OPB made a
2 recommendation that we take out of our OBR issues and
3 add it as language to the appropriation bill, I believe.

4 MS. MUSTAIN: You're correct. And then there
5 was another conversation had by the OPB where they asked
6 us to hold off on this LBR issue until we could come up
7 with a better plan of how to move forward.

8 MS. WHITMIRE: They want us to have a 4b (sic)
9 I'm sure, and there has to be some planning that
10 happens. We're about to begin requirements gathering
11 and we will be in a much better situation next LBR
12 cycle, but that does put us a little further behind.

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Any questions on item
14 seven?

15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes. I am a little
16 confused now. Does that mean that this item is coming
17 out of our request?

18 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: So Mr. Chair, if you
19 don't mind, I can try and answer that. Ultimately, the
20 statute says that the gaming commission is the LBR
21 (sic). So what you chose to include or not include is
22 ultimately up to you. I am trying to provide
23 information that I've received so that it's helpful for
24 your ultimate decision.

25 And for the court reporter, Lisa Mustain

1 just provided --

2 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: For the sake of
3 clarification, is the staff recommendation to remove
4 item number seven?

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, it is.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, any
8 objection?

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, when you say
10 "staff" are you talking about the gaming commission
11 staff or the --

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Ultimately, based upon the
13 input that you've received, we're asking for your
14 recommendation on whether this should or should not stay
15 in the LBR, including any conversations that you've had
16 leading up to this, whether that should stay in or not.

17 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I think the
18 recommendation would be to keep it in the LBR. This
19 will put us in the best case to get a move on and get an
20 early start on getting our own licensing system.

21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
22 just to follow up from earlier, OPB, in your discussion,
23 said they wanted more information for this cycle; is
24 that correct? There wasn't enough support for that
25 total request?

1 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commissioner Brown, that
2 is my understanding, yes.

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And we won't be able to
4 have that information before the deadline of
5 October 14th?

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So brass tax on this issue
8 is we are going to ask the legislature for money, and
9 we're going to ask the governor's office for their
10 support in the request for that money, and the
11 governor's office has communicated to us that they do
12 not feel ready to offer their support for this line
13 item.

14 With that said, I think that it behooves
15 us to consider where the support for that line item is
16 coming from. So if we're not ready to seek the support
17 for this line item, then it may be premature for us to
18 ask for those dollars in my opinion. Commissioners?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Just for clarity,
20 assuming this is polled, does that impact -- I think the
21 answer is yes -- but would that adversely impact the
22 ability to move to our own system by 2024 even?

23 MS. WHITMIRE: So yes and no. We are still
24 going to bill for requirements. We're still going to
25 bill the IT end. We're still going to bill for fee.

1 All the stuff we have planned for this fiscal year we
2 can continue to do. We can -- if we have more money --
3 of course, use existing funds -- it will put us about
4 six months out. We only lose about six months if we
5 don't fund it this fiscal year. But it does delay it.
6 Budgeting cycles are not kind to us at this point, and
7 we just need the information to put forth a 4b, or to
8 even put --

9 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Chairman, I would
10 prefer that we hold off on this then. I appreciate what
11 the staff is saying. There is no doubt in my mind that
12 they're writing what they're saying, but there are
13 always obstacles in budgeting every year and everyone
14 every year knows that. Sometimes you have to give and
15 take to think a budget through in order to get a budget
16 to work. I would rather personally have the support of
17 OPB on it rather than try to go it alone and then
18 hopefully get their support next time around. A
19 six-month delay is six months, but I think it would be
20 wiser for us to move with support than without.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I don't disagree. I
22 wonder though -- do we have an October meeting the first
23 Thursday? I wonder if it would be inappropriate -- I am
24 just thinking the 498 and if we're on DBPRs system for
25 six additional months, that would be six additional

1 months that would have to be given to the DBPR. The net
2 cost of this seems minimal. I just -- does staff feel
3 like they've exhausted all discussions with OPB on this?

4 In other words, would it be inappropriate
5 to ask to table the decision on this item until -- if
6 staff feels it's appropriate -- to have one more
7 discussion with OPB on this or do you feel like it's
8 exhausted?

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, I mean that
10 concept seems like the performed method for me, at
11 least. I think the goal for us was to get feedback and
12 then to -- I think we'd be happy to kind of go back and
13 have further discussion with OPB based on your feedback.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think we all want OPB's
15 support on this.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Bear in mind, that it's
17 going to be incumbent -- if we leave this in here now
18 and we go back to the well -- it's going to be incumbent
19 upon staff to make the sale.

20 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, it sounds like
21 maybe the thought process is to maybe table this one and
22 then we can go back and try to sell it and then get
23 feedback back to you on October 6th.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: That's what I was
25 thinking. If everyone feels like it's worth that, one

1 more attempt, and if staff feels like there's still room
2 to maneuver there. If they don't, then I think we
3 should pull it down -- pull it out. It's really up to
4 you, the thinking of staff, in my view at least.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Ms. Whitmire, is there
6 any additional information you could give OPB prior to
7 our next meeting to get their support that you haven't
8 already given them?

9 MS. WHITMIRE: Not at the level that they
10 need. This is really early in our process. We don't
11 have the first requirement down on paper. We know we
12 need to replace it. There's a lot that we need to do
13 before the next session. This was what we've been able
14 to glean in the few months I've been here. This is a
15 large system to replace.

16 I've talked to our partners that also use
17 VERSAREg and other agencies, they're in the same
18 situation in trying to figure out when to procure their
19 new licensing system as well. So it's not like I can
20 piggyback -- what I got was from partners. I'm not sure
21 that they're even asking this session for replacement.
22 So I'm not sure there's much more we can provide and
23 having a discussion on how they would like us to proceed
24 and talking to them more. I think talking about our
25 timeline might get them to understand where we're coming

1 from. I think it's worth going to talk to them. I
2 don't know that it will change their mind. I would like
3 to have one more effort to see what we can do on this
4 one.

5 It's just really early in the process for
6 us to be asking for a replacement considering that our
7 predecessor agency didn't look to replace it. We've
8 really only had two months to look at the issue, and
9 that 4b usually takes about a year to develop.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think that we're okay
11 since we have another meeting on the 6th to revisit the
12 issue and go back to the well. But again, asking the
13 same question, again, that we've already asked, let's
14 make sure that we have further support if we're going to
15 be asking.

16 MS. WHITMORE: Agreed.

17 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Also just to clarify, the
18 predecessor agency did request a new licensing system
19 the last fiscal year; just for clarification.

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Let's move on to item
21 number 8.

22 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: All right. Item
23 number 8, Suzie if you want to jump in this is multi-use
24 ticketing system.

25 MS. WHITMIRE: As a new agency, there are a

1 lot of tools we have to establish and one of them is a
2 ticketing system. We have a homegrown system currently,
3 and it does what we need to as far as tracking tickets
4 so that we know that people have tax -- but it doesn't
5 tie back to our systems for property or for tracking.
6 It doesn't allow us to do much more than simple tasking.
7 It doesn't send e-mails. So it's very basic. This
8 would be a ticketing system that we would grow to do not
9 only our IT ticketing, but we use for facility HR
10 onboarding and offboarding.

11 So one system that handles all of the
12 requests to administrative and IT so that we have a
13 place where we can do reporting and tracking, we would
14 want to use a cloud-based software that would allow us
15 to track those contacts. And this would be a solution
16 for all of other potential FPEs and OPS people.

17 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So I suffer -- maybe it's a
18 function of age -- but certain scrummagly stereotypes
19 are starting to set in with me. Most notably, I don't
20 think a cup of coffee should cost more than .50 cents.
21 And taking a look at this, other that integration, for
22 almost half a million dollars, explain what this does
23 more than streamline our ability to make our request
24 that we could otherwise make through a dedicated e-mail
25 address?

1 MS. WHITMIRE: So for one thing, ticketing is
2 the entry point. But this also is our configuration
3 management. This allows us to track our resources,
4 change control, tracking issues. So it will be a part
5 of our automated backup system. It allows us to do all
6 of the back office functions of an IT organization. So
7 the ticking is at the front end and it's how we
8 communicate, but the integration has to do with how we
9 maintain our organization and all its services in the
10 back office. All of that backup, all of the change
11 management that happens.

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Sorry, Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioner.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Ms. Whitmire, this is
15 something that almost every state agency has, if not all
16 of the state agencies have; right.

17 MS. WHITMIRE: That's correct. Again,
18 ticketing systems that have back office functions tend
19 to be more expensive than what you would do with a
20 simple request system. But this is actually right
21 around -- you know, it's not an absorbant cost. It's a
22 cost of a cup of coffee today for ticketing/back office
23 system. In fact, it may be a little low.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, any further

1 questions or we'll move on to item number nine.

2 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Item number nine
3 is a request for additional positions for the IT
4 section.

5 MS. WHITMIRE: So there are six FPE's in this
6 request. The first being a chief information security
7 officer. And this person will lead our security and
8 enforcement focused security items. This is a
9 requirement by law to have an information security
10 manager, but this goes even further in that we would be
11 doing the CEJIS-type stuff, as well as doing incident
12 response, investigation of security breaches, and
13 actually doing some forensics for our gaming enforcement
14 people when it comes to electronic systems.

15 The second one is a business intelligence
16 analyst. And it is -- as we move forward having our own
17 system -- this is our recording expert. This person
18 that would help us do some analysis; you always hear
19 about data warehouses. This person would be responsible
20 for helping us with analytics and developing our cue,
21 and working on data catalogs for digital as well as
22 automation because there's a lot of opportunities for
23 repetitive tasks to be automated. So this person would
24 be in charge of doing that kind of information.

25 The next position, business analyst -- to

1 be honest, we have a lot of unmet needs. There are a
2 bunch of things that we do in our current system, but
3 there are things that we do outside of our current
4 system. This business analyst would help us engineer
5 our processes and to get into our new COTS system --
6 because that's our hope to buy an office shelf system.
7 So we can change our business processes. The new system
8 means we won't have to make expensive customization in
9 our of COTS system. So having the business analyst on
10 board is important. But as we identify this person,
11 they will be able to help us develop our solutions.

12 The integration specialist is also
13 dependent upon -- not dependent upon -- but will help us
14 a lot during our COTS system, and will be a strong
15 developer helping to tie the back ends together. We
16 really only have one development position. So one
17 developer to do all the stuff that we need, this would
18 be a second development position. Especially when we
19 start integrating the systems that are outside of
20 whatever we replace it with -- and I'm thinking RMS,
21 CMS, the two other systems we have, plus we have other
22 necessary requirements.

23 Number five is Office365 administrator.
24 Currently, because we have 11 staff, the administration
25 of 365 is actually spread amongst help desk people, our

1 network engineer, our CTO. We have a lot of hands in
2 the 365 administration, so this would be a centralized
3 point to do the important environment requirements and
4 kind of allow us to get to at least state -- as our
5 role -- instead of having everyone's permission, this
6 would give us, like, the ability to control who has
7 what. Right, like I said, it's a role spread among a
8 lot of people.

9 Number six, is the web content developer.
10 It is a position that we identified early on as needing.
11 You can hire a programmer to do your web services, but
12 you really need somebody that can work with your
13 business to develop content and to make sure that all
14 the stuff that's on your website is correct. They will
15 also be used for a trainer-type position. So as we roll
16 out new technology, this would allow us to train on the
17 new technology. So it would be also in charge of our
18 multi-media, which would include business cards and
19 other marketing -- somebody that has a marketing web
20 content background. So those are the positions we have
21 requested.

22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I have a question on the
23 last staff member, web content developer, if I may.
24 Would that person also be a graphic designer?

25 MS. WHITMIRE: That would be our hope, yes.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Oh, good. Awesome.

2 Thank you.

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: And Mr. Chair, can I
4 provide a little more context about the feedback we got
5 on this item?

6 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Please do.

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: The feedback was
8 essentially that they felt comfortable supporting the
9 request for the chief information security officer, but
10 not the other requests.

11 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: All right. It sounds to
12 me, like, we are going to have a follow up meeting to
13 try and get governor support for these issues, we're
14 going to revisit at our October 6th meeting, that this
15 is going on that list. But again, with the same
16 admonition that can I have, no, don't just ask can I
17 have a, again. Make sure we can justify it.

18 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. Without any
19 question on number nine. Item ten is staffing rate
20 increase. Now this is for current employees; right,
21 Suzie?

22 MS. WHITMIRE: This is for current vacant
23 positions. The network manager we had advertised four
24 times and got one call back by an applicant who wanted
25 way more than what we could provide for that. The

1 current salary is \$63,000. We looked at the total
2 network managers in state government and it's 80 to 90.
3 So 63 is way below the market value for those people, so
4 we're asking for an increase for the network manager for
5 \$86,000. We should be able to hire somebody for that.

6 For this year, we have hired staff
7 augmentation that allows us to get through the first
8 year. But in order to hire for this position, it really
9 does need an additional rate.

10 The second is a cloud architect. This
11 was a position that was given to us as a database
12 administrator for 63,6. And again, this is another one
13 of those that whenever you talk about moving to the
14 cloud and being able to set your systems up, 63,6 is
15 really low for any IT position, but especially someone
16 who is going to help us move our information to the
17 cloud. So we're asking for an increase to 86,6.

18 And the last one is a Teams sharepoint
19 developer. And the Teams sharepoint developer is the
20 only development position that we have. And we have
21 advertised it now twice and got three applicants all
22 over 63,6. The going rate for a Teams/sharepoint/web
23 developer is upwards of \$70,000, so we requested 72.

24 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you. Mr. Chair,
25 item 11 is furniture. If I may, I am going to turn to

1 Lisa Mustain and her team, but let me try.

2 So this is a request for an additional
3 expense to provide furniture in our new office location.
4 This is specific to shared space. So in other words, we
5 get a package for furniture and offices, like, standard
6 DMS rate. This is just limited to furniture in addition
7 to that; it's mainly conference room and reception area,
8 break room furniture request. The next item -- item 12
9 is communication equipment for gaming enforcement --

10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Trombetta, could
11 you go --going back to item 11, does that include IT
12 equipment as well for the shared spaces that were not
13 otherwise contemplated?

14 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: No, it does not.

15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. The shared spaces,
16 the training rooms and conference rooms, you envision
17 having videoconferencing as well?

18 MS. WHITMIRE: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

20 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: 12, we withdrew the
21 request for gaming equipment for radios because Lisa and
22 her team and Carol were able to identify someone that
23 was able to fulfill this need without an additional
24 request.

25 Facility construction costs, item 13. So

1 this is essentially -- sorry -- yeah, so this was an
2 additional request to cover the surplus expense that
3 have been -- we now have a bill for the cost of
4 outfitting the new space. This is an additional
5 \$238,000 to be able to fulfill the total cost of the
6 bill; correct, Lisa?

7 MS. MUSTAIN: Yes, but we rescinded it. We
8 decided we're going to have to pay this fiscal year. So
9 we will have to do a budget.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Is that off?

11 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes. This one has been
12 withdrawn, 13.

13 Item 14, marketing promotion. So the
14 next request was for \$50,000 to essentially get FGCC's
15 name out there. We would be able to do little
16 advertisements or get printed materials done to get our,
17 kind of, brand out there. The feedback on this one was
18 to withdraw this one.

19 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Trombetta, is this
20 something the communications director can handle?

21 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. But this was a
22 request for additional money to provide more resources
23 for, whether it's the communications director or
24 somebody else, to be able to be a little creative in
25 what they do. We're still going to have the ability to

1 do this, and I think we're still going to be able to do
2 this, we were just trying to request more money specific
3 to that.

4 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I see.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: What's the current budget
6 for the marking in this year's LBR?

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: It's zero. We do not
8 have a budget for that.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So if we don't get the
10 web designer and the graphic art designer who can help
11 with the logo and things like that to help with the
12 promotion, is there anywhere we can find the resources
13 in the existing budget?

14 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Well, the position is a
15 little different than the budget for additional items.
16 In other words, we may be able to use some money from
17 our general expense budget to use it, but the question
18 about the position is a little bit more difficult. We
19 don't necessarily have a web developer or a graphic
20 designer on staff. We don't have a position for that.

21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yeah, I think that one's
22 a critical staff member for Ms. Whitmire group, quite
23 frankly. Do you think we could function without this
24 \$50,000 being requested?

25 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: It would be nice to have,

1 but it's not completely critical.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I would motion to
3 remove that item.

4 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I'm sorry, I didn't
5 understand, Vice Chair Yaworsky. You would what?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I would motion to not
7 include item number 14, marketing promotion.

8 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I second that.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Folks, I'm going to ask
10 those who are not Commissioners or presently engaged in
11 the discussion, ie., the Commissioners or the room that
12 contains commission staff to mute their microphones. I
13 am looking at least three or four people in the audience
14 who have their mics open and it's starting to cause a
15 little bit of interference when Commissioners are trying
16 to speak. Please check the bottom of the screen, there
17 should be a button for mic. Go ahead and shut your off.
18 Please don't make me call out independent names, please
19 just do it.

20 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, item 15 is a
21 request for \$115,000 to support a contract with an
22 independent testing lab. This will essentially serve a
23 few purposes. When we were doing our initial research
24 on gaming commissions and how they're set, it's kind of
25 a mix. Some have in-house testing groups, so they will

1 have full-time employees whose job is to do testing and
2 technical forensic accounting of the use of machines
3 that are either confiscated or asked to be put out on
4 the casino floor.

5 In Florida, any slot machine that goes on
6 one of the eight licensed slot facilities floor is sent
7 to an independent testing lab prior to being put on the
8 floor. We're requesting additional money so that we can
9 essentially have an independent testing lab on retainer.
10 The goal here is so that if our law enforcement
11 confiscates machines, we have expert analysis, expert
12 opinion, and we have people that can immediately help us
13 do a forensic review of the machine without having to go
14 through formal procurement every time.

15 A lot of these independent testing labs
16 also provide services in terms of getting them to opine
17 on, like, best practices and rule making, they're also
18 willing to provide training for staff. So overall, I
19 think this is the most economical way to get some expert
20 knowledge in the gaming commission without having to
21 hire and ask for money for several employees.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So how did we identify that
23 amount, and are we going to have to go through a
24 procurement process to put this independent testing lab
25 on retainer?

1 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 The amount is based on an estimate that I received when
3 I asked other gaming executives in other states, so
4 other regulators that have this arrangement, so what
5 they pay. They said between six and 10,000 monthly.
6 For the cost of, you know, a single staff member at the
7 executive level, we can have essentially a whole lab.
8 And I felt this was a conservative estimate, so I asked
9 for a little bit more just in case. There will be a
10 formal procurement process at the front end to secure
11 the vendor.

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Can I ask our general
13 counsel, Mr. Marshman, to review whether or not this
14 would be accurately included in the 287 exemption for
15 legal services. It seems like the information they're
16 providing us is a legal question of is this a legal
17 machine, is this an illegal machine, is this not an
18 illegal machine, and I'm not sure if that would fit
19 within those parameters. I'd rather not have an answer
20 at the moment, but if Mr. Marshman would commit to doing
21 a little research on that and give us an answer.

22 Having this testing ability is probably
23 critical to our law enforcement function. The first
24 person that we arrest with an illegal machine is going
25 to say, but that's not an illegal machine. And having

1 them on-hand to be able to review that sooner rather
2 than later is going to be time critical. So not being
3 delayed by a procurement process may be helpful.

4 MR. MARSHMAN: Yes.

5 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Moving on to
6 item 16. Lisa Mustain, do you mind --

7 MS. MUSTAIN: Sure. So the issue summary
8 basically was that we would request one position, an
9 administrative assistant position, to provide services
10 in our new facility that currently the DBPR is providing
11 to us. These services include mail services, banking,
12 going to the bank on a daily basis to deliver checks, to
13 the capital, supporting the whole Florida Gaming Control
14 Commission and its effort to pick up and deliver any
15 items to other agencies, stamp and mail, et cetera.
16 This particular position was not supported by the OPB.

17 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: The feedback was that we
18 should try to find another position to do this.

19 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: And do other agencies
20 have people dedicated doing that, going to the capital,
21 getting mail? Do other agencies have an employee
22 dedicated to doing just that?

23 MS. MUSTAIN: Yes, sir. The DBPR has an
24 armored truck that picks up all of the checks that every
25 division goes through the deposit scenario and takes it

1 to the bank. We wouldn't need an armored truck. But
2 there are other positions -- full positions -- that
3 deliver mail, sort and stamp mail. Because of the audit
4 standards that we have to put in place for collecting
5 cash, you have to have logs in place and there are
6 people that manage that effort. A locked bank bag,
7 receiving deposit slips, bringing them back and
8 reconciling those deposit slips with what is in -- yes,
9 there is multiple positions, but we only have 185
10 positions at FGCC.

11 It's not going to be, you know, a lot of
12 checks, but it would take probably half a day to receive
13 the mail, stamp it in, deliver it to where it goes, go
14 to the bank. That should at least be half a day's work.

15 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: May I ask a question?
16 Is it not permitted to use the remote check scanner
17 deposit that banks offer today versus going to the
18 window?

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, sir. I don't know
20 if we have an answer for that, but we can absolutely
21 look into it.

22 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: It's just a matter of
23 information, that all commercial banks today, for a very
24 modest fee of a few hundred dollars, provide you with a
25 scanner linked to a computer secure where your checks --

1 all images are copied in a PDF secure format and the
2 bank -- and the deposit is immediately received. It's
3 all fully compliant with bank regulations and such, so
4 there is no more going to the teller window. I'm
5 curious if the state is perhaps not permitted to do
6 that.

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: We will look into it.

8 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: With that said, I
9 think from what I'm hearing here, this is perhaps a
10 position -- once that's answered and maybe a few other
11 things, that maybe it can be divided and it doesn't
12 require a full-time employee. Living in the spirit of
13 automation, you know, less check perhaps in the future
14 and so forth, I'm on the fence on this one.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: If I may add, at a
16 salary rate of \$36,000, is that an AA1?

17 MS. MUSTAIN: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Okay. I would agree
19 with Commissioner D'Aquila. At the moment, with all the
20 other asks that are included in this LBR, I'm very much
21 on the fence on this one as well. I could probably be
22 pursued either way.

23 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I think I would like
24 to make a motion to remove this request.

25 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I'll second.

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Any objection? Seeing
2 none. I'm showing that motion carries. For the sake of
3 procedure, we will revisit at the end of the document on
4 this motion for the entire document and any input that
5 has been given so far. But again, as we said before,
6 any discrete issues that we need to address as
7 Commissioner D'Aquila did, we can go ahead and address
8 independently as well.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Item 17 is a request for
10 \$282,000 for satellite locations for the law enforcement
11 units that are now going to be in Tallahassee. This
12 amount will cover the costs of leasing space for two
13 locations at the yet-to-be-decided locations.

14 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So have we -- I know this
15 is an initial request and probably haven't done any real
16 research -- but have we considered where they might be
17 able to inhabit other state agencies or other PMW
18 facilities or that type of thing?

19 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commissioner Drago, I am
20 going to open the floor up to Mr. Carl Harold. But long
21 story short, we have made some of those considerations.

22 Carl, do you know -- what's the thought
23 process?

24 MR. HAROLD: We could join up with other state
25 agencies as far as sharing office space. I think since

1 we're going to be using CEJIS-type data, we're going to
2 have to make some sort of segregation from them, and I'm
3 not sure of the cost and how that works out. You know,
4 Suzie understands that better. You know, we would
5 certainly try to maximize our efficiency by, you know,
6 utilizing other state agencies if we have that
7 opportunity. Right now, it looks like it's someplace in
8 south Florida and then someplace maybe around Tampa will
9 be the two offices.

10 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So we will search out to
11 see if there are any opportunities to share office or
12 any agency before we go out and lease a whole new suite
13 or offices or something; correct?

14 MR. HAROLD: We would; yes, sir.

15 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Thank you.

16 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Okay. Any other
17 questions on that one?

18 Item 18 was a request for a vehicle for
19 the inspector general. This one was withdrawn.

20 Item 19 was an increase in the
21 acquisition of motor vehicles for gaming enforcement.
22 So this was \$185,000 to increase our budget for
23 acquiring more vehicles for our law enforcement
24 division. There was an appropriation of the current
25 fiscal year for this activity.

1 However, the appropriate amount was not
2 enough to cover our expected costs, so the appropriation
3 that we received was based on vehicles that would be
4 provided similar to what PMW or DPBR vehicles had. I
5 think it was \$20,000 a vehicle or \$22,000 a vehicle. As
6 our law enforcement team has been being built, it seems
7 there's a justified means to have different vehicles
8 that cost a little bit more, So that explains the
9 difference in cost here.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: In the nature of us going
11 back to the well with some of these budget items, I
12 would like to talk about this one a little bit. If
13 we're going back to have further discussions to try and
14 garner support in our budget request, this is an area
15 where I think we do need to talk more about it.

16 It seems like trivial stuff, but with a
17 law enforcement agency from the aspect of recruitment
18 and retention, and the idea of the people who you're
19 trying to recruit and retain in your agency taking you
20 seriously as a law enforcement agency, the equipment
21 that you issue and that you use is an existential
22 question.

23 And the importance of us actually getting
24 properly -- outfitting our law enforcement officers with
25 the tools that they need are critical. I understand

1 there ends up being a little bit of a chicken and an egg
2 problem when it comes to talking about the vehicles.
3 You want to have the officers before you buy the
4 vehicles, you're not going to be able to hire the
5 officers unless you have the equipment that you're going
6 to outfit them with. And if that is the cause of some
7 of the delay, then I think we need to work around that.
8 But as far as cutting back on this request, I think that
9 that would be unwise at this time. If we're going to
10 make additional asks, this absolutely needs to be one of
11 them.

12 Additionally, I would say, we need to go
13 from 15 -- we need to recalculate the amount to whatever
14 16 law enforcement vehicles would be as opposed to 15.
15 The earlier budget item that we rescinded may also seem
16 trivial, but we have a sworn IG specifically because
17 that's when IG performs an internal affairs function.
18 And God forbid we ever have a use of force incident or
19 an on-duty shooting, that IG is going to have to respond
20 possibly in the middle of the night to go check that;
21 and it is a sworn law enforcement officer. Every
22 full-time law enforcement officer in the state of
23 Florida should also be able to respond to a school
24 shooting.

25 So again, our gaming enforcement budget

1 for vehicles, I think, is something that we need to
2 revisit, and it should be for a grand total of 16 as
3 opposed to 15 vehicles.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: What would the 16th
5 vehicle be for?

6 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: It would be for our sworn
7 IG.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Just for clarity, is
9 it a typical process for the inspector general at other
10 state agencies to have law enforcement vehicles?

11 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: There is -- the short
12 answer -- and I'll defer to staff for an answer -- the
13 short answer is I don't know the answer to that question
14 because you don't always have sworn inspector generals.
15 The inspector general's office at a sworn agency can
16 farm that work out to other agencies. But the Law
17 Enforcement Officers Bill of Rights says that if they're
18 going to do the investigation of the sworn members, they
19 have to be sworn. We have a sworn IG for specifically
20 that purpose. And since that is a full-time sworn law
21 enforcement officer, if you're outfitting your full-time
22 law enforcement offices with vehicles, then I would say
23 yes, it's typical to outfit them with a vehicle. I
24 don't know about other agencies who have sworn IGs and
25 whether they have take-home cars or not.

1 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I have a few questions,
2 if I could. Is the IG's position a sworn law
3 enforcement officer position? In other words, is it a
4 sworn officer pension? Is it considered a sworn officer
5 position? Because I don't know. Does anybody know?

6 MS. MUSTAIN: I believe it is, yes.

7 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So they can participate
8 in the sworn officer pension, sworn officer benefits, et
9 cetera?

10 MS. MUSTAIN: I believe so.

11 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Okay. Just a few
12 questions on the police vehicles. Again, the police
13 vehicles seem kind of a basic simple question. I think
14 the Chair mentioned it too, it seems pretty simple.
15 It's going to be impacted by what this Commission
16 decides is the mission of these law enforcement officers
17 and what kind of equipment will they need to fulfill
18 that mission. And that message that we send to the
19 officers is going to be critical, because they need to
20 understand what is expected of them and what they're
21 likely to be called upon to do.

22 Are they going to be uniformed officers
23 in marked police cars? Are they going to be
24 plain-clothed officers as investigators in unmarked
25 cars? Are they going to be expected to run Code 3 or

1 run emergency mode to instances of any kind? Those are
2 all the kinds of things we need to decide. Because if
3 they're not going to run emergency mode, they're not
4 going to need lights and sirens and all the things that
5 go along with a police car, then we don't need to spend
6 the money for it.

7 Because a police car requires, first of
8 all, the police package that's much more expensive.
9 It's going to require -- if it's going to be a marked
10 vehicle where prisoners are going to be kept -- it
11 requires a cage; a prisoner cage. Are we going to have
12 mobile digital terminals in the vehicles, all those
13 types of things -- or all the kinds of things police
14 cars can have which adds to the expense of a law
15 enforcement car.

16 So we need to know what we want these
17 investigators to do, because we don't want to invest in
18 marked or expensive police packages for law enforcement
19 vehicles if we don't expect them to be running emergency
20 mode to things and that type of thing.

21 So one of my questions is going to be, do
22 these vehicles that we have listed here, are those costs
23 including those extra items as I mentioned; such as, the
24 police packages, which include high-impact brakes and so
25 forth. Does it include other items, like, a cage in it?

1 What is this price, I guess, is my question? Does it
2 include just the car or what?

3 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Do either Lisa or Carol,
4 do you know what this price is based on?

5 MR. HAROLD: Commissioner, I took some
6 assumptions -- liberties and assumptions beforehand in
7 that I don't believe that our folks are going to be
8 doing any type of traffic stops. I think that falls
9 outside the scope, responsibilities and duties that we
10 have kind of outlined for them. I also don't envision
11 them responding to any type of emergency fashion that
12 would require a police package. So the vehicles that
13 are listed here do not have the police package with the
14 performance engine and those kinds of things. These are
15 simply fleet vehicles that meet the needs of carrying
16 around larger amounts of evidence, the ability to have a
17 safe-mount inside of them so they can transport
18 valuables that are found during the execution of a
19 search warrant or something like that.

20 Also, this doesn't include a cage in it
21 because I would assume that most arrests will be made
22 with an arrest affidavit and probably joint with some
23 other agencies or some of our state partners who
24 actually have cages and those kinds of things like that
25 that would help us out.

1 And then to your last point about the
2 MDTs(sic), the MDTs are something that are pretty
3 essential for traffic people and officers that don't
4 have offices. All of our folks are going to have
5 cubicals or offices where they can come back and put
6 their reports together and type up affidavits and those
7 kinds of things like that. My goal is to issue these
8 officers with laptops, but we're not going to do the
9 ruggatized laptops or MTD stands inside the vehicles
10 because I think that they just add an unnecessary
11 expense. We're just going to try to take this from an
12 investigative avenue, you know, and the resources they
13 need for that.

14 Now, they will need lights and sirens
15 because to meet the law enforcement standard -- there's
16 a strong likelihood they might role up on a crash or
17 something like that, and then also the mutual-aide
18 function that goes with being a law enforcement officer
19 with a state agency, there's a requirement that we
20 participate in any type of natural or manmade disaster,
21 and they will need those types of equipment.

22 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So these cars at these
23 prices are pretty basic cars, with maybe lights and
24 sirens in it, that any person -- any state employee
25 might drive, I guess is what I'm trying to say.

1 MR. HAROLD: They are. And the only two
2 options that we outfitted them with was rubber floor
3 mats so that they won't mess up the flooring, and a
4 trailer hitch so if we seize more gambling machines than
5 can physically fit inside the vehicle, we can rent a
6 U-Haul trailer to do that.

7 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: So if we're not looking
8 at police package kind of cars here, why are we specific
9 about Ford Explorers and Tahoes as opposed to sedans or
10 some other kind of vehicle?

11 MR. HAROLD: Well, because of the necessity to
12 be able to put these larger objects -- the computers,
13 the slot machines, and other types of items -- they just
14 don't typically fit very well inside of a sedan.

15 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: You have two Tahoes. Can
16 you tell me the reason behind the Tahoe as opposed to
17 the Explorer?

18 MR. HAROLD: The reason we purchased the
19 Tahoes -- or request to purchase the Tahoes is because
20 those are the only two vehicles that are available this
21 year to pick up. Everything else in the fleet for the
22 state contract in the fleet availability was not there.

23 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Oh, really? So we, au
24 not have to buy Tahoes, we may be able to buy something
25 else at some point when we start getting better supplies

1 and vehicles?

2 MR. HAROLD: That is correct.

3 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I guess my point is we
4 don't need Tahoes, that's just all that was available.

5 MR. HAROLD: Right. We needed assets on hand
6 immediately and that was all that was available. The
7 Explorers will not be available until April or May of
8 next year.

9 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I see. Okay. I think I
10 have taken up enough of everybody's time here. That's
11 good. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: No, absolutely all value
13 added Commissioner Drago. Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Can I ask one more
15 question? I feel like we need to move on, if not, I can
16 hold off. We talked about the vehicles and that type of
17 thing, and the Chairman mentioned earlier, rightfully
18 so, that this equipment is important in doing this kind
19 of work.

20 Are we intending for the law enforcement
21 officers to have these cars to take home and keep at
22 home, or do they stay at the office?

23 MR. HAROLD: They would be take-home because
24 of the likelihood or the chance that they would have to
25 respond from home to some sort of criminal activity if

1 we were notified in the hours off of regular duty.

2 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Okay. Commissions, any
4 further questions? Discussion? Debate?

5 Mr. Trombetta, the floor is yours.

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you. Thank you,
7 Mr. Chair. Before we do move on to 19, the feedback
8 from OPB was to not move forward on this issue. So the
9 feedback from OBP was essentially that we had budget in
10 the current fiscal year to purchase these vehicles and
11 we should not move forward to request more.

12 Just taking what was said initially, I'm
13 going to suggest that I go back to OPB based on the
14 conversation you guys had here today and report back to
15 you at the meeting in October on this issue.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Correct.

17 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Moving on then, item 20,
18 are additional positions for the law enforcement unit.
19 Mr. Harold, if you don't mind.

20 MR. HAROLD: This is simply to cover the fact
21 that initially we had 15 positions for law enforcement.
22 And of that, one of those positions was for myself. So
23 that took the three squads of five down to one squad
24 with four when you deduct myself out of it. And then
25 also, I did not have a Deputy Director of Law

1 Enforcement. A deputy director is needed because we
2 need somebody at a command level that's able to make
3 some decisions related to law enforcement actions and
4 enforcements and reactions when I am not available.

5 So we're asking to create a Deputy
6 Director of Law Enforcement, and then one additional law
7 enforcement investigator since my position took
8 essentially that position, and that will bring all three
9 squads up to five members, which is what we would hope
10 to do.

11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Harold, I concur with
12 you about the intention was to add five, excluding the
13 head of gaming enforcement, five law enforcement in the
14 north office. I think that's completely appropriate. I
15 also think the deputy director, similar to the way that
16 PMW is structured with a deputy director, I think a
17 Deputy Director of Law Enforcement is also appropriate.
18 So I appreciate the thoughtfulness of these two items.

19 MR. HEROLD: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Concur.

21 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Herold, so we will
22 have 15 investigators statewide; correct?

23 MR. HEROLD: Each of those squads has one
24 supervisor. So the squad is four investigators and one
25 supervisor to supervise the squad.

1 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Okay. That's what I
2 wanted to clarify in my own mind to make sure I
3 understood that. Explain to me, if you would -- and I
4 thought when you said if you're not here you have
5 somebody to take charge -- but I thought you were always
6 going to be here. No vacations or anything. Tell me
7 what this -- what the deputy director is going to do?
8 This is not a large component. There's 15 people. My
9 concern is building these large chains of command with
10 multiple layers as opposed to keeping it as flat as we
11 possibly can, which would be my preference, in terms of
12 organizational structure.

13 Tell me, if you would -- because I want
14 to hear your reasoning behind wanting that deputy
15 director -- as opposed to using the Tallahassee
16 supervisor, maybe give him a higher salary a little bit
17 to fill in for you when you're off frolicking somewhere
18 on vacation.

19 MR. HEROLD: Well, I think that every duty
20 that you task a supervisor with takes him further away
21 from working interactively with the investigators that
22 we have here. While I recognize that having a more
23 flattened structure has some advantages, usually that
24 works much better with an agency that has a lot more
25 personnel. There are some needs here with writing

1 policy, the accreditation side of it, the law
2 enforcement training, and having a deputy director that
3 fulfills many of those tasks, just leaves the supervisor
4 more capable of interacting and guiding those units --
5 those investigators throughout who are trying to do the
6 work.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: From my part, just as my
8 observation, the deputy director position at this point,
9 possibly may be on the cusp of superfluous. But I think
10 what we're staring at is an inevitability anyway. For
11 such a small law enforcement unit, there are going to be
12 enough collateral duties spread around on our agents --
13 to Mr. Herold's point -- taking them away from the
14 investigation function that we're going to post-year
15 one, inevitability grow anyway.

16 At some point we're probably going to
17 need a full-time training officer or two. At some
18 point, yes, someone who is going to be dedicated to
19 monitoring accreditation standards. Although, that may
20 be a collateral duty that stays with the deputy director
21 long-term, who knows.

22 My point only being, that this is year
23 one and this law enforcement agency is very small. I
24 think that it is going to grow no matter what. We're
25 going to find that we have additional needs for people.

1 And if the deputy director is the first of those needs
2 to have them, then I don't think we're going down the
3 wrong path by doing so.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I would just echo the
5 Chair's comments. I think that's spot on.

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Shall I go on?

8 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: We can continue on. So the
9 document that we received that talked about discussion
10 of these items cut off at 19. So for the remainder of
11 these, I guess where lies our support for our repost?

12 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I'm sorry about that. So
13 there are two more issues. One was withdrawn. It was a
14 compression issue to deal with employees that were not
15 getting \$15 an hour. We withdrew that because I think
16 there was already a fix in the previous budget.

17 And then the final request has to do with
18 the request of \$35,000 to fix what looks like might have
19 been an error in the appropriation where the budget that
20 we received for our law enforcement unit did not match
21 the total if you added up each positions' pay. Is that
22 correct Lisa or Christine? Christine, do you mind
23 addressing that?

24 MS. HUTTON: Yes. This actually would help --
25 what we originally had in the budget did not include the

1 amount that the state received on July 1st for the
2 5.38 percent. So this is going to help support those
3 positions in order to hire those positions at the
4 \$60,000 of what this average position would make.

5 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: For clarification, was
6 there an indication OF support for line item 20?

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yes, there was.

8 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Did you mean by the whole
9 commission?

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I meant, did we have an
11 indication that we would have support in the governor's
12 recommendation of our budget request.

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, that's what I
14 was answering. You do have that. The governor's office
15 was okay with request 20.

16 With that said then, those are all the
17 items for OUR LBR request. And with that, I'll turn it
18 back to you, Mr. Chair, if you have anything additional
19 for me or for the staff?

20 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: No. But that does seem
21 like the appropriate time for me to poll the Commission
22 members. I think we have been pushing pretty hard, and
23 I guess that some folks might be getting a little low on
24 blood sugar. Would you-all prefer to take a break for
25 lunch? Do you want to power through? I am, as I like

1 to be, completely at your disposal. So I will defer to
2 the will of the body. Do you want to eat?

3 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I'm fine powering
4 through.

5 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Looking for a consensus.

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm fine powering
7 through, but I don't know about staff, because they have
8 the bulk of the rest of this, and they haven't had an
9 opportunity to eat; something brief.

10 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, I think the
11 staff here would prefer to go forward.

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So Commissioners, I hear
13 what I believe is a consensus and we're going to power
14 through without a lunch break. Thank you very much to
15 all.

16 And Mr. Trombetta, why don't we hit item
17 number three. Unless anybody needs a 10-minute break,
18 then we will power through three and then address a
19 break at that time.

20 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Mr. Chair, can we take
21 a 10-minute break? I would appreciate it.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Let's take a 10-minute
23 break. I'll see everybody at 1:30.

24 (Off the record for a break.)

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: All right. Commissioners,

1 we are re-adjourned. I have spoken briefly with
2 Mr. Trombetta, who ensure that the next three items on
3 the list are much, much, much quicker than the other
4 proceeding items. So it's all on you. Mr. Trombetta,
5 item number three. The floor is all yours.

6 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Item number three is an
7 overview of the Horse Racing Integrity and Safety
8 Authority and is going to be presented by
9 Elizabeth Stinson. Liz, I promised the Chair that you
10 would be 15 to 20 minutes.

11 MS. STINSON: I certainly hope that's all it
12 takes.

13 As Lou said, I'm Liz Stinson and I'm
14 going to be giving you an overview of the Horse Racing
15 Integrity and Safety Act and the Horse Racing Integrity
16 and Safety Authority. So first, I'm going to go over
17 the basics.

18 Congress passed the Horse Racing
19 Integrity and Safety Act in 2020. And this act created
20 the Horse Racing Integrity and Safety Authority known as
21 HISA. HISA says HISA so that's what I'm going to try
22 and do. HISA is relevant to this Commission because of
23 the Commissions' ability to regulate thoroughbred horse
24 racing in the State of Florida. It can be preempted by
25 HISA rules. HISA regulates covered persons that

1 participate in thoroughbred horse racing in states that
2 participate at interstate off-track wagering. I realize
3 that is a sentence with lots of unfamiliar words, so I'm
4 going to kind of break that down for you a little bit.

5 Covered persons are all trainers, owners,
6 breeders, jockeys. Basically anyone who deals with the
7 thoroughbred industry in the State of Florida, or in the
8 United States.

9 And off-track wagering is when a bet is
10 placed on a thoroughbred horse race that occurs at a
11 track other than where the track takes place. This is
12 also referred to as intertrack wagering. And it's where
13 races are simulcast to other tracks where individuals
14 can place bets on races in real-time. And there is
15 interstate and intrastate off-track wagering.

16 Interstate off-track wagering occurs
17 across state lines. The Act allows for HISA to preempt
18 state rules, and the statutes and states that
19 participate in this activity of interstate intertrack
20 wagering on thoroughbred horses. So in Florida, since
21 we do have racetracks that participate in this, HISA has
22 the statutory authority to regulate thoroughbred horse
23 racing in our state.

24 HISA is a non-governmental agency that
25 has oversight by the Federal Trade Commission. HISA

1 writes rules and they submit these rules to the FTC.
2 And these rules govern covered persons, covered horses,
3 racetracks, among other things. So the HISA structure,
4 there is a CEO named Lisa Lazarus. There's a board of
5 directors that governs HISA with five industry members
6 and four non-industry members. There are two committees
7 that the CEO oversees. There is the Racetrack Safety
8 Committee, which implements the racetrack safety
9 program. And this went into effect on July 1st of 2022,
10 and this regulates racetracks and certain behaviors that
11 occur at racetracks. Eventually, HISA plans to have an
12 accreditation process for racetracks as it is
13 statutorily required to do so.

14 Additionally, there's an Anti-Doping and
15 Medication Control Standing Committee. HISA was
16 required to contract with an anti-doping and medication
17 control enforcement agency. Earlier this year, HISA
18 entered into a contract with an entity called Drug Free
19 Sport International to be the anti-doping and medication
20 control enforcement agency. Drug Free Sport created an
21 entity called the Horse Racing Integrity and Welfare
22 Unit that will enforce medication and anti-doping rules.
23 The anticipated start date for this program is
24 January 1st of 2023.

25 Right now, HISA gets its funding by

1 assessing costs to the states based off of only the
2 racetrack safety program. But in January of 2023, they
3 will be assessing costs based off of both the racetrack
4 safety program and also the program they're going to be
5 starting with Drug Free Sport.

6 There are multiple factors that they use
7 to get the assessment. And one of the factors is the
8 number of races that a state has. Another factor is
9 what they call per size, which is the amount of the
10 winnings in a given race.

11 States had to elect whether or not they
12 were going to be responsible for collecting these
13 assessed funds before May 1st of 2022. And the Florida
14 Division of Peri-Mutual Wagering submitted a letter on
15 April 29th to HISA declining to collect fees in the
16 State of Florida. So other states have opted into
17 collecting fees, others have opted out. Since Florida
18 declined to collect fees, HISA has sent the assessments
19 to the individual racetracks in Florida.

20 I also want to cover a little bit, the
21 HISA rule promulgation process. They have been
22 proposing racetrack safety rules since December 2021,
23 and these rules are submitted to the Federal Trade
24 Commission for review, and then the FTC promulgates
25 these rules. And this process includes publishing of

1 the proposed rules in the federal register where the
2 public is allowed to comment on them, and the FTC is
3 required to address the public comment; very much like
4 how the Division of Peri-Mutual Wagering has promulgated
5 a rule, there is a public comment period.

6 Florida has submitted public comment on
7 multiple series, and HISA recently submitted rules to
8 the FTC regarding the Anti-Doping and Medication Control
9 Program that should be starting in January of 2023.

10 The way that HISA is implemented, is that
11 the act allows HISA to enter into agreements with state
12 racing commissions to help enforce HISA's rules.
13 Entering into an agreement with HISA allows the state
14 racing commission to retain some local control of
15 regulation of horse racing within the state. And it
16 also allows for states to continue to use employees to
17 complete tasks that would otherwise be completed by
18 HISA.

19 The Florida Division of Peri-Mutual
20 Wagering entered into an agreement with HISA on
21 June 30th of 2022, where the Division would continue to
22 regulate certain aspects of racetrack safety. These
23 agreements will have to be renegotiated, like, later
24 this year, because they're going to be encompassing the
25 new Anti-Doping and Medication Control Program.

1 One of the things that the Horse Racing
2 Integrity and Safety Act contemplates is the prohibition
3 of certain medications to a horse within 48 hours of the
4 horse's next racing start. And the Act allows for
5 during the next three years for HISA to study the
6 effects of certain drugs, specifically one of the drugs
7 is known as Lasix, it's also called Furosemide, or
8 another trade name is Salix.

9 And while the study is going on, the
10 state racing commission can request a waiver for
11 exemption from the prohibition on Lasix. And we have
12 had a request from one of the tracks in Florida that the
13 Florida Gaming Control Commission request one of these
14 waivers or exceptions for Lasix for the upcoming three
15 years.

16 This is a time-sensitive topic because if
17 we don't receive an exemption, if a horse race starts at
18 a thoroughbred track in Florida and tests positive for
19 Lasix after January 1st, there could be administrative
20 action taken against the owners and trainers.

21 Lasix is a drug commonly used in many
22 states in thoroughbred horse racing. It prevents
23 excessive bleeding in the lungs of horses who run at
24 high speeds, so thoroughbred racing horses. And there
25 is concern by some in the industry that if you just stop

1 this instead of weaning the horses off, there could be
2 some issues with that.

3 Additionally, there is currently multiple
4 lawsuits challenging the constitutionality of HISA, the
5 promulgation of rules by the FTC, but Florida is not a
6 party to any of this litigation.

7 So given this information, do you guys
8 have any questions for me? Did you want to go over any
9 part of this on its own? I'm happy to go into a more in
10 depth analysis.

11 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Ms. Stinson, very well
12 done summary of this legislation. Extremely well done.
13 My question is, do I understand correctly that if
14 Florida does not participate we cannot participate in
15 interstate racing? Is that the tradeoff here, we would
16 only have the -- be permitted to host in-state racing
17 with regard to thoroughbred racing?

18 MS. STINSON: I want to tweak what you said
19 just a little bit. If the State of Florida decides that
20 they do not want to participate with HISA, HISA will
21 still be the enforcer for these rules that they
22 promulgate. Really, the State of Florida's choice is
23 whether or not we participate in that. Right now, our
24 thoroughbred tracks, they choose to participate in this
25 intertrack/interstate wagering. And yes, if they

1 stopped doing interstate/intertrack wagering, then they
2 would no longer be governed by HISA. But I don't know
3 if that would be something that has been contemplated.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: So my understanding is
5 our existing tracks are doing this. They're fine doing
6 it. Because they've done their risk/reward benefit and
7 feel that the loss of revenue from the loss of
8 interstate far exceeds the costs of today's rates of
9 participating with HISA; correct?

10 MS. STINSON: Yes. Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: My second question, if
12 I may. Are we aware of which states have elected to
13 also not participate and which states are a party to the
14 lawsuit with regard to the constitutionality of this --
15 I imagine it's a for-profit or a not-for-profit
16 organization since it's not governmental -- and what
17 gives the FTC the right and so forth. Is there a quick
18 answer to that?

19 MS. STINSON: The quick answer to the lawsuit
20 question is there are multiple lawsuits that are going
21 on, and there are many, many, many entities involved in
22 these lawsuits. I know that Louisiana and Oklahoma are
23 involved, off the top of my head, but I know there are
24 multiple other states that are involved in these
25 lawsuits. The State of Florida last year declined to

1 enter into one of these lawsuits to become a party.

2 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: At the end of the day,
3 is this simply a federal claim here potential -- is the
4 claim potential overreach of a function already being
5 done by a state and the state's right to do such?

6 MS. STINSON: I think that is a position taken
7 by some of the states that deal with thoroughbred
8 racing. That's certainly the position that they have
9 taken.

10 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Not looking for an
11 opinion, just curious. Thank you very much. I'm sorry
12 to take so much time.

13 MS. STINSON: No, you're fine.

14 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Posture-wise, today's
15 agenda was a brief overview and cover of HISA, the
16 discreet issues that we, as a Commission, are going to
17 have to address. For example, the level and extent of
18 MOU that we have with HISA for our participation, and
19 whether or not we will seek the exemption for Lasix will
20 be things that will come before the Commission at a
21 later meeting.

22 What may be helpful, Mr. Trombetta,
23 Ms. Stinson, whoever wants to take the lead in just
24 formulating this, maybe a short one-pager on the issue
25 and on the things that were presented today. If each of

1 the Commissioners could be provided with a -- again,
2 just a short one-page white paper summarizing the
3 issues, that would probably be very helpful. There was
4 a lot of information for us to digest in an oral
5 presentation.

6 MS. STINSON: Is two to three pages short
7 enough for you guys? I can get that to you today. I do
8 have that available.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I don't think anyone is
10 going to quibble over an extra page or two.

11 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Liz. Anything
12 else or is that it?

13 MR. STINSON: I think that's it.

14 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, with your
15 blessing here, we can move to item four.

16 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Please do.

17 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Item four is an overview
18 of the licensing process. So I had asked Joe Dillmore,
19 the director of the Commission of PMW and Ross Marshman,
20 our general counsel, to be able to speak about the two
21 components. One, the general process and two, the
22 legal, I guess, consideration. With that, I think I
23 will turn it over to Joe.

24 MR. DILLMORE: Thank you. I would also like
25 to take the opportunity to introduce Linda Ricks, who is

1 our chief operations and head of our licensing unit.
2 You may hear from her about certain details and specific
3 questions.

4 I kind of want to give an overview of the
5 occupational licenses for the license facilities we have
6 here in Florida. So I kind of broke it up into some
7 different segments. Who needs an occupational license?
8 It's essentially, anybody that works at a pari-mutual
9 facility that's engaged in the racing or access to the
10 slot floor, access to the animals, access to the back
11 side of the track where the animals are stabled. And
12 each section of Chapter 550 is the pari-mutual
13 occupational license section. 551 covers the slots.
14 And Chapter 849.086 is the card rooms. And yes, each
15 section specifies its own licensing requirements and
16 they're slightly different.

17 So every occupational licensee, we're
18 required to do some background on them to get these
19 positions. They're fingerprinted on their initial
20 license, and we retain those fingerprints to be rerun.
21 And typically, the license is good for three years. To
22 give you an idea of the scope of how many people we
23 have, during the last fiscal year of 2021 and 2022, the
24 operations licensing section processed 15,616 license
25 applications. And to break those down, 2,700 were

1 related to card rooms; 9,470 were related to racing
2 operations, and 3,401 were related to slot machine
3 operations. That also includes the peri-mutual side,
4 it's not just people that access the back side. If you
5 own a horse for instance, you would also have to get an
6 occupational license.

7 And the next page is how can a person
8 apply for a license. We have many different avenues.
9 They can apply through our on-line licensing portal. We
10 have generated, like, a wizard to help guide them
11 through what kind of license they may need. So it kind
12 of cues them for different questions, and then we can
13 help guide them to apply for the appropriate license.
14 They can also do it through mail or e-mail or they can
15 get a paper application. Often they apply on-site at
16 one of our field offices. Particularly, thoroughbred
17 racing, where people show up and get a license to maybe
18 race in the next few days. So we have people on-site at
19 the thoroughbred facilities and particularly the slot
20 facilities where they can walk into the office with
21 their application and we can help them with the
22 application process.

23 What type of information does a person
24 provide in an application? They will get a completed
25 application which is a form with general information;

1 name, address, those types of things. Obviously, a copy
2 of their fingerprints which can be submitted in a hard
3 card format or they can go to an independent third-party
4 and get an electronic live scan. And then of course,
5 they pay for their associated fees for their
6 fingerprints, the background check, and the fee for the
7 license. And by the way, the fee for an individual for
8 three years can range anywhere from \$15 to maybe \$100,
9 that's for a three-year period -- so break down -- and
10 the caps on those were established by statutory
11 requirements.

12 So once we get a complete application,
13 the way we review it is the Commission staff will review
14 for completeness. They will go through -- particularly
15 for the peri-mutual side, they will go through something
16 called Association of Racing Commissioner International
17 Database, which has all of the violations that a trainer
18 or an owner might have as far as against their license
19 in another jurisdictions, which we can use to evaluate
20 as to whether they actually get a license in Florida.
21 We will review their criminal history results for any
22 disqualifying criminal history that they may have
23 depending on which type of license they're seeking. And
24 if for some reason they submit an application that's
25 missing the fess or has part of it not filled out

1 properly, staff has an opportunity to review the
2 application, send the individual a deficiency letter,
3 which will kind of freeze the time clock on how long we
4 have to process, and give them the opportunity to give
5 us the additional information so we can evaluate the
6 application in full.

7 Typically, the Division by law has, like,
8 90 days to evaluate until the application -- we do it
9 much more efficiently, which I will touch on in just a
10 minute.

11 Also the occupational license has an
12 effective date of July 1st and they should be valid for
13 the three subsequent fiscal years if it's not revoked or
14 something happens to them.

15 Is the person required to get multiple
16 licenses? If you're going to work in a card room and a
17 pari-mutual and a slot, all three, the individual does
18 not have to pay three separate fees. We give them one
19 application and we issue what's called a combination
20 license. It's very popular in a lot of slot facilities.
21 They will basically get all of their employees to get
22 their combination license that way they're able to move
23 about the facilities without any restrictions.

24 How long does it take an individual to
25 get a license? By law we have 90 days, but we typically

1 do it on a much shorter time frame. Typically, you saw
2 our measures earlier -- once we get a completed
3 application, we process it on average of about six days.
4 That's the whole review of the application, getting the
5 criminal history back, and actually processing and
6 returning the application.

7 Does the state have any reciprocal
8 licensing agreement? That's a common one we get.
9 Typically, if a person gets a peri-mutual license in,
10 like, Louisiana, they still have to get one in Florida.
11 Many states have joined -- and this is in the
12 Chapter 551 statute, which is called the Interstate
13 Compact -- many of the states that have memberships in
14 the interstate compact, an individual can get a
15 multi-jurisdictional license. We issued approximately
16 770 of those here in Florida. So if a person leaves
17 Florida with that interstate license, they can go and
18 participate in racing without additional licenses in
19 say, for example, New York or Texas or California.

20 That's kind of like a really high-level
21 overview of our occupational license process. And I
22 will entertain any questions if anyone has anything at
23 this time.

24 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Mr. Dillmore, can I ask a
25 question? You said once you get a completed application

1 it takes -- did you say six days or 60 days?

2 MR. DILLMORE: 1-6.

3 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I thought you said that.
4 And you also said you retain the fingerprints from folks
5 that apply. Where do we get the authority to do that?
6 Is there something that gives us that authority or do
7 they give us permission to do that?

8 MR. DILLMORE: That's an explicit
9 authorization in Chapter 551, and I believe 550 as well.
10 Also, it makes it much more of an expense to rerun those
11 prints if they're retained. And we also get an
12 automatic notification if an individual is arrested in
13 Florida, we would get a notification. We would actually
14 get from FDLE a hit on that.

15 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Right. Okay. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: First, excellent
17 summation. Thank you. It answers many questions. It's
18 very much appreciated.

19 My question is why would one not want to
20 obtain a multi-state jurisdictional license versus just
21 a state? Is it simply just a matter of cost or is there
22 a higher criteria?

23 MR. DILLMORE: I believe the criteria is
24 simply the same, the states all agree on this interstate
25 compact. I think it's more of a function of, if I am

1 only going to race in Florida or I'm only going to race
2 in a certain state, I'm just not going to go through the
3 effort of getting a multi-jurisdictional license.

4 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: It would seem logical
5 that if one thought they might work in another state,
6 and they have already been approved in Florida, they
7 would not have to go through that process again if they
8 were to move to Louisiana; correct?

9 MR. DILLMORE: That is correct. And I would
10 ask Ms. Ricks, who processes those interstate
11 applications, to maybe provide some additional
12 information on that.

13 MS. RICKS: Thank you, Commissioners. Just to
14 add a little bit of information. The interstate compact
15 is handled by the National Racing Compact Organization
16 out of Lexington. Individuals can become a member of
17 NRC. They will complete one centralized application and
18 set of fingerprints submitted to the NRC. And they will
19 identify that they intend to race in various racing
20 jurisdictions. Once the NRC has received the
21 application and received satisfactory background
22 screening on the information, they will notify the
23 various states that the individual is going to be racing
24 in. Each of those states will still issue their own
25 license for the individual. But the process is really a

1 measure of efficiency, in that it's kind of a
2 one-stop-shop for the individual and NRC will then
3 coordinate to the various states. But the individual
4 states will collect their own licenses, and will also
5 collect the necessary licensing fee for the application
6 in the given state. We do not duplicate the fingerprint
7 fee because that is already conducted. It's very
8 expeditious for an individual to have an application on
9 file with NRC. We routinely get e-mail communication
10 from them on a daily basis, and we know they have
11 approved and vetted the license. So it's really just a
12 technicality for Florida to issue a license for the
13 individual.

14 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Thank you.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: If I might. What is
16 the breakdown -- do you have any breakdown of the
17 applicants applying online versus traditional mail
18 versus e-mail? I am curious what the breakdown is if
19 you have any data on that.

20 MR. DILLMORE: I don't have any numbers and we
21 can look to pull some of those. I think historically a
22 lot of them have done on-site applications where they're
23 currently working at the facility so it's easier to walk
24 in. And I will say we recently had kind of -- the
25 wizard I mentioned that's on-line -- that's something

1 that we did the last six/eight months, maybe a year. So
2 we're still collecting data from that. It wasn't as
3 user-friendly back then, but we just need to take a look
4 at the data again and see how those people are accessing
5 the online portion.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: When it's an on-site
7 application, is that a paper application or are they put
8 in front of an iPad or computer? What does that look
9 like?

10 MR. DILLMORE: Initially, it starts with paper
11 and they go over it with our staff. And then once
12 it's -- I guess we have deemed it ready, our staff in
13 the field scan it in and then it's put into an
14 electronic cue. So essentially, it becomes on-line
15 pretty quick even if it's brought to our field office as
16 a paper application.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, any other --

19 MR. DILLMORE: One more thing as far as the
20 occupational, this also applies to the businesses who
21 supply the slot machines or other businesses that
22 require access to the floor or the gaming area. Like,
23 if a technician who is off-site and coming to work on
24 the slot machine, that individual is also required to
25 get an application so we can vet that person who also

1 gets access to the restricted gaming areas. I wasn't
2 sure if I made that clear in my initial presentation.

3 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Is it a fair statement
4 that the majority of these applications that you're
5 dealing with are photocopies of mail versus scanned
6 data?

7 MR. DILLMORE: I will ask Ms. Ricks to respond
8 and she can give a ballpark -- she has her hands on this
9 everyday.

10 MS. RICKS: I apologize for not having a
11 specific breakout, but we can get that number for you.
12 I am seeing an increase in the on-line activity on a
13 daily basis. We did some modernization to our system,
14 streamlined our process for on-line applicants in
15 September of 2020. During the COVID-era, the on-line
16 portal was a real saving grace for the industry and for
17 the PMW staff. It was widely utilized and we encouraged
18 our applicants to utilize that system.

19 We still have a very large percentage of
20 paper applications coming in. I am hesitant to venture
21 a ratio for you, but I will say it's higher than I would
22 like it to be. We are very hopeful that as we continue
23 to modernize and streamline our processes that we will
24 move more into an electronic era. But I will get some
25 numbers for you.

1 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: If I may ask a follow
2 up. If the majority of these employees, whether they be
3 in the card room or at the racing facility and so forth,
4 are doing this on site as I understood earlier,
5 shouldn't the owner's responsibility be on the future
6 employer for the site itself to have an incentive to
7 have that person file it on the computer versus mail?

8 MR. DILLMORE: So the main places we actually
9 have on-site facilities is just the two thoroughbred
10 racing facilities and the slot facilities. The others
11 don't have live racing -- we only stop in for a short
12 amount of time -- but the facilities that we are at
13 provide not only office space for us to utilize, they
14 provide equipment. And the slot facilities, they
15 provide live scans for the employees.

16 But like I said, it also helps in the
17 sense that we have someone particularity in the horse
18 racing industry for us to get their application
19 processed and their ability to get entered into a race,
20 I think is in the best interest of the regulator and the
21 facility as a whole.

22 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: So we track from the point
23 of completed application until the application is
24 processed at an average of about six days. Am I
25 correct -- and I don't expect that you'll have actual

1 numbers of this, but hipshot it -- am I correct in the
2 assumption that there is a disparity between the time of
3 application initiation and application completion
4 between electronic applications and paper applications?

5 In other words, is it taking folks
6 longer? Are you putting out more discrepancy letters?
7 Are we doing a lot more work for the paper applications?
8 Or frankly, are they waiting a lot longer from the start
9 of their application for the paper applications?

10 MR. DILLMORE: So that's a little bit of a
11 complicated question. So having people on-site and
12 being able to look at their application with them, we
13 can help identify deficiencies in person. It won't be a
14 mail in or a scan in or wait a few days. We can say,
15 hey, you omitted this part because we look at these
16 things every day.

17 I also think it depends on the
18 applicants' history and if they're honest on their
19 application. If a person completes an application
20 on-site and is very honest on their application about
21 their criminal history and their infractions in other
22 racing jurisdictions, they can get what's essentially
23 the same day, if the application is reviewed and they
24 don't have any problems, a temporary license. And we
25 give them a temporary license while we're looking at the

1 more detailed information, which is approximately six
2 days.

3 So yes and no. I think it really depends
4 on the individual's own history. And if there are some
5 things that are questionable on the application, they
6 may not get the temporary license until we can get the
7 criminal history or the ARCI verification back as far as
8 their licensing status in other jurisdictions.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, any other
10 questions?

11 Mr. Trombetta, the floor is reverting
12 back to you for your executive director's report.

13 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
14 just wanted to give Ross Marshman an opportunity if he
15 wanted to added anything to the licensing section.

16 MR. MARSHMAN: I know we've all worked through
17 lunch and the last person you want to hear from is the
18 lawyer, so I can be as brief as you-all permit me.

19 I think the main concern you're always
20 going to have with licensing is due process; notice and
21 opportunity. And you're going to have general and
22 specific. Generally, you're going to be working in
23 Chapter 120, which is the Administrative Procedures Act.
24 That's something that Mr. Dillmore already touched on,
25 that 90-day deadline. That stems primarily from

1 120.60 -- excuse me, 120 -- I forget the subsection.

2 Moving on, you have the application phase
3 where Ms. Rick's and her team are looking at everything
4 that's been submitted. And later on you have discipline
5 against a licensed person. And those are slightly
6 different postures. The Commission has already had an
7 opportunity to deal with both instances of it, and we
8 have been trying to provide as much guidance as we can
9 overall -- or going along rather.

10 And the last thing that we can touch on
11 just briefly is disqualification of a license holder or
12 disqualification of an applicant. That's where the
13 specific licensing requirements are going to be more
14 important in 550 and 551 and 849, and in the
15 accompanying rules.

16 We have discussed in the past if there
17 were certain caps on fines that could be accessed on
18 certain types of license holders, and there are. It's a
19 \$1,000 cap on para-mutual wagering and card room
20 offenses. However, there's a \$5,000 cap on offenses
21 tied to slots and slot gaming. With legal, the devil is
22 always in the details, so I hate to be too general, but
23 I think that does provide the kind of basis of at least
24 the phases where you're going to have the legal
25 challenges and the types of challenges you're going to

1 have are going to be based on those opportunities. Did
2 we do everything in the correct way. Did we tell
3 everyone the right thing in the right time. Did we
4 afford everyone the opportunity to contest our intended
5 action and contest the discipline we wish to take
6 against a licensee.

7 I am happy to answer any other questions,
8 but again, I know my time is short.

9 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, if there's
10 any questions? I see none. I think we're moving on to
11 the next agenda item.

12 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
13 have three kind of quick updates. We have 12 new
14 employees in the gaming commission, positions that have
15 been vacant. Plus, we have moved about five other
16 people into PMW and other areas. So the office of the
17 IG, Ms. Jeanne Morris is on the IT side. She's the CTO
18 of infrastructure. We've hired Jason Brock who is the
19 project manager on the IT team. We've hired two help
20 desk managers, one in Fort Lauderdale, so Randal and
21 Marvin. And then we've also hired Virginia Barker, who
22 is an AA in IT. So I know Suzie and her IT team are
23 doing well.

24 On the admin side, we've hired Kelly, who
25 is an AA. Lori Simmons has come in to help us to act as

1 the HR chief to help Lisa with some of our hiring needs.
2 And Mr. Tony Campbell has come in the government office
3 and has been a key role very recently in helping us
4 move. Sabrina Butler is another member of our HR team
5 that has been added.

6 And then for the legal time, we have
7 added two people. We have an agency clerk now, Melba --
8 I am going to struggle with her name -- Albaleniz
9 (phonetic spelling.) We're also starting an AA, I
10 think, tomorrow; and that's the second AA. So we have
11 been able to hire some positions and that has improved.

12 As I mentioned, we moved into the new
13 building on Friday. So Suzie and the team have been
14 there since September 1st working with vendors to set up
15 our network and get things rolling. On Friday, admin
16 will go over. So we're starting to -- if you go over to
17 the building, it's 4070 Esplanade Way in South Loop.
18 You will see people in offices and it's starting to come
19 together and look like an office.

20 The plan is still as it was. We are
21 still waiting for DMS to begin construction on the one
22 side, and while that construction is pending, we will be
23 operating on the other side of the building. Really, I
24 just want to thank both Lisa and Suzie and their teams
25 for making this move. Lots of people have stepped up

1 and pitched in and doing things that, you know, they're
2 not going to be doing long-term. And there's been some
3 struggles just in getting -- you know, not internally --
4 just struggles with vendors that weren't on the same
5 page with what we required, what we asked for, and the
6 hold up with people losing keys and stuff like that.
7 Outside of that, we're making it and we're getting into
8 the new building and things are going pretty well.

9 Any questions on either of those two
10 items?

11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I have a question. You
12 guys have been working tirelessly. What are your
13 priority? What's in the cue?

14 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: There's a few things in
15 the cue right now. Deputy general counsel -- legal is a
16 priority. We have been trying to find help with Ross.
17 His team is essentially very thin already. So we're
18 trying to boost that team.

19 Carl's team, we're starting to work on
20 getting law enforcement. So I think Carl had interviews
21 for two criminal intelligence officers -- or analysts.

22 MR. HEROLD: Two criminal analysts.

23 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: And then we're in the
24 process of trying to work through the section leader for
25 the Tallahassee office. I believe the plan for the law

1 enforcement unit is to kind of fill out the Tallahassee
2 office and then we are trying to figure out the
3 satellite offices. So the emphasis will be on that.

4 I am going to be kind of reaching out to
5 try to figure out a plan for commission advisors.
6 That's on my, kind of agenda, for the month of October
7 to get them in and get them help. I also have been
8 prioritizing assistant help for Dixie Parker -- who is,
9 again, not on camera -- but doing a ton of work behind
10 the scenes to make these meetings happen. We're getting
11 her support too, so that there is just more people
12 involved in getting the agendas ready and getting
13 meeting materials available. I would like to get five
14 analysts to help the Commissioners themselves be
15 prepared for these meetings. Again, I'm trying to do
16 that in October.

17 We're trying to get alleged affairs (sic)
18 person in, and we're trying to fill out some chief of
19 HR; it's been a struggle. We have -- again, as I
20 mentioned, Lori -- as a side note, Lisa was convinced to
21 come and help us out until we found a full-time HR
22 person. So that's sort of the plan there. And then
23 it's kind of filling out some of the other, down the
24 line, type of positions. I don't say that with any type
25 of disrespect or anything. You know, the goal is to

1 fill the higher levels and then let them hire their
2 team. The accounting team, I think, is the next on the
3 list. We're trying to get some people in to help our
4 accounting group.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Nice overview. Thank
6 you. In terms of looking at the LBR, we don't currently
7 have a graphic designer. Even if we get it allocated
8 for the next fiscal year, that's still, you know, a year
9 away to actually having somebody.

10 Do we have an intention to have a web
11 designer or have internal folks, not to add more to
12 Ms. Whitmire's plate, but to get that started, or are we
13 going to wait a year?

14 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Commission Brown, can I
15 just ask what the goal of that position would be? Is
16 there a specific work product you're trying to -- you're
17 interested in? Could we contract it out or is it a
18 position that we would have full-time?

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I mean, looking at the
20 web designer, the logo and things of that nature, just
21 from the description of the position that's being sought
22 in the LBR, is there someone that you're going to hire
23 or somebody that can do that internally if that position
24 is not filled?

25 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I am going to try to

1 answer it. Suzie, jump in if I'm wrong. Suzie has
2 hired -- I forget the title. John -- one of his first
3 priorities is to look at our website and revamp it. He
4 showed us a beta version of it yesterday. It's not
5 ready to be kicked out, but it's different. So we kind
6 of added --

7 MS. WHITMIRE: John is the applications
8 manager. He will have developer -- we have been trying
9 to hire but can't because of the salary -- but John has
10 a background in web design, so he is going to be filling
11 in some of that gap until then. We also have Jason, who
12 is a project manager, but he also is a creative force
13 who also will be working with John to work on some of
14 the graphics. We don't truly have a graphics designer
15 yet, but we're going to fill in the gaps as much as we
16 can. They're creative people. And rebranding us and
17 rebranding the website is a priority for John,
18 especially as we move towards doing the requirements for
19 the users, he has some time right now to be able to
20 focus on that. So he has been making us look like a
21 real state agency on the website and look at
22 possibilities of making us look like we're in the modern
23 times. So he is working on that.

24 Do we have a dedicated resource? No.
25 Can we fill in the gaps? Yes. We already started

1 rebranding. This is what the letterhead looks like. We
2 are trying to fill in the holes.

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's great. I hear
4 you-all are wearing multiple hats. I appreciate all
5 that you're doing. I know we have some new samples of
6 website domains, so that's what kind of triggered my
7 thinking about the need for that, and then seeing the
8 LBR and discussion on the recommendation. So I
9 appreciate that. I didn't know if you wanted to talk
10 about the domain name options.

11 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Yeah. That's probably a
12 good way to bridge to that. One of the items in the
13 materials was an e-mail from Suzie to me where she had
14 some options for potential domain names. So I am going
15 to also provide -- or ask Suzie to provide some
16 background on why there may be a need for this. Suzie,
17 why do we need a need a new domain?

18 MS. WHITMIRE: So when we became Florida
19 Gaming Control Commission on July 1st, the DBPR put
20 fgcc.fl.gov into their e-mail. And in doing so,
21 prevents us from putting it in our e-mail because you
22 can only have one domain tied to one location. So we --
23 if we were all doing a big bang theory to move to the
24 new e-mail to clients all at once, this would not be a
25 problem. But because we have a staggered approach to

1 our rollout, we have to have a different domain to go
2 into. It gives us an opportunity to use a straight
3 .gov, which gives us the protection that no one in the
4 world can use a .gov except Florida and it's controlled
5 by the federal government. It's not going to be
6 spoofed. It's not going to be easy for people to get a
7 similar kind of address. But would we like to keep our
8 fgcc.fl.gov? We would love it. But it just makes it
9 really hard from a technology standpoint -- it's not
10 impossible -- but it's really hard to work around not
11 going all together at the same time. The staggered
12 approach kind of says we need to figure out what we need
13 to call ourselves.

14 Plus, as we're rebranding and as we move
15 to our brand-new website and it's beautiful and looks
16 like a modern gaming organization, having a new address
17 will signify even further that we're a new organization
18 and it's different from the things of the past.

19 So we came up with some names that we
20 threw out there for some consideration. We looked at
21 other gaming sites in other municipalities and came up
22 with a few. And we would like for you to give us
23 feedback on which ones you like, or if you do not like
24 any of them and want us to work on a technical solution
25 too, we can do that. It will cause additional work, but

1 we will figure it out. But we're really looking for
2 some input into how we want to register us. And this
3 registration will be our e-mail address, our website
4 address, so this is you're claiming a name. We can
5 claim several of these and only use one if we want. We
6 need this in order to start setting up our domain and
7 moving our users. So it's a decision that's very timely
8 and needs to be made.

9 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: I was going to ask
10 Mr. Chair, if he had a thought process for doing this,
11 or if he even wanted to go down this road at all before
12 we open it up or didn't open it up.

13 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I am going to make a
14 comment and then I am going to open it up. I do want to
15 ensure -- and Ms. Whitmire, I think you can probably
16 give me the most comfort on this -- there is an easy
17 button that we can hit for forwarding all the e-mail
18 addresses to making sure that the people that we serve
19 and our customers are going to be able to find our folks
20 easily as they transition -- after they just
21 transitioned to our current domain name e-mail
22 addresses, that it will be a smooth transition for the
23 folks that we serve.

24 MS. WHITMIRE: We will put a web redirect on
25 our website. So if they go to fgcc.fl.gov it will

1 automatically go to our new website. For the e-mail,
2 for the people that are staying, the old client will
3 still have the one they have today, but as we move off
4 into our new one, there will be a redirect or a forward
5 to our new mailbox. So we should see little to no
6 problems with the conversion from one network to the
7 next; in theory. Of course, there is always going to be
8 snafus in the beginning, but yes, we should be able to
9 redirect and forward e-mail.

10 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: With that reassurance,
11 Commissioners, I like flgaming.gov of the list that
12 we've seen, and I will ask the rest of you what you
13 like.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So do I. That was my
15 first choice.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I think I like
17 gaming.florida.gov the most. I'm not opposed to the
18 others, but I think -- Suzie, is there an added benefit
19 to having the .fl.gov? I can't remember if that
20 matters. But I do like the gaming.florida.gov the most
21 for branding reasons as well.

22 MS. WHITMIRE: The DMS owns fl.gov, and we
23 would be a subdomain under the main domain fl.gov.
24 There's really no difference other than I don't have to
25 register it with the federal government. It's just a

1 request to -- and they add it to the fl.gov domain list.
2 It does cause some problem whenever you have a
3 three-level domain name that sometimes you have some
4 older applications that struggle with them, but really
5 it's doable. So anything that fl.gov is registered
6 through DMS. Anything that's just plain .gov is through
7 the federal register.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: So just to be clear,
9 the .fl.gov, DMS handles the -- I don't remember what
10 the domains are -- but they handle the registration and
11 they register all fl.gov, so we would be a subdomain
12 underneath that, and DMS would handle all the
13 registration requirements?

14 MS. WHITMIRE: So there is no more
15 registration. They have .fl.gov. The subdomains are
16 only registered through DMS. It's not registered with
17 the federal government at all. The fl.gov is what is
18 registered with the feds.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Okay. Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I'm coming from it, I
21 guess, from a marketing perspective, I like
22 floridagamingcommission.gov even though it's kinda long.
23 I didn't like the FGCC because when you put it in you
24 get all kinds of organizations and so forth. Florida
25 Gaming it sounds to me like a game -- a video gaming

1 company. So I think from a marketing perspective,
2 floridagamingcommission is only one -- every time you
3 put it in, there's no guessing involved. Every time
4 someone sees it they know where it's coming from and you
5 know what's involved. That's my preference.

6 MS. WHITMIRE: My only problem with commission
7 is no one spells commission right. It takes -- it's a
8 long word and that's one of those things that, you know,
9 could cause users who aren't able to type commission
10 in --

11 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Good point.

12 MS. WHITMIRE: A lot of the states had theirs
13 exactly like that, so...

14 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: To complicate things
15 even more, I was torn between fl.gamingcontrol.gov. I
16 like the control for the reason that Chuck so eloquently
17 pointed out, but I could also appreciate the brevity of
18 fl.gaming.gov as my second choice. So control.gov and
19 gaming.gov are my two. I'll go with the group.

20 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: Did that help anybody.

21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I will say my second
22 choice was fl.gamingcommission.gov.

23 MS. WHITMIRE: It makes sense. I mean --

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Herein lies my reservation
25 for that one. And while I agree on the identification

1 aspect of it, I am thinking about people who type in
2 e-mail addresses. And that's a lot of -- to be sure,
3 someone might type it in once and have it in their
4 auto-fill after that and it will forever come to us. A
5 lot of people, a lot of letters, that's a pretty
6 cumbersome tail end of your e-mail address. That was my
7 only thought. I didn't want to go with the shortest one
8 because it's not quite as identifying to me, which is
9 why I think I honed in on the flgaming.gov. Again, this
10 is an open discussion and I want to defer to the body
11 and see if we can come to a consensus.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: I guess to highlight
13 why I geared towards gaming.fl.gov, it seemed to me to
14 succinctly emphasize both, kind of, the arena that the
15 agency is playing in, which is gaming. But to avoid the
16 confusion of just saying flgaming.gov, for example, it
17 added a period and then the subdomain of fl, and it kind
18 of -- but to me, it seemed oriented more towards a state
19 operation, which you often find, with state e-mail
20 address these days all over the country, you have that
21 identifier of Idaho, Florida, Texas, whatever it might
22 be, that it makes it clear that it's a state entity that
23 is operating the website and is receiving the e-mail and
24 whatnot. That was my thought. I think
25 floridagamingcommission is very descriptive. I also

1 think it is very long as other have said.
2 Floridiagaming.gov, I don't know that it's as
3 descriptive, but I am not -- there are none here --
4 except for the ones that are acronyms -- all the other
5 ones I would be relatively comfortable with.

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: True.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioner Drago, does
8 the .gov on the end of any of these give you some
9 comfort level from the -- it sounds like a random video
10 game company aspect.

11 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: It doesn't because I
12 don't think most people even realize that. But, you
13 know, I agree that the gamingcommission is long and if
14 we could, you know, come up with something that makes
15 everybody feel better. I like when the domain tells you
16 exactly who you're dealing with, the name of the company
17 is right in there, or whatever it might be. I see
18 floridagaming, I just think it's probably some gaming
19 company. No matter what everybody says, that's what I
20 am going to think. But I'm open to discussing for sure.

21 Do we have any -- more than one --
22 leaning towards one particular one that we can start
23 building on?

24 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: It shortens it a little
25 bit. I think with the flgamingcontrol versus the

1 flgamingcommissson give you more comfort? Even though
2 it's still kind of long, it's simpilar convention. And
3 then I have to ask Vice Chair Yaworsky if that gives him
4 a comfort level. And I think you said anything other
5 than the initials you would be fine with. I could live
6 with floridagamingcontrol.gov.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: It's a tricky thing
8 because the only one -- to Commissioner Drago's point --
9 the only one that is descriptive of what the entity is
10 really is the last one. And even that one is difficult
11 just because -- half the people I tell I am on the
12 Gaming Commission think it's something to do with fish
13 and wildlife. It's a tricky thing. I don't know if
14 floridagamingcontrol adds any -- I don't know if it adds
15 much to a layperson's understanding of what the
16 organization does at first glance. And I think some of
17 the other ones like floridagaming.gov,
18 gaming.florida.gov don't really make an effort to do
19 that; it's going at it from a different angle. So I
20 don't know that we will be able to find -- other than
21 floridagaming -- I don't know that we will really be
22 able to find a domain name that succinctly exemplifies
23 what it is we do. It almost requires a parenthetical
24 notation.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chair, could we put a

1 hold on this until the first week of October and have
2 Ms. Whitmire show us some examples of all the other
3 state regulatory commissions to give us just, you know,
4 a barometer of identifiers -- you know, regulatory
5 agencies? I have seen them too and there's a lot of
6 acronyms out there.

7 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I see a headshake, but I
8 was also told that we didn't have to absolutely have to
9 do this. So let's resolve those two contradictory
10 statements if we could.

11 MS. WHITMIRE: So we can make the decision to
12 figure out a solution to stay where we're at or we can
13 make the decision to change it. But I am waiting to
14 start building our domain and start moving our active
15 directory and start actually doing this work until this
16 decision is made. So if we don't meet until, you know,
17 the beginning of October, that means I can't start even
18 working on anything on the active directory or all the
19 Office365 because I have to decide on a domain. This is
20 the first decision in the decision tree.

21 So if we decide we are going to be
22 fgcc.fl.gov, then the decision we make until we do a
23 migration somewhere down the line, at least a year from
24 now. We can make it work.

25 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, from my

1 part, again, I have reservations of
2 flgamingcommision.gov being too cumbersome, but at the
3 same time, I'm not one to spend a long time debating the
4 number of angels that will fit on the head of a pin. So
5 I am more than happy to defer if that is -- if that is
6 where the consensus leans. But again, I want to hear
7 input.

8 Commissioner D'Aquila, you were about to make
9 a comment.

10 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Yeah. I'm curious
11 what the aversion is to fl.gamingcontrol.gov. Control
12 is obviously an easier word to type than commission.

13 COMMISSIONER DRAGO: I am not opposed to it.
14 That would probably be my second choice. That comes the
15 closest after gamingcommission to kind of give you a
16 sense of what it is. Again, I don't want -- I would
17 rather table than have to do a whole lot of thinking,
18 you know, what the organization was if they were typing
19 it. I am not opposed to that.

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Personally, I mean, I do
21 like, flgaming.gov because of the brevity of it. And
22 gov indicates to me a state government and it's a legit
23 state legal entity. I like flordiagamingcommission.
24 Floridagamingcontrol however, kind of signifies a
25 different message of what the commission is and

1 emphasizes the control. And maybe that's what we want
2 to do, but it just didn't draw me to branding.

3 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Are you hearing the
4 imperial march from Star Wars when someone says that?

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think Fortnite. I
6 think of all the gaming names.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN YAWORSKY: Mr. Chair, unless I
8 counted wrong, I think there were -- maybe the only
9 consensus among the members was both you and
10 Commissioner Brown, the first choice being flgaming.gov.
11 With that in mind, unless I am wrong, I think you're the
12 only two individuals that had that one. I don't know --
13 because of that fact alone, I don't know if there would
14 be a willingness to concede that's the way to go.

15 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I will entertain a motion
16 if the body so chooses.

17 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Only if I have a second.

18 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: I'll make a motion to
19 pass fl.gaming.gov.

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: I think it's flgaming
22 without the dot between fl and gaming. Flgaming.gov.

23 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second.

24 COMMISSIONER D'AQUILA: Flgaming.gov; correct?
25 It's my eyes, they're going at this hour.

1 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Any objection? Seeing
2 none, the motion carriers.

3 Thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate
4 the way we can openly discuss things and arrive at a
5 consensus.

6 Mr. Trombetta, the floor turns to you.

7 DIRECTOR TROMBETTA: Mr. Chair, I have nothing
8 else. I will close. Thank you for the long meeting.
9 Thank you for entertaining me and my staff here and
10 working to get us going in the right direction on some
11 very important documents here.

12 CHAIRMAN MACIVER: Commissioners, I am going
13 to take a very short liberty with apologies. I know
14 that I've been pretty adamant about the fact that we
15 will do general public comment during our general
16 business meetings every month, and when we have these
17 offset meetings, we don't do general public comment.
18 But because this wasn't as decret at-issue meeting as
19 it usually is, and perhaps everybody in the audience
20 hasn't clung to every word I ever said at every
21 commission meeting, I would like to offer the
22 opportunity for a very, very brief general public
23 comment if there is any.

24 Going once. Going twice. Seeing none.
25 Commissioners, show us we're adjourned. Thank you.

1 Proceedings concluded at 2:37 p.m.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF LEE

I, Paige E. Kelleher, Stenograph Shorthand
Machine Stenographer and Notary Public, State of
Florida, certify that I was authorized to and did
stenographically remotely report the Zoom meeting; that
a review of the deposition was requested; and the
foregoing deposition, page 1 through page 161, is a true
and accurate record of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative,
employee, attorney, nor counsel of any of the parties'
attorney or counsel connected with this action, nor am I
financially interested in the action.

Dated this 27th of December, 2022.

Paige E. Kelleher,
Stenograph Shorthand Court Reporter

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In The Matter Of:
Florida Gaming Control Commission
Public Meeting
Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Vol. 1
(Pages 1-161)

DATE: Tuesday, September 20, 2022
TIME: 10:00 a.m. - 2:37 p.m.
LOCATION: Zoom

STENOGRAPHER'S CERTIFICATE ON CORRECTIONS
TO THE FLORIDA GAMING CONTROL COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
TAKEN ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF LEON COUNTY)

I, Paige E. Kelleher, Stenograph Machine
Shorthand Stenographer, hereby certify that this meeting
transcript has been compared to my stenographic notes
and is a full, corrected, and complete transcript of the
above-mentioned meeting.



Paige E. Kelleher,
Stenograph Machine Shorthand Stenographer
Lexitas
1551 Forum Pl #200,
West Palm Beach, FL 33401