



NEVADA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INTERIM STUDY CONCERNING THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY UPON GAMING

(Assembly Bill 360, Chapter 508, *Statutes of Nevada 2013*)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The second meeting of the Nevada Legislature's Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning the Impact of Technology Upon Gaming was held on February 27, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/77th2013/committee/>. In addition, copies of the audio or video record are available through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chair
Senator Greg Brower
Senator Justin C. Jones
Senator Tick Segerblom
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Peter C. Bernhard, Chairman, Nevada Gaming Commission (*Nonvoting Member*)
A. G. Burnett, Chairman, State Gaming Control Board (*Nonvoting Member*)
Michael Cohen, Representative, Nonrestricted Gaming Licensees (*Nonvoting Member*)
Mark A. Lipparelli, Representative, Manufacturers or Developers of Gaming Technology (*Nonvoting Member*)
Randy Miller, Representative, Restricted Gaming Licensees (*Nonvoting Member*)
Mike Sloan, Representative, Entities Engaged in the Business of Interactive Gaming (*Nonvoting Member*)
Whitney Thier, Representative, Operators of Race Books and Sports Pools (*Nonvoting Member*)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Melinda Martini, Principal Research Analyst, Research Division
Bryan Fernley-Gonzalez, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Dan Yu, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Lisa Gardner, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division

OPENING REMARKS

- Assemblywoman Diaz, Acting Chair, welcomed members and the public to the second meeting of the Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning the Impact of Technology Upon Gaming.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Assemblywoman Diaz called for public comment on Agenda Item No. II; however, no testimony was presented.

PRESENTATION ON *REGULATING INTERNET GAMING: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES* UNLV GAMING PRESS 2013

- Ngai Pindell, J.D., Editor, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), provided an overview of the book that he co-edited with Anthony N. Cabot, J.D., Editor, Partner, Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP, titled *Regulating Internet Gaming: Challenges and Opportunities*, UNLV Gaming Press, Las Vegas, 2013 ([Exhibit B](#)). He pointed out that the main themes of the book highlight: (1) international practices; (2) best practices and models; and (3) regulatory harmony and conflict between jurisdictions. Mr. Pindell remarked that UNLV is at the disposal of the Committee. He mentioned the gaming law expertise that is available at the Boyd School of Law.
- Mr. Cabot announced that Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval and Delaware Governor Jack A. Markell signed the nation's first Multi-State Internet Gaming Agreement on February 25, 2014. He said the Agreement allows smaller states to share player-pooled liquidity, which is critical to the survival of the Internet poker industry in less populated jurisdictions.

Mr. Cabot remarked that the Agreement establishes minimum regulatory standards, set forth through Section 2 of Article IV, which pertain to licensure and technical capabilities, including: (1) age verification; (2) geolocation verification; (3) privacy; (4) anti-money laundering; and (5) player protections. He stated the book addresses these standards and serves as a “roadmap” for new policies and regulations relating to legalized interactive gaming. Mr. Cabot pointed out that the Agreement allows states to maintain their individual practices. He noted that Nevada's standards exceed those required by the Agreement.

Mr. Cabot acknowledged the Boyd School of Law and the UNLV Gaming Press for their contributions with the book. He remarked that the Boyd School of Law is emerging as the international “epicenter” of gaming regulation study.

- Assemblywoman Diaz thanked Mr. Pindell and Mr. Cabot for writing the book and for sharing information with the Committee. She also commended the Boyd School of Law

for ensuring that Las Vegas remains at the forefront with Internet gaming innovation and regulation.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Sloan and Mr. Cabot regarding a provision in the *United States Constitution* that provides for Congressional oversight of interstate compacts. Mr. Cabot remarked that pursuant to case law, such oversight is not necessary for agreements that do not interfere with federal directives on interstate commerce.

PRESENTATIONS RELATING TO INTERACTIVE GAMING LICENSES AND COMPACTS

Status Report of Interactive Gaming Licenses in Nevada

- A. G. Burnett, Chairman, State Gaming Control Board, discussed the status of interactive gaming licensure in Nevada. He shared a brief timeline and noted there are currently 27 interactive gaming licenses in the State.

Status Report of Interactive Gaming Compacts With Other States, Nations, Local Bodies or Tribal Governments

- A. G. Burnett, previously identified, introduced Michon Martin, General Counsel, Office of the Governor.
- Ms. Martin shared Governor Brian Sandoval's appreciation for Chair Horne. She pointed out that Chair Horne sponsored Assembly Bill 114 (Chapter 2, *Statutes of Nevada 2013*), which allowed the Agreement to occur. She commented on the ease of joining the Agreement, the benefits of pooling liquidity, and the ability of each state to maintain sovereignty. Ms. Martin noted that states can retain their own policies and regulations under the Agreement. She mentioned that Nevada limits interactive gaming to poker, while Delaware allows for all casino-style gaming.

In response to a question from Assemblywoman Diaz, Ms. Martin stated that Governor Brian Sandoval and Governor Jack Markell began discussing the Agreement in the spring of 2013, after the passage of A.B. 114. She noted the expedient approval of the bill, as well as the positive and collaborative nature of the talks.

A conversation between Mr. Cohen and Ms. Martin addressed the scope of the Agreement. Ms. Martin explained that the Agreement focuses on interstate participation; it does not address international involvement. She remarked that a different agreement might be required to expand interactive gaming to an international level.

- Mr. Burnett commended Ms. Martin for her instrumental role with the Agreement.

Discussion ensued between Senator Segerblom, Mr. Burnett, and Ms. Martin regarding the potential for other states to enter the Agreement. Mr. Burnett said the Agreement allows for expansion, and other states are interested in participating. Ms. Martin explained that the intention of the Agreement is to create a large network of states across the country. She mentioned that conversations with New Jersey have been initiated.

In response to questions from Mr. Miller, Ms. Martin stated that the Agreement took effect on the day of signing (February 25, 2014), and Nevadans are limited to playing poker on Delaware's interactive gaming websites. She elaborated that in order for patrons to meet at a virtual table, they must enter through sites administered through their own states.

Presentation of the Current Tax Structure for Interactive Gaming and Brick and Mortar Gaming Entities

- A. G. Burnett, previously identified, introduced Terry Johnson, Board Member, State Gaming Control Board; Shirley Springer, Chief, Audit Division, State Gaming Control Board; and Frank Streshley, Chief, Tax and License Division, State Gaming Control Board.
- Mr. Johnson presented an overview of Nevada's gaming tax structure ([Exhibit C](#)), which covered the following topics:
 - Fiscal year (FY)total gaming collections;
 - Gaming collections, FY 2004 to FY 2013;
 - Revenues collected FY 2013, gaming collections by area;
 - Collections by category FY 2013;
 - Percentage fees;
 - The live entertainment tax;
 - The quarterly nonrestricted slot fee;
 - The quarterly restricted slot fee;
 - The quarterly nonrestricted game fee;
 - The advance license fee;
 - Manufacturer and distributor license fees;
 - Slot route operator license fees;
 - The annual slot tax;
 - The annual games fee;
 - Expired slot machine wagering vouchers;
 - The operator of interactive gaming license;
 - The manufacturers of interactive gaming systems license;
 - The interactive gaming service provider license; and
 - The gaming service provider license.

Mr. Johnson reported that revenue is trending consistently with projections. He mentioned a slight “uptick” with live entertainment tax collections.

Discussion ensued between Senator Segerblom, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Streshley regarding the projection of revenue to reflect possible adjustments to the tax structure for restricted gaming licensees. Mr. Johnson indicated the Tax and License Division would provide data at the April 22, 2014, Committee meeting. Mr. Streshley explained that the Division can only provide an estimate, as it does not receive complete data from restricted gaming locations; the “missing piece” is percentage fees. He elaborated that gaming win figures, extracted from the NGC-36 *Slot Route Operator Informational Report*, could be analyzed. Mr. Streshley noted that 80 to 85 percent of restricted locations are tied to a slot route operator.

PRESENTATIONS RELATING TO RESTRICTED AND NONRESTRICTED GAMING LICENSURE

Presentation of the Regulatory Distinction Between Restricted and Nonrestricted Gaming Licensure

- A. G. Burnett, previously identified, introduced Mike LaBadie, Chief, Investigations Division, State Gaming Control Board, and Robert M. Grozenski, Deputy Chief, Investigations Division, State Gaming Control Board.
- Mr. LaBadie provided an overview of the Investigations Division and discussed the requirements for restricted and nonrestricted gaming licensure. He remarked that 53 of the Division’s 80 employees are dedicated to investigating nonrestricted gaming operations. Mr. LaBadie explained that a nonrestricted gaming license is issued for an operation with 16 or more gaming devices, and any number of tables or games. He remarked that nonrestricted gaming applicants are required to pay the following fees to the Division: (1) a \$500 investigative fee; (2) an investigative deposit; (3) a charge for hard costs; and (4) an hourly investigative fee.

He noted that 12 Division employees work in the Corporate Securities Section, which processes nonrestricted investigations of publicly traded corporations.

Mr. LaBadie explained that a restricted gaming license is issued for an operation with 15 or fewer gaming devices. He elaborated that such operations are required to pay a \$150 application fee and a \$500 investigative fee to the Division, but are not charged an hourly investigative fee unless warranted by a special circumstance. He noted eight Division employees, working under the direction of Mr. Grozenski, are assigned to the licensure of restricted gaming operations.

- Mr. Grozenski presented information on restricted gaming licensure in Nevada, which highlighted the following topics ([Exhibit D](#)): (1) the Board’s restricted gaming program; (2) the history of related statutes and regulations; (3) the current

application of regulations and statutes in the restricted gaming world; and (4) Board determinations regarding the operation of slot machines as being incidental to a primary business.

- Mr. Burnett provided the following approximations for the total number of slot devices in Nevada: (1) 160,000 slot devices are operated by 458 nonrestricted licensees; and (2) 19,000 slot devices are operated by 2,000 restricted licensees.

There was a discussion between Mr. Sloan and Mr. LaBadie regarding the new questionnaire that restricted gaming licensees are required to complete to certify they are in regulatory compliance. Mr. LaBodie explained that, beginning this year, the Tax and License Division is notifying all restricted gaming licensees of their obligation to submit certain information to the Board. He noted issues that come to the attention of the Board will be addressed.

- Mr. Burnett pointed out that another method of monitoring restricted gaming locations occurs with a change of ownership, which creates a new licensing event. He stated that such an occurrence gives the Board cause to investigate the new owners as well as the location. Mr. Burnett noted that subsequent to statutory revisions to Chapter 463 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) in 2013, the Board has implemented new “checks” on the established square footage requirements for a bar or restaurant at restricted gaming locations.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Sloan and Mr. Grozenski regarding the role of the Board and local jurisdictions with primary business determinations. Mr. Grozenski explained that the role of the Investigations Division is to visit locations, complete surveys, and submit statements of facts to the Board and Commission. He pointed out that the Board does not determine the type of primary business being operated at a restricted gaming location; this is decided at the local level through the issuance of a business license. Mr. Grozenski noted that some local jurisdictions do not issue business licenses. He explained that in those cases, the Division relies on staff of local jurisdictions to identify the type of primary business being operated.

Additional discussion between Mr. Sloan and Mr. Grozenski addressed the requirement for ongoing Board oversight of restricted gaming locations. Mr. Grozenski explained that the Board monitors licensees through their certified responses to the Tax and License Division questionnaire. He added that the Tax and License Division and the Technology Division conduct on-site visits to confirm taxes and technology are current at a location.

A conversation between Senator Segerblom, Mr. Burnett, and Mr. Grozenski addressed the potential to reevaluate existing restricted gaming locations with the incidental test. Mr. Grozenski conveyed that the test would not be applied to an existing establishment unless the primary business has changed. Mr. Burnett reiterated earlier comments to clarify that compliance issues will be detected through the Tax and License Division

questionnaire as well as through on-site checks conducted by various divisions at the Board. Senator Segerblom expressed his interest in applying the incidental test to established businesses that have not made any changes.

- Senator Segerblom asked whether existing licensees could be required to pay for additional staff to conduct the incidental test with existing locations.
- Mr. Burnett replied that the idea is being considered for the 2015 Session; however, the Board is not prepared to speak to it at this time.
- Mr. Miller attested that, in his experience as a restricted gaming licensee, the Board conducts periodic on-site visits at restricted gaming locations. He mentioned that he is required to submit information to the Board every time a change is made with his business. Mr. Miller noted the importance of providing truthful information in the quarterly reports to the Board, and adhering to the regulations and statutes.

Overview of the Structure of Restricted Gaming Operations and a Discussion of Whether the Operation of Slot Machines is Incidental to the Primary Business of a Restricted Gaming Licensee

- John F. O'Reilly, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, O'Reilly Law Group, presented information regarding the operation of slot machines by restricted gaming licensees. He spoke on behalf of the Nevada Restricted Gaming Association and the Nevada Tavern Owners Association. Mr. O'Reilly mentioned various types of businesses that exist with restricted gaming operations and noted the economic value of restricted gaming at the community level. He shared statistics regarding the number of restricted gaming locations and the number of slot machines that were operated at such locations in 2007 and 2013; he noted a downward trend due to the economy. He stated that the percentage of machines in restricted gaming locations compared to the total number of machines in the State remained about the same.

Mr. O'Reilly remarked that the industry has experienced economic and regulatory challenges in recent years. He commented that the Legislature's approach with gaming regulation has historically been flexible. Mr. O'Reilly indicated that this approach allowed the industry to work with regulators in the crafting of certain regulations, which benefitted the industry. He mentioned the allowance for the pooling of race books as a case in point. Mr. O'Reilly suggested that the Legislature continue to allow regulators to determine the regulations that are appropriate for the industry.

Mr. O'Reilly referenced a timeline ([Exhibit E](#)), a list of documents and transcripts ([Exhibit E-1](#)), and statutes and regulations ([Exhibit E-2](#)) relating to the operation of slot machines by restricted gaming licensees.

Mr. O'Reilly commented on the term "incidental." He stated that the definition was established by regulators, not the Legislature. Mr. O'Reilly explained that the definition has not been defined in statute because there is a need to maintain compatibility with the "ever-changing environment." He suggested the Legislature refrain from imposing regulatory changes, as the Board and Commission are providing effective regulatory oversight.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Sloan and Mr. O'Reilly regarding the number of employees at restricted gaming locations who are engaged in primary business operations and the number of employees who are engaged in the incidental operation of slot machines. Mr. O'Reilly indicated there is no clear distinction, as employees at such locations are engaged in both aspects of a business. Mr. O'Reilly stated he did not have specific figures for the labor force of all the restricted gaming locations in the State.

In response to a question from Mr. Bernhard, Mr. O'Reilly stated that tavern owners do not share identical business practices; however, there are some similarities.

There was a discussion between Senator Jones, Mr. Bernhard, and Mr. O'Reilly regarding the role of regulation in the free market economy. Mr. O'Reilly noted the importance of minimizing regulatory oversight as a means of stimulating competition between regulated and nonregulated gaming operations. He suggested the Legislature should focus on the "overall" policy of gaming, while allowing the regulators to implement and control the industry in a fair and free environment. Mr. O'Reilly conveyed that the Legislature's broad delegation of authority to the Board and Commission has been essential to the economic viability of certain segments of the industry.

In response to a question from Mr. Miller, Mr. O'Reilly opined that current statutes and regulations will be sufficient for at least two decades.

- Sean T. Higgins, Vice President, Government Affairs, Porter Gordon Silver, representing Golden Gaming, Inc., stated modifications to NRS are not necessary for the regulation of restricted gaming operators and operations. He commented that while free enterprise plays a role in the gaming world, licensure is a privilege, which is subject to certain statutory requirements. Mr. Higgins commented that the primary business of grocery, drug, and convenience stores and liquor stores are apparent; however, the primary business of some restricted gaming operations falling "under the guise" of taverns is questionable.

He noted that the definition of "tavern" was adjusted during the 2013 Session and the Board and Commission have held subsequent workshops and hearings. Mr. Higgins pointed out that the Commission added language to Regulation 3.015 in November 2013, which clarifies that restricted gaming licensees will be monitored for adherence to subsections (a) through (g) of Section 2. He suggested

a wait-and-see approach with the statutes and regulations, while providing additional funding to the Board and Commission to monitor primary businesses in the restricted gaming world.

Responding to a question from Assemblywoman Diaz, Mr. Bernhard stated that the Commission has not seen changes with the types of applications being submitted for restricted gaming licenses. He added that no major questions or issues have emerged with applicants over the past three months since Regulation 3.015 was amended to implement statutory changes from the 2013 Session.

Discussion ensued between Senator Segerblom and Mr. Higgins regarding the reevaluation of existing licenses under Regulation 3.015. Mr. Higgins stated that the new requirements apply to existing licenses. He remarked that testimony provided earlier in the meeting clarifies that the Board is implementing the requirements to ensure that there is a primary business. Mr. Higgins added that this is a regulatory issue, not a policy issue, which needs time to unfold.

- Chair Horne announced his arrival at the meeting and explained that he was delayed due to a court proceeding.
- Assemblywoman Diaz requested clarification of the major changes made to Regulation 3.015 in November 2013, which became effective in January 2014.
- Mr. Higgins explained that regulatory adjustments were implemented pursuant to A.B. 360 (Chapter 508, *Statutes of Nevada 2013*) and Senate Bill 416 (Chapter 396, *Statutes of Nevada 2013*). He noted that, additionally, the following language was added to Section 2(ii) of Regulation 3.015: “the operations at the location continue to meet the requirements for a restricted license.”

In response to questions from Mr. Miller, Mr. Higgins provided the following information relating to the new statutes and regulations: (1) some bars of existing licensees will be required to make retrofits; (2) the square footage requirements for restaurants apply to new licenses; (3) the requirements for a tavern are clarified in subsections (a) through (g) of Section 2, in Regulation 3.015; and (4) legislation was enacted in the 2013 Session as a response to the proliferation of slot arcades.

PRESENTATION CONCERNING MOBILE SPORTS STATISTICS

- Whitney Thier, Vice President, Deputy General Counsel, and Compliance Officer, CG Technology (formerly Cantor Gaming), discussed the expansion of gaming through mobile devices. She commented on a CG Technology mobile sports application and referenced a chart containing statistics on mobile sports account wagering and mobile device wagering ([Exhibit F](#)). Ms. Thier noted the percentage of the company’s total handle that was wagered through mobile devices increased

from approximately 39 percent in 2012 to 50 percent in 2013. She elaborated that \$800 million was wagered on account at CG Technology in 2013; \$500 million of that amount was wagered through mobile devices.

- Chair Horne requested that other companies with mobile sports wagering technology share data and recommendations with the Committee.

A discussion ensued between Chair Horne, Mr. Sloan, and Ms. Thier regarding the possibility of expanding mobile technology into nonsports wagering. Chair Horne requested information and suggestions relating to the pros and cons of expanding the technology.

- Mr. Sloan indicated he would provide information amount mobile sports wagering technology at the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Barry Lieberman, Attorney, representing Michael Gaughan’s South Point Hotel, Casino & Spa, Las Vegas, Nevada, commended the Legislature, the Board, and the Commission for enabling the Agreement to occur. He discussed the distinctions between restricted and nonrestricted gaming operations. Mr. Lieberman mentioned the differential tax structure, the criteria for restricted gaming licensure, and the evaluation of revenue factors. Mr. Lieberman remarked that prior to the issuance of a restricted gaming license, the Board and Commission reviews projected revenue. He suggested that revenue factors continue to be evaluated after a license has been issued. Mr. Lieberman stated the Board and Commission might need additional funding to monitor restricted gaming operations subsequent to licensure.
- Guy Hillyer, Executive Vice President, Cannery Casino Resorts, Las Vegas, Nevada, mentioned that he is a former voting member of the Board and a former chief of the Board’s Audit Division. He remarked that all licensees should be on a “level playing field” with statutory and regulatory compliance. He opined that a significant number of restricted gaming licensees are circumventing laws and benchmarks put forward by the Commission. Mr. Hillyer stated that gaming is the primary, not incidental, business of slot arcades. He recommended providing the Board and Commission with tools necessary to monitor restricted gaming locations on an ongoing basis.
- Marc H. Rubinstein, Senior Vice President , General Counsel, and Secretary, Affinity Gaming, Las Vegas, Nevada, opined that slot arcades mock gaming regulation, proliferate gaming into neighborhoods, and unfairly compete against legitimate restricted and nonrestricted gaming operations. He stressed the importance of adhering to, and enforcing, the incidental test. Mr. Rubinstein quoted Section 2 of NRS 463.0129, Section 1 of NRS 463.1405, and Section 8 of NRS 463.170. He said the statutes clarify the following: (1) licensees are required to meet suitability requirements and abide by applicable regulations on an ongoing basis; and

(2) regulators have an ongoing obligation to ensure that licensees are in compliance. Mr. Rubinstein suggested that, in order to generate more funding for regulators, the following recommendations be considered by the Committee:

- Impose upon slot route operators a revolving investigative fund; and
 - Consider increasing the device fees at restricted locations.
- Russell Rowe, Shareholder, Griffin Rowe, LLP, Las Vegas, Nevada, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation, indicated the Committee should determine whether there is a need for legislative oversight pertaining to regulatory enforcement.
 - Mr. Lipparelli stated he has been in contact with manufacturers regarding the Committee's study of the impact of modern and evolving technology upon gaming and the regulation of gaming. He referenced an Association of Gaming Equipment Manufacturers (AGEM) handout ([Exhibit G](#)), which he submitted on the association's behalf. Mr. Lipparelli stated that the organization is prepared to speak at the next Committee meeting.
 - Chair Horne remarked that he would include AGEM on the agenda for the Committee's April 22, 2014, meeting in Carson City. He stated the following areas of study will be addressed at that meeting:
 - The impact of modern and evolving technology upon gaming and the regulation of gaming;
 - The effect of expanding capability of personal and portable electronic devices upon gaming and the regulation of gaming; and
 - The potential effects and consequences of authorizing the acceptance of race book and sports pool wagers made by an entity.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Gardner
Senior Research Secretary

Melinda Martini
Principal Research Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chair

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda” provided by Melinda Martini, Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit B](#) is a book titled *Regulating Internet Gaming: Challenges and Opportunities*, UNLV Gaming Press, Las Vegas, 2013, submitted by Antony N. Cabot, Editor, Partner, Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP.

[Exhibit C](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation dated February 27, 2014, titled “Nevada Gaming Control Board: Gaming Tax Structure Overview,” provided by Terry Johnson, Board Member, State Gaming Control Board.

[Exhibit D](#) is the written testimony of Robert M. Grozenski, Deputy Chief, Investigations Division, State Gaming Control Board, dated February 27, 2014.

[Exhibit E](#) is a document dated February 27, 2014, titled “Overview of the Structure of Restricted Gaming Operations and Discussion of Whether the Operation of Slot Machines is Incidental to the Primary Business of a Restricted Gaming Licensee: Timeline,” submitted by John F. O’Reilly, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer (CEO), O’Reilly Law Group.

[Exhibit E-1](#) is a document dated February 27, 2014, titled “Overview of the Structure of Restricted Gaming Operations and Discussion of Whether the Operation of Slot Machines is Incidental to the Primary Business of a Restricted Gaming Licensee: List of Documents and Transcripts,” provided by John F. O’Reilly, CEO, O’Reilly Law Group.

[Exhibit E-2](#) is a document dated February 27, 2014, titled “Overview of the Structure of Restricted Gaming Operations and Discussion of Whether the Operation of Slot Machines is Incidental to the Primary Business of a Restricted Gaming Licensee: List of Statutes and Regulations,” submitted by John F. O’Reilly, CEO, O’Reilly Law Group.

[Exhibit F](#) is a chart titled “Mobile Sports: Account Wagering and Mobile Device Wagering Statistics,” provided by Whitney Thier, Vice President, Deputy General Counsel, and Compliance Officer, CG Technology.

[Exhibit G](#) is a document dated February 26, 2014, titled “Association of Gaming Equipment Manufacturers (AGEM) Submission for Consideration by the Nevada Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning the Impact of Technology Upon Gaming,” submitted by Mark A. Lipparelli, Founder, Gioco Ventures, LLC.

This set of “Summary Minutes and Action Report” is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits and other materials distributed at the meeting are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.