

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of L.E. Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past year, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,



Mark English
Owner
L.E. Gaming, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of Rhino Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past three years, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M English', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark English
Owner
Rhino Gaming, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of Rhino Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past three years, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MLB', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael LeBlanc
Owner
Rhino Gaming, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of L.E. Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past year, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MLB', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael LeBlanc
Owner
L.E. Gaming, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of Certified Players, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past 15 years, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MLB', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael LeBlanc
Owner
Certified Players, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of Certified Players, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past 15 years, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "P. LeBlanc".

Patricia LeBlanc
President
Certified Players, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of Rhino Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past three years, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,



Kevin Barclay
Owner
Rhino Gaming, Inc.

November 26th, 2014

Susanne George
Research Analyst
California Department of Justice
Bureau of Gambling Control
Sacramento, CA 95820

RE: Proposed Amendment to Gaming Activity Authorization Regulations

Dear Ms. George,

On behalf of L.E. Gaming, Inc., I am writing to inform you of our **OPPOSITION** to any proposed regulations that hinder a gambling establishment's ability to collect or waive fees as such regulations would be a **JOB KILLER** in our community.

These proposed regulations would severely limit our ability to operate our business by mandating that the casinos charge customers certain collection fees per wager. Since the rise of tribal gaming after the passage of Proposition 1A in the year 2000, our business has had to adapt in order to compete with large tribal casinos who offer a variety of games that the casinos I provide services for cannot.

If the Bureau were to require that casinos must charge customers certain fees, my business would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I would be forced to close my business due to a drastic loss of revenue. If a customer has a choice of whether they are going to pay a collection fee per wager or not, they will always prefer the casino that does not charge a collection fee. For the past year, my business has provided entertainment for the citizens of many communities while also contributing living wage jobs and vital tax revenue. This all could be lost if these regulations become law.

No other gaming business in California is forced by law to charge their customers a fee per wager, and there is no rational basis for the Bureau to institute this discriminatory practice at the bequest of Special Interests that do not want to compete with other small businesses. This proposal is a form of regulatory price fixing, and it should not be tolerated. Responsible business owners in this state should be able to determine the fees that they want to charge their customers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K Barclay', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kevin Barclay
Owner
L.E. Gaming, Inc.