

KICKAPOO TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA
SECONDARY ADMINISTRATION

FAX

COVER SHEET

P.O. Box 70
McLOUD, OK 74851
PHONE: 405-964-4204
FAX: 405-964-4206

SEND TO: NIGP	FROM: Kickapoo Gaming Commission
ATTENTION: Shawn Pensoneau	OFFICE LOCATION: McCloud, OK
OFFICE LOCATION: Washington, DC	DATE: 2-12-11
FAX NUMBER: 202-632-7066	PHONE NUMBER: 405-964-7018

URGENT

REPLY
ASAP

PLEASE
COMMENT

PLEASE
REVIEW

FOR YOUR
INFORMATION

TOTAL PAGES, INCLUDING COVER:

COMMENTS:

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU FEEL THIS IS A COMMUNICATION ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE AT (405) 964-4204.

To: National Indian Gaming Commission

From: Mr. Martin Frye, Chairman, Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma Gaming Commission

Date: February 11, 2011

Re: FINAL COMMENTS - Framework for evaluating the NIGC Notice of Inquiry and Request for Information

The NIGC review should be focused on the Primary Regulator – the Tribes. Federal regulations and standards need to be complimentary and supportive.

The NIGC regulations and standards should deal with fundamental fairness, due process, and protection of individual and Tribal rights in the context of fulfilling regulatory oversight, enforcement, and approvals.

The above paradigm would have the effect of making the work of the NIGC complementary and collaborative with the primary regulator.

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
502.15	Management Contract This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should the definition be expanded to include any contract that pays a fee based on a % of gaming revenue?</p> <p>a. NO. This would be an improper and unauthorized expansion of the NIGC's approval powers. Further, fees paid, as a % of gaming revenue does not by itself constitute a management contract. <u>The NIGC should follow IGRA in all its considerations.</u></p> <p>(2) Should the calculation include reimbursement of expenses and development and other nongaming management fees - "acceptable compensation"?</p> <p>a. NO. This proposal makes no sense because the reimbursement of expenses would not qualify as compensation under GAAP and general business principles. The jurisdiction of the NIGC to approve agreements does not extend to agreements that are not collateral to a management contract. <u>The NIGC should follow IGRA in all its considerations.</u></p> <p>(3) Having raised this particular area for possible regulatory action, if the NIGC decides to proceed or otherwise set this aside, a clear statement as to the reasons for such decision is advisable.</p> <p>(4) Your statements should reflect how Gaming Tribes will benefit!</p>

01/31/2011 19:30:3836

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
502.16	Net Revenues This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should the definition of "Net Revenues" be revised to be consistent with GAAP?</p> <p>a. While it might be good practice to the extent consistent with §2703 (9) to conform calculations to GAAP, the statute defines Net Revenue and the NIGC does not have authority to change the definition.</p> <p>b. The NIGC needs to explain to Tribes how this benefits Tribes as change is not disclosed beside reflecting GAAP.</p> <p>(2) Should there be a separate definition for "allowable uses"?</p> <p>a. There is no statutory authority to expand the definitions under IGRA. The NIGC should not arbitrarily create a new definition.</p> <p>b. <u>The existing Bulletin (05-21) defining Net Revenue should be withdrawn because it is overreaching and outside the authority of the NIGC.</u></p> <p>(3) <u>Having raised this particular area for possible regulatory action, if the NIGC decides to proceed or otherwise set this aside, a clear statement as to the reasons for such decision is advisable and needed to maintain continuity for Tribes.</u></p>
514	Fees This is NOT a priority item. Priority for late payment procedure system	<p>(1) Fiscal vs. Calendar year for fee calculation?</p> <p>a. Tribes should be allowed to elect either method. Fiscal year calculations should accommodate Tribal business practices.</p> <p>b. IGRA outlines the collection of fees quarterly and allows Tribes freedom to adopt system that fits their need.</p> <p>(2) Implementation timeframes?</p> <p>a. The NIGC current Regulation's clearly explains how to calculate fees, as fees are based on last year revenues. It is based off IGRA on a quarterly basis which covers both fiscal and calendar year.</p> <p>(3) Should the definition of "Gross Gaming Revenues" be revised to be consistent with GAAP?</p> <p>a. The statute defines Gross Revenue and <u>the NIGC does not have authority to change the definition.</u></p> <p>b. Prior to NIGC, all tribes were covered by A-133 that does not have GAAP requirements. IGRA allowed for Tribes to following normal accounting used</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.3836

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
		<p>by Tribes!</p> <p>(4) Fingerprint fees?</p> <p>a. This is a useful service provided to the Tribes. It should allow for Tribes if Ordinance as approved to run vendors as primary IGRA is to keep out corruption.</p> <p>b. IGRA requires a law enforcement agency to run back grounds, the NIGC currently uses FBI to fulfill the law. If FBI has concerns about meeting their mission as members of working group they should consult with tribes!</p> <p>(c) There is no need to do this by regulation; rather a Bulletin that sets out the process, procedures, and fees is all that is needed. The Bulletin can be updated and revised as needed.</p> <p>(5) Late payment system vs. NOV?</p> <p>a. A late payment system is preferable over the current practice of issuing an NOV. The NOV should be retained as a final action if necessary. The late payment system should include a grace period before assessing late penalties etc. A revised regulation must clearly state with supporting guidance given via Bulletins.</p> <p>b. This area is of great interest to Tribes. A late payment system that is comprehensive and clear with due process protection would be a great step forward in the relationship the NIGC has with Tribes.</p> <p>c. IGRA allows Chairman the flexibility to do what is best for NIGC and Tribes. All Tribes ask for is fairness in its dealings!</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.3836

4

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
518	Self Regulation of Class II <u>THIS IS A PRIORITY ITEM.</u>	<p>(1) How can this section be made to be less burdensome to comply with and should it be revised?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The NIGC should revise these regulations so as to make certain the steps to Self Regulation as clear as possible and not punitive in nature. The current 518 is not consistent with the Statute §2710(c)(4). b. The factors should be those contained in §2710(c)(4) and be weighted to take into consideration years of operating with integrity, honesty, and the implementation of a comprehensive Tribal regulatory regime. The independent audit conducted by the Tribes CPA should serve as the basis for the accounting/process review and determination of financial soundness. Self-regulation is a hallmark of sovereignty and ought to be supported and encouraged by this 518 not suppressed. c. It is suggested that the NIGC adopt a negotiated rule making process for attending these provisions so as to give Tribes a full voice and to create a transparent process and record. d. Having raised this particular area for possible regulatory action, if the NIGC decides to proceed or otherwise set this aside, a clear statement as to the reasons for such decision is advisable and needed to maintain continuity for Tribes. e. IGRA needs to be followed as to fees collected from Self-Regulation as 25% of 1% has to be collected, and current Regulations at end has not met requirements of IGRA.
519	Service	See §539 below.

01/31/2011 - 19230.3836

NIGC Regulation	TITLE	Comment
523	Review and Approval of Existing Ordinances or Resolutions This is NOT a priority item.	(1) Should this section be eliminated because it only applied to ordinances enacted prior to January 1993? a. No. IGRA requires the Chairman of the NIGC this duty to approve and disapprove ordinances. I don't think the date of 1993 makes a ordinance less effective, as Tribes are Primary Regulators and have to follow all laws and regulations, so must NIGC!
524	Appeals	See 5539 below

01/31/2011 - 19230.3R36

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
531	Collateral Agreements This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should the NIGC consider whether or not it has the power to approve collateral agreements to determine if the cumulative effect of such agreements violates the sole proprietary provisions of IGRA?</p> <p>a. The NIGC currently has the authority to require submission and review of all documents that are collateral agreements to a Management Contract. It is unlikely that a regulatory definition will anticipate all of the possible circumstances and conditions under which future management contracts might be negotiated. It may be a better practice to eliminate or revise current bulletins dealing with topic taking into account the effect of the submissions already acted upon by the NIGC and the practice and body of law that has developed as a result.</p> <p>(2) Sole Proprietary Interest has historically been a lightning rod for both Tribes and non-tribal interests when attempting to form business relationships. The Ad Hoc nature of the historical NIGC approach has not brought clarity, thus leaving the field open and subject to uncertainty. The most visible result to date is the decision and fallout from the Lac du Flambeau case.</p> <p>a. The NIGC has taken on a burden since this case of issuing declaration letters specific to each set of agreements presented. Unfortunately, these decisions are not available to the public, so guidance is again lacking and the void continues.</p> <p>b. Having a definition would in some ways help the market place, but also runs the risk of shutting the door on many business deals that, given specific risks and other business factors, will likely not fit into the definition or exceptions. A regulation by its nature must be definite, even with exceptions, and as such cannot take into account the limitless permutations business risk and reward can come up with. Therefore, the desire for a definition comes with a cost,</p>

01/31/2011 - 15230.3836

7

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
		<p>one that Tribes and the market likely will not find acceptable.</p> <p>c. Given the above the following suggestions may form the basis for a solution that will address both long and short term needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Make all declaration, rejection, or approval letters available to the public (with appropriate redactions). ii. Make all declaration, rejection, or approval letters final Agency Action so that the parties have recourse and so that a body of jurisprudence may develop. iii. Perhaps limiting the review and potential regulation to a definition of "Primary Beneficiary" would be helpful and give enough guidance for the development of a jurisprudential approach. It would also necessarily involve a statement on the limits of "revenue sharing" in light of the Rincon Case and the decision by DOI disapproving the Habematlel Pomo of Upper Lake compact. iv. Begin a process of comprehensive review of the topic, conducted in conjunction with Tribes. The review would take into account Tribal experience, experts in the evaluation of risky/reward and economics, business experience, and the NIGC history of advisory opinions, among other factors. The goal should be to develop guidelines to be published in a Bulletin. d. One last observation - the development of strict criteria for sole proprietary interests published, as a regulation would be a continuation of the paternalistic policies of the federal government toward Tribes. Regardless, if the NIGC wants to pursue this it must be done in conjunction with Tribes. e. IGRA makes it clear on priority interest and sets 70-30 or 60-40 in two sections of IGRA. One deals with Management agreements and other with individual run operations. The Creek Courts took up issue between Tribe and Communities, I suggest you read as it held to IGRA!

01/31/2011 - 15230.3836

B

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
533	Approval of Management Contracts This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should this section add standards for the trustee standard as a basis for disapproving management contracts?</p> <p>a. The trustee standard within the federal government has proven to be at best a moving standard cloaked in the sole discretion of the delegated administrator. At worst, the trustee standard has been used as a shield for misuse, misappropriation, misanthropy, and out and out thievery toward Tribes. As such, any attempts to codify this standard are fraught with dangers and may be viewed through a less than welcome perspective.</p> <p>b. If the desire to give notice to Tribes and the market that a trustee standard will henceforth be an additional factor in the approval of a management contract, it would be preferable to do so by issuing a Bulletin.</p> <p>1. Set forth factors that make up the trustee standard for the NIGC Chair</p> <p>II. Give examples of how these factors may be applied</p> <p>III. This is necessary for Tribes and business to apply the standard to future transactions.</p> <p>c. This would be a continuation of the paternalistic policies of the federal government toward Tribes</p> <p>(2) Suggest that 2 grounds for disapproval be added – (a) not submitted in accordance with the requirements of §533 and (b) submission does not contain requirements of §531.</p> <p>a. If the submission does not fully meet the requirements of §533 or §531 then it should be held and no work be done for a specified period of time, with notice to the submitting parties. If the time period expires with no action by the submitters then disapproval can be the result.</p> <p>b. This should be clarified via a Bulletin.</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.3836

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
537	Background Investigations for Persons or Entities with a Financial Interest In, or having Management Responsibility for, a Management Contract This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should changes be made to clarify the submission requirements for Class II and Class III background investigations?</p> <p>a. Yes.</p> <p>b. Any changes to 5537 It should be to make definitions and disclosures as consistent with other agency's rules as possible. For example, the SEC and other financial regulatory agencies have disclosure thresholds and requirements; NIGC should to the extent possible and consistent with IGRA mirror those other agency requirements.</p>
539	Appeals This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should the NIGC consider more comprehensive and detailed procedural rules addressing (a) service of process and computation of time - 5519; (b) intervention by 3rd parties; (c) motion practice and briefings; and (d) the nature of written submission in enforcement appeals.</p> <p>a. Yes. It would be good practice to formally adopt procedural rules. The underlying principle should be the guarantee of due process. The NIGC should adopt process and procedures that require it to conduct regular periodic meetings where a record is made and final agency action is taken.</p> <p>b. The NIGC should also adopt rules and procedures that require a written record be maintained of all meetings and available to the affected parties. This record would also be available for formal proceeding and litigation.</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.3835

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
542	Class III MICS <u>THIS IS A PRIORITY ITEM.</u>	<p>(1) Should this section be struck and replaced with recommended guidelines?</p> <p>a. There is a diversity of opinion on this issue. Some Tribal-state compacts make reference to §542 and as such are part of regulatory framework approved in the compact. This is where the argument has most strongly been made that §542 must be updated.</p> <p>b. There is a view that §542 can be updated by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Stating clearly that the provisions are advisory only but that specific Tribes may choose to adopt the regulations along with NIGC oversight by written agreement. This would require continual updating and revision of §542. (Timeframe every 3 to 5 years) II. Another view is that §542 state the above with the addition that the provisions will be issued as guidelines in a Bulletin. The Bulletin will be regularly updated based on input from Tribes and other affected parties. Tribes adopt standards consistent with (IGRA.) <p>(2) What are the implications?</p> <p>a. This process envisioned in (1)(b)(iii) above would more closely resemble the way that Nevada works with the industry to keep rules current and relevant.</p> <p>b. Standards could be submitted that TGRA approve to meet Compacts with States and meet Industry Standards!</p>
543	Class II MICS <u>THIS IS A PRIORITY ITEM.</u>	<p>(1) How should these regulations be reviewed and revised?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes. b. A first step in the process should be to withdraw the current §543 regulations and/or suspend any enforcement of the regulations. The current §543 is in need of total replacement. c. Tribes, as Primary Regulators, should develop Internal Controls, that reflect all

01/31/2011 - 19230.3836

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
547	Class II NITS for Gaming Equipment THIS IS A PRIORITY ITEM.	<p>areas that protect assets of the tribe. This could be done with Standards that reflect the protection of Tribes assets. As Class II is a important asset to all tribes and we know what areas require we should submit suggestions that best reflect that duty. The current MICS is not a minimum all you have to do is look at your NIGC checklist and review MICS audits and you will see!</p> <p>(2) What is the appropriate starting point for this review (which document/draft should be used)?</p> <p>a. The Tribal Gaming Working Group has identified the last published NIGC draft used by the last Tribal Advisory Committee as the starting point.</p> <p>b. A broad approach to IGRA, and a standard can be used to fulfill this requirement. The NIGC needs to look to primary regulators for guidance as they fulfill their role daily.</p> <p>(1) Should these regulations be revised and if so, what process should be used?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. The current 5547 is in need of revisions and clarifications.</p> <p>c. Tribes have formed a working group that is preparing a revised 5547 to be adopted by Tribes and to be recommended to the NIGC.</p> <p>d. Tribes are writing Class II standards that fulfill Class II in all aspects. The NIGC should look at this concept.</p>
556	Background investigations for Licensing This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should the pilot program for submission and processing of fingerprints through the NIGC be formalized with regulations?</p> <p>a. Yes and No</p> <p>b. The pilot program has been a success in Tribal and NIGC cooperation. It is also a necessary and vital enforcement tool used by Tribal Gaming Regulators.</p> <p>c. The NIGC continued facilitation of fingerprinting resources of the FBI is vital and should be made a part of the regulatory framework of the NIGC.</p> <p>d. It is clear that synopsis and conclusion must be submitted for any finger prints to be accepted. If you read your regulations it leaves no doubt that a pilot</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.31866

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
<p>New</p>	<p>Fingerprinting for non-Primary Management Officials or Key Employees This is NOT a priority item.</p>	<p>(1) Should the fingerprinting process be expanded to include vendors, consultants, and other non-employees that have access to the gaming operations? a. Yes, if requested by Tribes. This cannot be a mandate from the NIGC; Tribes must request such fingerprint requests on a case-by-case basis and consistent with Tribal regulations or ordinances. b. This will require close cooperation between the NIGC and Tribes in order to be certain the procedural requirements of the FBI are adhered to as well as the NIGC and Tribal regulations. c. If the NIGC has approved Gaming ordinance that requires back grounds on these individuals and tribes has submitted funds, the NIGC should honor. If FBI has raised issue, they should read IGRA and consult with Tribes to remedy the problem!</p>
<p>559</p>	<p>Facility License Notifications, Renewals, and Submissions This is NOT a priority item.</p>	<p>(1) Should the section be revised and if so, what process should be utilized? a. Yes. b. There is a view that the current 559 is outside the authority of the NIGC and has great potential to create another CRIT like situation if and when enforcement actions are taken. c. It is the view of some that 559 should be withdrawn and/or enforcement suspended until such time as substantial revisions or replacement can be</p>

04/31/2011 - 19730.3836

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
571	Inspection and Access This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should this section be revised to clarify access to papers, books, and records, including at sites maintained or owned by 3rd parties?</p> <p>a. Yes. The GRIT case has established some limits that must be recognized.</p> <p>b. Other types of enforcement actions and requests for information under for example, §2715 require a clear set of criteria and procedural rules so as to protect Due Process.</p> <p>c. IGRA, allows for Chairman to subpoena any information he needs to make decision. This process makes no difference as to party involved!</p>
573	Enforcement This is NOT a priority item.	<p>(1) Should there be a process for withdrawing a NOV after issuance?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. It is the view of some that the Chair possesses the power under the various provisions of IGRA that authorize the issuance of an NOV. If the Chair has the discretion to authorize, then it follows that the Chair may withdrawal using</p>

01/31/2011 - 19291.8826

14

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
New	Tribal Advisory Committee This is NOT a priority item	<p>(1) When should a Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC) be formed?</p> <p>a. When requested by Tribes and when the Chair needs comprehensive advice on a given topic.</p> <p>(2) Should a regulation be adopted or a policy statement made?</p> <p>a. Policy statement along with plans for complying or exempting from FACA.</p> <p>(3) Is financial cost a relevant factor in determining whether or not to form a TAC?</p> <p>a. Yes, but a minor factor</p> <p>(4) The Executive Order – Improving Regulations and Regulatory Review – Issued on January 18th and the Presidential Memoranda Issued on the same topic on the same day should be used in the development of any policy relating to TAC formation and utilization.</p>
New	Sole Proprietary Interest This is NOT a priority item	<p>a. See comments above.</p> <p>b. IGRA, has established the interest as 70-30 and 60-40% no other Standard exists.</p>
New	Communication policy or regulation identifying when and how the NIGC communicates with Tribes This is NOT a priority item	<p>(1) Should there be a regulation that sets a process for determining how and with whom the NIGC communicates at a Tribe?</p> <p>a. After extensive consultation with Tribes, the NIGC should use policy statements and bulletins</p>

04/31/2011 - 10230.2835

NIGC Regulation	Title	Comment
New	Buy Indian Act This is NOT a priority item	<p>Comment</p> <p>b. It is likely that there will not be a one fits all answer. Tribes and Tribal governance process are varied based on culture and practical considerations. The NIGC must be prepared to adapt to Tribes not vice versa</p> <p>(2) What types of communication, and what protocols should be included?</p> <p>a. Decide after consultation with the Tribes</p> <p>(3) If so, what process should be used?</p> <p>a. Decide after consultation with the Tribes</p> <p>(1) Should the NIGC adopt a "Buy Indian" regulation consistent with 25 U.S.C. 477</p> <p>a. Yes - simple and straightforward</p> <p>b. Since the Act was passed in 1910, and sister agencies overlooked until 2010, I suggest following the three criteria that law and they have used.</p>

01/31/2011 - 19230.9836