Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS

In 2010, the NIGC posted on its web-site draft Class II MICS. Because the NIGC has not promulgated an equivalent provision to 542.18, the TGWG worked from the Class III MICS to create a proposed provision for Class II.

Editing convention: The words in blue (underlined) and red (struck-through) are the additions and deletions made by the TGWG.

July 2010 Draft MICS	TGWG Version
No equivalent provision. Due to the fact that there is no 2010 draft regulation corresponding to 543.18, the TGWG proposed text is compared to the existing 542.18 text (which the TGWG edited for purposes of its recommendation).	 §542.18 543.18 How does a gaming operation apply for a variance from the standards of this part? (a) Tribal gaming regulatory authority approval.
§ 542.18 How does a gaming operation apply for a variance from the standards of this part?	(Revised May 4, 2005) <u>Variance.</u> (1) A Tribal gaming regulatory authority may approve a variance for a gaming operation if it has determined that the
 (a) <u>Tribal gaming regulatory authority approval</u>. (Revised May 4, 2005) (1) A Tribal gaming regulatory authority may approve a variance for a gaming operation if it has determined that the variance will achieve a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace. (2) For each enumerated standard for which the Tribal gaming regulatory authority approves a variance it shall submit to the Chairman of the standard it is control sufficient. 	 variance will achieve a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace.Should a TGRA grant a variance to any provision of these <u>MICS</u>, the TGRA shall deliver a notice of the same to the Commission within ten (10) days of such approval. (2) For each enumerated standard for which the Tribal gaming regulatory authority approves a variance it shall submit to the Chairman of the
 variance, it shall submit to the Chairman of the NIGC, within thirty (30) days, a detailed report, which shall include the following: (i) A detailed description of the variance; (ii) An explanation of how the variance achieves a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace; and (iii) Evidence that the Tribal gaming regulatory authority has approved the variance. (3) In the event that the Tribal gaming regulatory authority or the Tribe chooses to submit a variance request directly to the Chairman, it may do so without the approval requirement set forth in 	 variance, it shall submit to the Chairman of the NIGC, within thirty (30) days, a detailed report, which shall include the following: (i) A detailed description of the variance; (ii) An explanation of how the variance achieves a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace; and (iii) Evidence that the Tribal gaming regulatory authority has approved the variance. (3) In the event that the Tribal gaming regulatory authority or the Tribe chooses to submit a variance request directly to the Chairman, it may do so without the approval requirement set forth in
 paragraph (a)(2)(iii) of this section and such request shall be deemed as having been approved by the Tribal gaming regulatory authority. (b) <u>Review by the Chairman.</u> (Revised May 4, 2005) (1) Following receipt of the variance approval, the Chairman or his or her designee shall have sixty (60) days to concur with or object to the approval of the variance. (2) Any objection raised by the Chairman shall be in the form of a written explanation based upon the following criteria: 	 paragraph (a)(2)(iii) of this section and such request shall be deemed as having been approved by the Tribal gaming regulatory authority. (b) Review by the Chairman. (Revised May 4, 2005) (1) Following receipt of the variance approval, the Chairman or his or her designee shall have sixty (60) days to concur with or object to the approval of the variance. (2) Any objection raised by the Chairman shall be in the form of a written explanation based upon the following criteria:

Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS



Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS

believes the Chairman's objections should be	(3) Upon any re-submission of a variance approval,
reviewed, and shall include supporting	the Chairman shall have thirty (30) days to concur
documentation, if any.	with or object to the re submitted variance.
(iv) The Tribal gaming regulatory authority shall be	(4) If the Chairman fails to object in writing within
provided with any comments offered by the	thirty (30) days after the date of receipt of the re-
Chairman to the Commission on the substance of	submitted variance, the re-submitted variance shall
the appeal by the Tribal gaming regulatory authority	be considered concurred with by the Chairman.
and shall be offered the opportunity to respond to	(5) The thirty (30) day deadline may be extended,
any such comments.	provided such extension is mutually agreed upon by
(v) Within thirty (30) days after receipt of the	the Tribal gaming regulatory authority and the
appeal, the Commission shall render a decision	Chairman.
based upon the criteria contained within paragraph	(d) Appeals. (Revised May 4, 2005)
(b)(2) of this section unless the Tribal gaming	(1) Upon receipt of objections to a re-submission of
regulatory authority elects to wave the thirty (30)	a variance, the Tribal gaming regulatory authority
day requirement and to provide the Commission	shall be entitled to an appeal to the full Commission
additional time, not to exceed an additional thirty	in accordance with the following process: Comment
(30) days, to render a decision.	 Jess to revise to mirror licensing language in
(vi) In the absence of a decision within the time	IGRA.
provided, the Tribal gaming regulatory authority's	(i) Within thirty (30) days of receiving an objection
resubmission shall be considered concurred with by	to a re submission, the Tribal gaming regulatory
the Commission and become effective.	authority shall file its notice of appeal.
(2) The Tribal gaming regulatory authority may	(ii) Failure to file an appeal within the time
appeal the Chairman's objection to the approval of a	provided by this section shall result in a waiver of
variance to the full Commission without	the opportunity for an appeal.
resubmitting the variance by filling a notice of	(iii) An appeal under this section shall specify the
appeal with the full Commission within thirty (30)	reasons why the Tribal gaming regulatory authority
days of the Chairman's objection and complying	believes the Chairman's objections should be
with the procedures described in paragraph $(d)(1)$ of	reviewed, and shall include supporting
this section.	documentation, if any.
(e) Effective date of variance. The gaming operation	(iv) The Tribal gaming regulatory authority shall be
shall comply with standards that achieve a level of	provided with any comments offered by the
control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the	Chairman to the Commission on the substance of
standard it is to replace until such time as the	the appeal by the Tribal gaming regulatory authority
Commission objects to the Tribal gaming regulatory	and shall be offered the opportunity to respond to
authority's approval of a variance as provided in	any such comments.
paragraph (b) of this section. Concurrence in a	(v) Within thirty (30) days after receipt of the
variance by the Chairman or Commission is	appeal, the Commission shall render a decision
discretionary and variances will not be granted	based upon the criteria contained within paragraph
routinely. The gaming operation shall comply with	(b)(2) of this section unless the Tribal gaming
standards at least as stringent as those set forth in	regulatory authority elects to wave the thirty (30)
this part until such time as the Chairman or	day requirement and to provide the Commission
Commission concurs with the Tribal gaming	additional time, not to exceed an additional thirty
regulatory authority's approval of a variance.	(30) days, to render a decision.
(Revised May 4, 2005)	(vi) In the absence of a decision within the time
	provided, the Tribal gaming regulatory authority's
	resubmission shall be considered concurred with by
	the Commission and become effective.
	(2) The Tribal gaming regulatory authority may
	appeal the Chairman's objection to the approval of a
	variance to the full Commission without
	resubmitting the variance by filling a notice of
	appeal with the full Commission within thirty (30)

Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS

days of the Chairman's objection and complying
with the procedures described in paragraph (d)(1) of
this section.
(e) Effective date of variance. The gaming operation
shall comply with standards that achieve a level of
control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the
standard it is to replace until such time as the
Commission objects to the Tribal gaming regulatory
authority's approval of a variance as provided in
paragraph (b) of this section. Concurrence in a
variance by the Chairman or Commission is
discretionary and variances will not be granted
routinely. The gaming operation shall comply with
standards at least as stringent as those set forth in
this part until such time as the Chairman or
Commission concurs with the Tribal gaming
regulatory authority's approval of a variance.
(Revised May 4, 2005)Advise the TGRA, in
writing, that it has no objection.
(ii) Provide the TGRA a written
statement itemizing its objections.
(iii) Take no action, in which
case, the TGRA's variance shall
<u>be final.</u>
(2) If the Commission has provided the
TGRA a statement itemizing objections to
the variance:
(i) The TGRA shall reconsider the
variance taking into account the objections itemized by the
Commission.
(ii) The TGRA may seek
reconsideration by submitting a
request to the Chairman and
members of the Commission.
(iii) Upon receipt of a request for
reconsideration, the Commission
shall conduct an informal hearing
with the TGRA within 30 days,
which may be conducted in
person or through the exchange of
documents, as requested by the
TGRA.
(iv) After the informal hearing,
the Commission must issue a
written decision within 14 days. If
the Commission disapproves the
variance, such written decision
must include an explanation of
why the requested variance
creates an imminent threat to the
integrity of the tribal gaming

Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS

operation.

NIGC Comments and Questions regarding the TGWG Proposed Regulation (questions in blue).

Overall Comment

The development of a separate section for Class II gaming variances (543.18) rather than referring to 542.18 is an improvement over the Draft Proposal. However, the TGWG proposed § 543.18 does not provide the Commission with a process for meaningful review and assessment of variances approved by the individual TGRAs. How could this be addressed?

Tribal Gaming Regulatory Approval

Effect of §542.18: The existing text contains a clear criterion against which the TGRA is to evaluate the proposed variance to determine whether it is acceptable and warrants approval i.e. whether "the variance will achieve a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace."

Effect of TGWG Proposal: Does deleting the criterion against which the TGRA is to evaluate the proposed variance increase the risk that the TGRA decision to approve or disapprove a given variance will be arbitrary and capricious?

Reporting

Effect of §542.18: The existing text defines the content requirement of the submission. The required information is necessary for the Commission to determine whether the TGRA-approved variance satisfies the criterion for approval. For example, whether "the variance will achieve a level of control sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace."

Effect of TGWG Proposal: The TGWG version deletes the submission requirements, mandating instead only that the TGRA "deliver a notice" to the Commission within ten days. What information should this "notice" include? Failure to specify what documents are to be submitted to the TGRA in the application for approval of a variance increases the risk of inconsistency in the approval decisions due to each decision being supported by different information. Does the TAC foresee a problem stemming from the fact that there is no required uniformity in information or documentation submitted to the TGRA? Could this lead to a lack of uniformity in what is then submitted to the Commission?

Review by Chairman

Effect of §542.18: The existing text defines the circumstances under which the Chairman may object to the TGRA-approved variance and the relevant deadlines

Effect of TGWG Proposal: The amendment substitutes "the Commission" for "the Chairman" as the evaluator of the approval, reduces the time period provided for review from 60 to 30 days, and eliminates the possibility of extending the review period by mutual agreement. The proposed standard allows the Commission to disapprove the variance only in the event that a determination is made that said variance constitutes "an imminent threat to the integrity of the tribal gaming operation." Can the TAC foresee a situation in which a proposed variance, while not rising to the level of "an imminent threat to the integrity of the gaming operation," may pose an increased albeit not imminent threat to the integrity of the gaming operation, an imminent or less than imminent threat to the finances or other component of the gaming operation or simply fail to meet the intent of the standard? Is the "imminent threat" language necessary?

Comparison of July TGWG Submission to July 2010 Draft MICS

Presumably a TGRA would not approve a variance that would constitute "an imminent threat to the integrity of the gaming operation."

Curing Chairman's Objections

Effect of §542.18: The existing text provides a method by which the TGRA may appeal a Commission decision not to concur with a TGRA approval of a variance.

Effect of TGWG Proposal: Given the limited grounds for objecting to a variance under what circumstances will the appeal process be utilized?

Effective Date of Variance

Effect of §542.18: The existing text provides guidance to the gaming operation regarding compliance with standards during the time period that a TGRA-approved variance is under review by the Commission.

Effect of TGWG Proposal: How does a gaming operation proceed while a variance is under review?

TGWG Guidance

The TGWG did not submit guidance for this proposed regulation.