

limit each operator to three locations and you require that they be locations that only are operating a live game on the premises as well. Thirdly, you take and you require or limit that no operator shall have more than 60 of these keno video machines, player-accessed devices. And, fourthly, we say that in addition to the tax that's imposed on the gross receipts for the state in terms of 2 percent that would flow back to the state, that the 50 percent of the, in essence, the gross proceeds after the payment of prizes and expenses as defined in Section 9-605, from the operation of the player-accessed devices, in other words, from the machines only, 50 percent of the gross proceeds after prizes and expenses have been paid goes into the charitable gaming operation fund. So this incorporates the amendment that Senator Smith offered to the bill earlier that dealt with where the funds should flow in terms of housekeeping for purposes of addressing this addition or this allowance to the Local Option Lottery Act, that being the use of video keno machines. The...and then I have an amendment to this provision that we won't be able to do until we adopt this amendment but...because we're currently on an amendment to an amendment, and that amendment would add a fifth criteria, and you've had that passed out to you as well. That's the amendment that is handwritten that for clarification's sake I believe that the proposal as it's currently drafted, because it uses language that is taken directly from the Department of Revenue Charitable Gaming dealing with the issue of player access, which means it has to be a machine that's tied to a central computer, it cannot be a freestanding device that would operate outside of a computer run in terms of the game so it could not be, in my opinion, player-accessed, and the difference between that is player-activated which is usually the definition for a freestanding operation. This amendment, when it comes up, would be, I think, the provision that would lock up the issue of whether or not freestanding or slot machines would be a potential problem in this area because it would ban those and would clarify that a player-accessed device shall be directly linked to a central computer and shall not include stand-alone machines or slot machines. So, in other words, it clearly addresses the issue of any freestanding operation or any slot machine operation. Those would be banned. They would not fit the definition of player access, as they do not now. This is only for purposes of guaranteeing that there is no misunderstanding with regards to what the intent of the legislation was. Again, with that, the purposes behind the amendment are really, for me, twofold, one, to allow for a very