

wee@sierradesign.com; Patrick Miller; smaddocks@c2gaming.com;  
gcervantes@cabazonindians-nsn.gov; pslama@cabazonindians-nsn.gov;  
damon.jones@chickasaw.net; amartinazzi@colusacasino.com; khoosh@genting.com.my;  
t.elsasser@gaminglabs.com; sosbourne@hsdwor.com; teresa.poust@hklaw.com;  
susan.carletta@igt.com; john.chamberlain@igt.com; goldschmidt@konami.com;  
lj\_comish@msn.com; jbliss@hdnlaw.com; mvannorman@indiangaming.org;  
dwaters@novagaming.net; luisewo@pechanga-nsn.gov; tedg@rocketgaming.com;  
clombardo@semtribe.com; amartinp@cirsa.com; mpace@wmsgaming.com  
Lyle Bell, who is a Vice-president of GSA, has actively supported the process and the final form of the draft standards. He has indicated that he would be happy to formally state his (and GSA's) support. Note Greg Solomon also committed his support while in Oklahoma City and the GSA – NIGC meeting was held at Mandalay Bay under his joint sponsorship with NIGA.  
The following is the email that he sent out on January 20:

**PERSONAL OPINION**

These standards could easily serve as a basis for technical standards for Oklahoma as they are perceived to be achievable and reasonable.

**GLI COMMENTS**

The following is a copy of the email from Todd Elsasser of GLI to Lyle Bell. I am not sure if we can use it directly but here it is. The bolded part is my highlights.

**From:** Todd Elsasser [mailto:t.elsasser@gaminglabs.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 1:27 PM  
**To:** Lyle Bell  
**Cc:** James Maida  
**Subject:** RE: Technical standards v1 07

Lyle,

I went through the changes and it looks like Patrick made all of the changes we discussed.

I agree with his comments that Section 2.9 Software Upgrades (the ability to make emergency field upgrades without going through lab testing first) still needs some fine tuning. I understand the manufacturers desire to provide immediate customer service and the need for that service in an emergency situation. I can also see the regulatory concern of running "untested" software and the inherent risks that come with this type of policy. I will call some of the manufacturers and see if we can perhaps suggest some better wording for this section.

The specific changes made to the FAC section were exactly what I had suggested. I would like to see if the manufacturers have any additional comments but it is now in line with what they currently do in Class III areas and should not prove overly restrictive or difficult to comply with.

I agree with moving the sections dealing with game play to the Classification Standards (Sections 4.13, 4.15, 4.16, 4.17 and 4.6.6.2) even at the risk of inflaming the Classification debate even further, these sections really do not belong in the Technical Standards.

Overall, I think we are just about done with the Technical portion of the standards and are now going to need to face the Classification Standards.

I would like to personally thank you for all of your help and support, I was afraid that with all of the commotion over the Classification Standards the Technical Standards might go unnoticed. ***With everyone's help and suggestions I think the Technical Standards now provide an excellent framework for designers to work in and give both the NIGC and the Tribes a good solid set of standards to build upon.*** As always, GLI will be available to assist in any way possible, please feel free to ask if you need anything.

Todd Elsasser  
Executive Director  
Engineering and Testing  
Gaming Laboratories International, Inc.  
600 Airport Road  
Lakewood, NJ 08701 USA  
732-942-3999 Ext. 118  
732-942-1395 (Fax)  
[www.gaminglabs.com](http://www.gaminglabs.com)