STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION
BEFORE THE BOARD OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA ATHLETIC COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF):
)
BOARD BUSINESS)
)
)

Given before Robin K. Reibold, Certified Verbatim Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of South Carolina, commencing at 10:06 a.m. on Tuesday, February 12, 2019, at the office of the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, 110 Centerview Drive, Columbia, South Carolina.

Reported by:
Robin K. Reibold

ROBIN K. REIBOLD, CVR 113 Grandview Circle Columbia, South Carolina 29229 803.447.7868 - rkreibold@yahoo.com

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	Committee Members Present:
4	William L. McCullough, Chairman
5	Edwin M. Estridge
6	James D. Vaught - via telephone
7	Paul. H. Kennemore - via telephone
8	
9	Advising the Committee:
10	Robert E. Horner, Esquire
11	SC Department of Labor, Licensing & Regulation
12	Office of General Counsel
13	110 Centerview Drive
14	PO Box 11329
15	Columbia, SC 29211-1329
16	
17	Also Present:
18	Eric Thompson, Board Administrator
19	Charlie Martin, Administrative Assistant
20	Renee Young, Administrative Assistant
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: This meeting is called to order.
2	Public notice of this meeting was properly
3	posted at the South Carolina Athletic
4	Commission office, Synergy Business Park,
5	Kingstree Building and on the commission
6	website and provided to all requesting persons,
7	organizations, and news media in compliance
8	with Section 30-4-80 of the South Carolina
9	Freedom of Information Act. The first thing we
10	have on the agenda today is the approval of the
11	agenda. With us right now we've got Mr. Mack
12	Estridge. And then on the line, just note if
13	you would please, gentlemen, when I say your
14	name, just say "here" for the record. Dr. Hamp
15	Kennemore, are you here?
16	DR. KENNEMORE: Here.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, sir. And Dr. Dillon
18	Vaught, are you here?
19	DR. VAUGHT: Here.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent, thank you, sir, as
21	well. All right. So the first thing we have
22	on the agenda is the approval of the agenda
23	itself. Is there anybody, most especially on
24	the line, to whom the agenda has not yet been
25	provided?

1	COMMISSION: (No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Hearing nothing, I'll assume we
3	all have it. Is there a motion from board
4	members to approve the agenda?
5	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon, I'll make a motion to
6	approve the agenda.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Thank you, Dillon.
8	We have a motion to approve. Is there a
9	second?
10	MR. ESTRIDGE: Mack Estridge will second.
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Mack. All right. We
12	have a second. All in favor say aye?
13	COMMISSION: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
15	COMMISSION: (No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. The motion is
17	approved, and the agenda is approved as well.
18	All right. The next item we have is the
19	approval of excused absences. I understand
20	that Dr. D'Andrea has some family medical
21	issues going on right now that are of
22	importance. Dr. Phillips is doing surgical-
23	related things in his cardiology thing. And
24	Ms. Pam Wright, also in the medical field,
25	can't be with us today either. Is there a

1	motion to approve those absences?
2	MR. ESTRIDGE: I will make a motion to approve those
3	absences.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Thank you. Is there
5	a second?
6	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon. I will make a second.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Thank you. All in
8	favor say aye?
9	COMMISSION: Aye.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
11	COMMISSION: (No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. The motion is
13	approved passed. Thank you very much. The
14	next item we have on the agenda is the approval
15	of minutes from our board meeting on October
16	2nd and our teleconference age-waiver hearing
17	from November 15th. If board members will just
18	take a quick moment and look over those
19	minutes; and once somebody has read faster than
20	the others, if they'd like to make a motion
21	whether to approve those minutes or not, it
22	would be greatly appreciated.
23	DR. VAUGHT: You're talking about the ones in the
24	packet, right?
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yes, sir. Yeah, just looking

1	for a motion to approve or not those past
2	minutes.
3	DR. VAUGHT: Got you. I read them earlier. Dillon.
4	I'll make a motion to approve the past minutes
5	from the two meetings, the October 2nd and the
6	teleconference on November 15th.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Dillon. Is there a
8	second?
9	MR. ESTRIDGE: Mack Estridge, second that.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Mack. All in favor
11	say aye?
12	COMMISSION: Aye.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
14	COMMISSION: (No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And the motion has passed and
16	the approval of the minutes is approved. The
17	next item we have is Chairperson's Remarks.
18	That's me. Hooray! So with regard to
19	chairperson's remarks today, we've got a couple
20	of people speaking about some interesting
21	topics today. We're not going to be making a
22	decision on those topics as they come up with
23	regard to some specific things, the stand-up
24	quasi MMA thing that somebody wanted to
25	discuss, or at least have mentioned. And we're

1 going to talk a little bit about bare-knuckle boxing. Just to say up front, our intent today 2 isn't to make a decision on those, but to gain 3 4 more insight on that so perhaps we can make a decision at an upcoming, if not the next 5 6 upcoming, meeting. That being said, since I 7 have the soapbox right here, we are a small board. As you can tell by looking up here, 8 9 there's not many people. We have a total of, 10 let's see, seven members right now? What's our 11 -- what's our -- what are we supposed to have 12 in a perfect world. Can anybody tell me? 13 MR. MARTIN: Nine. 14 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Nine. So the way it works with 15 these -- the way being on this board works -- I 16 can tell you how I personally got on. Somebody 17 in the state government reached out, like the 18 different state senators, and asked is there 19 somebody in your district that you know that 20 would like to potentially serve on this board. 21 I knew our local state senator, and he happened -- he knew I had a, you know, fighting martial 22 23 arts background, loved that kind of stuff. 24 reached out to me and I said, sure, I'd like to 25 So that's how I personally got on the do it.

1	board. I would say that we are lacking member	`S
2	right now. I mean, we have because what yo	u
3	have to have is a quorum. You have to have or	ıe
4	over half to be able to conduct this meeting.	
5	So today, with our two who were good enough to)
6	call in, and the two that are here, we just	
7	made our quorum. If we didn't have that	
8	quorum, and, you know, these are a lot of	
9	people in you know, these are professionals	;
10	that own their own businesses and do what they	7
11	need to do throughout the course of the day.	
12	It's not if there is a family emergency or	
13	things, it's realistic to expect that they	
14	can't always physically come to this or call	
15	in. I'm saying that because if you happen to	
16	know somebody or be personally interested in	
17	serving on this board, consider reaching out t	0.
18	your local congressman or senator and say, hey	, ,
19	I understand there's some vacancies on the	
20	Athletic Commission board; I'd be interested i	.n
21	potentially serving, what do we do? That's no	t
22	something that we can initiate. I can't say	
23	Don Steele should be on this board, let's get	
24	him. It's not that way. That has to come fro	m
25	powers beyond ourselves, if that makes sense.	

1 So like I say, again, if you personally 2 potentially have an interest in being on this 3 board or you know folks that you think would 4 serve well and serve the fighting community in 5 the state, reach out to your local 6 representatives, voice that, and see if they 7 can help kind of start the path to you or someone you know getting up here too. Because 8 9 we need -- we're kind of -- I don't mean to say 10 this in a derogatory form towards the rest of 11 LLR, but if you think about it, we're kind of 12 in a way a stepchild. I mean, we're not a 13 large -- I own a real estate brokerage. 14 Real Estate Commission is a big board. I know 15 counsel sits on this board and Nursing, and 16 what was the other one? 17 MR. HORNER: Dental. 18 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Dental. I mean, those are large 19 industries. And so, it's not that it's not 20 important to the state, it's that we need 21 people who it is important to, like yourselves, 22 to reach out so you can be a part of it. Does 23 that make sense? So I just wanted to pass that 2.4 on and put a bug in your ear to pass that bug 25 into other people's ear. You know, if fighting

1 -- although from a big-picture fiscal 2 perspective, maybe the Athletic Commission is a 3 small board in the LLR realm, to the people 4 that are sitting out here right now it's the 5 most important thing in your world, or one of 6 them. And so find ways to get involved and 7 push that issue. It's appreciated. Love to see some of y'all up here. All right. 8 9 ends Chairperson's Remarks. That being said, 10 the next thing we have is Administrator's 11 Remarks. Mr. Eric Thompson, what have you got 12 for us today? 13 MR. THOMPSON: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair, board 14 members. The first thing I want to talk about 15 is we've got a couple of events that are coming 16 March 2nd we have an MMA event that's 17 coming up in Greenville, South Carolina. will be the 864 Production. 18 So we have that 19 Also, on March 30th we have a boxing event. 20 event that will be here in Columbia at Jamil 21 That will be the Stokes Production. Temple. 22 So those are two events that we know of that 23 are on tap right now as far as events, upcoming

events. As you can see in the budget, we have

the December budget, which is the last quarter.

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

The beginning balance of course was \$438,570 in the red. We took in a total of \$81,221.27. had direct expenditures of \$31,716.33. Leaving us with a net of \$49,504.94. Which means our year-to-end balance is still \$389,065.53 in the red. So we're chipping at it slowly. But thanks to some of the fees that we have waived internally, we're able to maintain a net. that's our budget. Also, Charlie should have reached out to all of the commission members. We should have everybody complete their statement of economic interest. That should be in before March. I think that we sent an email out to all the board members. So we encourage everybody to make sure that they get that turned in. I would like to introduce to some -- we have a new administrative assistant who came up, and she's partially being paid by Athletic. It's Ms. Renee Young. Renee is here today. This is her first meeting. She will be assisting with some of the licensing practices, also assisting with some of the areas of Athletics, so I wanted to kind of introduce her here. Normally I would give you some numbers on licensing. Our internal system, because

we're a small board, obviously do not trigger over like some of the larger boards. And so those numbers would be a little bit skewed. We know everybody's license ends on December 31st. We have had some folks that are licensed since. But those numbers that I have include all of the numbers from '18 and '19, and I don't want to present those to you because they would not be accurate. Charlie has reached out to our IT folks to make sure that we get an accurate number. Hopefully by the next board meeting we'll have that fixed and we should be able to give you some accurate numbers on the amount of licensees that we have with the various licenses.

CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent.

MR. THOMPSON: In terms of reports, we've had an uptake this year so far with a couple of issues with unlicensed practicing in the wrestling sport. So we've had a couple of visits that we've made, some visits to a couple of shows.

But that's kind of been the only uptake we've had. That's the only sport that we've had so far this year that's been active. I would also just recommend, based on some of the history,

1 that we take a look at maybe creating a task 2 force to kind of review some of our regulations and statues in the near future. I think that 3 4 we've had a couple of questions that have come 5 up from the various sports, from MMA to boxing, 6 and we've even had some questions about Muay Thai. 7 So I think that this is a good 8 opportunity for us to take a look at maybe 9 updating or drilling down some of the 10 regulations and statues. I think a task force 11 would be the way to go. I would solicit maybe 12 some members from the industry, as well as some 13 board members or commission members, to kind of 14 take a look at those items. Aside from that, 15 that concludes my administrative remarks. 16 we will just now get some of the updates and 17 reports from the other areas. So we'll have 18 the OIE report from Rodney Pigford. 19 MR. PIGFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. 20 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Rodney, may I for one second? 21 MR. PIGFORD: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: When you had mentioned upcoming 23 events, you had mentioned about MMA and you had 24 mentioned about boxing. I know -- what's going 25 on with regard to wrestling just off the top of

1	your head? You may not have numbers as far as
2	the smaller promotions, but WWE and anything
3	else that you may know?
4	MR. THOMPSON: Well, we do have WWE that's coming the
5	23rd the 23rd of this month will be coming
6	through Columbia.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
8	MR. THOMPSON: I believe that before Columbia there is
9	a stop in
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Charleston?
11	MR. THOMPSON: They've been to Charleston.
12	MR. STEELE: They're in Greenville the following
13	night.
14	MR. MARTIN: And Greenville the following night, yeah.
15	So Monday night or Sunday night will be in
16	Greenville. They've been to Charleston earlier
17	in the year.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
19	MR. MARTIN: But that's the only two on deck for them.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
21	MR. ESTRIDGE: I'm sorry, I don't mean to
22	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: No, no, that's fine.
23	MR. ESTRIDGE: I have a quick question just because
24	I'm sure you've got it there. You mentioned
25	the MMA and the boxing, the dates on that again

1 in March? MR. THOMPSON: March 2nd would be the MMA event that's 2 in Greenville at the Shrine Temple. 3 4 MR. ESTRIDGE: Okay. 5 MR. THOMPSON: And then March 30th would be a boxing 6 event at the Jamil Temple here in Columbia. 7 MR. ESTRIDGE: Okay. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Sorry for the interruption. 8 9 Thank you. 10 MR. PIGFORD: No problem, sir. The OIE report for 11 today, February 12th, 2019, it reflects cases 12 received from January 1st, 2018, to February 7, 13 2019. We have one closed case, we have one do-14 not-open case, three cases pending board 15 action, one case pending complaint analyst 16 review, and one case pending further 17 information, for a total of seven cases. 18 the OIE report I also included on down below 19 some of the alleged allegations that the 20 complaints fall under. Was just allowing 21 unlicenced persons to practice, fraud in 22 obtaining license and unlicensed practice, and 23 then professional conduct. If there is no 2.4 questions pertaining to the OIE report, we can 25 proceed to the IRC report.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I have a question in general,
2	and it's more for my own education, as well as
3	other board members, as well as everybody else
4	that's present today. When we get this report
5	from yourself, speaking in generalities,
6	basically what happened is in one form or
7	another there has been a complaint or there has
8	been at least a suggestion of something
9	incorrect that's been reported. It doesn't
10	come to us on the board; you're basically the
11	dam between us and that complaint. We only
12	hear of that complaint if there is if it's
13	deemed necessary through this entity; am I
14	correct?
15	MR. PIGFORD: You are correct.
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So when you give terms like
17	"it's closed" or "do not open," can you define
18	those?
19	MR. PIGFORD: I can.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: What does that mean?
21	MR. PIGFORD: And I can also offer you guys a
22	presentation at one of your future board a
23	presentation on investigation process which
24	details how complaints come in and how we
25	handle the complaint and how we investigate it.

1 Which all ties in to your OIE report. 2 complaint is called in and the complaint analyst -- he reviews, he or she reviews the 3 4 complaint and sees a couple of things. first if we have jurisdiction. If we don't 5 6 have jurisdiction, then it falls in that do-7 not-open case. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. 8 9 MR. PIGFORD: The second thing, we make sure that we 10 have enough evidence to proceed, that the 11 violations does fall under your practice act. 12 If that's the case, then we will go ahead and 13 proceed and say, okay, open this case, and it 14 will then be assigned to an investigator to 15 conduct the investigation. 16 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. And just, what would be a 17 hypothetical non-real-world specific case 18 example of something that would not be under 19 our jurisdiction? Like, what's something that 20 could happen that could be complained at as a do-not-open, that is --21 22 MR. PIGFORD: A do-not-open case, if someone 23 complained that they went to an event and it deals with refunds or money issues. 2.4 25 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.

1 MR. PIGFORD: That could be a do-not-open case because 2 that's basically a civil issue, if someone said well, I didn't get paid and I participated, I 3 4 went to this event and didn't get paid. that's a civil issue, that's a money issue, 5 6 that's a do-not-open case. 7 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Okay. MR. PIGFORD: And if a complaint call comes in that 8 9 does not fall under your practice act, that 10 will also be a do-not-open case. 11 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Thank you for that clarification. 12 13 MR. THOMPSON: An example of that would be any event 14 that occurs on a military institution and they 15 complain because we're the commission, thinking 16 we have jurisdiction on a federal -- which we 17 don't, that would count as one of those as 18 well. 19 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Thank you. 20 MR. PIGFORD: And to go further, if you would like, I 21 will get with your administrator, Mr. Eric 22 Thompson, to see, at one of your future board 23 meetings, where you guys would like to hear an 2.4 investigative process presentation to give you 25 more details on the process, the ODC, the

1	disciplinary process as well.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Understood. Thank you.
3	MR. PIGFORD: You're welcome. Moving to your IRC
4	report. This report is presented to you for
5	your approval. Today we have a total of three
6	cases I want to present to you for your
7	approval for dismissal. So at this point the
8	ODC has the case numbers and probably a little
9	maybe the information of who the complainant
10	was. If you'd like, if you have any questions,
11	you can ask me questions about the case, we can
12	explain, and then you guys can vote on why the
13	IRC committee decided give a dismissal.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Understood. At this point is
15	there anybody on the board who has a motion
16	with regard to approving this IRC report or
17	not? Basically what we need is a motion to
18	approve or not.
19	MR. ESTRIDGE: That's what I was wondering, if we
20	(unintelligible).
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Stereotypically we
22	historically we have always approved.
23	MR. ESTRIDGE: So we just yeah, because these I
24	mean, we're going with this as a then Mack
25	Estridge will make a move that we dismiss those

1	charges.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So we're actually we're
3	making a motion to that we approve the IRC.
4	MR. ESTRIDGE: Approve the dismissal of those charges.
5	I'm sorry.
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Don't be sorry. Thank you. Is
7	there a second?
8	DR. KENNEMORE: This is Hamp. I second that motion.
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Thank you, Hamp.
10	All in favor say aye?
11	COMMISSION: Aye.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
13	COMMISSION: (No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: The motion is passed and the IRC
15	report is approved.
16	MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Along those lines, since the IRC
17	report we dismissed those cases, there is no
18	report from the ODC, which is the Office of
19	Disciplinary Counsel. So had there been a case
20	where we had to bring it before this
21	commission, then we would have to. But because
22	we dismissed those, there is no report from the
23	ODC.
24	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Understood. Thank you.
25	MR. PIGFORD: Thank you, sir.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you for your time. I
2	believe so a while back we started this
3	thing where every meeting we would have what we
4	call State of the Sport, which I really enjoy.
5	So basically we staff is kind enough to
6	invite somebody out each time from within the
7	state's fighting community to speak on
8	different topics. We've had referees, we've
9	had fight doctors. Dr. John Lucas came. I
10	believe today we have, let's see, Mr. Robert
11	Keller, who's a wrestling promoter.
12	MR. KELLER: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And we'd love to hear from you.
14	So if you would, come on up, identify yourself
15	for the record, have a seat or stand, wherever
16	you're more comfortable, and anything that you
17	have to say or share is
18	MR. KELLER: I kind of wish your investigator wouldn't
19	have left because I've got something I'd like
20	to talk about with him.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Well, share it.
22	MR. KELLER: Absolutely. My name is Robert Keller,
23	I'm a promoter with Midlands Championship
24	Wrestling based here out of Columbia. We run
25	shows in St. Matthews. We also promote with

1 other promoters throughout the state, 2 throughout North Carolina and South Carolina as well. A few things that I'd like to talk 3 about: First of all, I'd like to -- where you 4 5 I didn't leave when you got here. qoinq? 6 Charlie Martin has done an exceptional job over 7 previous folks that have been in that job. Glenn Frick was another one that done an 8 amazing job with this, but Charlie has really 9 10 turned around as far as paperwork and the 11 licensing. I handle a lot of my guys, I bring 12 their stuff in, and within a couple of days 13 they've got their stuff in the mail, to where 14 in the past it was a couple of weeks we were 15 even still trying to make sure that they were 16 licensed. I just wanted to point out to the 17 board that Charlie has done an exceptional job 18 19 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. 20 MR. KELLER: -- getting things like that taken care 21 of, and we'd like to commend him for that. 22

of, and we'd like to commend him for that. One of the other things that I'd like to address is how the complaints are handled. Last year, I believe it was in August, someone filed an online complaint, but they filed it under my

23

2.4

25

1	name. And under my former company's email
2	address. The only way I found out about this
3	is the fact that they did not present enough
4	evidence and I got a letter from the commission
5	stating that my complaint was going to be
6	closed because it did not have enough evidence.
7	Like I said though, the only problem was I
8	never filed a complaint. So what I would like
9	to present to the board is a changing of how
10	that is done. Eliminate the anonymous
11	complaints and that they either have to be made
12	in person, where they have to show an ID of who
13	they are, or if they're out of the area, you
14	fill out a form and have it notarized as we
15	have to have certain forms notarized to show
16	that that person is who they say they are.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Can you pause one second?
18	MR. KELLER: Yeah, absolutely.
19	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: What's the logistical reality of
20	that?
21	MR. THOMPSON: The agency already has a policy of how
22	complaints are handled, and that would take
23	that would probably take some act of someone
24	much higher than this commission to change
25	that.

1 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So that's an LLR level thing? 2 Can we at least bring it to their -- what's up, counsel? 3 MR. HORNER: It is an LLR level thing, and I think the 4 5 idea is of course that we'd rather -- we'd 6 rather be over-inclusive with the complaints than under-inclusive so that someone doesn't 7 fear retribution. Obviously, submitting 8 9 complaints under somebody else's name is not 10 what's supposed to happen. But I think 11 generally the idea is to allow anonymous 12 complaints in the hopes that people aren't 13 scared off by the process and don't file them 14 for fear of retribution or something like that, 15 and some illegal practice is still going on out 16 there that we need to prevent for the safety of 17 the participants or the public. Obviously, I -18 - typically what happens is there is someone 19 who gets interviewed as part of the initial 20 complaint process, and that's sort of where the 21 first stage of legitimacy is established. 22 people do leave names. They do allow contact 23 to be made. There are cases where they will 2.4 just submit documents and the documents speak 25 for themselves. And the complaint process

1	could take off that way without involving the
2	complainant, who may not know anymore than
3	what's in a newspaper article or something of
4	that. We can certainly discuss it with the
5	higher-ups at LLR, particularly if it becomes
6	an abusive process. I think they would look
7	into trying to streamline that or narrow that
8	and focus on who is making the complaints.
9	Generally, though, at this point I think LLR
10	feels the abuse level is very low and the
11	potential to be gained out of it is fairly high
12	and so
13	MR. KELLER: Excuse me, may I interrupt you for just a
14	second?
15	MR. HORNER: Sure, absolutely.
16	MR. KELLER: How do you feel it's low, because nobody
17	knew that it was made a false complaint was
18	made in my name until I made you aware of it?
19	So how many other complaints out there are like
20	that?
21	MR. HORNER: Well, and I agree with you
22	MR. ESTRIDGE: It was made via your email?
23	MR. KELLER: I'm sorry?
24	MR. ESTRIDGE: It was made via your email?
25	MR. KELLER: No, sir, it was not made via our email.

1	It was made through another email address, but
2	they left my email as a contact. And I knew
3	that it wasn't from one of myself or one of
4	my partners because we don't use that email
5	address.
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: It would seem, not trying to be
7	evasive
8	MR. KELLER: No, absolutely.
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: because what you're saying is
10	I would be pretty jacked if that happened to
11	me, especially in my business.
12	MR. KELLER: Right.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: That being said, if you're
14	looking at LLR, which oversees the nursing
15	commission, the medical
16	MR. KELLER: Absolutely. I understand.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: commission, it's their
18	policy. So we will it would seem to me just
19	as a layman that there would be some type of
20	verification process that this is real.
21	MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think it would vet out through
22	the investigation.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But in this case it didn't.
24	MR. KELLER: Well, and the thing of it, how much time
25	is wasted with your investigators looking up

1	things that are people just being petty or
2	being so-to-speak keyboard tough guys? You
3	know, there and it's unfortunate. I don't
4	know if it happens in other entertainment
5	businesses or fighting communities. But I also
6	own a karaoke and DJ business. Small
7	businesses, for whatever reason, are very
8	petty. Some people don't stay in their own
9	yard, so to speak. They are more they think
10	they are going to help themselves by trying to
11	damage other people rather than promote what is
12	good for them. If you understand what I'm
13	saying. Rather than saying, hey, this is what
14	we've got and how great we're doing, we're
15	going to tell you how bad somebody else is
16	doing to try to make ourselves look better.
17	MR. THOMPSON: Well, I can attest to that. When you
18	asked the question of how often it happens, I
19	oversee ten other boards and I can tell you in
20	the cosmetology world it happens every day. In
21	the barber world it happens every day.
22	MR. KELLER: Right.
23	MR. THOMPSON: So you're not unique in your complaint.
24	MR. KELLER: So if somebody has the hair on their back
25	to write a complaint if they've got the hair

1	on their back to write a complaint, they should
2	be able to stand up and say, yeah, I made this
3	complaint. The constitution says I have the
4	right to face my accuser. If somebody is
5	writing a complaint about me, I should be able
6	to be able to say, no, this isn't what
7	happened. If I have a question about something
8	that somebody has done, I will call Charlie
9	directly and say, this is how this is seen, is
10	this what happened? Rather than
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Let me
12	MR. THOMPSON: And that's where, like the cases you
13	had just a few minutes ago that were dismissed,
14	some of what you're saying is the same thing.
15	They went through the investigative process and
16	it was determined that it either didn't happen
17	or it was
18	MR. KELLER: And you also said your budget is in the
19	red. How much money and time could be saved by
20	not going through cases that are garbage like
21	that?
22	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Eric, let me stop for a second.
23	MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Just on on that point. I
25	mean, that is an LLR level thing.

1	MR. KELLER: Right.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So, once again, I'm not making
3	little of it. If it was me I'd be, like I say,
4	not happy at all about it too.
5	MR. KELLER: Right.
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But do recognize that at a board
7	level, our ability to impact any change on that
8	is negligible at best.
9	MR. KELLER: Right.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: We will let LLR know that this
11	is something that has been raised. And I would
12	encourage you to badger LLR about this
13	specifically. However, our intent for having -
14	- and I want to hear complaints. That's what
15	we're here for.
16	MR. KELLER: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But that one is one we can't do
18	much about.
19	MR. KELLER: But at least it's heard, and you can
20	you can get
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: One second, sir. Sir, one
22	second please. The reason that we've asked you
23	to come today is, respectfully, we want to hear
24	how specifically we can better impact the
25	wrestling world. The complaint world is

1 legitimate, but it's a little bit out of our 2 That doesn't mean we're going to bypass realm. 3 it when you say something. But how can we as a 4 commission better improve what we're doing in 5 your world of wrestling? 6 MR. KELLER: That brings me to my next -- next thing. 7 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. MR. KELLER: Unfortunately, we live in a world that's 8 9 not perfect. And it has been brought to our 10 attention that some people can't behave themselves and have wound up on a sexual 11 12 offenders list. I'm going to recommend that 13 this board require a background check for 14 anybody getting a professional wrestling 15 license, as they do for me to have a promoters 16 license; I'm required to have a background 17 check that goes ten years. I feel that every 18 person that gets a wrestling license or is 19 involved in the wrestling business should also 20 be required to have that same background check. 21 The website is very vague as far as licensing 22 look-up. Charlie and I have discussed this in the past. It gives you people's real name. 23 For the first seven years that I lived in this 2.4 25 state, I promoted wrestling events but I used

1	my my now ex-wife's name. She was actually
2	listed as the promoter, I wasn't, because I
3	didn't want people to know my real name, you
4	know, because of the persona that I put on in a
5	wrestling ring, you know, so. And there are a
6	lot of people out there still like that. I
7	know them under the wrestling name, I don't
8	know them by their real name. You know, I'll
9	get a license number and I'll check it with
10	Charlie, "They're good," you know, so. But
11	there are so many people out there that it's
12	hard for us at our level to be able to do
13	background checks. So I think each person
14	should be responsible for their own background
15	check. You know, if I had to check every
16	wrestler at \$25 a head, I wouldn't be able to
17	be in business.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Your point is duly noted. What
19	else you got, sir?
20	MR. KELLER: That is pretty much it.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: How is your promotion doing?
22	How often are you running stuff in the state?
23	MR. KELLER: We're running once a month. We're about
24	to have our third event as far as Midlands
25	Championship Wrestling.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
2	MR. KELLER: And so far it seems like we're doing
3	pretty good. One of our fans is actually here
4	today. He could probably tell you more about
5	it. He's seen more of the wrestling matches
6	that we've put on than I have.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Do you go do you go to
8	here is a good question for you, sir. So you
9	mentioned from the get-go that you hold
10	wrestling events in South Carolina and North
11	Carolina.
12	MR. KELLER: I help with other promotions, yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So in the logistics of managing
14	those events within the different states, is
15	there anything that you see in the nuts and
16	bolts, I'm not talking about at LLR level
17	MR. KELLER: Right.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But in the nuts and bolts of
19	applying for licensing or how the event is
20	held, is there anything that you see in these
21	other states that they're doing in a way that
22	might better benefit if it was done here? On
23	the commission level?
24	MR. KELLER: North Carolina has no commission.
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Well, that's easy.

1	MR. KELLER: And in Georgia also the promoters are
2	required to pay a licensing fee, but there is
3	no license commission as far as wrestlers
4	having a licenses or anything like that.
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
6	MR. KELLER: The only states - Kentucky, Virginia,
7	West Virginia, Maryland or excuse me, West
8	Virginia doesn't. Virginia, Maryland,
9	Kentucky, South Carolina, New York, I believe
10	New Jersey, are the states that require
11	licenses.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
13	MR. KELLER: And Philadel or Pennsylvania does, but
14	only for promoters, not wrestlers.
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
16	MR. STEELE: And Louisiana.
17	MR. KELLER: And Louisiana, yes, sir.
18	MR. ESTRIDGE: We're way ahead of the curve.
19	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: What's that?
20	MR. ESTRIDGE: So we'd be way ahead of the curve.
21	MR. KELLER: As far as commission, yeah, you're right
22	out in front.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And did you since he's back
24	in, did you want to restate all the complaints
25	you had against Charlie?

1	MR. KELLER: I have not got the first complaint about
2	Charlie Martin in the world. He's as I said
3	before, you know, he has been a vast
4	improvement. We won't mention the previous
5	person that did that, but she did a horrible
6	job. So we'll just leave it at that. Charlie
7	has been a ray of sunshine in this position.
8	Didn't think anybody could replace Glenn Frick,
9	but he at least smiles. Charlie at least
10	smiles.
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Sir, we thank you
12	for joining us.
13	MR. KELLER: Thank you. I appreciate y'all having me,
14	and I appreciate you all hearing what I had to
15	say.
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you. Excellent. All
17	right. So the next topic that we have on the
18	agenda with the with Mr. Derek Shoemake
19	leaving us for a position that he has accepted
20	with regard to his legal practice, we now have
21	a vacancy in our vice chair position. So the
22	way that is normally resolved is, I, as the
23	chair, will ask our attending, including those
24	on the line, if they have a nomination,
25	somebody that they would like to nominate for

1	vice chair. That can include themself. So
2	someone will make a hypothetical nomination,
3	and following that there will be see if
4	anybody else is nominated. If there are none
5	others, we will see if there is a second on
6	that initial nomination. Then we'll all vote,
7	and that's that. So one way or another,
8	between Hamp and Dillon and Mack, are there any
9	nominations that any of you would wish to make
10	for the vacant vice chair position?
11	MR. KENNEMORE: Can we nominate Derek to come back?
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: We could, but I don't think that
13	much would happen with that unfortunately.
14	Derek was a great guy and it was wonderful to
15	have him, but we all must depart sometime. So
16	here we are. Apparently crickets.
17	MR. KENNEMORE: I nominate Mack Estridge.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And who was that speaking? Can
19	you identify yourself?
20	MR. KENNEMORE: This is Hamp. I nominate Mack.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. We have a nomination
22	for Mack. Are there any other nominations on
23	the table? Is there a second with regard to
24	before we go any further, if there is a we
25	will table second. Is that a position that you

1	are willing to step into?
2	MR. ESTRIDGE: I think so, as long as you double my
3	pay.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Well, zero times
5	two. Congratulations. Is there a second with
6	regard to the nomination of Mr. Mack Estridge
7	for the vice chair position of the state
8	athletic commission?
9	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon, I'll second it.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Very well. All in
11	MR. ESTRIDGE: It's a close call.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: It is a close call. All in
13	favor say aye?
14	COMMISSION: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
16	COMMISSION: (No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: The motion is passed, and Mr.
18	Mack Estridge is now the vice chair of the
19	state athletic commission. Congratulations,
20	Mack.
21	MR. ESTRIDGE: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Mack has been on the board for,
23	goodness, four years now, -ish?
24	MR. ESTRIDGE: I think so, -ish.
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And has been a great asset and a

1	great person that often I will call with
2	questions about this and that and get opinions,
3	so nothing really changes on that. I
4	appreciate it. So thank you, sir. All right.
5	Great. So we've got a vice chair, yay! The
6	next thing we have to talk about is bare-
7	knuckle boxing. So well, I won't steal any
8	thunder from anyone who's getting ready to
9	speak, but we have Mr. Nate Shook. What
10	exactly is your relationship to this realm of
11	bare-knuckle boxing?
12	MR. SHOOK: Sir, thank you for having me.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yeah.
14	MR. SHOOK: Again, my name is Nathan Shook. I work for
15	Bare Knuckle Fighting Championships. We are
16	the first company that has promoted legal,
17	sanctioned and regulated bare-knuckle boxing
18	events. We're on our we just completed our
19	fourth event, and we've been in three different
20	locations. So just to talk a little bit about
21	bare-knuckle fighting
22	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: May I interrupt for one more
23	second?
24	MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir.
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: For those of us that are new or

whatever, just so you know, Mr. Shook came and presented this to us multiple times over the last couple of years. There were some factors we needed to consider and some other ongoing things. But invited him back to come speak again. I think you've got some things off the ground, and maybe we'll test drive some stuff. And we'd just love to hear about your growth and everything you've got and what's -- not just growth from a physical perspective, but hurdles that you've seen, pros and cons. I know you've got stuff prepared.

MR. SHOOK: Yes.

2.4

CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But really curious about seeing what's happened from the idea of inception to the reality and some things you've had to go through, and just anything you want to share, we'd love to hear it.

MR. SHOOK: That's great. So last time I was here it was 2017. And in 2017 we had the idea. We spoke with doctors and neurologists, and everyone said bare-knuckle boxing is safer than boxing and mixed martial arts. We had no proof from our promotions because we weren't able to do an event, but we had a bunch of specialists

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

and professionals that said this is a safer sport. So after going through multiple states, talking to them, Wyoming actually allowed us to do the first ever legal, sanctioned and regulated bare-knuckle boxing event in history. This happened on June 2nd, 2018. We had a little over 2100 people live in attendance. The event was so popular that we were the number two topic in Twitter in the world. the only thing that beat us out was, hockey was going on at the time and they got a little bit more attention. But considering everything going on the world, there was so much interest in it that we were number two on Twitter. So I think that's pretty huge. The promoter of it and the founder of Bare Knuckle Fighting Championship is an MMA promoter by the name of David Feldman. David's dad was a world class boxing trainer. David was a professional boxer himself. His brother was a professional boxer as well. David promoted over 300 boxing and mixed martial arts events. So he wasn't unfamiliar with combat sports by any means. His events have been on Fox, Fox Sports, ESPN and Pay-Per-View. So not only has he done

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

local shows, but he's done larger shows. he came up with this idea, he did one fight at the Ft. McDowell Indian Reservation on August 5th, 2011. One bout sold the arena out, 5000 people. It was a huge success. From then he knew he had something special. Our sport is different than professional boxing. First, there is no gloves. It's truly -- the knuckles are truly bare. The members wrap their wrists and they wrap the back of their hands. That's They use gauze and one layer of tape. it. And it goes up to about a finger to two fingers away from the top of the knuckle. Secondly, our rounds are two minutes long. We do five rounds. So it doesn't matter if it's a championship fight or a non-championship fight, every round is -- every fight is five rounds, two minutes each. Our fighting platform, if you've seen it, it's a 30-foot square with circular ring. Our ring is custom made so, without going into all the padded stuff, we have four, what we call ropes; they are made out of metal. The metal is covered with a protective material. The second rope is hinged a certain way so it can be lifted up so people

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can get in and out. The bottom rope is hinged so should a fighter fall and hit the rope, it gives and actually goes all the way down to the For our events we provide the cut men. We have three cut men. We have two doctors, one ringside and one in the back. Our last show we just did, two weeks ago in Cancun, we provided three doctors. We have one in each back corner, one ringside. Three cut men, two referees: Bill Clancy, world class referee in boxing, Big Dan Miragliotta, world class referee in MMA. We also brought in Stitch Duran as one of our cut men. He's done all of our events so far. One of the concerns of our people is the fact that hearing about a bare fist punching someone upside the head sounds dangerous. But statistically speaking, the force is less. When a person punches someone without a glove, they typically punch less hard. In a hundred years of bare-knuckle boxing here in the United States there was no reported fatalities. Boxing averages three to four deaths a year here in the United States. Nearly 15 percent of professional boxers report some sort of brain trauma. I have 12 pages of

1 our -- every single fight that's ever fought 2 for us and the injury report off of it. 3 94 competitors. We've had two broken fingers, 4 two broken hands, one broken nose. Now, we do 5 Everyone says, oh, well, using a get cuts. 6 bare fist you're going to get cuts. 7 But our fighters grease, just like other combat 8 In addition to that, we have our --9 our cut men applies the grease to the members 10 so it's applied properly. So going back to the 11 lacerations, when you have a leather glove, the 12 leather glove is a larger surface than a boxing 13 fist -- or than a closed fist, I should say. 14 With that, the leather on the glove, when it 15 makes contact with the skin, it grabs it and as 16 it goes across it and as the person falls with 17 the punch, a lot of times it twists the skin, 18 causing tears and deep lacerations. We don't 19 have that in bare-knuckle boxing. If you look at all of our cuts, they're superficial. 20 21 They're smaller, they're thinner, and they're 22 not as deep, requiring less stitches or just a 23 suture done. And the long term effects of it 2.4 are a lot less than with a glove. Also --25 DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon.

1 MR. SHOOK: Yes. DR. VAUGHT: May I just ask you a real quick question? 2 MR. SHOOK: Yes. 3 4 DR. VAUGHT: I don't want to distract you, I just 5 don't want to forget my question. Are there 6 any in your, I believe you said 96 fights or 7 participants, have there been any reports of eye injuries? 8 9 MR. SHOOK: There have not. 10 DR. VAUGHT: Okay. 11 MR. SHOOK: I have every single injury report from all 12 four events, and we have not had one eye 13 injury. Recently we had a fighter who had a 14 hard weight cut, and he went to the hospital 15 afterward for -- after his fight for 16 dehydration. It was down in Mexico. We drank 17 the water. Even after reading the sheet saying 18 do not drink the water, a lot of us ended up 19 drinking the water at the hotel. But I have 20 every single injury report, and I have 12 pages 21 that I'd be more than happy to share with you. 22 We're not trying to hide anything. The thing 23 with this is, Low (ph.) Sports, I believe it 24 is, did a study showing that -- they did a 25 When someone punched -- they took punch meter.

1 a combatant sport and they had the person 2 punch, kick and knee a punch meter. With an 3 un-gloved punch he hit at 326 pounds. With a 4 glove on, he hit at 776 pounds. With a kick he 5 was up at 960 pounds. And with a knee, where 6 he got to pull the force down, it was at 1029 7 pounds. So a knee theoretically, going off the stats, is three times more forceful when 8 9 pulling the member down and kneeing them in the face compared to a bare-knuckle punch. Yes, 10 11 sir? 12 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Just so you know, Dillon, I'm 13 going to interject on that, I am in no way 14 necessarily advocating for this or against it 15 in any way, just making a personal opinion 16 observation: It's always been my opinion, based 17 on personal experience, that the fighting done 18 in a bare-knuckle scenario may have more visual 19 -- more visual damage, there's blood, there's 20 cuts and stuff like that, but it's much more of 21 a superficial nature than the long-term 22 pounding of a brain with a glove. Nothing 23 against traditional boxing. Any time you have two bodies have different forms of impact, 2.4 25 there's going to be hazard. But, you know,

1 there's a --2 DR. VAUGHT: Right. 3 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: -- there's a potentially 4 negative stigma associated with the concept of 5 bare-knuckle fighting, when if you look at what 6 we do in MMA, where they're throwing a bare 7 knee or a bare foot, I mean, it's really just another appendage that's being utilized. 8 9 so on a personal level I think it's more of a 10 stigma and appearance-based push back than it 11 is one based necessarily on tangible greater 12 damage than any other fighting sport. 13 that's just my thought on it in general. 14 DR. VAUGHT: Right. 15 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: You know, you can lose an eye 16 with a toe. And you can -- certain knees are -17 - knees and elbows, I mean, those are -- now 18 we're talking some pretty wicked weapons, so 19 just take that into general thought account as 20 we hear this discussion at least. 21 DR. VAUGHT: Yeah, my general -- and it could just be 22 bad timing at a -- I'm an eye doctor, and I had a 12-year-old that got in a fight at school and 23 2.4 punched in the eye, and a lot of stuff detached 25 and vision is pretty much done in that eye for

1 the rest of his life. And I know these are 2 trained people and it's just -- but, you know, it's hard for me to just kind of forget that 3 4 eye injuries happen and stuff. So I was just concerned and curious as to if you had any 5 6 documentation of anything like that. But I'm 7 happy to hear everything you've got to say about it. Thank you. This was Dillon Vaught. 8 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And, Dillon, when I was speaking 9 10 -- I'm going off on a slight tangent. But when 11 I was speaking earlier about people being on 12 the board and if you think you've got something 13 to potentially add, Dillon is a perfect example of that. Dillon may personally not have any 14 15 previous actual in-a-cage fighting experience, 16 but his knowledge as an eye doctor brings a 17 perspective that hadn't occurred to anybody 18 else sitting around this table or whatever. So 19 it's that mixed eclectic impact from different 20 people's voices that's important. So once 21 again, if you think you may want to be on this 22 board, please reach out to LLR. Sorry, Nate, 23 go ahead. MR. SHOOK: No, it's fine. But just touching on that, 2.4 25 like you said, a knee to the eye -- and we've

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

talked to people. I grew up in Pennsylvania, and it was not uncommon for males to get into scuffles, elementary, middle school, high school and whatnot. Those are untrained people throwing fists, and I don't know anyone that had serious injuries. Now we're taking professional athletes, and we hold ourselves to a higher standard. So our pro fighters that do bare-knuckle, they have at least three professional wins. And, at least for the first four fights, they haven't been coming off knockout or TKO losses. For us it's important not to take the untrained person off the street, like an off-the-street boxing match, and put him in there, in a bare-knuckle fight. We want to show this as high-level athletes that are taking interest from either mixed martial arts or boxing and come into this new sport -- and that's what it is, it's a sport that up until 1897 was the tradition. And then they put gloves on so members could hit harder, causing more knockouts so they didn't have these 75-round fights. So we're taking these high-level athletes and putting them into this new sport, and it's a little bit more fast-

1 So you do get a lot more punches. The paced. 2 punches -- and when you see the fighters interview, they'll say they don't hit as hard 3 4 as they possibly can; they hit more often and 5 with 40, 50, 60 percent. They do have more 6 I'm not going to dispute that. But 7 again, look at the cuts. They're smaller, thinner, less deep. They still bleed, but not 8 9 nearly as bad as, like I said, a knee or a 10 forehead or a forearm to the head. 11 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Can we discuss a little bit 12 about the thought that hypothetically some 13 might view that this is a bit of a side show? 14 It's my personal impression that this has taken 15 off a good bit. You've got some big names, 16 former UFC fighters. What's the -- what's the 17 reach and public -- I mean, you mentioned your 18 turn-out when the tournament started; was that 19 a flash in the pan, or have you continued to 20 grow? What's -- talk a little bit about how 21 the public is receiving this from a volume and 22 interest perspective. 23 MR. SHOOK: So from the fighter community I have over 2.4 2300 professionals fighters that reach out to 25 me that want to compete in this. Every single

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

event that we do, we get more UFC veterans and Bellator veterans reaching out to this saying I want to be a part of this new sport. Our last event down in Mexico, WBF sanctioned the fight. So we had -- the Latin America WBF title was on the line for that event. That was between Julian Lane and Leonard Garcia, two UFC veterans. We've had Kendall Grove, Bec Rawlings, Joe Graves, Chris "Lights Out" Lytle, who was I believe like 15-1 pro boxing, and he was top five, top 10 in UFC at 170 pounds. So we're drawing huge names competing in this. Now, from the fan standpoint, our first event, number two in the world on Twitter. Not even debatable. 2100 people in attendance, place was sold out. Cheyenne, Wyoming, at the Ice Our next event was in Biloxi. over 3200 people, live attendance. Our first show we had right around 2500, 2600 I believe. I'd have to double-check numbers on that. far as worldwide reach, we had one fight between Bec Rawlings and Britain Hart. Britain Hart is a professional boxer, doesn't have a huge names behind her except for maybe a little bit locally. She fought for us when we did the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Roy Jones-Bobby Gunn Pay-Per-View event up in Delaware. She fought on the under card, so not a lot of people knew of her. We posted that It got shared thousands of times, and the last time I checked there was over eight million views. One bout. Our commercials are averaging 1.4, 1.6 million views when we run our commercials on social media. Every time we put stuff out it gets shared hundreds, if not thousands, of times. We have a huge -millions of people see what we're doing and constantly reach out to us. We have fighters from Australia, Germany, Italy, every state. 14 This isn't -We bring in fighters from Hawaii. - and I'm not knocking anyone by any means, but we promoted mixed martial arts here in South Carolina in 2014. We had 4400 people in attendance. So I believe that's the largest mixed martial arts crowd for South Carolina too. For that event we used a lot of local fighters, and we brought some in from the neighboring states. We are getting people from all over the world saying please get me on one of your cards. And like I said, I mean, 2200, 2300 applicants, professionals. So -- yes,

1	sir?
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: You mentioned in your most
3	recent event which was in Mexico
4	MR. SHOOK: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: that had been sanctioned by
6	the WBF, have all of your events, or any of
7	your other events, been sanctioned by a
8	national- or international-level third party?
9	Like, your other ones like say for Wyoming,
10	for example, is there a third-party regulatory
11	body that's overseeing it, like the WBF?
12	MR. SHOOK: Yes. So the Bound Boxing Hall of Fame
13	oversees all of our events. So when I say WBF
14	oversaw it, they oversaw two of the fights.
15	The main and co-main fight, they sanctioned
16	those title belts.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Not the entire card?
18	MR. SHOOK: Correct. Not the entire card. We had the
19	a commission from Mexico that was there to
20	oversee it. They brought in official and
21	things of that nature, and then we had
22	officials that were licensed in Mississippi
23	that came on up and also or came on down,
24	and also was part of that event. Wyoming
25	oversaw theirs. They have a mixed martial arts

1 committee. They don't have a boxing 2 regulatory, I believe. So their mixed martial arts oversaw that. And then our next show, 3 4 April 6th, is in New Hampshire. 5 Hampshire will be the first ones up there doing 6 it as well. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Question: Now, because this is a 7 very new thing -- well, actually it's a very 8 9 old thing, but it's a new thing as we relate to 10 time over the last 50 years or so. These 11 fighters and whatnot that you've brought on, 12 Kendall Grove and whatnot --13 MR. SHOOK: Right. 14 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: -- these are, you know, big-name 15 professional MMA fighters and professional 16 boxers who are coming over to do this. Nothing 17 keeps them from continuing to also potentially 18 compete in their home sports so to speak. 19 does or does not their performance, or lack of 20 same, impact their record in those sports? So 21 for example, if I fight in a bare-knuckle 22 boxing event and I lose, does that impact, or 23 how does it not impact, my boxing record? 2.4 MR. SHOOK: It's a great question. It doesn't. 25 it's own sport. We have a lot of similarities

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

with boxing, but we're a different sport. rounds; boxing's four, six, eight, etcetera. Two-minute rounds. We're in a round instead of, you know, a square. And right now the only document -- records that we have is the Bare Knuckle Boxing Hall of Fame. So he comes down -- Mr. Burke comes down to each of our events and he documents the score cards, which is in the 12-page packet. He says who the winner is, who the person who didn't win is, and he registers -- or I should say it's registered, their injury report. So our big goal is to have a website or a place where people can go and look them up and check the fighters out. Because right now we have the Bare Knuckle Boxing Hall of Fame, who ranks everybody for us, who monitors our records. But let's say Kendall Grove, his last fight, he got knocked out by Marcel Stamps. Marcel Stamps is 3-0 or 4-0, I believe, in mixed martial arts. played at University of Alabama, played in the There are records. Now, one of the records reflects - in mixedmartialarts.com; it doesn't reflect in BoxRec - it is solely maintained by the Bare Knuckle Boxing Hall of

Fame out of New York.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So let me just put this forward for everybody's ear. I -- and I would defer to future executive session conversations with counsel and whatnot.

MR. SHOOK: Sure.

CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Once again, we're not here to decide anything today. What I -- here is my personal take on it. I appreciate staff giving this to me, because I looked it up earlier and didn't have it. But here is as a state how we define currently -- and there is no doubt that our regulations need tightened up. I mean, just across the board, all these things have been hodgepodged together over the years as new sports have evolved. However, the framework for changing that is years in the making. have proposed multiple, multiple, multiple changes in regulations through the results of multiple task forces and things like that over the four or five years I've been on the board. Not a single one has yet been enacted through the legislature or whatever. So while we wanted to do that and make those changes and are actively going to pursue that, for the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

moment we've got to dance with who asked us to the ball and work within our existing framework. So that being said, here is how we as a state currently define mixed martial arts. I have an eye infection going on that I'm getting over so it's hard for me to read. need Dillon Vaught here. Mixed martial arts means " an event or exhibition, or part thereof, where the contestants are compensated and allowed to use any variation or combination of combative sports or fighting skills, which may include, but are not limited to, boxing, wrestling, kickboxing, or martial arts." would say that if over discussion and time we as a state look at potentially doing something like this, I believe that we as a board could do so on the basis that it fits our definition under mixed martial arts. Now, taking that a step further, and I pulled this up earlier -the thing is that it also has to have some form of -- you know, since the ruling is different there's lots of -- there's lots of arenas, pun intended, where we have slight deviations in the application of our rules as they apply to what's going on. Like, you wouldn't be allowed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

take downs, for example, in this quasi MMA event should it be something that we actually consider. It could hypothetically be governed under MMA because it meets our definition of MMA, but because you're not allowed to kick or whatever, our regulations further -- this is Section 40-81-445, "mixed martial events; compliance with rules of professional organizations and sanctioned body." This is why I asked that one question. "The department and commission shall require that mixed martial art events comply with the rules of a recognized professional organization or sanctioning body." And it goes on after that. So, once again, I am not an attorney and this is something that we have not discussed collectively, but I believe from my layman's perspective that the regulations exist. should we decide to allow a trial run of something like this, I think that we can. However, I defer to guidance that we might receive from counsel at a later time. But I think it's possible, in much the same way that we attempted initially, and we did several trial runs of the two-person MMA, which was

1 going on at the time that we initially proposed 2 it, which is why we decided let's table this and discuss it and see how you've done. 3 4 did that. You went out, you did what we asked, 5 go out and try it elsewhere and see how it 6 goes. Now you're coming back to us. 7 MR. SHOOK: Sure. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So what I would propose, with 8 9 potential to staff, is that we consent and, 10 counsel, this may be over the course of the 11 next coming months, we look at our existing 12 regulations and see -- truly answer my - am I 13 correct, is this something that we could do? 14 And then at our upcoming board, next meeting, 15 we discuss yes or no, this is something that we 16 can do, and then following that we decide do we 17 want to. I think that's a prudent course of 18 events. Counsel, would you concur? 19 MR. HORNER: Yeah, I would agree with that. 20 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Nate, before we continue 21 to march. 22 MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. 23 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Mack, Vice Chair Estridge, do 2.4 you have anything you wish to ask of this 25 gentleman on the topic?

1	MR. ESTRIDGE: I don't believe so. I was just looking
2	at some of his information on his website. I
3	think we're good.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Dr. Kennemore or Dr.
5	Vaught, any input or further questions from
6	y'all?
7	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon Vaught. As far as just a
8	safety profile, are there other organizations
9	or are we saying that you guys are the only
10	bare knuckle boxing organization?
11	MR. SHOOK: So there are or, I should say, have
12	been at least two others that I'm aware of. We
13	were the first that I call it the trifecta.
14	We were legal, regulated and sanctioned. We
15	were the first ones ever to do that. Even in
16	the 1800s they didn't have that. There have
17	been two other promotions out there. The one
18	has been in the news recently for some stuff
19	going on that people can look up for
20	themselves. And the other one is very, very
21	small. I'm not sure of his status. But no one
22	is doing it at the level that we are. And
23	that's not to knock other promotions, but our
24	events, every single one has been televised
25	live on Pay-Per-View, on TV, and on internet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We've been garnering millions and millions of views as far as our free stuff that we have on Facebook, our teasers, our fights we've put on afterward, so I feel confident in saying that we are definitely the largest in the United States. And our fourth show, we went abroad. I'm not familiar with too many companies that do that. And we already have deals lined up in England, so we will be going over there this year. And like I said, New Hampshire opened We're there April 6th. So as more and more commissions are seeing it and seeing that the injuries are nowhere near what they were thinking and seeing how popular we're getting -- and we truly put a lot of money into these events. Our purses are higher than the average mixed martial arts or boxing purse on a local level, and the revenue generated is great. to touch on the state stuff because obviously I don't know everything that goes on with the revenue, but when we have televised events we're paying obviously a larger -- or more money in taxes than a small promotion doing 400 people at the local YMCA or something. that's not directed at anyone in particular by

1 any means; that's just, you know, normal facts of what we pay in comparison to everybody else. 2 3 DR. VAUGHT: Okay. I'll just be real quick with my 4 next two questions. Did you say you were in Wyoming was the other area where y'all did that 5 6 one fight? 7 MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. And we're going back there June It was just announced. 8 9 DR. VAUGHT: Okay. 10 MR. SHOOK: Our very first show is Wyoming. 11 DR. VAUGHT: And the -- do you have the names of the 12 other two organizations? 13 MR. SHOOK: The one --14 DR. VAUGHT: That do bare-knuckle boxing. MR. SHOOK: The one that did the last show that was in 15 16 the news --17 DR. VAUGHT: You don't have to tell me which one does 18 what, just the two names of them. 19 MR. SHOOK: All right. I believe the one is called 20 Who's Your Daddy. 21 DR. VAUGHT: Okay. 22 MR. SHOOK: And the other one I believe is WBKFF, 23 World Bare Knuckle Fighting Federation or 2.4 something. 25 DR. VAUGHT: WBKFF?

1 MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. 2 DR. VAUGHT: Okay. 3 MR. SHOOK: Sir, the accepted --4 DR. VAUGHT: Thank you. I just wanted to do a little 5 research between now and our next meeting as to 6 stuff. 7 MR. SHOOK: Yeah, and --DR. VAUGHT: All right. I appreciate it. That will 8 9 be the end of my questions. 10 MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. So the executive director out 11 there in Wyoming is going to be a Mr. Bryan 12 Pedersen, and then down in Mississippi is Mr. 13 John Lewis. Those are the two gentlemen that 14 oversaw their commissions, oversaw our last 15 events. And like I said, the other two bare 16 knuckle promotions, not talking down on them, 17 but I feel that we're just at a whole other 18 level with how we do our stuff. So if you look 19 up our stuff and look up theirs, it's kind of 20 night and day. And the rules are even 21 different because Wyoming allows -- it falls 22 underneath mixed martial arts. So they allowed 23 spinning back fists and things of that nature. We don't allow that. We allow traditional 2.4

boxing, strikes to the head and to the body.

25

1 Yes, sir? 2 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I think just an important point on what you just said, they allow spinning back 3 fists or whatever, that's the heart of the 4 5 question of whether or not there is a reputable 6 third-party sanctioning entity that already 7 exists that those rules would fall under, so that's the question. 8 9 MR. SHOOK: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So yeah, staff and counsel, if 11 we could just add that to the next agenda. And once again, the next agenda won't be voting on, 12 13 yes, we're going to allow this or not; it's a 14 more detailed discussion of the potential 15 logistical possibility of the regulations and, 16 if it was something that we were going to 17 allow, is it possible. That's all. And then 18 we go from there. Staff, do you have a point? 19 MR. THOMPSON: I have a few questions for Nate. 20 MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. 21 MR. THOMPSON: So you're saying y'all use your own 22 officials, or the commission provided the 23 officials? I think I heard you say something about you had two guys -- I couldn't --2.4 25 MR. SHOOK: Yes. So they are licensed within the

1	state. So Bill Clancy is a licensed referee
2	and Dan Miragliotta's a licensed referee, so
3	they're already licensed through a state. We
4	asked to continue using them right now. They
5	have been with us from the beginning. They
6	understand the sport very well. They have seen
7	it through every step, and they're both two of
8	the best in their respective sports. So that's
9	how we have been going forth for the first 40
10	bouts.
11	MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And the rules, right now is
12	there any official rules that are out there?
13	MR. SHOOK: Yes, I can provide those. Back in 2017 I
14	brought it. It's literally like 20 pages all
15	together. I'd be more than happy to email
16	that, injury reports, anything you'd like.
17	MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And licensing, do you guys have
18	to get licensed in those particular states?
19	MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. So we carry a promotion bond
20	just like boxing and mixed martial arts. We
21	require medicals the same, fighter trio, blood
22	work, physical. Some states, you know, might
23	require a dilated eye exam, kind of depending
24	on fighter age. We do have older fighters.
25	Like I say, Chris Lytle is still a phenomenal

1 athlete. He's over the 40 thing. So, you 2 know, if fighters were required over 40 to get 3 extra medicals, we would expect the same for 4 the sport. 5 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And the role that the commission 6 played was just basically there making sure 7 that you guys provided the medicals, had the doctors and had the cut men, and those kinds of 8 9 things in place? 10 MR. SHOOK: Yeah, so the commission's still an 11 integral part. I mean, we could have done this 12 on a location that didn't require a commission, 13 but that's not our company goal. Our company 14 goal is to be recognized as a legitimate sport, and in order to do that we need commissions on 15 16 So therefore, anything that -- weighboard. 17 ins are oversaw by the commission. 18

ins are oversaw by the commission. Medical, suspensions. You know, all those things, we still want to go through the commission for. We don't want to run our own event and have the commission just there to see it. If that was the case, I could do it on a military installation like that was brought up earlier by someone. It could be done on certain Indian reservations. We want South Carolina Athletic

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Commission as, you know, overseeing this event
2	and brining legitimacy to it.
3	MR. THOMPSON: That's all I have.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Anything else that
5	you need to add?
6	MR. SHOOK: No, sir. Thank you all for your time. I
7	really appreciate it.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Well, we appreciate it,
9	and congratulations on your success to date.
10	Very good.
11	MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. April 6th, live on Pay-Per-
12	View. Thank y'all.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So as both Eric, you said how
14	many different boards do you serve on?
15	MR. THOMPSON: Ten.
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: What's that? Ten?
17	MR. THOMPSON: Ten.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And you've got three, counsel,
19	you serve over? So being both newer to the
20	commission, I just would like to ask, is this
21	confirmed as the first time either of you have
22	had the phrase utilized, "who's your daddy?"
23	MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.
24	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Welcome to the Athletic
25	Commission. There you go. Yay!

1	MR. HORNER: At least in public.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: What's that?
3	MR. HORNER: At least in public.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: At least in public, so. I'll
5	just stop right there in a moment of rare
6	restraint.
7	(Off the record while Mr. Shook leaves the room.)
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. So the next item
9	that we have on the agenda is the topic of
10	professional boxing, standing eight count and
11	suspension, clarification of same. Staff, what
12	can you educate us I understand there is a
13	need for some clarification on this topic as we
14	as the state regulate it and what it should be,
15	so can you fill us in?
16	MR. THOMPSON: What brought this about is we've had at
17	least two boxing events here in the Columbia
18	area where the promoter have asked questions
19	about the standing eight count and the
20	instructions that were given during the rules
21	meeting. And at the last event we had the
22	rules meeting there was some instructions that
23	was given by the referee in regards to what the
24	unified rules were, and then there was some
25	I don't want to say disagreement, but there was

1	questions concerning the no-standing eight
2	count, mandatory eight count, and so at that
3	point I felt like the commission needed to
4	provide both the promoter and the referee with
5	some clarity as to what is acceptable, what is
6	not acceptable, things of that nature. And
7	I've asked both of them to be here. They are
8	both here, the referee and that promoter. And
9	so we just need to get some clarification on
10	what is acceptable and what is not acceptable
11	in terms of eight count, standing and
12	mandatory. I think that both have a little
13	history, and I think that they can provide more
14	history than I can.
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Before we get to the history, is
16	our regulation specific on this topic?
17	MR. THOMPSON: This is where counsel can speak, and I
18	will yield to counsel at this point.
19	MR. HORNER: Okay. Let me find it right quick.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
21	MR. HORNER: I marked it earlier.
22	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: One of the duties of vice chair
23	is during pauses, provide relaxing background
24	humming or singing, chanting if you would.
25	MR. ESTRIDGE: I'll spare you that.

1	MR. HORNER: So the regulation is 20-3.7, Compulsory
2	and Discretionary Eight Count. "A compulsory
3	count of eight must be taken by every boxer who
4	is knocked down by a punch, and he or she must
5	take the count whether reclining or standing."
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Compulsory meaning it must
7	happen?
8	MR. HORNER: It must happen.
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
10	MR. HORNER: Any time the fighter gets knocked down.
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
12	MR. HORNER: The next section, section two, "The
13	referee may declare a standing eight count at
14	any time."
15	DR. VAUGHT: Can you repeat the very first part?
16	MR. HORNER: Yes.
17	DR. VAUGHT: One more time for me. I'm sorry.
18	MR. HORNER: "A compulsory count of eight must be
19	taken by every boxer who is knocked down by a
20	punch, and he or she must take the count
21	whether reclining or standing."
22	DR. VAUGHT: Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And then the second part, "The
24	referee," and I'm paraphrasing, "may," and I'm
25	adding these words in addition to what's

1	"must," may have a standing eight count at his
2	discretion.
3	MR. HORNER: At his discretion.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: At his or her discretion. At
5	any point in the bout.
6	MR. HORNER: At any point.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. So that being said,
8	what's the question? Am I making the right
9	assumption that Mr. Don Steele and Andrew
10	Stokes are the two with the question about this
11	topic?
12	MR. STEELE: Yes. He's brought it to the attention.
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Both exemplary boxing
14	MR. STEELE: He's brought it to the attention.
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: It's fine. I mean, there is no
16	doubt that the two of you are both the tip of
17	the spear when it comes to boxing in the state
18	of South Carolina and knowledge and everything
19	else, so I mean, you're both here at every
20	meeting. You both participate. You're both
21	exemplary individuals. None of this is any
22	this is just to get clarification from the
23	state level. This is what it is. Mr. Stokes.
24	What's the question that needs verified?
25	MR. STOKES: Whether we're using unified rules or

1	we're going by regulations.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Now, my quick reading of
3	regulations, and counsel correct me if I'm
4	wrong on this, is that the third-party rules
5	go, they win, unless there is a conflict in
6	those; and in that case, the state rules apply.
7	Am I right in my general application of this,
8	on all things?
9	MR. HORNER: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. And our state ones are
11	this (indicating). You don't know what I'm
12	pointing at, but
13	MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. We use the unified, whatever the
14	latest version, which is the
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So we're using the unified
16	rules, but since there's a little bit of a
17	conflict, am I because I'm not making a
18	I'm not making an assumption, I'm just making
19	sure I have the facts right for all of us. The
20	unified rules say one thing, and it's a little
21	bit in dispute to what our regulations say.
22	And because that dispute exists, our
23	regulations win; is that
24	MR. HORNER: That's right.
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: That's right?

1	MR. HORNER: Correct.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Now, I don't know who's on what
3	side of the coin, don't even care. But of
4	course I care, but you know what I'm saying.
5	There is no this is just it: In that case, I
6	would say that this and we're going to talk
7	about it as a board, but my snapshot opinion is
8	that it's the regulations just quoted by
9	counsel. Mr. Stokes, what's your thoughts and
10	opinions now?
11	MR. STOKES: Well, two things: I think there should
12	be, there should be a change in our
13	regulations.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
15	MR. STOKES: So that we would come under our unified
16	rules.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Agreed.
18	MR. STOKES: And I don't think that takes legislative
19	change.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
21	MR. STOKES: That's something that might be able to be
22	voted on here today. And the second part is,
23	when he's given a briefing, when our referee is
24	giving a briefing, or whatever official is
25	giving a briefing to the soldiers, when you say

1	we're using the unified rules but I can give a
2	standing eight count anytime I want, then a lot
3	of confusion comes in with the fighters. They
4	don't know whether you're using unified or
5	we're going back most of them don't know
6	what the state regulations are.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
8	MR. STOKES: We haven't used the standing eight count
9	in boxing in over 20 years.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Now, define for us when you
11	say the standing eight count, is that the one
12	that's at the referee's discretion, or is that
13	
14	MR. STOKES: That's at the referee's discretion.
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And so
16	MR. STOKES: Not the mandatory.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So, to your knowledge, for
18	roughly two decades that hasn't been the norm
19	in application but it's still within our
20	regulations, but it goes against the unified
21	rules? Do I have that right?
22	MR. STOKES: Yes.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Okay.
24	MR. STOKES: Our regulations just haven't been
25	updated.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
2	MR. STOKES: And we haven't had a problem, you know,
3	except for the last two years, when we started
4	doing standing eight counts again. Prior to
5	that, no one was doing standing eight counts.
6	Am I correct with that now?
7	MR. STEELE: I'm not exactly
8	MR. STOKES: About two years ago?
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Mr. Steele, what you got
10	to add?
11	MR. STOKES: It is done it is done in Toughman
12	contests.
13	MR. STEELE: Right.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
15	MR. STOKES: All the time.
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And when you say "it," you're
17	meaning the standing eight count done for any
18	reason
19	MR. STOKES: And I think that's why the rule is in
20	there.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Can I just interject, and tell
22	me if I'm right on this for everybody's ear
23	again. Is the issue with regards to having a
24	potential standing eight count for any reason
25	is that it could, worst case scenario, a

1	fighter could be on the ropes and the referee
2	could interject and pause that winning
3	advantage that the other fighter has for a
4	moment? Is that the core issue?
5	MR. STOKES: Exactly.
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: At the same time, the referee is
7	the man in there whose is responsible for
8	everybody's safety, and he kind of needs that
9	discretion too. So I see that. But that's
10	what's at play; is that right, basically?
11	MR. STOKES: That's exactly what it is.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. What you got to add
13	there, Don?
14	MR. STEELE: Well, being a former
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Do you mind identifying yourself
16	real quick?
17	MR. STEELE: Don Steele, former fighter, head referee
18	for the state. Being a former fighter, I've
19	personally been in that situation where I
20	call it "ghosted." And the reason I say that
21	is because there is a blank look in that
22	fighter's face. Their pupils are dilated.
23	They are unresponsive to the touch. They are
24	unresponsive to the person talking to them, and
25	they are basically out on their feet. Tommy

1	Morrison and Ray Mercer comes to mind right off
2	bat. Tommy Morrison was out in the ropes,
3	physically didn't look like he was out, but he
4	was out. Referee probably should have stopped
5	the fight about 30 punches before. The
6	discretion the real problem is, it's not
7	really the rule per se, but my line of thinking
8	is and you gave me a license for a reason,
9	my license is to protect the fighters. I'm in
10	the ring closer to them than you are, you guys
11	are, the people at ringside. I can see things
12	that you can't see, they can't see. And I get
13	close, y'all see me. I'm right in the guy's
14	face, and I'm looking for that look. It's
15	called a ghost look. If they give me that
16	ghost look, I have to step in and give them an
17	eight count to avoid someone getting killed,
18	someone getting hurt.
19	MR. STOKES: Just stop the fight. Just stop it.
20	MR. STEELE: But it's a ghost but you can't stop a
21	fight if their body is physically still there.
22	MR. STOKES: But you can still
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Gentlemen, gentleman, let me
24	pause for a second. I want to hit on this
25	topic really quick. You mentioned don't stop

1	the fight Within our megulations and the
	the fight. Within our regulations and the
2	framework of the unified rules and everything,
3	is it the referee's discretion at any point to
4	stop a fight if he feels it's unsafe?
5	MR. STOKES: Yes, absolutely.
6	MR. STEELE: Right.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: You agree that that's the case?
8	MR. STOKES: I didn't say don't stop, I said
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I heard you. You said in that
10	case your opinion would be stop the fight.
11	MR. STOKES: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Very well. Thank you.
13	Go ahead, Don, I'm sorry.
14	MR. STEELE: Well, see, my opinion in that point is
15	that I should be able to step in and give that
16	guy an eight count to see how responsive he can
17	be, to see if he sometimes you shake
18	yourself back awake basically is what I'm
19	saying. So let's just say that person was
20	ghosted. Let's say that person did have that
21	look in their eyes. And I go up to them and I
22	give them that eight count. They come back to,
23	they're right back in mode, ready to go. So
24	how can I legally stop a fight when the fighter
25	is looking at me and going to say whoa, whoa,

1	I'm here, you can't stop this fight. See,
2	that's where we're going to run into a lot of
3	issues, because of that unified rule.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Just another moment from each of
5	you, and then I think we're probably going to
6	go into executive session to discuss this.
7	Andrew?
8	MR. STOKES: He I think when you see a fighter in
9	trouble as a referee you're still allowed to
10	give instructions, like, "Show me something.
11	You're not protecting yourself. If you don't
12	show me something I'm going to stop the fight."
13	Prior to that, in the locker room, you give
14	those same instructions. "If I think you're in
15	trouble I'm going to verbally tell you, show me
16	something. Protect yourself. If you don't
17	feel that you can protect yourself, or you
18	don't take a knee," because when he takes a
19	knee, they get automatic eight count, "or you
20	don't show me something, I'm going to stop the
21	fight." And I think you can give those
22	instructions during the match as well.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Mr. Steele, anything
24	else?
25	MR. STEELE: Being a former fighter, I've actually

1	been in that situation. 1996, when I fought
2	Brian Nelson for the world heavyweight title, I
3	got knocked down three times in the fight. I
4	only remember one. With one of the best
5	referees, Steve Smoger, in the world. Steve
6	Smoger let me continue. I remember going down
7	the first time. I don't remember going down
8	the second two times when I lost the bout. I'm
9	in the dressing room thinking I won a bout, I
10	won a championship. I didn't; I got knocked
11	out. So this is where I feel that we need the
12	discretion. You gave me a license for a
13	reason. My reasoning for stepping in to give
14	someone an eight count is I think they may be
15	there and I think they deserve that chance to
16	continue if they can. But I'm going to look
17	them down good, and when I'm close to them
18	y'all see how close I get to them. You see how
19	I talk to them. If they can't answer my
20	question, I'm not going to let them continue.
21	But I should be able to give them an
22	opportunity where here we are, you know,
23	tugging at both ends, so.
24	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I see.
25	MR. STEELE: We just need clarification. That way we

1	can kind of go forward as we go.
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Clarification we
3	shall have. Is there a motion to go into
4	executive session for legal advice?
5	MR. ESTRIDGE: I'll make a motion that we
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Is there a second?
7	DR. KENNEMORE: This is Hamp. I second that motion.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. All in favor say
9	aye?
10	COMMISSION: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
12	COMMISSION: (No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Motion is passed. We're going
14	into executive session for legal advice, and
15	we'll call you back in when we're done.
16	(Executive session from 11:24 a.m. to 11:42 a.m.)
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Is there a motion
18	that we come out of executive session, where we
19	were for legal advice?
20	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon Vaught. I make a motion
21	that we come out of legal session come out
22	of legal oh, my gosh. I can't even talk.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Executive session?
24	DR. VAUGHT: Executive session for legal advice, thank
25	you.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you. Is there a second on
2	whatever it was Dillon was trying to say?
3	MR. ESTRIDGE: I'll second whatever it was Dillon was
4	saying.
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. I think we have a
6	second to come out of executive session, where
7	we were for legal advice. All in favor say
8	aye?
9	COMMISSION: Aye.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Hamp. Any opposed
11	say nay?
12	COMMISSION: (No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. The motion is
14	passed, and we are now out of executive where
15	you may have heard we were for legal advice.
16	Okay. I'm just going to the topic right now
17	for mass discussion is at this moment over.
18	I'll tell you just the general quick thoughts.
19	Basically the topic at hand is we have, under
20	the unified rules and our existing regulations,
21	a situation now where if somebody is knocked
22	down they are permitted a standing eight count
23	or, you know, an eight count. And there is
24	under the unified rules this doesn't exist, but
25	in the current state regulations - also at the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

referee's discretion, at any point based off of his or her discretion, they can give the fighter a standing eight count to determine that fighter's ability to continue. in both of those is the -- is the referee's discretion at any point if he or she feels that it is unsafe to stop the fight. So a referee will always be able and encouraged that they -if he or she feels that it's unsafe or in the fighter's best interest to waive that fight off and stop it immediately. So that being said, the way our regulations are written, our current -- my opinion at the moment, our current regulations basically state that where there is a conflict between the state regulations and the third party, in this case the unified rules, where there is a conflict, the state rules trump that. So under the current scenario, it's my opinion that that needs to stand. That the referee continues to have the discretion to give a standing eight count despite the fact that the unified rules no longer reflect that. We don't feel -- or I don't feel under the current scenario we can However, I would like to make a change that.

1 motion that we submit to the legislature to 2 remove the referee discretion of a standing 3 eight count to better reflect the unified So what that would mean is that for the 4 moment and for the time being the referee 5 6 discretion for a standing eight count would 7 still exist, but I'm making a motion that we submit to the legislature to remove that 8 9 discretion for the specific reasoning of a standing eight count to better reflect the 10 11 unified rules. And I want to also note for the 12 record that that in no way hinders, and 13 continues to encourage when that is adopted, 14 the referee's ability and strong encouragement 15 to stop a fight when they feel that the safety 16 is impacted. So my motion, I'll just repeat it 17 for a potential second, is to submit to the 18 legislature that we remove the referee's 19 discretion of the standing eight count to 20 reflect the unified rules, but until that is 21 done the state rules trump it and that referee 22 discretion will continue. Is there a second? 23 MR. ESTRIDGE: I'll second that. 24 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. All in favor say 25 aye?

1 COMMISSION: Aye. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay? 2. 3 COMMISSION: (No response.) 4 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: The motion has passed. 5 just going to ask really quick of counsel, can 6 you just explain in layman generic terms what's 7 going to happen with that from this point forward? 8 9 MR. HORNER: Basically we re-draft this particular 10 regulation. We will strike through the 11 language that's currently there so that the 12 legislature understands we want that language 13 removed. I will submit it to our legislative 14 She has to run it in the State liaison. 15 Register, the newspaper that the statehouse 16 puts all of the potential regs or bills in. 17 This will happen sometime around September. 18 could be August, September. Once that gets run 19 twice, it gets a vote on it, it gets voted up 20 or down. As long as, you know, it's generally accepted as, you know, a rule in line with the 21 22 unified boxing rules, there shouldn't be an 23 issue with it. And then sometime around the 2.4 end of the year, first of next year, January, 25 it will just go through with all the other regs

1 that have been approved or okayed in advance. CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And just to re-state for the 2 3 record, it's -- I'm speaking for myself, but I 4 believe it's the opinion of the board, that 5 that in no way should hinder fighter safety 6 because that's our first and foremost goal. 7 But it's got to be done within the framework of our regulations and what's the legal and proper 8 9 And this is that vehicle. That being 10 said, if a referee is in a position where they 11 feel that that fighter's safety is in any way 12 in danger, then they should stop that fight 13 immediately. And we're not hindering that with 14 this proposed change to the regulations. With 15 that being said, yes, sir? 16 MR. THOMPSON: So I want to make sure I'm clear on 17 what we're saying. So for the rules meeting, 18 when the referee -- if it's Mr. Steele giving 19 the rules meeting, he can provide the rules as 20 it is written in the unified rules, but just he 21 has that discretion to --22 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And it should be mentioned that 23 under the regulations of South Carolina he does have the discretion to utilize the standing 2.4 25 eight count, until or unless those regulations

1	are adopted via the legislative that counsel
2	just outlined.
3	MR. THOMPSON: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: But until and unless that time,
5	our current regulations as they are written do
6	trump that. The vehicle for potentially
7	changing those is this. I honestly, in the
8	interest of you know what, heck no. Mr.
9	Steele, what you got?
10	MR. STEELE: My question is, do and you brought
11	this point up a couple of times today. Do
12	y'all really understand what a no-standing
13	eight count actually stands for?
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yes.
15	MR. STEELE: Okay. To me, personally, and I mean this
16	is what we were taught in school when we took
17	our testing and stuff, and being involved in
18	the sport, that doesn't mean we can't give an
19	eight count. That means we can give an eight
20	count but it's just not mandatory. So that's
21	what we're taught. So, see, even if we change
22	the law, we're still I don't understand. I
23	need clarification from my standpoint.
24	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Clarification clarification
25	on the proposed is that when a fight is going

1	on, if you feel that fighter is in trouble you
2	have every ability and encouragement to stop
3	that fight. But to pause
4	MR. STEELE: But do I have the same ability to step in
5	and give him an eight count?
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Under under what we just
7	proposed, if it's adopted, if it's adopted, no.
8	There wouldn't be a standing eight count or a
9	method, for lack of a better way to describe
10	it, to pause the fight to determine whether or
11	not to continue. It would either be stopped or
12	it would continue. Stopping is always your
13	discretion as a referee in a hypothetical
14	situation. That's encouraged. But that is if
15	it's adopted and moves forward. Under the
16	existing framework, you as a referee will
17	continue to have the ability to stop and give
18	them an count at your discretion.
19	MR. STEELE: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And that will continue until at
21	least January.
22	MR. STEELE: Okay. Got you.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And that would be to reflect
24	right now it reflects the state regulations.
25	We're proposing that that specific item is

1	adopted to reflect the unified the unified
2	rules as they currently exist.
3	MR. STEELE: So under the unified rules and let me
4	make sure I've got this correct. Under the
5	unified rules I am not allowed to step in and
6	give a guy a standing eight count?
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: That would be correct.
8	MR. STEELE: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: You are allowed to step in and
10	stop the fight.
11	MR. STEELE: Got you.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Anybody else, comment or
13	question on the topic? Although it's
14	COMMISSION: (No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Very well, okay. The next item
16	that we have on the agenda, goodness I can't
17	see, Head Referee Pre-Fight Rules Meeting.
18	Staff, what is what is the question?
19	MR. THOMPSON: I think we sort of culminated it all
20	together. I think some of the issue was that
21	the direction that was being given by the
22	referee was somehow in conflict with what the
23	regs and the unified rules. And I think we
24	just I think we just covered that.
25	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: The thing is I mean, all of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

you -- and there is nobody in the state boxing world that I personally have more respect for than the two individuals who are sitting in front of me right now. I think one of the biggest problems that we have had as a commission in trying to deal with all this stuff and continue to move forward, looking at the growth of all the combative sports while simultaneously protecting fighter safety, is that these regulations have been put together in a, for lack of a better term, a hodgepodge manner over years as different sports - bareknuckle boxing - have came in and they've tried to -- MMA has tried to shoehorn in and this -and they are written, it's not like -- it's not like other boards. And then -- and it's often something comes into conflict. And you've got somebody with such an exceptional wealth of experience and knowledge like Mr. Steele or Mr. Stokes, who it's been done this way, and for very good reasons this way, and there's very good reasons for this. They are going to come into conflict, and I think -- not that we don't, there is often some -- some room for discussion on the why and what's best. And we

1	just do the best we can to help it evolve and
2	get everybody's insight and go from there.
3	It's not always the right decision, but it's
4	our darn best attempt at it. So the rules
5	meetings, I think in other words, do I need
6	to ramble on anymore about rules meetings? I
7	mean
8	MR. THOMPSON: I think we're good. I think one of the
9	issues that came up was just the fact that we
10	just need to make sure that when we're
11	presenting the rules, I think it came up that
12	we just need to be dressed, ready for work per
13	se. So that was one of the issues, I guess.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Are there any topics that staff
15	or anybody else feels needs to be addressed by
16	the board with regard to rules meetings?
17	MR. THOMPSON: Nope.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Anybody here in the public?
19	MR. STOKES: No, I think they've already been
20	addressed.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Very well. Continuing to
22	march. The next topic on here is Upright Only
23	MMA Discussion Topic. This event a promoter
24	had asked me a question about here is a
25	general question. It's not something we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

proposing, it's a question. And anytime somebody asks me a question about regulations, I'll try to defer it to staff or whatever. This one I thought warranted -- and I did defer to staff and I thought, you know what, this is something maybe we just discuss as a board and get -- the question that's came up within the fighting community is, you know, if somebody wanted to have a promotion in the state where they wore MMA gloves but they followed the rules of boxing, could they? It would be like a fist fighting promotion, or it would be upright only. So they would -- they would follow the rules of boxing, but they would wear the 4-ounce or 5-ounce, you know, the 4-ounce MMA gloves instead of traditional boxing gloves. Well, my quick snapshot thought, which I didn't want to answer this because I didn't want it to be an opinion, is that it's kind of in a way comparable with the question with regard to bare knuckle boxing; it probably could be, you know, shoehorned into our existing MMA rules if that was something that was proposed. But I think one would lack the third-party regulatory overseeing it -- not

1 regulatory, but a third-party --MR. MARTIN: Sanctioning? 2 3 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you. Third-party 4 sanctioning, because no such thing exists. it was such an off-the-wall question that I at 5 6 least wanted to bring it to the board and 7 counsel and staff. So what do you think, if somebody came in here and they wanted to have 8 9 effectively an MMA promotion that only involved 10 punching? 11 MR. HORNER: I think you could get there, like you said. You could shoehorn it into the rules 12 13 that we have; they're pretty broad. You're 14 looking for -- sanctioning would be an issue. But I think -- when I was looking generally at 15 16 the rules before this meeting, I mean, they are 17 I mean, our authority as a commission 18 is a broad authority to really govern any 19 combat sport, any combative sport, which 20 certainly that would fall into. I think you 21 would just have to sit down with -- what 22 exactly are they asking guideline-wise and 23 rule-wise, and what exactly do our laws and our regs allow them to do or not do. 2.4 25 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Well, I don't believe

1 that it's a topic that staff or anybody else 2 needs to put any leg work in. It's not 3 something that was -- that was proposed. 4 was asked, and this is the proper forum to 5 address that question. So probably, but it 6 would take some homework, I believe is the end-7 all answer on that. Any other input from staff or board members on it? 8 9 COMMISSION: (No response.) 10 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. Guess not. We've 11 discussed it. And that was the Upright Only 12 MMA discussion topic. Okay. I believe that we 13 have an age-waiver hearing with a Mr. Gilbert 14 Is that still going on? Mr. Gilbert Jacobs. 15 Jacobs is here, so I guess so. Let me look

the age-waiver hearing, look through your

packet; I think at the very back is some data

on that. Let's just take a moment before we

officially start this and kind of read through

through my packet here. Do we have -- those of

you on the phone, before we officially start

it. And then if you've got questions that

you're going to ask during the hearing, it's

probably a good time to pencil them in or

25 whatever.

16

17

2.4

1	DR. VAUGHT: Do you want me to tell you my questions
2	now or wait until we get
3	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: No, just wait. I was just going
4	to give everybody a chance to kind of glance
5	through it before we
6	DR. VAUGHT: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Full disclosure, I hadn't read
8	through the whole thing yet, so. Okay. Does
9	any board member need more time to review the
10	package?
11	COMMISSION: (No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I am going to mark my page with
13	a banana. Probably something else you haven't
14	heard in a previous meeting. Excellent. All
15	right. I need a I don't have my script.
16	MR. MARTIN: All the way at the front, sir. In the
17	pocket.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you.
19	MR. MARTIN: You're welcome.
20	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
21	(Board discussions adjourned at 11:59 a.m. for a hearing
22	per the agenda. Board discussions resumed at 12:15 p.m.)
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Put my banana in the
24	wrong spot. Another phrase never previously
25	before uttered on the record, I hope.

1	MR. ESTRIDGE: And those people who can't see that
2	really don't understand.
3	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Good Lord. All right.
4	Unfinished Business. Staff or anybody who's in
5	the know, what's the status with regard to our
6	stuff that's forwarded to the legislature,
7	kickboxing, age, etcetera? Where is that in
8	the government hierarchy?
9	MR. THOMPSON: We get weekly reports, and I haven't
10	seen it on a weekly report.
11	MR. HORNER: I haven't seen it come up yet. I checked
12	this morning just to
13	MR. THOMPSON: We get a weekly report now, so.
14	MR. HORNER: We've gotten two weekly reports, and it
15	hasn't come through yet as to where it is.
16	MR. THOMPSON: That's one of the changes that the
17	director has started, was that now
18	administrative will receive, at least weekly,
19	on Fridays, all the bills and where they are
20	at, whether in the House, Senate, or whether
21	they are coming up. And I hadn't seen anything
22	as it relates to kickboxing.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Is there any way perhaps before
24	the next meeting we could inquire of the status
25	of that stuff?

1	MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.
2	MR. HORNER: Yeah.
3	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Even if the answer is nobody
4	knows? I mean, I'm not faulting; I'm just
5	asking.
6	MR. THOMPSON: Sure.
7	MR. HORNER: Yeah.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent.
9	MR. THOMPSON: I will check on it.
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: All right. I shouldn't be I
11	shouldn't make the assumption that there is no
12	current need for another executive session, but
13	I'll ask. Board members, does anybody have any
14	reason for us to go into an additional
15	executive session for legal advice?
16	MR. ESTRIDGE: None that I can think of.
17	DR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon, I don't.
18	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Great. I wanted to
19	mention, going off on a tangent really quick,
20	but that last vote, as you noticed, it wasn't
21	unanimous. Dr. Hamp Kennemore voted no. And I
22	encourage all board members to do the same.
23	Not vote no, but to always vote your
24	conscience. This stuff doesn't need to be I
25	mean, we're all on here for a reason. It's to

1 vote our conscience and our thoughts. So kudos 2 to Hamp for doing exactly that, and to 3 everybody else for doing exactly that. That's how it should be. You know, we don't always 4 5 have to be a hundred percent. Okay. Public 6 Comment. There is the public, who wants to 7 comment? MR. STOKES: I just have a question for --8 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Sure, just identify yourself 9 10 again. 11 MR. STOKES: Andrew Stokes, promoter. This might be 12 for counsel. When we send up that regulatory 13 change, are we going to have to have a sponsor? 14 Is that going to go in the form of a bill or 15 will we have a -- we'll have to have a sponsor? 16 MR. HORNER: Yeah. 17 MR. STOKES: And is that the hang-up with the other 18 stuff that we already have that's supposed to 19 be going through legislation? 20 MR. THOMPSON: I got sort of a history lesson on that 21 today. I think it was four years ago it went 22 through and somehow fell through the crack. 23 I'm not sure whether we did not pick up that 2.4 baton and move forward. But it's a possibility 25 that we just have to follow up on those. But I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

think, as I mentioned earlier in the meeting, that now is the time to kind of review and so that making some additional changes or additional updates that need to be made. And so hopefully if we get this task force going we might be able to lock most of that into this new change. Not just what we discussed today, but just reviewing all of those.

MR. HORNER: Yeah. And generally we're supposed to every two years take a look at our regulations, see what needs to be updated or cut or rewritten. Obviously this governor is very interested in removing unnecessary regulations, but keeping the regulations that of course protect the health of the public and the licensees. And so that's a two-year mandate from him. And I'm not sure where we are in the process as far as what we've got up there at the statehouse pending, whether that was more than two years and this is our year to go through everything or not. Certainly nothing prevents us from going forward with the regulation change that was discussed earlier outside of the two years. They just want a routine two year review so that if we could

1 make the regs better, if we could make the 2 boards function better, they -- you know, make 3 businesses grow, want to come into South 4 Carolina, that's sort of one of our mandates to And honestly, since this is my second 5 6 board meeting, I can't tell you where this 7 particular board is in that two-year process, but obviously nothing prevents us from moving 8 9 forward with any ideas that we have going 10 forward. We do have to get a sponsor who will 11 sponsor the bill and put it up. But that 12 hasn't really been a problem for any of the 13 There are a lot of legislators that we 14 can reach out to and explain the need for the 15 change and they'll sign onto the bill. 16 CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Covering a bit more history on 17 that topic, Mr. Stokes was a pivotal member of 18 our previous task force to do exactly that. 19 Going through literally every regulation word-20 for-word and watching -- which included the age 21 that we keep coming up with. And that was, I 22 believe, probably four years that was 23 initiated. We had a sponsor, Senator Tom Davis 2.4 out of Beaufort, who heralded that through 25 whatever, and since then we've lost sight of

1	it. So what we're articulating is what was
2	done, and then nothing has actually happened
3	from that. And I think that may be the core of
4	his question - Is there something stopping
5	those things that we already did that addressed
6	pretty much all of this, or what happened to
7	the stuff where we kind of already did this?
8	MR. ESTRIDGE: Those ones have got moved on for vote,
9	right, in the House? But they ran out of time
10	and they never voted on
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: That's the question.
12	MR. ESTRIDGE: it and it just kind of
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: So since they ran out of time
14	and never voted on it, what happens next?
15	Because what we are saying that we need to do,
16	we've done. We did it. We did a really good
17	job, because I was on a task force too.
18	MR. THOMPSON: We can check with
19	MR. HORNER: Yeah, with Holly.
20	MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, we can check around.
21	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yeah, we've
22	MR. STOKES: I think we needed one more reading in the
23	Senate. And then after all the readings were
24	done, if they didn't take action they would
25	automatically become law. But we didn't get

1	that last reading, that's my understanding. So
2	is Tom still sponsoring that bill, or do we
3	need to find somebody else to sponsor the bill?
4	We just don't know where we're hung up at. And
5	I know that LLR can't go out and basically
6	solicit
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Right.
8	MR. STOKES: Right. So you need somebody from the
9	public to do that, and I have some
10	representatives that are ready to do that if we
11	need.
12	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: It would be the chair's opinion
13	that you should reach out to them. Senator Tom
14	Davis is my state senator out of Beaufort. So
15	it's way inappropriate for me to go ask him
16	MR. STOKES: Absolutely.
17	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: go do this, please, could
18	you. But I really want to. So I would
19	encourage you to consider reaching out to them,
20	to just see what's happened with that and if
21	they can get started again. Because what we're
22	all saying we'd like to do is what we've done;
23	we just need somebody to kick the ball across
24	the line.
25	MR. STOKES: Some of these representatives can be

1	funny when somebody else goes to find out
2	something about a bill that they're that,
3	you know, they're already sponsoring. So I
4	don't want to go out there and say go find out,
5	and then Tom feel like somebody's stepping on
6	his toes or you know what I mean?
7	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yeah.
8	MR. STOKES: So if that's the hang up can we find
9	out what the hang up is?
10	MR. HORNER: Yeah. We'll contact our LLR rep, who's
11	the liaison at the legislature and ask. We'll
12	find out.
13	MR. STOKES: Okay.
14	MR. HORNER: We'll talk to her. I'll get with her
15	this week.
16	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And by all means feel encouraged
17	to reach out to your representatives, because
18	what they're supposed to do is in that title -
19	Representative. I'm not faulting them, but
20	they're your representatives. So if it's of
21	interest to you, which there certainly is valid
22	reason why it should be, reach out to them and
23	ask them to look into it too. We can come at
24	it from two different angles and, one way or
25	another, get some movement on this stuff.

1	Anything else? Public, commenting? Apparently
2	not. Well, in that case is there go ahead.
3	MR. STOKES: You did miss one thing on the agenda, the
4	suspensions?
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I do not have that on my agenda,
6	or do I?
7	MR. MARTIN: It would be Number 3 under New Business.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Oh, Professional Boxing,
9	Standing 8 Count and Suspensions. What did we
10	miss on that topic?
11	MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to ask too, what about the
12	suspensions?
13	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yeah, what about them?
14	MR. STOKES: So this was just started.
15	MR. THOMPSON: Oh, okay, I got you.
16	MR. STOKES: Everybody that fought on the last card,
17	they eventually went on the suspension list -
18	winners and losers. That wasn't being done
19	previously. Although I think in this state
20	I know in this state that you can't fight
21	you can only fight once within a seven-day
22	period.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: I personally am at a loss. Can
24	anybody shed some light on this?
25	MR. THOMPSON: I think I'm vaguely remembering what

1	he's saying. In our regulations, when a
2	fighter fights in this state there is a
3	mandatory seven-day suspension that goes to the
4	fighters, as he's alluding to, for this state.
5	And then, you know, of course
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: For seven days?
7	MR. THOMPSON: Seven days.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
9	MR. STOKES: Rest period.
10	MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think it's the way it reads,
11	it says suspension; I'm not sure.
12	MR. STOKES: Okay. All right.
13	MR. MARTIN: It's a mandatory rest.
14	MR. STOKES: Right.
15	MR. THOMPSON: So rest period. So then there's
16	if it's a TKO or a KO, it's 60, 30, whatever.
17	And I think, if I'm understanding or
18	remembering, there was maybe some fighters that
19	wanted to fight somewhere else, and that was
20	the hold-up. Is that what we're referring to?
21	MR. STOKES: Well, the fighters, all the fighters that
22	won on that card couldn't understand why they
23	were on the suspension list. And if they're on
24	the national suspension list, they can't go
25	fight anywhere. Even if they're being

1	considered for a fight 14 days prior, the
2	commission won't even acknowledge them being
3	put on the fight card because they are under
4	suspension.
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: This hasn't happened with
6	previous I mean, could it be just a
7	potential data entry thing?
8	MR. THOMPSON: That's what I was about to ask, because
9	I couldn't remember
10	MR. MARTIN: As far as I understand, if we suspend a
11	fighter, say let's use one of our rules as
12	an example: a KO is 60 days, it's a mandatory
13	suspension.
14	MR. STOKES: Right.
15	MR. MARTIN: It's my understanding that that
16	suspension was a of national or
17	international reporting.
18	MR. STOKES: It is.
19	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Yeah, that's my understanding
20	too.
21	MR. STOKES: That's true.
22	MR. MARTIN: But then I guess, Mr. Stokes, your
23	question is
24	MR. STOKES: South Carolina has a mandatory seven-day
25	resting period, so that means they cannot fight

1	here again within the seven days. But other
2	states don't have those rules. So when we put
3	them on the national suspension list, they
4	can't box anywhere else because they're on the
5	national suspension list.
6	MR. THOMPSON: For the seven days.
7	MR. STOKES: Right.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Say like they won the fight for the
9	seven days.
10	MR. STOKES: Right.
11	MR. THOMPSON: So your question is, can we either not
12	put that or remove it for national but hold it
13	for South Carolina? I'm trying to make sure I
14	understand
15	MR. STOKES: I think they should be on some internal
16	list that says that this person fought this
17	week, they can't fight again until this day.
18	So if they try to apply to fight here again, of
19	course, they can't because they are under that
20	seven-day rest period.
21	MR. MARTIN: So then my question would be it's
22	possible that I've put it down wrong, where
23	they are mandatory rest for seven days from a
24	fight, but it might be possible that I
25	incorrectly suspended the fighter for those

1	seven days; is that your question?
2	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: And that's reflecting on a
3	national level.
4	MR. MARTIN: Right. Is that your question?
5	MR. STOKES: Yes, yes.
6	MR. MARTIN: Okay.
7	MR. ESTRIDGE: But, so those guys would fight, and
8	within seven days go to another state to fight?
9	MR. STOKES: They potentially can because other states
10	don't have that rule. And if we're going to
11	put them on the national suspension list for
12	those seven days, I think there should be some
13	language in there. Because if you don't put
14	language in there that they're under it's a
15	seven-day rest period per South Carolina law,
16	you put that in there, then these other
17	commissions will know that he's not under
18	suspension for a knockout, a TKO, or some
19	medical problem; they'll know it's per South
20	Carolina law that he's on a seven-day resting
21	period.
22	MR. MARTIN: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Are you also saying that while
24	somebody is in that being reflected on a
25	national level as a seven-day suspension or

1	whatever, that other promoters from other
2	states might not even consider them for a bout
3	beyond that time frame because they just see
4	"suspension"?
5	MR. STOKES: Absolutely.
6	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay.
7	MR. STOKES: See yeah, because as a promoter we
8	only see that they're under suspension.
9	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Well, that's
10	understandable.
11	MR. THOMPSON: So, so would it be fair to say if we
12	keep them within the regulations, we just need
13	to add that language, what he's saying as
14	regards to the rest period?
15	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Mandatory seven-day rest period
16	as per South Carolina regs.
17	MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.
18	MR. MARTIN: That would work. That's very easy for me
19	to do. I can do that.
20	MR. STOKES: I think we need to look further though
21	because it says "rest period" versus
22	"suspension"; we're putting them on the
23	national suspension list. I'd be okay with
24	that until we figure that part out. I think
25	everybody would be.

1	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: We may not have a specific
2	answer to completely address that, but I'm sure
3	we can come up with one. And that's a new
4	thanks for bringing that up. I'm sure we can
5	crack that egg. Okay. Great.
6	MR. THOMPSON: That's for the winners, right?
7	MR. STOKES: For the winners.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Just for the winners. Just for the
9	winners.
10	MR. STOKES: Absolutely.
11	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. All right.
12	MR. THOMPSON: I think internally we can we can
13	take care of that internally.
14	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Okay. Cool. All right. I
15	think that's it. Is there anything else from
16	any other board member who needs to put input
17	on anything?
18	COMMISSION: (No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Dr. Vaught and Dr.
20	Kennemore, for joining us in the course of your
21	busy day. And thank you, Mack, for accepting
22	the vice chair position and leaving your
23	business for the day to come here and do this
24	as well. And of course, staff and everybody
25	else, thank you too. With that being said, is

1	there a motion to adjourn?
2	MR. ESTRIDGE: I'll make a motion that we adjourn.
3	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. Is there a second?
4	MR. VAUGHT: This is Dillon, I'll make a second.
5	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Excellent. All in favor say
6	aye?
7	COMMISSION: Aye.
8	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Any opposed say nay?
9	COMMISSION: (No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN McCULLOUGH: Motion is passed, we're
11	adjourned. Thank y'all.
12	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of 109
4	pages, is a true, accurate and complete transcript of the
5	meeting taken before me, Robin K. Reibold, the undersigned
6	Court Reporter. This meeting before the South Carolina
7	Athletic Commission was held on February 12, 2019, at the
8	offices of the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing
9	and Regulation, 110 Centerview Drive, Columbia, South
10	Carolina.
11	
12	Said meeting was reported using the method of Stenomask with
13	backup and was transcribed by me.
14	O(1/2, 16)
15 16	KK. Kuloke
17 18 19	March 10, 2019 ROBIN K. REIBOLD, CVR MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 4-28-2021
20	
21	
22	