COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * * *

IN RE: CLOSING ARGUMENTS FOR CATEGORY 2 LICENSE
APPLICATIONS, PHL LOCAL GAMING, LLC

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

* * * * * * *

BEFORE: WILLIAM H. RYAN, JR., CHAIRMAN

Gregory C. Fajt; Annamarie Kaiser; Keith R.

McCall; John J. McNally, III; Anthony

Moscato; David W. Woods; Members

Jennifer Langan, representing Robert

McCord, State Treasurer

Robert Coyne, representing Daniel Meuser,

Secretary of Revenue

HEARING: Tuesday, February, 26, 2014

10:57 a.m.

LOCATION: Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Strawberry Square Complex

2nd Floor

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

Reporter: Jennifer D. Crawford

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency.

	2
WITNESSES: None	

```
1
                A P P E A R A N C E S (cont'd)
2
3
   ALAN C. KOHLER, ESQUIRE
4
   Eckert Seamans
5
   213 Market Street, 8th Floor
6
   Harrisburg, PA 17101
      Counsel for Stadium Casino, LLC
   JOHN M. DONNELLY, ESQUIRE
10
   Levine, Staller, Sklar, Chan, Brown & Donnelly, PA
   3030 Atlantic Avenue
11
12
   Atlantic City, NY 08401
13
       Counsel for SugarHouse Casino
14
15
   LARRY H. SPECTOR, ESQUIRE
16
   Larry Spector, PC
17
   One South Broad Street
18
   Suite 1500
19
   Philadelphia, PA 19107
20
       Counsel for Congregation Rodeph Shalom, the
21
       Mathematics, Civics and Sciences Charter School
       and Friends Select School
22
2.3
2.4
25
```

```
5
 1
                APPEARANCES (Cont.)
 2
 3
   JOHN F. O'RIORDAN, ESQUIRE
 4
   O'Riordan Law Firm
   1601 Market Street
 5
   Suite 2600
 6
   Philadelphia, PA 19103
       Counsel for PHL Local Gaming, LLC
 9
10
   WILLIAM J. DOWNEY, III, ESQUIRE
11
   Fox Rothschild, LLC
12
   Midtown Building, Suite 400
13
   1301 Atlantic Avenue
14
   Atlantic City, NJ 08401
15
       Counsel for Market East Associates, LP
16
17
   RAYMOND A. QUIGLIA, ESQUIRE
18
   Ballard Spahr, LLP
19
   1735 Market Street, 51st Floor
20
   Philadelphia, PA 19103
21
       Counsel for Tower Entertainment
22
23
24
25
```

				7
1	I N D E X			
2				
3	CLOSING ARGUMENT			
4	By Attorney O'Riordan	9 -	- 1	L 6
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

				8
1		EXHIBITS		O
2				
3			Page	Page
4	Number	<u>Description</u>	Offered	Admitted
5		NONE OFFERED		
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

PROCEEDINGS

2 ------

CHAIRMAN:

Next, you will hear from Attorney John O'Riordan, representing Applicant PHL Local Gaming, LLC.

ATTORNEY O'RIORDAN:

Members. I'm John O'Riordan; O, apostrophe, R-I-O-R-D-A-N. Of the five Applicants before you, Casino Revolution and its team PHL Local Gaming, are the best partners in the Commonwealth. We offer everything the Commonwealth is looking for and everything it needs in a casino project. We have the best location. We have a million cars annually that pass right past our location. That location has unparalleled access and visibility. We alone have a 23-acre footprint, which gives us the ability to both expand our gaming and our nongaming activities. And we're almost one full mile away from the closest residential neighborhood.

In terms of economic impact, we have a plan to revitalize that area, starting with the LoSo Entertainment and Recreation District. And that is in an area that needs revitalization, unlike some of these other areas, where some of the other Applicants

1 are claiming they're going to transform the area.

2 Our ownership team has economic

3 firepower. The ownership team is putting in \$130

4 million in equity, with a commitment to put in another

5 | \$25 million more. And we are backed by Jeffries and

6 | Wells. And in the event anything untoward would

7 happen in the markets, we have a full financial

8 commitment for our project from Jeffries. So, our

9 commitment is the same as any other Applicant saying

10 | we can write a check, which the Board is well aware no

11 one does write a check they all finance their

12 projects. We have the full commitment of Jeffries

13 behind us.

14 We have diversity that no one else has.

15 We have more than 12 percent African-American

16 ownership. We have H.J. Russell as part of our

17 | construction team, the 15th largest African-American

18 owned company in America. And we have specific

19 unmatched diversity goals.

We have something else that no one else

21 has here. We have solid community support from our

22 Whitman neighbors. We don't have a non-opposition

23 agreement that we procured. We have solid support,

24 and we've had it throughout the duration of our

25 project. We have a history of developing tourism and

1 recreational facilities. Joe Procacci developed a 2,000-acre vineyard down in Naples, Florida.

And then, finally, we have the Merrick Management team. They have decades and decades of experience building and operating local casinos. Not a strip casino in Las Vegas or Maucau but local casinos of this sort that will be built here in Philadelphia.

You've heard those points before and I appreciate you listening to them, again. I'm not here, really, to belabor them. But I'm here to focus on three points that I heard raised at the hearings, that I respectfully suggest the Board ought to consider in exercising what it --- its broad, broad discretion.

The first one was brought up by Bob

Green of Parx. He brought it up both as a casino
owner and operator and a Center City resident. Bob

Green said, and I completely agree with him, putting a
casino in Center City Philadelphia would be an
absolute disaster for many of the reasons you just
heard. It would deepen already overwhelming traffic
congestion. Center City is gridlocked. Foot
messengers and bicycle messengers move much faster
than traffic.

The two casino projects in Center City have significant opposition. Bart Blatstein's project has a whole coalition of opposition. And the Market8 group has Chinatown. Those projects were based on unrealistic numbers. The tourists --- the same people who were going to retrace the steps of our founding fathers are somehow, hours later, going to be found pulling a slot machine lever, or throwing dice at a craps table.

The heavy reliance on tourists for their economic projections just make the projects unrealistic. They have unrealistic numbers about the percentage of people who were going to take public transportation. This is Philadelphia. People who have a pocketful of money and are going to go gamble, don't hop on the Broad Street subway or the Frankford Market L or take the C Bus. It's just not safe. It's not going to happen.

Both of those Center City projects suffer from parking shortages. Again, I said they're propped up by some unrealistic and unattainable economic projections, both in the tourism area, as well as any conventioneers. They're just not gambling people.

And finally, as several experts have

- opined, including PHL's expert, Gene Christianson,
 putting a casino in Center City will cannibalize the
- 3 | SugarHouse Casino. Mr. Christianson is a highly,
- 4 highly recognized expert in his field, and he talked
- 5 at length about how that would cannibalize the
- 6 SugarHouse.
- Bob Greene had it exactly right. The
 Center City sites won't work. The only place that I
 suggest the Board ought to be looking is South
 Philadelphia. And of the three South Philadelphia
 proposals, Casino Revolution is the best such
- 12 proposal.

21

22

23

24

25

- 1.3 The two other proposals down there, the 14 Parx/Cordish team and the Penn National team, they're 15 in the frequently congested Stadium area. 16 almost on top of the Stadiums. They are adjacent to youth ball fields, charter schools, churches. 17 18 they're within a block or two of heavily populated 19 residential neighborhoods, who oppose those casinos 20 going into that area.
 - They're also on small parcels and they don't have the ability, like we have, to open early or to expand once they do it. They're on 9 acres and 13 acres, respectively. They have no ability to transform that area down there.

The second point I heard at the hearings
that I urge the Board to consider is that this project
ought to be more than just a casino. And Casino
Revolution is just that. We have 23 acres, a 250 room
hotel that will be open when we open. And we alone
have the unique ability to catalyze the transformation
of the food distribution center.

1.3

2.3

We offer more than just slot machines and tables. We can generate more revenue more quickly and we're planning for the LoSo entertainment district down there, which will be a recreational district, where people can go with their families and it will be transformed.

We're adjacent to the TIDC. It's about 27, maybe 30 acres, a full-square city block that sits exactly next door to us. That whole block can be transformed into that LoSo entertainment area. Nobody else can do that. And we've already heard --- had significant interest from national restaurant chains. Lastly, Joe Procacci owns ten additional acres immediately in that area. We have the ability and we have the property and we have the financial wherewithal to transform that area.

Lastly, there's something that came up. Gene Christianson raised it during his testimony and

- 1 | the Pennsylvania legislators billed this concept into
- 2 | the statute. And that's the issue of competition.
- 3 | This Board has broad discretion. And two other
- 4 Applicants down in South Philadelphia already have
- 5 casino licenses in Pennsylvania. Penn National has
- 6 one that sits outside of Pennsylvania, as well.
- Competition is a good thing and in
- 8 passing this Act the legislature limited the number of
- 9 casinos that one could have in the Commonwealth.
- 10 | Well, to give Parx a casino license in South
- 11 Philadelphia, while they had one sitting right on top
- 12 of the northern tip of Philadelphia, will be
- 13 essentially granting them a monopoly over Philadelphia
- 14 | gaming. And that I suggest was inconsistent with what
- 15 the legislation was looking at when they said in the
- 16 whole entire Commonwealth, you can only have one and
- 17 one-third, here Parx would essentially control two
- 18 casinos within a very short distance from each other.
- 19 Penn National license presents, I think,
- 20 unique problems. I think it's, respectfully, an end
- 21 run around this one and one-third rule that the
- 22 | legislature passed. It's not real ownership. Real
- 23 ownership could be transferred. You can have an
- 24 impact on decisions. You can say what kind of fees
- 25 that you're going to pay and you get to negotiate

those. But to have as a captive two-third ownership
in a public entity there, that has no say over what
fees they're going to have to pay. By the time they
get done it's up two-thirds of the casino. It's twothirds of a small little pit that's left over.

I would urge the Board just to consider the two things --- the three things. If you award the license to Casino Revolution, it won't be the disaster that will happen in downtown Philadelphia. It will be more than a casino and it will be promoting competition and going against the monopolization that the legislature was so concerned about.

And finally, if Casino Revolution or one of the other South Philadelphia casinos was coming on line, don't you think that SugarHouse would've had their expansion up and done by now? Competition will raise the level of gaming offering in the Philadelphia area. It's good and it ought to be promoted. Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. O'Riordan.

* * * * * * *

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 11:07 A.M.

* * * * * * *

25

6

7

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Ryan was reported by me on 2/26/2014 and that I Jennifer Crawford read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.