COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING

* * * * * * * *

BEFORE: GREGORY C. FAJT, CHAIRMAN

Raymond S. Angeli, Jeffrey W. Coy, James B.

Ginty, Kenneth T. McCabe, Sanford Rivers,

and Gary A. Sojka, Members

David Barasch, ex-officio designee

representing Revenue Secretary Stephen

Stetler

HEARING: Wednesday, June 3, 2009

10:02 a.m.

LOCATION: State Museum Auditorium

300 North Street

Harrisburg, PA 17120

WITNESSES: Frank T. Donaghue, Kevin O'Toole, Claire

Yantis, Doug Sherman, Troy Beaverson,

Marsha A. Sajer, Michael Sklar, Susan

Hensel, Cyrus Pitre, Dr. Anthony Ceddia,

Steve Cook, Melissa Powers, Katie Higgins

Reporter: Cynthia Piro-Simpson

Any reproduction of this transcript

is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency.

```
2
                    APPEARANCES
1
2
3 FRANK T. DONAGHUE
4 Interim Deputy/Executive Director
5 PA Gaming Control Board
6 P.O. Box 69060
7 Harrisburg, PA 17106-9060
8
      Counsel for the Gaming Board
9
10 MARSHA A. SAJER, ESQUIRE
11 | Kirkpatrick & Lockhart, Preston, Gates, Ellis, LLP
12 17 North Second Street
13 18th Floor
14 Harrisburg, PA 17101-1507
15
      Counsel for Autovalet Systems, LLC
16
17 MICHAEL D. SKLAR, ESQUIRE
18 Levine, Staller, Sklar, Chan, Braun & Donnelly, PA
  3030 Atlantic Drive
19
20
  Atlantic City, NJ 08401-6380
21
      Counsel for Mount Airy #1, LLC
22
23
24
25
```

	Г	2
1	INDEX	3
2		
3	STATEMENT	
4	By Justice Baer	6 – 8
5	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	8 - 12
6	PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS	
7	By Frank Donaghue	12 - 14
8	By Kevin O'Toole	14 - 17
9	By Mrs. Yantis	18 - 19
10	By Attorney Beaverson	20 - 23
11	By Attorney Sherman	24 - 26
12	By Attorney Sajer	27 - 30
13	QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD	30 - 44
14	PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS	
15	By Attorney Sherman	44 - 48
16	By Attorney Sklar	48 - 50
17	By Attorney Pitre	50 - 53
18	QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD	53 - 72
19	PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS	
20	By Dr. Ceddia	72 - 74
21	QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD	75 - 80
22	PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS	
23	By Attorney Sherman	80 - 89
24	By Attorney Cook	89 - 92
25	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	93 - 100

		4
1	I N D E X (continued)	4
2		
3	PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS	
4	By Mrs. Hensel	100 - 113
5	By Attorney Powers	114 - 115
6	By Attorney Higgins	115 - 116
7	By Attorney Powers	117 - 118
8	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	118 - 119
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
5
                           EXHIBITS
 1
 2
 3
                                                         Page
            Description
                                                       Offered
 4
   Number
 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 FAJT:

1

3

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Good morning, everybody. If I could have 4 you take your seats, please. Thank you. My name is Greg Fajt. I'm the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. Just a little matter of housekeeping, I'd like to ask everybody to turn off their cell phones, Blackberries, other electronic 10 devices. They tend to interfere with our communication system here in the State Museum. Thank 11 12 you.

A quorum of the Board is present. This 14 meeting is called to order. I'd like to ask everybody to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED 16

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

I'd now like to ask my good friend, Justice Max Baer, to come up for swearing in. Justice?

JUSTICE BAER:

Congratulations. I'm going to be very 23 brief, but anybody that knows a judge knows that you can never keep them quiet, and that's especially true in my case, according to my colleagues on the Supreme Court. So just a couple words, wholly unprepared.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Greg and I have known each other for 24 or 25 years, and he's watched my career and helped in it when appropriate and vise a versa, although I've been able to help less because of the constraints of judicial ethics. I think it's a real, real tribute that through all of it, you've maintained universally, among your legion of acquaintances, complete integrity and collegiality. And I am not aware of political enemies. I'm aware of some political adversaries, but they nevertheless refer to you as friend and colleague, and they give you, I think, the highest compliment that can come to one that has run for office, served in office, was the spokesperson for our Governor, which is a tough task, and he knows that as well as all of us, and that is that you were always honest and always above board and always accessible.

So I think that it's wonderful that you've come to this point. Now, I have to tell you, I think you have a very difficult job ahead of you. I think all of Pennsylvania is reliant upon you and your colleagues here. I understand that Gaming is going to pay for everything from real property taxes to socks for abused and neglected children, and that all of Pennsylvania sort of looks at this as one of the

lynchpins to fiscally save the Commonwealth in this economic time. I'm not sure that that's so, but I think that you have to push forward amid nothing but controversy and difficulties that I think come with the birth of all new entities from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh and from the south to the north. So we wish you well.

1

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I have to tell you that when I complete swearing in, I'm going to leave, because your docket today will be our docket in about two years and I don't want to be here to listen. And I'm already going to have to disclose the fact that I did the swearing in, but at least I didn't stay to listen to the deliberations that form the issues. So as I was coming up here, apropos that your legion of admirers that I happened to speak with in the car --- I save my phone calls for the car. Marie Lolligreen (phonetic) sends her very, very best, people in Mt. Lebanon, who you probably don't remember, but all know you and speak well of you, of course my wife and my two boys and so many others say congratulations to you and we hope that you prosper and you continue to grow in your career, and you and your colleagues bring nothing but success to Pennsylvania Gaming, our very important new industry as we move forward.

So if you'd put your hand on the Bible, it's my great pleasure, it's my honor to swear you in.

JUSTICE BAER ADMINISTERS OATH TO GREGORY C. FAJT

JUSTICE BAER:

I want everybody to know that you do not dare change that oath, because it is in our Constitution and apropos the Chief Justice of the United States and the President of the United States, I didn't want any mistakes.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you very much, Justice Baer. And before he leaves or as he's leaving, I just want to again personally thank him. As Max said, he and I have known each other for a quarter of a century. One of the most honest, hardworking public servants, and he didn't get to where he is without a lot of hard work and recognition of his work for --- mainly for children in Pennsylvania. Max started out in the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas, really revolutionalized the juvenile court system there and is a recognized leader in that area of the law, so I am very, very proud and pleased to have him here today. And again, Max, thank you very, very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to be here.

To my fellow Board members, thank you so

1 much for making me feel at home. I feel like I've come back home, starting with the Gaming Board back in 2004 as an ex-officio member, and I've got to know virtually all of you in a prior life, and I really, really look forward to working with you.

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To the staff of the Gaming Control Board, as I said to you earlier, I quess last week when we spoke, what you have been able to accomplish with the Board is nothing short of amazing. When you think of what you've done over the last four years to provide \$1.5 billion of property tax relief for Pennsylvanians, to create 7,000 permanent, life and family-sustaining jobs for Pennsylvania residents, another 7,000 jobs in the construction industry, to save the horseracing industry and revitalize that, to provide financial assistance to the host municipalities and the counties where our facilities are located, when you think of that and starting literally from an agency that had no paper clips, had no office, had no cell phones, had no computers, it really is amazing. You should all be very proud of yourselves, along with the Board, of what you've been able to accomplish over the last four years. hope I don't screw it up, so ---.

> It's great to be sworn in. And let's get

started with our business of the day. Now, by way of 1 2 announcement, the Board held an executive session yesterday, June 2nd, 2009, in accordance with the 3 Sunshine Act. The purpose of the executive session was to discuss personnel-related issues, litigation matters and conduct quasi-judicial deliberations 6 relating to matters pending before the Board. Our first item of business is approval of 8 the minutes and transcripts of the Board's April 8th 10 and April 22nd meetings. May I have a motion to 11 approve the minutes and the transcripts? 12 COMMISSIONER ANGELI: Mr. Chairman, I move the Board approve 13 14 the minutes and transcripts of the April 8th and April 15 22nd, 2009 meetings. 16 COMMISSIONER COY: 17 Second. 18 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 19 All in favor?

20 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any opposed?

23 NO RESPONSE

21

22

24

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

The motion carries. Moving on to new

business, I'd like to have Frank Donaghue and Kevin O'Toole provide the Executive Director's report.

ATTORNEY DONAGHUE:

members. First, it has been a privilege to serve as your acting Executive Director for the last year. I want to thank each Board member for their commitment, energy and cooperation over what has been a very busy and successful time for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. The opening of three new facilities, the creation of thousands of new jobs and the continued evolution of a regulatory structure that is making Pennsylvania one of the premier regulatory jurisdictions in the nation. I would also like to thank the Gaming Control Board's staff, who are committed to the objective of protecting the public through the strict regulation of gaming in Pennsylvania.

Next, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. Kevin O'Toole to his first public Board meeting as your new Executive Director. But before I introduce Kevin, I would like to take just a moment to share some of his background. Just prior to accepting the Executive Director position with the Gaming Control Board, Kevin served as the Commissioner of the

Oneida Indian Nation of New York. He also served as a Chief Regulatory Officer since February of 2007 after serving as its Executive Director for ten years.

The Oneida Indian Gaming Commission is the premier regulator and primary regulator of the Turning Stone Resort and Casino in Verona, New York, a 700 room hotel, convention and gaming facility with over 3,600 employees, offering more than 2,000 gaming machines, 80 table games and five golf courses.

Prior to his leadership in New York,
Kevin worked for the New Jersey Division of Gaming
Enforcement for 16 years, including Deputy Attorney
General and Supervisor of the Casino Investigation
Section. In his role, he oversaw 30 attorneys or
investigative agents and was responsible for
prosecuting complex civil litigation. In addition,
his work in New Jersey included the drafting of
proposed legislation to amend the Casino Control Act,
involvement in the opening of new casinos to ensure
readiness to meet regulatory standards and acting as a
liaison with the New Jersey Council on Compulsive
Gaming.

Kevin earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Economics from the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School of Finance and Commerce

and his J.D. from the Rutgers University School of Law in Camden. And with that, I'll turn it over to Kevin.

ATTORNEY O'TOOLE:

Thank you, Frank. Good morning. As terrific a resort Turning Stone Casino is, I encourage all attendees today to patronize the Pennsylvania slot casinos. But thanks for those very nice words. On behalf of the staff and myself personally, I would like to congratulate Chairman Fajt on his appointment as Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

It is a pleasure to make my first appearance before the Board. I'm very appreciative of the opportunity that the Board is giving me to serve the citizens of Pennsylvania in a very important mission to ensure the integrity of gaming operations in the Commonwealth. I am truly excited to be here, and I assure you that I will work diligently to lead the Agency in accomplishing the mandates of the Gaming Act.

At this time also, I would like to express the Board's appreciation, the staff's appreciation of Frank Donaghue for his willingness to assume the responsibilities of the Executive Director position over the past year. Frank has done an outstanding job, and the Board has benefited from his

leadership.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to the Executive Director's report today, from an operational standpoint, the significant event that has occurred since the Board's last meeting has been the opening of the Sands Casino Resort Bethlehem on May the 22nd. I only started this week, so I did not attend the test nights or the opening of the Sands. However, staff has provided me with information detailing the cooperative effort to bring that property to a very successful and a very impressive opening. On May 22nd, Sands Casino Resort Bethlehem opened with their new facility, a 103,000 square foot casino with 3,000 slot machines, and they expect to expand that by the end of the year to 132,000 square feet and 5,000 slot machines. newest casino in the Commonwealth employs over 900 individuals, most of them Pennsylvania residents. one of their unique features is that you can dine at restaurants that literally overlook the gaming floor. From the Gaming Control Board's standpoint, this was an extremely successful opening, thanks in large part to the very experienced and qualified opening team, a group that includes

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908

representatives from Gaming Operations, the Gaming

Lab, Casino Compliance, Licensing, Information

Technology and Legal Counsel. And their efforts could only be successful with a high level of cooperation from the Sands staff.

We would also like to thank and commend Commissioners Coy, Sojka and Ginty for their oversight during the test nights in the opening. It's also very important to recognize the role and the cooperation and assistance of the Pennsylvania State Police, the Department of Revenue and the staff from G-Tech. All of these entities contributed significantly to the very successful opening of the Sands.

I'd also like to note that the Sands

Bethlehem had the largest opening day revenue of any
casino in Pennsylvania with over \$1.6 million in gross
terminal revenue on their initial day, almost \$700,000
more than the next closest opening day.

And I'd like to conclude the Executive Director's report with a positive report on revenue in the just completed month of May. The revenue numbers continue to be strong with Pennsylvania slot machines, generating \$178 million in gross terminal revenues last month, a 17.9 percent increase over revenues generated by gaming in May of last year. The ten days of operation of the new Sands facility certainly contributed significantly to that increase. However,

it's important to note that even if you take out those ten days of revenue from the Sands, the seven existing slot casinos in Pennsylvania that operated both in May of 2008 and May of 2009 performed and experienced gross terminal revenues that would have --- that increased by 10.8 percent.

So again, I would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to be a part of this process, and I look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you, Kevin and Frank. Kevin, I'd just like to welcome you on behalf of the Board, and other Board members can feel free to chime in, but your reputation for professionalism and competence, both during your time in New Jersey and also New York, preceded you. I was not involved in the hiring process, but I know my colleagues up here were, and all of them, to a person, had spoken glowingly about your reputation and the results that you've obtained in your prior life. So welcome to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board as Executive Director, and we all look forward to working with you.

Frank, before you --- and Frank's halfway out of his chair, but I'm going to embarrass you just for a minute. You know, you and I have known each

other for a long time, you know, from your days in the Attorney General's Office and mine as Secretary of Revenue, and your professionalism and your ethical 3 backbone has always been your calling card. And you are a tremendous person. We are lucky to have you at the Gaming Control Board. We appreciate what you did for us to sit in as interim Executive Director, and we look forward to continue working with you. So thank you for stepping in when we needed you. Any other 10 comments from Board members? Okay. Thank you, guys.

Next up is David Rhen for our regular 11

12 financial report.

14

15

17

25

OFF RECORD DISCUSSION 1.3

Compliance, Tom Sturgeon.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All right. Next up is Claire Yantis for our Human Resources. Claire? 16

MRS. YANTIS:

18 Good morning, Chairman, Board members. We ask you today to consider a motion to hire four 19 2.0 individuals. First, Jennifer Courtney King is being recommended for hire as a Casino Compliance 21 22 Representative at the Meadows Racetrack and Casino. 23 Ms. King has completed the PGCB interview process and is being recommended for hire by Director of Casino 24

Second, Michael Cruz, Director of Gaming 1 2 Laboratory Operations, conducted interviews for two 3 positions within the Gaming Lab, one for an Electronics Engineer position and one for a Statistician position. At this time, Mr. Cruz is recommending the hire of Mark Dinse to fill the Electronics Engineer and Matthew Belella to fill the Statistician position. Finally, it's recommended that Katherine Smith be hired as an Executive Secretary to 10 the Chairman.

Insomuch as all four individuals have completed the PGCB background investigation and drug screening, we ask the Board to consider a motion to 14 hire these individuals as indicated.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you. Any questions or comments from the Board? Can I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER COY:

Mr. Chairman, I move the Board approve the hiring of the Agency staff as proposed on a condition that all employees have completed the necessary background investigation and drug testing.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Second.

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

20

All in favor?

2 AYES RESPOND

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Anybody opposed?

NO RESPOSNE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes. Thank you very much,

Claire. Next up is our Office of Chief Counsel (OCC),

Doug Sherman. And Troy Beaverson is joining Doug.

Good morning.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Good morning, Chairman Fajt and members of the Board. Our first two agenda items relate to a proposed regulation and a Final-form regulation, which Assistant Chief Counsel Troy Beaverson will address.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. First up we have Proposed Regulation

Number 125-104. This proposed rulemaking makes minor revisions to provisions related to employees to improve the clarity and effectiveness of the Board's regulations. More specifically, in this rulemaking, this rulemaking does the following.

The definition of gaming employee has
been amended to include employees of certified vendors

that must have access to the gaming floor or other restricted areas. This change makes the definition consistent with the existing requirement that these employees receive occupational permits from the Board.

New language has been added to Section 435a.1, which requires slot machine licensees to contact the Bureau of Licensing (BOL) to verify the status of a license or permit of any potential employee who is already licensed by the Board.

Finally, transfers to Category 1 licensees from the Racehorse Development Fund will be payable to the appropriate recipients by the close of the next business day. If there are no questions, I would ask for a motion to adopt Proposed Regulation Number 125-104.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

17 Any questions or comments from the Board? 18 Can I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt 21 Proposed Regulation 125-104, that the Board establish a public comment period of 30 days and that the proposed regulation be posted on the Board's website.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Second.

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

22

23

24

25

22

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

10 For your next consideration, we have Final-form Regulation Number 125-96. The Board 11 12 adopted these changes as a Proposed Regulation on 13 December 18th, 2008, and they were first published in 14 the Pennsylvania Bulletin on January 24th, 2009. 15 Public comments were due on February 23rd, 2009. 16 | Final-form Rulemaking contains a variety of amendments which correct errors in the existing regulations, 17 18 clarify a number of requirements and delete, revise or 19 add new requirements that reflect current practices. 20 The most significant changes include changes to ---Sections 461a.24 and 465a.30 are being revised to 21 22 clarify that Request For Waivers of Internal Control 23 Regulations are to be submitted to the Board as a 24 formal petition and that the waiver must be approved 25 by the Board.

Revisions have been made to streamline a review process for merchandise jackpots. These jackpots will now be approved by the Executive Director after review by the Office of Gaming Operations. Section 465a.12 has been totally rewritten to clarify the licensee's duties to develop an access control employee badge system and eliminate any confusion between that system and the emergency and temporary credentials that may be issued by the Board.

2.4

Most of the comments received from the public concern the regulations prescribing the access control employee badge system. It was suggested that the Board allow individuals other than those designated in the proposed regulation to be responsible for assigning access levels and for maintaining the system's database. The Board agreed, and a proposed regulation was amended to require the slot machine licensee to designate the individuals who will be responsible for these functions in their internal controls.

If there are no questions, I would ask for a motion to adopt Final-form Rulemaking Number 125-96.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

1 Any questions or comments from the Board? 2 May I have a motion? 3 COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Mr. Chair, I move that the Board adopt 4 Final-form Regulation 125-96, and that the Final-form Regulation be posted on the Board's website. 6 COMMISSIONER RIVERS: Second. 8 9 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 10 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 11 12 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 13 Any opposed? 14 NO RESPONSE 15 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 16 The motion passes. Thank you, Troy. 17 Doug, you'll continue on with your report? 18 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 19 Today the Board has four petitions Yes. 20 before it for consideration. These petitions are all 21 scheduled to be considered upon the documentary 22 record. In each case, the Board has been provided 23 with the petition, the responsive pleading of 24 Enforcement Counsel, any additional pleadings, as well 25 as all supporting evidentiary materials. In addition,

all parties have been notified that their petitions will be considered today and that they have the right to be present to address the Board with respect to any aspect of the petition or otherwise to answer any questions.

2.0

I'll briefly summarize each petition before asking for a motion. First, on the Board's agenda for consideration, is Autovalet System, LLC's Petition to be Removed from the Prohibited Vendor List. Autovalet manufactures a computer controlled system that permits employees of licensees to store and retrieve uniforms and personal items from an automated carousel. Autovalet systems are in use at Hollywood Casino, at Penn National and Harrah's Chester Downs.

On December 18th, 2008, Autovalet was placed on the Prohibited Vendor List for failing to provide a complete Private Holding Company Form for its parent company, Autovalet Systems International. About three weeks later Autovalet corrected that omission and filed the missing Private Holding Company Form with the Board, as well as a Petition seeking Removal from the Prohibited Vendor List.

The Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) objected to the petition, arguing that the required

1 holding company application for a company holding a 32 percent stake in Autovalet's parent company was not 3 included in the filing. Autovalet argued that the holding company at issue, which is Woodbourne Trustees Limited, is based in Bermuda, and under that law, under the law of Bermuda, a disclosure of certain information required by the Board and the licensing process would be prohibited.

Subsequently, Autovalet submitted a plan to the BOL proposing a reorganization of the business enterprise to avoid the disclosure issue raised by 12 | Woodbourne's ownership interest. Autovalet has now provided the BOL with all documents necessary regarding its sale to its new owner, Kirkwell, Limited, and as a result, Autovalet's application is now considered complete by the BOL.

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, in the past, in relation to Petitions to Remove an entity from the Prohibited Vendor List, the Board has imposed a sanction or an assessment of \$1,500 in connection with that activity. That matter is up to the Board's discretion. believe that Counsel in this case may want to address that issue as well as any others --- or answer any questions the Board may have.

ATTORNEY SAJER:

Good morning, Chairman Fajt and members of the Board. I'm Marsha Sajer, Counsel with 3 Kirkpatrick & Lockhart here in Harrisburg. represent the Vendor, Autovalet Systems, LLC. Sherman has described, Autovalet has worked diligently and cooperatively with the BOL to overcome not only the original deficiency that got it placed on the Prohibited Vendors List, but also to satisfy the Board in absolutely completing the application.

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Autovalet will accept any fine imposed by the Board, but did not want to waive its opportunity to address the fine issue. Autovalet was informed just this Monday that it would be facing a fine. And we have three points that we just want to briefly raise and bring to your attention, particularly to Chairman Fajt, as the new leader of the Gaming Control Board.

We believe the Board lacks the authority to impose a fine on this particular vendor. believe also that the imposition of a fine of which Autovalet was given notice only on Monday offends due-process. And finally, we believe that any fine that might be recommended against Autovalet Systems should be waived under the circumstances of this case.

We believe that the Board, first, lacks

authority to impose a fine against this vendor. 1 2 regulations dealing with placement of a vendor on the 3 Prohibited Vendors List specifically state the process by which a vendor can seek removal, and that is by filing a petition showing good cause for the removal, and more importantly, showing the deficiency that caused it to be placed on the Prohibited Vendors List has been corrected. Autovalet has done that. is nothing in those provisions of the Board's 10 regulations that authorizes imposition of a fine or gives notice to Autovalet that a fine would be 11 12 imposed.

Moreover, although the OEC clearly has the authority to file a complaint against a vendor or any other entity seeking licensing in which the complaint can set forth penalties, including a fine, the OEC has never done so to this moment when it announced to the Board its recommendation for a fine.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Posting a fine without adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard clearly offends dueprocess. Autovalet had no notice of this fine until Monday. There is nothing set forth in this Board's regulations that indicates that a fine would be part of the removal. There is nothing on the Board's website that posts the fines or indicates that they

would be part of the removal.

1.3

We're advised instead that Autovalet

Systems, LLC should have been monitoring the Board's

previous proceedings in order to become aware of the

fact that this Board, has in the past, imposed fines

on vendors seeking removal from the Prohibited Vendors

List. That is --- that's not the proper, adequate

notice to a vendor seeking removal.

The vendor is a small business, as are many vendors participating in Pennsylvania gaming.

Autovalet will absolutely acquiesce in the imposition of this fine, because it cannot afford to do otherwise. It cannot afford to continue to pay attorney's fees to appeal, nor can it afford the delay, because we have been advised that Autovalet would not be removed from the Prohibited Vendors List until it has paid the fine, so we will do so.

Moreover, Autovalet Systems is licensed in many other gaming jurisdictions in this country, and by remaining on the Prohibited Vendors List, casts doubt on its good standing in those other licensing jurisdictions.

As Mr. Sherman indicated, Autovalet went through a substantial corporate, in effect, restructuring. It had to divest itself of a Bermuda

trust that has no interest in the kind of work being done by Autovalet Systems in any of these gaming matters. Autovalet is only a step away from being a supplier. It installs the equipment in the pre-gaming phase of gaming operations, and goes back only a couple of times a year to service machinery that is in no way connected with the gaming floor.

Autovalet was penalized by being placed on the Prohibited Vendors List for its deficit in filing proper documents. There should be no further penalty. It has now made good on what it needed to do to be restored and have its application ready to move forward for investigation. A further penalty is simply not appropriate.

I have here Fred Mullinax of Autovalet Systems if any of the Board members have any specific, factual questions that he might be able to respond to.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Board?

Thank you, Marsha. Questions from the

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

Yes. My question would be to Doug

Sherman. Doug, you've heard the concerns that Counsel
has brought forth. What are your responses to the
issues that she's raised?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Really, I think we have two issues here.

One is to the extent Autovalet asserts that they did

not have notice or an opportunity to respond, I think

we have to go back to the original basis for the

imposition of a sanction, and that is typically a

vendor gets placed on the Prohibited Vendor List

because of the failure to comply with licensing

requirements. That has been explained here. I guess

the question really becomes whether that was a willful

failure on the part of Autovalet, whether they

knowingly did not comply with the regulations, and

that would go, obviously, to the Board's consideration

of whether or not there should be a fine, and if so,

what extent.

So to the extent that Autovalet is asking for notice and an opportunity to be heard, to contest whether the fine is appropriate or the amount of it, I think in that case, the appropriate remedy of the Board would be to remand the matter to the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) and develop a record on those very issues. On the other hand, it certainly would be within the purview of the Board to ask Autovalet if they would waive that claim and consent to the imposition of the fine to resolve the matter

today.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

You bring up a good point, because I have a concern about their due-process. First, we've initiated a civil fine on other companies; correct?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

But what I'm concerned about is the due-process and just being notified on Monday, but what I think I heard from you was that they do not want to go into the expense of us tabling this, remanding it back to OHA to have hearings, because initially, that's what I was leaning towards as well, let's just remand this back, but I think I heard you say they really don't want to go through that whole process, and that they're going to waive it; is that correct?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

You are absolutely correct. We will waive any objections to a fine, but we did not want to waive our opportunity to raise these issues, because this would be our sole opportunity to respond.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

2.0

My next question relates to the issue of authority. Counsel's questioning the Board's authority to impose a fine, what is our position on that?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, it's my role from the OCC --- Ms. Sajer discusses the regulations, but the OEC believes the authority lies in the statute itself under Section 1202(b)(19). That section specifically says that the Board has the authority to levy fines or other sanctions against an applicant, licensed entity or other licensee, permitee or employee of the Board. It goes on from there.

and there's been approximately seven petitioners to come off the Prohibited Vendors List. Three of those have been granted and have paid the fine. One of those has paid the fine in advance of being granted. But we believe we've turned to that section in every one of those situations to address authority.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

And then my question would be to Counsel. What part of that are you challenging our ability to impose a fine?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

I'm challenging it as a basis
predominantly of due-process. We believe that the
Board can establish regulations under which the Board
can impose fines, but to take pure statutory authority
to issue fines without any further promulgation and
regulations that makes them applicable to vendors,
particularly a vendor who has been sanctioned by the
penalty of being placed on a prohibited list to now
have an additional penalty placed without any kind of
regulatory notice offends due-process.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

But you're precluding us from curing any due-process issues here by virtue of the fact that you don't want this delayed any further. So if we wanted to cure it, that would not be acceptable to you; is that true?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

Well, we believe that perhaps a systemic cure might be appropriate, even if our client does not get the benefit of it.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Systemic? Okay.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Other questions? Commissioner Sojka, you

look like you're contemplating.

1

3

6

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 <u>COMMISSIONER SOJKA:</u>

I'm a bit puzzled by that terminology.

Could you again please tell me what you mean by a

systemic cure? You want ---?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

7 We would suggest that it would be appropriate for this Board, particularly under new 8 leadership, to revisit some of the vendor regulations 10 to perhaps set forth in greater detail what a vendor should expect, to set forth the fines that a vendor 11 12 might encounter, to specifically advise a vendor who's 13 been placed on the Prohibited Vendors List that it 14 will require more than correction of deficiencies in 15 order to come off the list. I think some regulatory fixes would provide a little bit more notice than 16 Autovalet has had. But, all that said, Autovalet 17 18 cannot live with further delay and further expense. It's lost business opportunity already. 19

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Let me ask a quick question trying to get to the nub of the issue. As I understand it,

Autovalet was put on the Prohibited Vendors List

1 because of this company that either was their parent 2 company or was an affiliate in Bermuda. You had asked 3 for information from this company. Bermuda Law prevents them from giving you this information. brought it to the attention of Autovalet. They then restructured whatever it was that they needed to restructure to get you that information; is that an accurate statement of the facts?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

That's exactly correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Okay. And how long did that process take from when you notified Autovalet of this quirk in the 14 law or the interpretation of the law of Bermuda until when they changed their corporate structure to get you that information?

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Could I just add this? I thought they didn't change their structure until they were placed on the Prohibited Vendor List, that they didn't do that before.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

23 That's true. That is true. 24 being placed ---.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

So the only reason they changed was because we put them on the Prohibited Vendor List and they were not longer allowed to do business in Pennsylvania. Then that forced them to restructure. Up until that time, they were not going to restructure?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

I think that's probably true, yes.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I mean, that's the point. And I think that the Board --- well, I shouldn't speak for the 12 Board. My mind is, you know, if they were, you know, of the mind to say we are who we are, we're a Bermuda company, you know, go pound sand, we're not going to give you that information. And then because of that attitude, we had to put him on the Prohibited Vendors List, then you know what? I'm okay with the fine. But if it was merely informing them that, you know, because of this Bermuda Law that we had to put them on the Prohibited Vendors List and they immediately weren't aware of the intricacies of the Bermuda Law and immediately changed their corporate structure to give us that information, I'm less inclined. think --- I'd like to know that answer.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I believe there was a 1 2 failure to cooperate or a failure to supply the 3 information which led to Autovalet being placed on the Prohibited Vendors List. Once on that list, I'd be hard pressed to say they didn't make attempts to comply. I believe from January of 2009 until March 31st or early April, they had supplied all the documents required by Licensing and the investigators. So certainly they were able to bring everything to the table, but you know, arguably it was under the 10 pressure of being placed on that list, which really 11 set the events in motion. 12

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And your response to that, Counsel?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

Chairman Fajt, Autovalet believed that it had corrected the deficiency by filing one form that had been requested. Because the BOL had the authority to retain Autovalet's systems on the Prohibited

Vendors List, Autovalet continued to work and work and work, not to correct the deficiency, but in order to absolutely have a complete, clear, acceptable application.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Wait. Are our regulations clear that an

entity with a 32 percent interest in Autovalet has to disclose ownership?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

1

2

3

4

8

10

11

12

15

19

21

22

23

25

Yes, Mr. Commissioner. I believe it's anyone that has a five percent ownership in an entity has to turn over documentation.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

So when Autovalet filed their Okav. application, they were on notice that it was deficient from the start. Am I missing something?

ATTORNEY SAJER:

Chairman Ginty, you raise a good point, and I'm not entirely sure why the vendor system has to 13 14 be so complicated that a man of good education, training and business experience was unable to figure that out. Let me say a few things on Autovalet 16 Systems' defense. There was a certain disconnect 17 between the American subsidiary and the UK parent that 18 caused the ball to be dropped and the original form 2.0 not to be filed.

But with respect to this fairly fine technical point of law, yes, attorneys as practitioners and certainly the Board understands that if you trace the regulatory provisions, you'll get to 24 the point of saying well, yes, if you're more than a

certain percent ownership, then you should know that you need to do this.

Autovalet at that point was not represented. They thought they could do it by themselves because they had done so successfully in a number of other licensing jurisdictions. Pennsylvania does things a little differently but does not do so in a very clear, transparent way. And I think you're going to see increasing numbers in vendors show up before this Board because they have had missteps due to their lack of understanding of the process.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Well, you know, quite frankly, you know, perhaps we should take a look at our regulations, but it's clear to me that a failure to disclose a one-third owner of a company is not a technical issue. I mean, one-third is a pretty significant ownership interest.

ATTORNEY SAJER:

Well, it's one-third of the parent. I mean, we're a few steps removed from the Autovalet Systems that does work here in Pennsylvania.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

I don't want to prolong this, but I guess
I'd like to have a timeline or hear the timeline from

our individuals in terms of when the application was submitted, when the Notice of Deficiency was filed and just what happened in between.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Well, I can say that from my notes here, I know they were placed on a Prohibited Vendors List in December of 2008. I know Autovalet filed a Petition to be Removed from that list on January 12th of 2009. The time frame between January 12th of '09 and March 31st of '09 is really a dialogue that has occurred between our BOL and the Petitioner in which I believe a part of the problem is as information is turned over, it tends to open up or uncover other layers where additional information may then need to be obtained to clarify what was first turned over in the initial request.

All of that dialogue back and forth takes place between Licensing and the Petitioner, so I can't in good faith stand before you or sit here before you today and say I know exactly how many times Licensing contacted Autovalet. I can't say by what means they contacted Autovalet. But I know for a fact that letters were sent to the parent company. I know there were e-mail correspondences. I know there were telephone conversations in attempt to obtain this

information. As it's been related to the OEC, it was just a failure of the United Kingdom company, who is removed from the continental United States, wanting to cooperate, and then Bermudian trust issue surfaced, which became another hurdle to clear.

honestly can't vouch for. I'm very well aware that there was notice. I know that there was open dialogue between both parties. It was pretty clear what was trying to be obtained at first. I will admit that as the initial documentation was turned over, that then opened lower layers and additional clarification had to be provided, but I don't know if that's responsive to your question. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Commissioner Sojka?

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Just one quick question that can take a yes or no answer. We have had people placed on the Prohibited Vendor List. We've had them come off. In each and every one of those instances, has there been this sort of civil fine levied as they come off? Have there been any exceptions?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

I'm sorry, say that ---.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The question is, we've had people on --entities on this prohibited list. They have come off
in the past. In every single instance without
exception, has there been a civil fine levied?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Yes, Commissioner. It has been of varying degrees. I mean, the minimum amount is \$1,500. There have been fines that have been beyond that, but it seems from prior practice of this Board, the minimum amount is \$1,500.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Other questions? Can I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the Petition to Remove Autovalet Systems, LLC from the Prohibited Vendors List as described by the OCC. However, prior to any such removal, Autovalet shall pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,500.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

2

3

4

5

6

8

1

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any opposed?

NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion carries. Thank you, Marsha.

Thank you, guys. Continue on.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

9 The second petition before the Board today is Downs Racing's Petition for Approval of 10 Service Level Agreement with Mohegan Tribal Gaming 11 Authority. Mohegan Tribal Gaming Authority is a 12 13 parent company to both Downs Racing and Mohegan Sun 14 Connecticut. The Service Level Agreement will allow 15 Mohegan Tribal Gaming Authority to provide IT support to Downs Racing for traditional IT services, including 16 17 help desk support, network and application support, project management, system analysis and data center 18 19 services. Essentially, the Service Level Agreement 20 will allow the Mohegan Tribal Gaming Authority to 21 integrate certain IT functions for both facilities and 22 avoid duplication of services. All gaming operations, 23 security and surveillance functions would remain fully provided by and controlled at the Downs Racing 24 25 Pennsylvania facility, as is required by the Board's

regulations.

1

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Downs Racing and the OEC have entered 2 3 into a Stipulation regarding this matter whereby the OEC does not object to the approval of the Service Level Agreement but requests that the Board condition the granting of relief to assure that, one, Downs Racing maintains an IT department in Pennsylvania supervised by an IT Director, who will be responsible for the quality, reliability and accuracy of all of Downs Racing's slot machine computer systems. 10 that Downs Racing maintains records of all services 11 provided under the Service Level Agreement and 12 13 provides Board staff with quarterly reports of that 14 activity. And three, that the BOL is notified prior 15 to any subcontracts being entered into to perform services under the agreement. 16

Unless there's any further questions by the Board, that matter is ripe for the Board's consideration.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any questions or comments from the Board? May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I move that the Board 25 approve the Petition submitted by Downs Racing as just

46

described by the OCC.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI: 2

Second.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

6 AYES RESPOND

1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes. Thank you.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Next for the Board's consideration is Mount Airy #1, LLC's Petition requesting that the Board vacate its February 5th, 2008 Order suspending Louis DeNaples' Principal License.

By way of background, on January 23rd, 2008, the Fourth Dauphin County Investigating Grand Jury recommended that criminal charges be filed against Mr. DeNaples and the Mount Airy facility. On January 30th, 2008, criminal complaints were filed against both Mr. DeNaples and Mount Airy, charging each with four counts of perjury relating to testimony 24 provided to the Board. As a result of those charges, 25 Mr. DeNaples' Principal License was suspended by the

Executive Director and subsequently upheld by this Board.

1

2

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 On April 15th, 2009, an Agreement for the Withdrawal of Charges was entered into between Mr. DeNaples and the Dauphin County Office of District Attorney. Pursuant to the agreement, the District Attorney agreed, in part, to nolle prosequi all charges in exchange for an agreement that Mr. DeNaples would irrevocably transfer his ownership interest into 10 trusts on behalf of, initially, his daughter, Lisa DeNaples, that Mr. DeNaples would not exercise legal 11 12 control or dominion over Mount Airy, except as 13 required pursuant to his financial covenants, and that 14 Mr. DeNaples' agreement --- or agree that he would not 15 serve as the director, officer, manager of Mount Airy or exercise similar authority for Mount Airy. 16

The agreement with the District Attorney does contemplate that Mr. DeNaples will make application for reinstatement of his Principal License before the Board given his ongoing role as Mount Airy's sponsor, lender, mortgager and guarantor of financing.

The Petition presently before the Board seeks dissolution of the Order suspending Mr.

DeNaples' Principal License, and requests termination

of the Board appointed Trustee.

The OEC has responded to the petition, agreeing in part to the requested relief. They're requesting that the Trustee remain in place to attend Audit Committee meetings and meet with management and provide the Board with periodic updates pending completion of any further contemplated proceedings. Both Enforcement Counsel and Counsel for Mr. DeNaples are present to address the Board.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Please proceed.

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Good morning, Chairman Fajt, members of the Board. Michael Sklar on behalf of Mount Airy #1, LLC. This is Mount Airy's Petition to Vacate the Board's February 5th, 2008 Order, suspending the Principal License of Louis DeNaples.

Just a brief history. On February 26th, 2007, Louis DeNaples was issued a Principal License as the sole owner of Mount Airy #1, LLC. He underwent a thorough investigation and was fully vetted by the Gaming Board. On January 23, 2008, a presentment was issued by the Fourth Dauphin County Grand Jury for Louis DeNaples and Mount Airy #1, LLC, and complaints were issued by the Dauphin County DA on January 30,

2008.

1

25

Also on January 30, 2008, the OEC filed a 2 3 request for the suspension of Mr. DeNaples' Principal License on the sole basis that the District Attorney filed charges against Mr. DeNaples. On January 30, 2008, the Gaming Board issued a Temporary Emergency Order suspending Mr. DeNaples' Principal License. February 5th, 2008, again, based solely on the issuance of the Dauphin County complaint, the Board 10 suspended Mr. DeNaples' Principal License. On April 17th, 2009, the District Attorney formally withdrew 11 all charges against both Mr. DeNaples and Mount Airy. 12 13 As the Board is fully aware, from the day 14 that the charges were filed, Mr. DeNaples has 15 maintained his innocence. He has also maintained that the charges were meritless and he has maintained that 16 17 he was innocent of any wrongdoing. Nevertheless, Mr. DeNaples fully complied with the Board's February 5th 18 Suspension Order. He complied to the letter of that 19 20 Order. This, I think, speaks volumes about Mr. 21 DeNaples' integrity and character. Despite his 22 maintaining his innocence, he nonetheless accepted the Board's authority and the Board's Order and fully 23 24 The dismissal of all charges certainly complied.

vindicates Mr. DeNaples and Mount Airy.

This has been a long, difficult and costly process for Mr. DeNaples. And since the sole basis for the February 5th Suspension Order was the filing of the charges, since they have now been withdrawn, it is appropriate at this time to lift the suspension and vacate the February 5th Order.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

1

2

3

6

8

9

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Michael. Cyrus?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

10 Cyrus Pitre, Chief Enforcement Counsel. The underlying basis for the suspension of Mr. 11 DeNaples' Principal License and the conditions that 12 were placed upon Mount Airy #1, LLC was the issuance 13 14 of the Dauphin County Grand Jury presentment dated 15 January 23rd, 2008 and a subsequent filing of a criminal complaint on January 30th of 2008 against Mr. 16 17 DeNaples and Mount Airy #1, LLC.

to my knowledge, fully complied with the Board's Order and has complied with all requests made of him by the 21 Board, the Trustee and the various Board Bureaus. Additionally, during the period of his suspension, Mr. DeNaples filed Renewal Applications with the Board on December 26th, 2007 and April 9th, 2009. However, so as not to interfere with or impede the Dauphin County

Since his suspension, Mr. DeNaples has,

1 District Attorney's criminal prosecution, and so as not to undermine Mr. DeNaples' Fifth Amendment privileges under the United States Constitution, and 3 in the interest of justice, it was determined that the public interest would not be injured, but in fact, the public would be served through the Board Order Suspension and Trustee appointment pending the final resolution of the criminal charges. In keeping with this determination, the processing and review of Mr. DeNaples' Renewal Applications and the background 10 investigation that would be attached to those of Mr. 11 12 DeNaples were postponed pending the final resolution 13 of the criminal charges.

14 As a result of the entry by the Dauphin 15 County District Attorney and the subsequent agreement with Mr. DeNaples --- between Mr. DeNaples and the 16 17 District Attorney's office, it is the recommendation of Enforcement Counsel that the Board lift the 18 19 suspension of Mr. DeNaples' Principal License and 20 dissolves all the prohibitive conditions placed upon 21 Mr. DeNaples by the Board. But in keeping with the 22 Dauphin --- his agreement with the Dauphin County DA's 23 office. However, because Mr. DeNaples has two pending Renewal Applications that have yet to be vetted by 24 25 Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (BIE) and

because there's a pending petition to restructure the
ownership of the Mount Airy Casino, which also
requires a complete vetting by BIE, and because a
potential restructuring will require additional
application and document filings with the BOL, it is
the recommendation of the Enforcement Counsel that the
Board Order be modified with respect to the Trustee.

In this respect, Enforcement Counsel recommends that the Trustee remain in place pending a final Order of the Board regarding either Mount Airy's Petition to Restructure and/or regarding Mr. DeNaples' pending Renewal Applications for a Principal License.

Additionally, it's recommended that the modified Board Order limit the Trustee's responsibilities, powers and duties to his attendance at meetings held by Mount Airy #1, LLC's Independent Audit Committee and to conduct monthly meetings to be updated by Mount Airy #1, LLC's management team.

In this regard, the Trustee will serve as a failsafe mechanism for the Board during the pending business restructuring and/or Principal Renewal Application investigation and will be kept apprised of the facility operations. The modified Trustee appointment will ensure that no matter the result of the renewal investigation or business restructuring,

the Mount Airy Casino will continue to operate, its employees will continue to work and the Commonwealth will continue to receive its share of slot revenue from the licensed facility.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Thank you. What I'd like to do is allow the Board to ask the panelists that are before us questions and get the answers, and then we'll call the Trustee of Mount Airy, Tony Ceddia, to the dais for additional questions, so ---.

COMMISSIONER COY:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Yes, Commissioner Coy?

COMMISSIONER COY:

Cyrus, let me just try to clarify where

--- what I just heard you say with respect to the

Trustee would have us. Is it fair to say that the

work of the Trustee would now turn from more of a

management role, which he has been in, to more of a

transitional role in transitioning to returning the

management of the casino to another source?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

That's correct. The Trustee's role will be strictly to monitor and to speak with the

management team and be there during that transition as we move towards the eventual restructuring of the business.

COMMISSIONER COY:

So the Trustee would be there as a licensed entity from the Board to simply continue to make sure that the transition occurs and that it occurs in a smooth nature?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

That's correct.

COMMISSIONER COY:

One more question, Mr. Pitre. And that is, do you believe in your discussions with the Office of the District Attorney and other law enforcement entities that you may have spoken to, do you believe there is anything that should preclude this Board from lifting the suspension and moving forward as the Order provides?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Based on my discussions and based upon the agreement that was entered into between Mr.

DeNaples and the District Attorney's Office, the District Attorney's Office contemplates through this agreement that Mr. DeNaples will be seeking the suspension to be lifted and that Mr. DeNaples will

continue to be licensed as a principal even after the restructuring is complete.

COMMISSIONER COY:

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

25

And has any law enforcement agency or entity objected to you to the reinstatement of this license?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

There has been no objection.

COMMISSIONER COY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

I see this --- and to follow up a little bit of what Commissioner Coy's theme was, is this --the way I understand the way you explained it, it's almost a three step process. We're today going to be possibly amending our Order removing him from the 21 casino. That is going to be the first step. And then the next step is his petition --- we're going to be 23 hearing his Petition to Transfer the ownership over to 24 Lisa and to the trust, and then while that's all going on, we're still doing a --- for his renewal, there

will be that investigation going on, and then we'll take up the issue of his renewal; is that correct?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

3

4

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My goal is, and it might be a little ambitious on my part, but my goal is for the renewal investigation and the restructuring to meet at a point. We're operating on two different tracks with the renewal investigation and the restructuring, and my goal is to --- for both of those to meet at one point at the same time so the Board can take those matters all together so we can have a renewal of the 12 license, a restructuring, a proper transfer, and then have --- if so be it, then Mr. DeNaples will still 14 have to serve as a principal --- as a quarantor for the loans.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

And how long a period are we talking? ATTORNEY PITRE:

I can't put a time period on the renewal investigation. The restructuring, we're still awaiting documents, loan documents that need to be analyzed and reviewed. There are still some filings that need to be made with regard to the trust. would think six months would be adequate time. months --- three to four months would be very

ambitious, but I don't expect it to last longer than six months.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

2.

And then it's your opinion that we should maintain some sort of relationship with the Trustee to oversee the conditions that we put on him, put on the Order and to see this transition period?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah. Well, the Trustee has been put in place, as you well know, for over a year now. He has intimate knowledge of the operations of Mount Airy. He has intimate knowledge with regard to the previous restructurings that have occurred, with regard to the loan documents. So even if we did the restructuring today and everything was contemplated today, I think a Trustee would have to be in place for some time to ensure a smooth transition.

However, based on the amount of work that we still need to do to vet both the restructuring of the business and with regard to Mr. DeNaples' Renewal Applications, I contemplate that the Trustee will be there to ensure, as we move forward, a smooth transition and also to monitor --- to keep in touch with the management team with regard to the operations.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Thank you.

1

2

3

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

I'm sorry, can I just add one thing? 4 With respect to the Trustee, Mount Airy agrees that it would be in the best interests of the company, the Gaming Board, the employees at Mount Airy for Dr. Ceddia to remain in place in the limited capacity that Cyrus laid out, of attending Audit Committee meetings 10 and to get periodic updates from management. And the reason for that is Dr. Ceddia has been in place for 16 11 12 months now, and in order to ensure a smooth 13 transition, I think it is important for Dr. Ceddia to 14 remain in place to advise and consult, to make sure 15 that this transition is orderly.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

I'd like to follow up and kind of better understand the different roles here. Mr. Sklar, under your petition, as I understand it, we would, with respect to Mr. DeNaples, simply vacate the suspension, which would then put him in control and exercising legal dominion over Mount Airy. Is that your position?

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

And you think that's consistent with the agreement that Mr. DeNaples has reached with the District Attorney?

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

It is --- let me address that in a couple ways. First, when we're talking about the legal control and dominion over Mount Airy #1, LLC, Mr.

DeNaples has maintained from the beginning that we're not talking --- he's not exercising day-to-day management. What we're talking about is at the parent level where strategic-type decisions, financing, you know, acquisition, major acquisitions of assets, those are the kind of decisions that Mr. DeNaples would be involved with.

But to directly answer your question with the DA agreement, what was contemplated when that agreement was entered into was that there was going to be a simultaneous --- simultaneously the Gaming Board was going to act on the transfer to Lisa the trust of 100 percent of the Mount Airy interest, and at the same time, Louis' Principal License, the suspension would be lifted. So that's what was contemplated.

There was discussion that, well, what happens if the Gaming Board doesn't do it in this

simultaneous fashion? And the agreement --- there was 1 a provision that was added, and it's paragraph 16 of 3 the agreement, which contemplates that all the parties, Louis, Mount Airy and the District Attorney recognized that the Gaming Board is in control here, that the Gaming Board is the supreme body that controls everything with respect to gaming and the licenses. So that provision states that whatever the Gaming Board does, whatever they --- in their 10 discretion, they feel is appropriate, the Dismissal Agreement with the District Attorney would be modified 11 12 accordingly.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to get back to this. I want to know who's in control, who's exercising legal dominion over the period while the change of control is taking place. Whether that's two months, six months or a year, whatever it is, somebody has to be in charge. I mean, somebody has to sign documents on behalf of Mount Airy and so forth. And the question is, is that going to be Mr. DeNaples or --- I guess in my opinion, we should amend the Suspension Order consistent with the agreement that he has reached with the District Attorney which would prohibit Mr. DeNaples from exercising legal dominion over Mount Airy. But, you

know, somebody has to be in charge.

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Mr. DeNaples --- under what we're suggesting, Mr. DeNaples would be exercising legal control. That would not be violative of the Dismissal Agreement with the District Attorney. Again, what was contemplated was there was not going to be a gap period where the suspension would be lifted, Louis, his Principal License would become active again, and then there would be a period of time after that, subsequent where the transfer would take place. So it was never contemplated with the District Attorney that there was going to be a gap period where Dr. Ceddia or a third party would be exercising legal control. It was always contemplated that it was going to be Louis and then it was going to be Lisa.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

And if it were only that simple that we could do it all in one ruling. An alternative, obviously, would be to amend Dr. Ceddia's responsibilities as Trustee in such a way that he can exercise whatever legal dominion has to be done during this interim period.

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

The only thing I can tell you is that

agreement. And the reason why --- and the way that the parties thought that this issue or any issue that came up subsequently when the Gaming Board was going to act was this paragraph 16, which recognized that it's the Gaming Board who is going to make the call on how this is going to proceed. And the parties will abide and conform the agreement to that decision.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

Well, perhaps it might be proper to allow Dr. Ceddia to exercise that control until we receive a modified agreement between Mr. DeNaples and the DA's Office that that was not what was contemplated.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

15 Well, I think Mr. Sklar is correct in that --- you know, as I read the documents, I thought 16 17 this was going to be a fairly simple process that we --- again, could take place in one day with one 18 combined ruling, but that's not going to be the case. 19 20 For some interim period, Mr. DeNaples will still be 21 100 percent owner of Mount Airy, and I'm concerned 22 during that period that what happens is fully consistent with the ideas that the District Attorney 23 has. I'm not sure whether we've reached an agreement 24 25 on this or not.

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Again, if the --- as Cyrus said, if the

Board issues an Order or makes a decision that Mr.

DeNaples --- the suspension would be lifted, and

during this period of time until the transfer took

place and Louis would be in control, we could

certainly have this agreement amended. I mean, that's

specifically why this provision was added. We did

discuss changing some of the language in the Dismissal

Agreement itself, but we couldn't anticipate what the

Board was going to do.

So the idea was, well, let's just put a catch-all at the end, because everyone --- it was clear as a bell that everyone recognized that the Gaming Board was going to make the decision on how this was going to proceed from a licensing point of view. So if the Board makes the decision, then that's exactly what was contemplated by the agreement. We would modify the Dismissal Agreement.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Doug, do you have any thoughts on this?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Certainly, it's --- I mean, whatever Mr.

24 DeNaples and the District Attorney's, you know,

25 Counsel has all agreed to. Michael is correct that

it's ultimately for the Board's determination of what
to do and what conditions to impose, how the Trustee
would be further utilized, if at all, and what powers
are granted or not granted. It probably would be good
to get some input from the Trustee on this very issue
so that the Board can form an opinion on what
direction you want to go.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Commissioner Angeli?

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

Yeah, just a couple questions. First of all, Mr. Pitre, is the Restructuring Petition in to us now?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

The petition is in and a response has been filed. This is akin to --- well, we haven't decided yet, a change of ownership, a change of control. I mean, we're faced with similar but not on the same scale nature of financial work that we did in the PITG matter. So there's still documents that are being reviewed. The petition, in our opinion, right now is premature, because we don't have all the information and we're not ready to move forward yet.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

Okay. I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If I could just jump in for a second.

What's contemplated with the Restructuring Petition is that Mr. DeNaples would transfer his 100 percent interest to a newly created trust, as it was created a month ago. Lisa DeNaples established the trust. She is the sole beneficiary, the sole Trustee. Lisa DeNaples currently is licensed as a Key Employee at the property. She's currently the Chief Operating Officer.

The transfer documents --- it's a very simple transfer. We sent drafts to the Gaming Board staff. And the only thing that we were waiting for was comments from the lenders, from JPMorgan, and we have --- this is --- unofficially, they have told us that they don't have --- they don't object to the transfer. There's going to be a modification to the Credit Agreement with JPMorgan. It's going to be a very simple modification because Louis is going to stay on as quarantor. It's just going to simply reaffirm that Louis is still on place with the quarantees, and Lisa's trust is now going to be the owner, and that's --- it's really not a complicated transaction, at least the way we view it. And this week, we're going to provide final drafts of the

transaction documents to staff.

2 <u>COMMISSIONER ANGELI:</u>

Is there a transfer of dollars in this trust between Mr. DeNaples and the new entity?

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

The way it's going to happen is --what's contemplated is there's going to be an
appraisal, and the --- whatever that appraisal comes
out at, that's going to be the purchase price. And
the Lisa trust will give a note back to Mr. DeNaples,
which will be repaid from the cash flow from the
facility.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

14 Lisa DeNaples currently is licensed as a

15 Key Employee?

1

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

18

21

23

16 ATTORNEY SKLAR:

17 Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

19 She would now be licensed as a Principal

20 Employee?

ATTORNEY SKLAR:

22 Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

And the applications are very similar
with one exception. I believe this is the financial

difference. Since she's going to have a dollar value, and the question in the principal investigation is going to be where did Mrs. DeNaples get the money to buy Mr. DeNaples' portion of this?

ATTONREY SKLAR:

2.4

On, I think it was May 20th, we sent in a letter to Licensing requesting an upgrade of Lisa's status, licensing status from Key Employee to Principal. But to answer your question, it would be solely payable with the proceeds from the facility. To the extent there was a shortfall, the payments will just accrue.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

Going back to the Renewal Application,

Mr. Pitre, will the --- because we have to do the --because Mr. DeNaples is included in the financial

structure of this organization, he will have to be
licensed as a Principal even after the trust has been
transferred unless there's some other reorganization
that financially takes him out of this. Would the --I hate to use the term investigation, but would the
renewal process be any --- would that any way affect
the transfer of this agreement, that is, the petition
that's in now?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

As far as the renewal process is concerned, no matter what, Mrs. DeNaples has to be licensed as a Principal. Therefore, it's going to come down as to whether or not he has maintained his suitability or not. That's dependent upon the background investigation.

1

2

3

22

23

24

25

So with regard to the restructuring, the restructuring could possibly occur prior to that 8 renewal investigation being done. I mean, if we 10 finish doing everything that we have to do with regard to the restructuring in 30 days and we're not done 11 12 with the renewal investigation, the renewal 13 investigation still has to continue until it's ended. 14 I don't contemplate holding up the restructuring just 15 because the renewal investigation is not complete, because either way, he has to be licensed as a 16 17 Principal, and it's going to be dependent upon the renewal investigation, but either --- it's not going 18 19 to affect the overall restructuring, because 20 basically, it's all going to lie with that background 21 investigation.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

When the Board put the Order in place suspending the license, we placed Mr. Ceddia actually, and correct me if have this wrong, but he actually was

in Mr. DeNaples' place during this time frame, making all of the strategic and operational decisions for Mount Airy during that time period?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

1

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

24

25

That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

So if we vacate the Order now, between now and the time that you --- that the transfer occurs, how do we envision the operational decisions? If Mr. DeNaples is in an overseeing position, who signs the documents? Who reports back to the Board during this transition period?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

If the Trustee is no longer in place, then that would be Mr. DeNaples.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

17 Okay. But if we keep the Trustee in place for a limited role, still the decisions would be 18 made by Mr. DeNaples? 19

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Those overall --- Mr. DeNaples is the 22 Principal, sole Principal at Mount Airy, and it would 23 be Mr. DeNaples or whoever he designates to do that in his place.

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Commissioner Sojka?

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

May I make a proposal, Mr. Chairman? And that is we are now, I think, focused on the real business at hand, and I have a couple questions that I would like to ask that relate to this two step process that might be valuable before we completely adjourn, but I'd like to hold those questions until we can stay on this thread, resolve this issue. And then before we let everyone go, could I ask a couple questions?

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Certainly.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any other questions for the panelists that we have here? And what I'm going to do, Michael, I'm going to have you remove yourself, and we'll have Trustee --- Dr. Ceddia come up and take your seat. Cyrus, why don't you stay where you are? Doug, stay where you are. Anybody else have any questions before we do that?

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

While we're waiting for Dr. Ceddia, just to be clear, and I think you've answered this, you have been working with the District Attorney and his people, and I assume they have full background of the Grand Jury investigation; would that be a correct assumption?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have been in --- I have had some conversations with the DA's Office. I have met with the DA's Office. And the DA's Office does have access to the Grand Jury information.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

And they have expressed no reservations on our re-licensing Mr. DeNaples as a Principal in this case?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

It's contemplated through the agreement with the District Attorney's Office, and Mr. DeNaples, that he will be licensed as a Principal.

COMMISSIONER GINTY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Dr. Ceddia, thank you for joining us.

Why don't you make any comments that you want and then
we'll open up the question period for the Board?

DR. CEDDIA:

1 2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just briefly, 3 it's been discussed already that the Trusteeship has been in place for a number of months, actually 16 months. During that period, I'm pleased to report, as I have in the past, to this Board, and again today to stress it, that the Trustee has had excellent cooperation from the Gaming Board, from the Gaming Board staff, from the Mount Airy group itself at the 10 casino, and also Mr. DeNaples. It's been reported by Attorney Sklar that 11 Mr. DeNaples has paid very close attention to the 12 13 Board's Order of February 5th, and as I have attested 14 before this Board several times in my monthly reports, 15 Mr. DeNaples has scrupulously met all of the obligations of that Order and has allowed me, as 16 17 Trustee, to work in a very smooth and harmonious way with all the parties concerned. So I would reinforce 18 the fact that Mr. DeNaples has consistently showed a 19 20 great deal of concern and interest in meeting the 21 commitments that were established by this Board on

I also want to just conclude by saying that during the 16 to 18 months, the LLC itself has been through a number of significant changes.

22

23

24

25

February 5th.

1 Board is fully aware of the fact that we wedded and navigated through two significant refinancings and that we have also restructured the entire Executive Management Team. And I'm pleased to again report to this Board that that new management team is doing an excellent job and has made extensive efforts, not only in the areas of compliance and fiscal management, but also to reduce the facility's operating overhead.

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would just caution yet again that there still may be some turbulent economic times ahead for the facility with the opening of the Sands. We've seen some diminution of our database, but we have planned for that. We are confident that we'll continue to improve in that direction, but it is still possible that the facility could have some economic challenges in the third and fourth quarter of this fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you. Questions from the Board.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

You made reference to the fact that Yes. there are some outstanding issues that you see in the future. Do you feel that the staff that's onboard right now have the technical wherewithal to weather that particular storm?

DR. CEDDIA:

I think, Mr. Commissioner, we have a group on the management team today that really has not only significant gaming experience, particularly in Mr. George Toth, who's the CEO of the facility, but coupled with Lisa DeNaples as the Chief Operating Officer --- and I might add parenthetically that during the last 18 months that I've been associated with the property, she has grown tremendously in her professional understanding and operational knowledge of gaming.

In fact, one of the things that occurred during this period was a revolving internship where she spent considerable time in areas where she was not as versed as, perhaps, she is now, in finance, in information technology and food and beverage. And beyond that, we've added a new CFO, Mr. Grancy, who brings to us some previous experience in gaming as a CFO. So I'm very, very confident that the group now onboard is in a better position to not only lead the facility, but also adapt to the ongoing challenges that any gaming facility would experience in its daily and monthly and yearly operations.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you, Dr. Ceddia. Other questions?

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

Not at this point.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Commissioner Coy?

COMMISSIONER COY:

Dr. Ceddia, you've had a chance with your Counsel, I think, to look at the proposed Order and agreement; is that true?

DR. CEDDIA:

10 Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER COY:

Do you believe, given your past 16 months experience and what you would anticipate in the next several months, that this agreement is workable?

DR. CEDDIA:

Yes, I believe it is. I believe it does provide an orderly transition. It does provide for not only the role of the Trustee to continue to work with the facility, but also to protect the interests of the Commonwealth.

One of the primary responsibilities this 22 Board imparted on me on February 5th was in addition 23 to protecting the asset, the LLC, was also to protect the interests of the Commonwealth as it pertained to compliance, and in addition to that, the obligation of the owner to meet the expectations of the February 5th Order. I believe we've been able to do that. I believe that we would be in a position, if this Board determined it, to help assist in a transition period over the next few months as both the license renewal for Mr. DeNaples were completed and the change of ownership were to be finalized.

I would add also, too, that again, we've 8 been able to create a good communication network with 10 all the interested parties, including Mr. DeNaples, 11 who I had frequent contact with via telephone and also 12 in personal meetings during the past 16 months to 1.3 ensure that we were all basically on the same page. 14 And again, I'll stress he made no decisions. 15 the decisions. I informed him of issues and concerns. The decisions he made were strictly focused and 16 17 limited to his obligation as the personal financial 18 quarantor of the facility. Beyond that, our working relationship continued to be very, very positive and 19 20 meaningful.

COMMISSIONER COY:

Thank you.

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Could I --- I should ask this one question, I guess, before we finish up, because it's

just bothering me, and I don't want to distract us, but it just popped up again. And I have been troubled since January 30th, 2008 about the fact that the 3 charges in this case were twofold. They were against Mr. DeNaples, and it was perjury, then it was against Mount Airy #1, LLC, which I think I was not alone in having difficulty in understanding. But now we realize that this non pros tender that was offered to Mr. DeNaples covers both sets of charges. But the part that bothers me is, did somebody need to speak 10 for the LLC in that arrangement, and if so, was that 11 12 you or is that entirely within the purview of the District Attorney? 13

DR. CEDDIA:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We, as the team --- when I say we, the Trustee team, scrupulously avoided any involvement in the pending criminal matter. What we did, however, when asked by one of Mr. DeNaples' attorneys who was seeking to have the LLC absolved from the original indictment, provided information regarding the significant economic contribution that the facility was providing to Mount Pocono and beyond.

One of the things that clearly hit me when I first got on the site after being appointed by the Board, in talking with the rank and file

membership of the Mount Airy cadre of employees, and also having some conversations with some of the local vendors and merchants and small businesses in the area, was the incredible economic engine that this facility was providing for that whole area. And as several of the employees reported to me, these were the first ever jobs that they ever had in that area where health benefits were part of --- or a retirement plan was part of their employment.

This is the kind of information we reported to one of Mr. DeNaples' attorneys, who, for various legal reasons, was seeking, as you suggest, the removal of the LLC from the indictment.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Commissioner McCabe.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

I don't have a question. I have a comment. Dr. Ceddia, this isn't --- the action we're probably going to take today is not going to sever our relationship with you, but I think we may end up taking a big weight off of your shoulders. And I just want to publicly thank you and your team for what an outstanding job you have done during this time period,

looking out for the Commonwealth of the people, the interest of all of us, and in addition to how you have helped Mount Airy, I think, become a better and a stronger institution. I just want to thank you and let you know we really appreciate it.

DR. CEDDIA:

1

2

3

6

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you. I appreciate your comments and I accept them on behalf of my entire team and candidly on behalf of everybody who's helped the 10 Trusteeship. I also want to tell you that it's been a privilege to me, as a retired state employee and 11 12 former University President, for the first time, to be 13 able to contribute back to the General Fund as opposed to drawing from the General Fund. And I'm very proud 14 15 of the fact that during our tenure, almost \$135 million to \$137 million have been provided to the 16 17 General Fund for the operation of the Commonwealth. And we're all, as a team, and I believe Mount Airy as 18 an entity, very pleased with that. 19

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you, Dr. Ceddia.

DR. CEDDIA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any other questions before we take a

15 minute break to talk among ourselves? I'd just like to ask everybody involved with this specific issue to please stay in the auditorium. We will be 3 back in 15 minutes. Thank you.

SHORT BREAK TAKEN

6

8

10

11

19

21

22

24

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you, everybody. I'd like to reconvene our meeting and ask Doug Sherman to read the motion before the Board.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Members of the Board, based upon Yes. 12 the documentary record that's been presented to you, 13 along with the arguments and positions advanced by 14 Counsel, as well as the statements by Dr. Ceddia, the 15 Board has had the opportunity to engage in quasi-judicial deliberations. The OCC does have a 16 17 Proposed Order, which Deputy Chief Counsel Steve Cook will read, after which it would be appropriate for the 18 Board to entertain a motion with respect to that 2.0 Order.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, and 23 now this third day of June 2009, upon consideration of the Petition of Mount Airy #1, LLC to vacate the Board's February 5th, 2008 Order, which is based on

the nolle prosequi entered on April 17th, 2009 by the
Dauphin County District Attorney in the matter of The
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Louis A. DeNaples and
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Mount Airy #1,
LLC, it is hereby ordered that the Board's Order of
February 5th, 2008, which suspended the Principal
License of Louis DeNaples and which installed the
Trustee to oversee operations of Mount Airy #1, LLC,
shall be amended pending the Board's consideration of
the Amended Petition of Mount Airy #1, LLC for
approval of a corporate restructuring as follows.

The suspension of the Principal License of Louis A. DeNaples is lifted. Paragraphs number three, five and six of the Board's prior Order are vacated. Paragraph number four of the Board's prior Order shall remain in effect, except that it shall not be construed to prohibit any transfer of ownership or change of control of Mount Airy #1, LLC approved by the Board.

Louis A. DeNaples shall not exercise any legal control or dominion over Mount Airy #1, LLC unless a particular act or endorsement is required by a bank or other lending institution which act or endorsement is approved by the Board. This condition shall not be construed to prohibit any transfer of

ownership or changing of control of Mount Airy #1, LLC approved by the Board.

Louis A. DeNaples shall not serve as a director, officer or manager of Mount Airy #1, LLC, nor exercise the authority vested in the directors, officers or managers of Mount Airy #1, LLC. This condition shall not be construed to prohibit the provision of advice and consultation by Louis A. DeNaples in his capacity as founder and financial guarantor to the officers, directors, managers and other persons responsible for the security, operation and performance of Mount Airy #1, LLC.

or becomes liable for any loan, mortgage, debt or other financing commitment or undertaking related to the business or property of Mount Airy #1, LLC or has rights related to the same or is entitled to receive payments there under or thereto related, this Order is not intended to limit or impair the security for or obligations related to any provision whatsoever in any such loan, mortgage, debt or other financing commitment or undertaking.

Louis A. DeNaples shall submit himself to a full background and suitability investigation and agrees to cooperate fully with the BIE and the OEC

during any suitability investigation and/or background investigation in connection with his Principal License Renewal Application. Louis DeNaples shall provide all information and assistance in gathering all information requested by the Board, the BIE and the OEC in connection with his Principal License Renewal Application.

Due to the conditions placed on Louis A.

DeNaples by the Order, the Trusteeship shall remain in place until further order of the Board. However, paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Board's prior Order are hereby vacated. The Trustee shall have the duty and authority to attend meetings of Mount Airy #1, LLC's Independent Audit Committee, meet with Mount Airy #1, LLC's management no less than twice a month and to provide the Board with periodic updates on the management of the facility as to be directed by the Board.

Provide the Board with a written monthly report on any material matters concerning the findings and actions of the Independent Audit Committee and management of Mount Airy #1, LLC and the compliance with this Order. Consult with the Trustee's Forensic Auditor and Legal Counsel as reasonable and necessary to carry out the Trustee's duties. To exercise all

rights and obligations of Louis A. DeNaples under the operating agreement of Mount Airy #1, LLC as reasonably necessary and to perform any additional duties as ordered by the Board.

While this Order remains in effect, the Trustee shall be compensated at a rate of \$15,000 per month for the performance of all of his duties. The Trustee's legal and forensic accounting advisors shall be compensated at customary and reasonable hourly rates as approved by the Board for time expended on behalf of the Trustee.

This Order is not intended to impair, limit, terminate or otherwise negate any insurance coverage provided to the Trustee and as applicable, his professional advisors and agents, including coverage under Mount Airy #1, LLC's existing blanket crime policy or any standalone professional liability policies. This Order is not intended in any way to alter, impair, limit, terminate or otherwise negate either the obligations of Mount Airy #1, LLC under the express superseding indemnification and hold harmless agreement or the obligations of Louis A. DeNaples under the express superseding hold harmless agreement.

Upon completion and approval of a corporate restructuring, as presently contemplated,

the Board will consider dissolving the Trusteeship presently provided for in a manner to assure transition of function which will not impair Mount Airy #1, LLC's operations.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

2.0

Thank you. Doug, just for the purpose of the record and also anybody else in the audience who's not a lawyer, can you try to put that in laymen's terms for us, please?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Sure. The laymen's interpretation is essentially the Order would lift the suspension of the Principal License of Mr. DeNaples, which in turn allows him to accept --- have access to the Mount Airy facility. It also permits his giving of advice or consultation with the management team of Mount Airy.

Essentially, what the Order does is it implements the agreement of Mr. DeNaples, which he has previously expressed relative to the --- his ongoing involvement or the restrictions on his ongoing involvement and the intent to transfer ownership of the facility to the trust on behalf of his children. While doing this, the Order continues the Trustee, Dr. Ceddia, in his duties in somewhat of a more limited than previously engaged. And that would, obviously,

86 1 be through the transitional phase, which the Board will consider at some point in the future. 3 And finally, the Order continues the BIE review process through the renewal of the Principal License of Mr. DeNaples. 6 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 7 And this Order is reflective of Mr. DeNaples' agreement with the Dauphin County District 8 Attorney? 10 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 11 It fully implements the major Yes. 12 aspects of that agreement. 13 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 14 Thank you. Any other questions before we 15 call for a vote? Can I have a motion? 16 COMMISSIONER COY: 17 Mr. Chairman, I move the Board approve 18 the Mount Airy Petition in part and modify the Board's 19 February 5, 2008 Order as described by the OCC. 20 COMMISSIONER GINTY: Second. 21 22 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 23 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 2.4 25 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Next for the Board's consideration is
Mountainview's Petition for Approval of Additional
Slot Machines on its gaming floor. Mountainview is
Penn National's Hollywood Casino. They seek to
increase the number of slot machines by 200. That
would take it from 2,315 machines to 2,515. The 200
additional machines would include ten electronic table
games. 104 of the 200 machines will be in the smoking
area, 96 machines placed in the non-smoking area. And
the gaming floor boundaries will remain the same at
94,301 square feet.

The OEC does not oppose the relief requested, subject to the ten conditions listed in its Answer. Those conditions have been provided to the Board and essentially require the Licensee to submit internal controls, amendments necessitated by the expansion, as well as to assure the requirements of the Bureau's Gaming Laboratory Operations, the Department of Revenue, the Bureau of Gaming Operations, Bureau of Casino Compliance and the Office

88 of Compulsive and Problem Gambling. 2 Based upon the documentary record 3 presented, it would be appropriate for the Board to now entertain a motion to grant that request. 5 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 6 Before we do that, any questions or comments from the Board? May I have a motion? 8 COMMISSIONER GINTY: 9 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 10 approve the Mountainview Thoroughbred Association's Petition for additional slot machines on the gaming 11 floor as described by the OCC. 12 13 COMMISSIONER MCCABE: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN FAJT: Any questions or comments from the OEC? 16 17 ATTORNEY POWERS: 18 No comments, no questions. 19 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 20 Thank you. All in favor of the motion? AYES RESPOND 21 22 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 23 Opposed? 2.4 NO RESPONSE 25 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

The motion passes.

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

22

25

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Next on the agenda are Withdrawals by Principals and Key Employees presented by Deputy Chief Counsel Steve Cook.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you, Doug. And Steve, before you start, a little housekeeping matter. I see Dave Barasch in the audience. Dave, thank you for being here on behalf of our ex-officio member, Secretary Steve Stetler. Any other ex-officio members or representatives in the audience? Okay. Steve?

ATTORNEY COOK:

14 The Board has received nine unopposed 15 Petitions to Withdraw Key Employee Applications, 16 Principal Applications or Personal History Disclosure 17 Statements. The individuals subject to these 18 Petitions are as follows: Chris Anderson, Mark Hoppe, Albert Keyack, Gina Ladocsi, John Lorenty, Chad 19 20 Mummert, Ryuichi Nakata, Markus Stenzer and Joel 21 TePastte.

The OEC has no objections to these 23 withdrawals. As such, the OCC submits these 24 withdrawals to the Board for consideration of a motion to grant the same without prejudice.

90 1 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 2 Any questions or comments from the Board? 3 May I have a motion? COMMISSIONER MCCABE: 4 5 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue 6 Orders to approve the Withdrawals or Surrenders as described by the OCC. 8 COMMISSIONER RIVERS: 9 Second. 10 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 11 All in favor? 12 AYES RESPOND 13 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 14 Opposed? 15 NO RESPONSE 16 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 17 Motion passes. 18 ATTORNEY COOK: 19 Next before the Board, and I believe the 20 last thing before the Board for the OCC is 21 consideration of one Report and Recommendation 22 received from the OHA relative to TriState HVAC 23 Equipment, LLP. 24 The Report and Recommendation, along with 25 the evidentiary record, has been provided to the Board

in advance of this meeting. Additionally, the 1 2 applicant has been notified that the Board is 3 considering the Report and Recommendation and that they have the right to be present to address the Board. If any individual is present on behalf of TriState HVAC Equipment, they could please --- if they could please come forward.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

TriState HVAC is a heating, ventilation and cooling provider which has installed central utility plants in Mohegan Sun at Pocono Downs and the Hollywood Casino at Penn National. As a result, on January 30th, 2008, TriState submitted a Certified Vendor Application with the BOL. Subsequently, the application was forwarded by the BOL to the BIE for the purpose of conducting a suitability investigation.

On May 12th, 2008, the BIE requested additional information from TriState as well as requesting that certain of its principals be fingerprinted. For the ensuing seven months, there were numerous communications between the parties. 21 | However, BIE alleges that it still did not receive all of the requested information. As a result, the OEC sent a Notice of Recommendation of Denial on January 29th, 2009. As a result of that Notice, a hearing before the Board's OHA was conducted on March 12th,

2009, and subsequently a Report and Recommendation was issued by the OHA, and that is now before the Board.

It is this report and --- excuse me, I'm sorry. The Report and Recommendation briefly makes the recommendation that the Board return the matter to the BIE to permit TriState one final opportunity to supply the requested information within a very limited time period. The Hearing Officer further indicates that if TriState fails to comply with providing this information in the limited time period, that its application be denied. On the contrary, if TriState does provide the information, that BIE complete and conclude its investigation.

This matter is now ripe for the Board's consideration. Should the Board choose to adopt the Hearing Officer's recommendation, the OCC believes it would be appropriate to set a ten day time limit by which TriState could submit this information.

Additionally, the OCC believes that this applicant should remain on the intent to deny status, unable to perform any services or do any business with our slot machine licensees until all of the information is submitted.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any comments from Counsel for TriState?

MR. GREENER:

1

2

3

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm not counsel, but I'm a managing partner of TriState HVAC, Tony Greener. Yeah. comments are the application delays resulted totally from a situation outside our control. I had a partner looking to leave my company. He did not want any part of this process. And it just perpetuated through the entire year of 2008.

Short of that, there were delays. Nobody's denying them. But I think the recommendation from the hearing was appropriate except that, you 12 know, we'd look for maybe 15 to 20 days to make sure that we can comply properly and get this over with. There's been no criminal intent found through the processes that have happened so far, so they're --basically, we have nothing to do with the casino floor. We're just supplying air conditioning to the casino. So that's my comments.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you. OEC, your comments?

In Mr.

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

Greener's defense, he has probably been the most 23 cooperative of the three members that make up TriState 24 25 HVAC. I will admit that he had some difficulty with

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 his other two partners, one being Joseph M. Callahan, the other being Samuel J. Long, and I think even at the hearing before the OHA, he admitted that he could not get them to comply.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

As we currently sit here before you today, the letter that was sent out by the agent, Mark Paluck, on May the 12th of 2008, which by bullet point identified all the materials that would be required, that's still outstanding. It still hasn't been satisfied, and every item on that list will still be required. I have that list. I'd be willing to read it into the record. It is somewhat extensive.

If the Board has a copy of the exhibits that were entered during the course of the hearing, it is OEC Exhibit Number Two and Number Three. Two is for the corporation and the documents that they would have to provide. Number Three goes to the specific individuals, Mr. Greener, Mr. Long, Mr. Callahan, and the documentation that they would have to provide. As of this date, Mr. Greener, is the only one who has really made an attempt to give anything to Agent Paluck to satisfy those requests.

One last outstanding issue has to do with 24 Mr. Long's involvement with TriState HVAC. I believe it was in June of 2008 there was some discussion from

1 TriState that Mr. Long would no longer be a partner, and essentially his need to continue through the process was going to dissolve. That has not really happened.

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Greener's informed us through the course of the hearing that in December of 2008, Mr. Long --- that process has come to a conclusion. Unfortunately, when the Board looks at its records, no official Motion or Petition has been filed by Mr. Long removing him as one of the controlling partners. as we currently stand, we're still expecting documentation from Mr. Long. So until that's updated, we still have three outstanding individuals who need to supply information, and then the corporation itself has to supply the information.

I honestly don't know if ten days will be enough. And it's because it's so extensive. And at this point, the information requested is dated. were asking in some situations for two or three years worth of information, and that was back in May of 2008. I think if that information is provided now, it's stale. So I think the two or three year time frame would have to start from this point forward or this point back, I quess.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Mr. Greener, if we were to grant a 10 day --- or 20 day extension as opposed to 10, do you think you'll get the information in by then that's required? It sounds like it's a little more involved than I initially thought.

MR. GREENER:

1

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Not quite. Or it's not that quite The information --- the post-dated involved. information is available now. It's been ready. Updating it, we would need to discuss, you know, what time frames they want to see, but you know, 2008 tax returns, et cetera, are all available, ready to go. And we're aware of his extensive list.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Unfortunately, Counsel, movement from 10 days to 20 days, any issue from your standpoint on that?

ATTORNEY BEAVERSON:

There's no issue that we would have. We just don't want to set up a process that essentially is going to put Mr. Greener and his corporation in the path of failure, and I honestly --- given the correspondences that have taken place up to this 24 point, which have been almost 20, and promises that 25 have been broken, I just don't know if 10 days would

97 be sufficient, and I'm just trying to be cautious. 1 2 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 3 Sure. Any questions from the Board? objection from the Board? I don't want to, you know, assume that all of you are okay with moving from 10 to 20 days. COMMISSIONER GINTY: Is Mr. Callahan onboard now? 8 9 MR. GREENER: 10 Yes, he is. 11 COMMISSIONER GINTY: 12 Okay. And so it's just the two of you as partners? 13 14 MR. GREENER: 15 That's correct. The only thing that I would ask is if I can get a formal recommendation of 16 17 how we subtract Mr. Long from the process. I'm not aware of the process. 18 19 COMMISSIONER MCCABE: 20 I'm concerned there may not be enough time, because aren't they going to have to first file 21 22 a Petition to Remove Mr. Long ---23 ATTORNEY BEAVERSON: 24 That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

25

--- and then --- how's that going to play into this 10, 20 day period? They may need more time.

ATTORNEY COOK:

1

2

3

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

If I could, Commissioner. I believe they could file the Petition to Withdraw and the missing documents, and in the pendency of the Withdrawal Petition, they still could operate as a Certified Vendor.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

From what it sounds like, we need to be able to be in communication with each other. There's been a breakdown.

ATTORNEY COOK:

I think the BOL contemplates those types of situations and we'll be able to deal with them.

MR. GREENER:

If I may ask one item? We supply some extremely critical processes to the casinos from the air conditioning side, which we're currently involved in both of those casinos. To not be allowed to do that process could cause a major a breakdown of those casinos. So I submit that we could provide the paperwork almost immediately within a couple days and 24 get that into the process, but we need to be allowed to still do what we do for those casinos.

ATTORNEY COOK:

I think that was the relief that we were suggesting. The relief that I had recommended was that when all the documents are submitted, that they get interim certification and be able to go back to work pending the completion of the investigation.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you. Any other questions from the Board? May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

Yes. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to put in a 30 day time period as opposed to a 20 day time period, because it sounds like you are at least attempting to do all the right things, and at least our Counsel is agreeing with you. So we're going to give you a 30 day period.

Now, the motion is I move that the Board issue an Order to adopt the Report and Recommendation of the OHA related to the TriState HVAC Equipment, LLP with the modifications described by the OCC.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

25 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

100

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

NO RESPONSE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

15

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes. Thank you, gentlemen.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

That concludes the business of the OCC.

Thanks.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

And stay in contact with them so if there are any issues, that you're aware of them.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Next we have our Director of Licensing,
14 Susan Hensel. Good morning, Susan.

MS. HENSEL:

Thank you, Chairman Fajt and members of the Board. I have a number of licensing matters to bring before you today. First we have two

Manufacturer Licenses, IGT and Spielo Manufacturing,

ULC, and a Supplier License, KGM Gaming, LLC that are up for their second renewals. In each case the BIE has completed its investigation, and the BOL has provided you with a renewal background investigation and suitability report.

No issues were identified by either the

101 1 BIE or Licensing that would preclude licensure. 2 have provided you with draft Orders for each of these renewal licenses and ask that the Board consider the 3 Orders beginning with IGT. 5 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 6 Enforcement Counsel, any issues on your end? 8 ATTORNEY PITRE: 9 In each instance we've reviewed each 10 investigation, and we do not object to the renewal of 11 these licenses. 12 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 13 Thank you, Cyrus. Questions or comments 14 from the Board? Can I have a motion? 15 COMMISSIONER SOJKA: 16 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 17 approve the Order renewing the Manufacturer License of 18 IGT as described by the BOL. 19 COMMISSIONER ANGELI: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 22 All in favor? 23 AYES RESPOND 24 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 25 Opposed?

		103
1	All in favor?	
2	AYES RESPOND	
3	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
4	Opposed?	
5	NO RESPONSE	
6	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
7	Motion passes. Next?	
8	COMMISSIONER GINTY:	
9	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board i	ssue
10	an Order to approve the issuance of Temporary Key	
11	Employee Licenses as described by the BOL.	
12	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
13	Any questions or comments from the Bo	ard?
14	COMMISSIONER MCCABE:	
15	Second.	
16	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
17	All in favor?	
18	AYES RESPOND	
19	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
20	Opposed?	
21	NO RESPONSE	
22	CHAIRMAN FAJT:	
23	Motion passes.	
24	MS. HENSEL:	
25	Next are Gaming and Non-gaming Permit	S

and Registrations. Prior to this meeting the BOL 1 2 provided you with a list of 521 individuals, including 3 307 initial and 214 renewals who the Bureau has granted Occupation Permits to, and 692 individuals who the Bureau has granted Registrations to under the authority delegated to the BOL. I ask that the Board adopt a motion approving the Order. 8 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 9 Any questions or comments from Enforcement Counsel on those? 10 11 ATTORNEY PITRE: 12 There are no objections. 13 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 14 Any questions or comments from the Board? 15 Hearing none, may I have a motion? 16 COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue 17 18 an Order to approve the issuance of Gaming Permits and 19 Non-gaming Registrations as described by the BOL. 20

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND 2.4

21

22

23

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

105

Opposed? 1 2 NO RESPONSE 3 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 4 Motion passes. 5 MS. HENSEL: 6 In addition, we have recommendations of denial for one Gaming and three Non-gaming employees. Prior to this meeting, the BOL provided you with Orders addressing these Applicants, who the BIE has 10 recommended for denial. In each case, the Applicant failed to request a hearing within the specified time 11 period. I ask that the Board consider the Order 12 denying the Gaming and Non-gaming Applicants. 13 14 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 15 Any questions or comments from Enforcement Counsel? 16 17 ATTORNEY PITRE: 18 We just ask that you confirm those 19 denials. 20 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 21 Any questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion? 22

23

COMMISSIONER RIVERS:

24 Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 25 issue an Order to approve the denial of Gaming Permits

and Non-gaming Registrations as described by the BOL.

COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor?

6 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes.

MS. HENSEL:

The BOL has also provided you with an Order declaring, pursuant to Board Regulations, Gaming and 143 Non-gaming Employee Applications as abandoned. All of these applications have been pending for six months or more and are still incomplete because the Applicants failed to get fingerprinted. Once an application has been declared abandoned by the Board, the Applicant is eligible to 21 reapply at any time provided the Applicant meets the appropriate eligibility requirements. I ask that the

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Board consider the Abandonment Order.

Any questions or comments from

	107
1	Enforcement Counsel?
2	ATTORNEY PITRE:
3	None.
4	CHAIRMAN FAJT:
5	Any questions or comments from the Board?
6	COMMISSIONER SOJKA:
7	Just a comment that this is, in my
8	opinion, a nice kind of housekeeping to clean things
9	up. I think it's very good.
10	CHAIRMAN FAJT:
11	Thank you. May I have a motion?
12	COMMISSIONER SOJKA:
13	You certainly may. Mr. Chairman, I move
14	that the Board issue an Order to approve the
15	Abandonment of Gaming Permits and Non-gaming
16	Registrations as described by the BOL.
17	COMMISSIONER ANGELI:
18	Second.
19	CHAIRMAN FAJT:
20	All in favor.
21	AYES RESPOND
22	CHAIRMAN FAJT:
23	Opposed?
24	NO RESPONSE
25	CHAIRMAN FAJT:

108

Motion passes.

MS. HENSEL:

In addition, we have four Orders
regarding vendors. The first is to certify the
following nine vendors: Abate Irwin, Inc., Bean, Inc.,
C. Abbonizio Contractors, Inc., Chispanic Enterprises,
Inc., Innovative Glazing Systems, Inc., Metz Concepts,
LLC, Multiscope, Inc., Prestige Packing, Inc. and
Rockland Bakery, Incorporated. I ask that the Board
consider the Order approving the vendors for
Certification.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any questions or comments from

14 Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel supports the

17 approval.

1

2

12

15

16

18

21

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any questions or comments from the Board?

20 May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ANGELI:

22 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue

23 an Order to approve the Applications for Vendor

24 Certification as described by the BOL.

COMMISSIONER COY:

	109		
1	Second.		
2	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
3	All in favor?		
4	AYES RESPOND		
5	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
6	Opposed?		
7	NO RESPONSE		
8	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
9	Motion passes. Next?		
10	MS. HENSEL:		
11	Next the BOL provided you with an Order		
12	and an attached list of 21 registered vendors. I ask		
13	that the Board adopt a motion approving the Order		
14	registering these vendors.		
15	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
16	Any questions, comments from Enforcement		
17	Counsel?		
18	ATTORNEY PITRE:		
19	Enforcement Counsel supports approval.		
20	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
21	Thanks. Questions, comments from the		
22	Board?		
23	COMMISSIONER RIVERS:		
24	So moved.		
25	COMMISSIONER SOJKA:		

		110	
1	Second.		
2	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
3	All in favor?		
4	AYES RESPOND		
5	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
6	Opposed?		
7	NO RESPONSE		
8	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
9	Motion passes.		
10	MS. HENSEL:		
11	The BOL also provided you with Orde	rs,	
12	the approval of which would result in the follows	ing	
13	five vendors being added to the Prohibited Vendors		
14	List. A&H Equipment Company, OCE Imagistics, Inc., OP		
15	Ventures, Pyro-Stop and Reactor Watches, LP.		
16	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
17	Any questions or comments from Cyru	s?	
18	ATTORNEY PITRE:		
19	No comments.		
20	CHAIRMAN FAJT:		
21	Okay. Questions, comments from the		
22	Board?		
23	<u>COMMISSIONER RIVERS:</u>		
24	Yes. Susan, you heard earlier that	we do	
25	not notify or give proper notification. I assume	e that	

we will properly notify these individuals about the repercussions of being on the Prohibited Vendors List?

MS. HENSEL:

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes. Each of the vendors that we are proposing to put on the Prohibited Vendors List has received multiple notices from the BOL of the consequences of being placed on that list and have been given an option to cure the deficiencies in their applications to avoid being placed on the list, and they have failed to do so.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Including that they will be fined?

MS. HENSEL:

I don't believe that we have specified that they would be fined, but that would be something that would happen if they were trying to get off the list, not get on the list.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

We should make our notice specific that if they attempt to come off the list, they could be fined.

MS. HENSEL:

So noted.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Thank you. May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GINTY: I move the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of vendors to the Prohibited

Vendor List as described by the BOL.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE:

Second.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

All in favor.

AYES RESPOND

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

24

25

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Opposed?

12 NO RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Motion passes.

MS. HENSEL:

Next is an Order denying a Vendor

18 that its application would be recommended for denial

Application. In this case, the vendor was notified

19 and was given an opportunity to request a hearing.

20 The vendor did not request a hearing within the

21 specified time frame. I ask that the Board consider

22 the Order denying the application for Dekolink

23 Americas, Inc., an applicant for Vendor Certification.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Cyrus, any questions or comments?

113 1 ATTORNEY PITRE: 2 Only that we would ask the Board confirm that denial. 3 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 4 5 Thank you. Questions or comments from the Board? May I have a motion? COMMISSIONER MCCABE: 8 So moved. 9 COMMISSIONER SOJKA: 10 Second. 11 CHAIRMAN FAJT: All in favor? 12 AYES RESPOND 13 14 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 15 Opposed? 16 NO RESPONSE 17 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 18 Motion passes. Thank you very much, 19 Susan. 20 MS. HENSEL: 21 Thank you. CHAIRMAN FAJT: 22 23 Next up is Cyrus Pitre, our Chief 24 Enforcement Counsel. 25 ATTORNEY PITRE:

We have four matters for the Board's consideration today. In each one of these matters, Assistant Enforcement Counsel will be presenting these matters for the Board. We're asking in each one of these matters that the individuals are revoked. In the first instance, we have a Revocation that we're seeking of a Non-gaming Employee Registration of Tiffanie Nelson. Melissa Powers is here on behalf of OEC.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Welcome, Melissa.

ATTORNEY POWERS:

Thank you very much. On April 1st, 2009, the OEC filed a complaint for Revocation against Ms. Tiffanie Nelson for failure to comply with federal or state laws and also failure to maintain suitability.

Ms. Nelson did not respond to the complaint within 20 days. Therefore, her right to a hearing has been waived and the facts alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted.

On May 5th, 2009, OEC filed a request for

default judgment. At this time, OEC would ask that

the Board revoke the Non-gaming Employee Registration

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

of Tiffanie Nelson.

115 Any questions or comments from the Board? 1 2 May I have a motion? 3 COMMISSIONER RIVERS: So moved. 4 5 COMMISSIONER SOJKA: Second. 6 CHAIRMAN FAJT: All in favor? 8 AYES RESPOND 10 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 11 Opposed? 12 NO RESPONSE 13 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 14 Motion passes. Next? 15 ATTORNEY PITRE: The next matter will be presented by Ms. 16 17 Katie Higgins. 18 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 19 Welcome, Katie. 20 ATTORNEY HIGGINS: 21 The next matter is that of Thank you. 22 Danielle Raub. On March 24th, 2009, the OEC filed a 23 complaint for Revocation of Ms. Raub's Non-gaming 24 Registration due to her failure to maintain 25 suitability. Ms. Raub did not respond to the

complaint within 20 days, and therefore, pursuant to
Board regulations, all facts alleged in the complaint
are deemed admitted.

The OEC filed a request for default

judgment on May 12th, 2009. And at this time the OEC would ask that the Board revoke Danielle Raub's Non-gaming Registration.

CHAIRMAN FAJT:

Any questions or comments from the Board?

10 May I have a motion?

11 COMMISSIONER SOJKA:

12 So moved.

13 <u>COMMISSIONER COY:</u>

14 Second.

15 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

16 All in favor?

17 AYES RESPOND

8

9

18 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

19 Opposed?

20 NO RESPONSE

21 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

22 Motion passes. Next?

23 ATTORNEY POWERS:

The next matter before you is that of

25 Adam Sundberg. On March 10th, 2009, OEC filed a

1 complaint for Revocation against Mr. Sundberg for 2 failure to maintain suitability. Mr. Sundberg did not 3 respond to the complaint within 20 days. Therefore, his right to a hearing has been waived, and all facts alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted. 6 On April 29th, 2009, OEC filed a request for default judgment. At this time, OEC would ask that the Board revoke the Non-gaming Employee Registration of Adam Sundberg. 10 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 11 Any questions or comments? Motion? 12 COMMISSIONER ANGELI: So moved. 13 14 COMMISSIONER COY: 15 Second. 16 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 17 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 18 19 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 20 Opposed? NO RESPONSE 21 22 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 23 Motion passes. Next? 24 ATTORNEY POWERS: 25 The final matter before you today is that

of Amanda Brooke Raymond. On March 16, 2009, OEC filed a complaint for Revocation against Ms. Raymond 3 for failure to maintain suitability. Ms. Raymond did not respond to the complaint within 20 days. Therefore, her right to a hearing has been waived, and the facts alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted. On April 29th, 2009, OEC filed a request 8 for default judgment. At this time, OEC would ask 10 that the Board revoke the Gaming Employee Permit of Amanda Brooke Raymond. 11 12 CHAIRMAN FAJT: Any questions or comments from the Board? 13 14 Motion? 15 COMMISSIONER COY: So moved. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GINTY: 18 Second. 19 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 20 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 21 22 CHAIRMAN FAJT: 23 Opposed? 2.4 NO RESPONSE 25 CHAIRMAN FAJT:

```
Motion passes. Just to do a little
1
2 housekeeping, that concludes our meeting, but looking
3
  ahead, our next public meeting is Wednesday, June
  17th, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. here in the State Museum
  Auditorium in Harrisburg. Any final comments or
  questions from the Board? May I have a motion to
   adjourn?
8
                COMMISSIONER RIVERS:
9
                So moved.
10
                COMMISSIONER MCCABE:
11
                Second.
12
                CHAIRMAN FAJT:
13
                All in favor, say aye.
14 AYES RESPOND
15
                CHAIRMAN FAJT:
16
                Opposed?
  NO RESPONSE
17
18
                CHAIRMAN FAJT:
19
                The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
20
21
               MEETING CONCLUDED AT 12:35 P.M.
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, Public Meeting was reported by me on 06/03/2009 and that I Cynthia Piro Simpson read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.