COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

* * * * * * *

BEFORE: GREGORY C. FAJT, CHAIRMAN

James B. Ginty; Raymond S. Angeli; Jeffrey

W. Coy; Kenneth T. McCabe; Gary A. Sojka;

Kenneth I. Trujillo

David Barasch, Deputy Secretary of the

Department of Revenue, Representative;

Michael Dillon, representing Russell

Redding, Secretary of Agriculture

HEARING: Wednesday, April 7, 2010

11:17 a.m.

LOCATION: Temple University, Harrisburg Campus

Room 246/248 Lecture Hall

Harrisburg, PA 17101

WITNESSES: Robert DeSalvio, Fred Kraus, Michael

Perrucci, Richard Fischbein, Adrian R.

King, Esquire

Reporter: Alicia R. Brant

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

```
2
                    APPEARANCES
1
2
3
   OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT COUNSEL:
        NAN DAVENPORT, ESQUIRE
 4
5
        THOMAS S. DIEHL, ESQUIRE
6
7 PA Gaming Control Board
8 P.O. Box 69060
  Harrisburg, PA 17106-9060
10
       Counsel for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board
11
12 RAYMOND A. QUAGLIA, ESQUIRE
13 Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
14 1735 Market Street
15 51st Floor
16 Philadelphia, PA 19103-7599
17
      Counsel for the Bethworks Now
18
19 HOLLY LYNN EICHER, ESQUIRE
20 77 Sands Boulevard
21 Bethlehem, PA 18015
       Counsel for Sands Casino Resort
22
23
24
25
```

				3
1	I N D E X			
2				
3	OPENING REMARKS			
4	By Chairman Fajt			4
5	PRESENTATION			
6	By Attorney Eicher			5
7	TESTIMONY			
8	By Mr. DeSalvio	5	_	24
9	PRESENTATION			
10	By Attorney Diehl	24	_	25
11	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	25	_	28
12	PRESENTATION			
13	By Attorney Davenport	28	_	30
14	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	31	_	50
15	PRESENTATION			
16	By Attorney Quaglia	50	_	56
17	By Attorney Davenport	57	_	61
18	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	61	_	85
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

PROCEEDINGS

2

CHAIRMAN:

1

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

24

25

We'll now call the matters of Sands Bethworks Gaming, L.L.C., Petition Seeking License Renewal and Authorization to Conduct Table Games. For the sake of expediency and because we suspect there to be a fair amount of duplication we'll be hearing those matters together. Although the renewal and table games and the petition will be considered by the Board and voted on separately. So we're going to hear the two matters at the same time, but we will vote on them separately. Please come to order and try to find a seat. Thank you.

Again, could I have all of the witnesses and potential witnesses for Sands Bethworks please stand to be sworn in?

18

19 WITNESSES SWORN EN MASSE

20

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Again, before we start the 23 presentation if I could just ask before you speak to state and spell your name. For the matter of the record the Sands Table Games Public Input Hearing was

5

1 held on March 11th, 2010, at the Bethlehem Town Hall. 2 And with that, Sands, you may begin.

ATTORNEY EICHER:

3

Good morning, Chairman Fajt. Good 4 morning, members of the Board. My name is Holly 6 Eicher, E-I-C-H-E-R. I am vice-president and general counsel for the Sands Casino Resort, Bethlehem. We're here today to present two matters in one if that's appropriate for the Board to consolidate the hearings 10 between our slot license renewal and our table games certificate. We've already had public hearings on 11 12 both of our slot license renewal hearing and our table games hearing, and our presentation today is 13 14 predominantly focused on our table games application. 15 I have with me today to present our information, the president of the Sands, Robert DeSalvio and Fred 16 17 Kraus, corporate counsel for our parent company. And in addition, we have Scott Cramer, outside counsel. 18 19 And I turn it over now to Bob. 20 21 ROBERT DESALVIO, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY SWORN, 22 TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 23 Thank you. Good morning, Chairman and 24 A. 25 Commissioners. My name is Bob DeSalvio. That's

1 D-E, capital S, A-L-V-I-O, president of Sands Casino Resort Bethlehem. Thank you for the opportunity to present this morning and I'll get right into this today.

3

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The first slide talks about the history of the Sands in Pennsylvania. We were awarded our gaming license in December, December 20th, 2006. We broke ground in May of '07. About two years later we opened the property May 22nd with our first phase that included 3,000 slots and electronic table games, four restaurants including Emeril's first restaurant in the 12 northeast, two bars, and an entertainment lounge. Wе had an additional six months after our opening, November 22nd, where we added two additional restaurants including Emeril's first gourmet hamburger restaurant and a legendary Carnegie deli, another lounge, an ultra lounge, and 250 additional slot machines.

This is an overview slide of our table games expansion. And as you'll notice you can see where the pits are lined up directly off the main aisle of the casino floor that runs from the two bar locations. like the pits to be perpendicular to the main aisle to allow for easy access. We also wanted those pits to 25 be near the centralized ---.

MR. COY:

2 Use the pointer.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

24

25

A. Sure. Thank you. Hold on one second.

MR COY:

Push the red button.

A. I'll do a quick overview this way.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

A. Main aisle --- those high-priced lawyers come in handy.

MR. COY:

Yes, they do.

This is the Coil Lounge, that main center bar on 13 14 the casino floor. This is the new Infusion Lounge. 15 And we thought that we would actually just run right down that center aisle of the floor, and you can see 16 17 these games primarily in six-game pit layouts that run perpendicular to the main aisle. We wanted to make 18 sure that the games were again centrally located on 19 20 the floor. The slots surrounding that to provide a 21 lot of energy and activity. But we also wanted to be 22 near the main cage operation which is right here right off of this side of the casino floor. 23

This area that has an enclosure is an area for our

is for our high-limit and Asian games on the main
floor. We were able to accommodate these games within
our existing footprint. As most of you know and
you've been on our casino floor we have quite a large
footprint that was able to accommodate these games
without having to do any substantial construction on
the casino floor.

This is the breakdown of the number of games that we're going to have. You can see there's 77 banking games including all the main games that you would expect on the floor. And we are starting out with 12 Poker games.

Table games-related jobs are going to create about 393 full-time equivalent team-member positions. The reason I use the FTE number is because we're not sure yet of the mix between full time and part time. There may be some part-time opportunities and if that was the case it would actually increase this number. And you can see they're broken out all through various departments on the floor with the main number going into the table games area and the dealers and the supervisors, assistant shift managers and shift managers, and then many of the support areas, casino credit, casino administration, security. There will be additional surveillance positions, casino

accounting, back of the house administration, marketing, and EBS.

Now, some of those positions will be coming from existing team members that have expressed some interest in moving over into the table games area, and some will be coming from the outside as well.

Our table game staffing plan includes about 275 dealers, 48 supervisors, shift managers, and assistant shift managers. Our plan, our table games supervisory plan is that we have one supervisor for every six games. And the way that we arrived at this model was by using what's really a classic table games utilization model. You look at a typical week every day of the week. Obviously the highest occupancies are going to be Friday evening, Saturday day and evening, and Sunday dayshift. And then the rest of the week it's busy during the day and it tails off on the evening. So we're able to basically outline our supervisory and staffing needs based on the utilization model that we've used successfully in our operations all around the world.

Average dealer salaries including salaries and tips estimated to be about \$38,000 to \$40,000. And as I mentioned earlier, we'll be increasing staffing and security, surveillance and the count room to make sure

that we protect the integrity of the games as well as watch for underage and any other problem gaming issues.

Our hiring and training plan, we were very lucky to be able to bring in a gentleman from Las Vegas who spent the last ten years at the Venetian as our director of table games. That's a gentleman by the name of Jack Kennedy. He's going through his licensure process now. He has his Temporary Key. Before the Venetian he spent many years in the gaming industry in Nevada at other properties. And he's able to draw in a lot of the resources that we currently have in Las Vegas as well so he's been a wonderful addition to our team.

We've already begun hiring our shift managers and assistant shift managers, and they're currently working over at the dealer's school. We partnered with Northampton Community College on the dealer training program and they set up that program in cooperation with Atlantic Cape Community Casino Career Institute which is just outside of Atlantic City.

The Sands and MCC and providing experienced table game trainers who will make sure that the additional training is done on a very professional basis. Our training plan has been submitted to and was approved

1 by the Board. The table games training school was inspected and approved by the Board. And we began operations on March 22nd with 177 students. And as of vesterday we were up to 199 students. So it continues to grow.

3

5

6

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

All dealers must be trained in a minimum of two games, and they must have at least Blackjack and all must be trained in CPR. We anticipate the vast majority of the dealers to be Pennsylvania residents. We're an equal opportunity employer. We expect our table game team members will reflect the diversity of the surrounding communities as well as that of our current workforce.

On our economic impact slide the licensing fee is \$16 and a half million. We did a range on the table games tax, because of course, this depends on the revenue numbers. So we put in an estimate of \$5 to \$10 million for the first year. Annual wages approximately \$8 million. Additional purchasing as it relates to supplies and other things we would need on the floor, about \$4 million. And the construction spend in addition to the \$16 and a half million licensing fee is another \$10 million. And this is going to create approximately 100 construction jobs. We surveyed our contractors and asked them about how

many people they'll be putting on during this job. So it came in at around 100.

I know you've asked this question previously so we went back and researched these numbers. This is the economic impact as it relates to supplier and construction spend only for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and for the last approximate 12-month Our combined supplier and construction spend period. is about \$144 million. And \$121 million of that is in the Lehigh Valley and contiguous counties. So that means by going south we're talking about Berks or 12 Bucks and then over to Berks, Monroe and so the areas right around the Lehigh Valley we've got --- you can see a vast number of the spend is in that local area.

MR. MCCABE:

3

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If I can interrupt you, this is why I keep asking that question. You see those numbers up there. You in a 12-month period have spent \$144 million to Pennsylvania companies. That message has to get out there. That's a good story. So I appreciate you doing this.

Α. Right, sure. And of that \$3.1 million was to minority and women-owned business companies.

I'll talk a little bit about our business experience and ability. Las Vegas Sands Corp. is the

leading international developer of multi-use 1 2 integrated resorts. The Las Vegas, Nevada company 3 owns and operates as you well know the Venetian, Palazzo and the Sands Expo Center and Convention Center in Las Vegas. And in the People's Republic of China the Macau special administrative region, we operate the Venetian, the Sands, and the Four Seasons. We are currently getting ready to open shortly the marina-based Sands facility in Singapore, and 10 obviously operate the Sands Casino Resort in 11 Bethlehem.

This slide shows you our properties. They're very prominent structures all over the world. On the left-hand side you see the Venetian in Las Vegas. You've got the Sands Macau, the Palazzo in Las Vegas, Venetian Macau which is similar in look to the Vegas property, Four Seasons in Macau, a very iconic structure, the marina-based Sands facility which will again be opening shortly in Singapore.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Our business experience and ability combined LVS operations worldwide. We have over a million square feet of gaming space, in excess of 10,000 hotel suites with five diamond ratings for Venetian and Palazzo, thousands of team members at all locations, more than two million square feet of convention and meeting

space in Vegas alone, affiliations with some of the world's greatest celebrity chefs, Emeril, Wolfgang Puck, Mario Batali, and our properties feature world class entertainment. In Vegas alone we have Blue Man Group, Jersey Boys and the Phantom.

As far as financial suitability, we provided the Gaming Control Board with the funding details for our project. It included a commitment of funds letter from LVS, sources a new statement, our most recent audited financials, report of our independent auditors, and funding details for the payment of the licensing fee which I believe is due prior to June 1st.

Additional requirements, the slot machine license is in good standing currently with the Board. All required waiver forms have been executed and submitted to the Board. We have agreed not to permanently reduce our slot machines below the level and operation as of October 1st of '09, and that number was 2,973. We had a public hearing on our Table Games Petition. That was on March 11th, 2010.

The Sands is an equal employment opportunity company. We are very committed to this. Our diversity plan was reviewed and approved by the director, and she has reported that we've demonstrated

good faith effort toward achieving the diversity goals of the Board. Minorities represent over 23 percent of our workforce comparing very favorably to the 2008

Northampton County census. Pennsylvania residents

make up 96 percent of the workforce, and women make up over 45 percent of our workforce.

As of December 31st, we had 912 total team members. You can see the 23 percent minority, that representing 212. The largest group, the Hispanic group, a large Hispanic community in the south side of Bethlehem, and we've been very happy that they've joined our workforce as a number of our team members. Again, females representing 45 percent. And I know this question came up at a previous meeting as well which is the breakdown, and I didn't have the answer then so we researched this. The breakdown on the management side is 42 percent female and 11 percent minorities. And Pennsylvania residents make up again 877 or 96 percent of the workforce as of the end of last year.

As far as our equal business opportunities, minority and women-owned business registration. We've partnered with the Community Action Committee, the Lehigh Valley, to assist minority and women-owned businesses with their state certification process. We

participate in the regional minority and women-owned 2 business job fairs. Sands purchasing department is actively involved in these job fairs and there's been 3 --- they've been both in Harrisburg and in Philadelphia. And I think you've heard at one of the public hearings one of our suppliers was there and they were introduced to us at one of those fairs and they've done a substantial amount of business with our company.

We're sponsors of the Bethlehem branch of the NAACP, the Hispanic American Organization which is 12 based in Allentown, and the Council of Spanish-speaking organizations of the Lehigh Valley. And we're a member of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of the Lehigh Valley.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

We take the issue of responsible gaming very serious as a company. I think these two awards are very significant, and we put a lot of time and effort in this. The Sands was awarded the Corporate Social Responsibility Award by the National Council on Compulsive Gambling for our demonstrated outstanding commitment to social responsibility. And the 23 Pennsylvania Council on Compulsive Gambling presented the Sands Casino Resort Bethlehem with the first ever Gaming Award in recognition of our outstanding

commitment to responsible gaming outreach and education.

2.

Our problem gambling treatment training workshops have been talked about throughout the state. We offer and sponsor problem gaming training programs for the community that are conducted by trainers through the Pennsylvania Council. All of the costs associated with the series are underwritten by the Sands.

Approximately 900 people have attended and received continuing education credits from '06 to '08. And in 2009 an advanced problem gambling treatment series, a faith-based series and a Spanish-speaking bilingual counselor series were held with approximately 500 attendees in total. And our 2010 training sessions are currently in session.

All new team members receive mandatory compulsive and problem gambling training during orientation. There's an annual retraining of all team members and we've just recently started that process as we approach our one-year anniversary so everyone's going to go back through the program. We hosted a media open house in conjunction with problem gambling awareness week. And we had Nan Horner from the Board came to visit. We met with members of the media and explained to them our programs.

One of the things we try to do is get the word out about these programs because it helps when people want to self-identify themselves if they're having a problem so any publicity surrounding this actually is a help, I believe, to both us as operators and to you as the Board.

1

2

3

We're a member of the National Council on Problem Gambling. And recently I met with Doctor Lynch, and she is the executive director of the Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges. We are going to 10 reinforce this issue about underage and problem 11 gambling with the student population in the Lehigh 12 13 Valley prior to our introduction of table games. 14 They're going to have their own meeting in another 15 couple days with all the universities, and then we're going to provide one of our training programs for the 16 17 group and we're going to see if we can get the word 18 out to all of the incoming students this year when they get back to school in September about how I'm 19 20 sure as most of you know with Act One underage 21 gambling is now a summary offense. They will get 22 fines. There are increasing penalties should you get 23 more than one offense. And we want to make sure we get the word out to all of the students, do not come 24 25 in and try to gamble at the Sands. So we're taking

that very seriously and trying to get ahead of it before the introduction of table games.

All team members are trained to check for proper identification of individuals who appear to be under the age of 30. Security personnel are posted at each of our entrances and provide --- they're provided with electronic handheld scanners to check for valid IDs. And if a person appears to be under 30 but is over 21, they're given a wristband and we change that color every day to try to prevent ways to beat the system.

Since opening on May 22nd, we have challenged 327,000 people at our door. Now, that is a big number. And of that 8,177 were denied entry because they were either minors or they had invalid ID. And we issued 240,000 wristbands. During the first two months of operation 4.4 percent of our patrons were turned away. In 2010 that number's fallen to 1.3 percent indicating that fewer attempts by minors are being made to gain entry. So what happens is through social networking the word gets out that it's pretty tough to get in at the Sands. And I think this helps support our case.

Now, I will tell you that we are not successful 100 percent of the time. I know that we're dealing with some issues now that will --- you know, there are

1 minors that find ways to get in there. But we are very, very diligent to make sure that we protect that casino floor as much as humanly possible.

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our relationship with local law enforcement is really good. The Pennsylvania State Police stay onsite, compliance personnel, the City of Bethlehem Police Department, Fire and EMS, and the Northampton County District Attorney's office.

Our involvement with local community, we're very active with fundraisers, food drives, charitable donations, adopting families at the holidays, volunteer services and other community events.

We've established satellite human resource operations at locations around the valley to try to get people to get through our online employment process. We're working with again the Community Action Committee, the Southside branch of the public library, the Hispanic American Organization, Project Easton and the Council of Spanish-speaking Organizations.

Our community job orientation workshops were sponsored again by the Community Action Committee and the Sands. We're trying to get as many folks as we can from the community in for the new jobs that are created. Our team members serve on the following

boards, LVIP, NCC, Arts Quest, PBS 39, the local convention and visitors' bureau, and the Economic Development Corporation.

We work very closely with Northampton Community College. They've expanded their hospitality program, customer service programs and created the table games training program.

Charitable donations, 112 different entities. You can see the list here. I won't read them all, but they're a wide variety of nonprofits throughout the Lehigh Valley that we have supported. And since 2007, we've spent about \$459,000 on those efforts. And that's not including the amount of money that we put into the annual music fest which is a major event in Bethlehem every summer. It attracts a little over a million people. That sponsorship is really separate and apart from that. So, the company has been very generous.

Our community partner projects, you know, the Arts Quest, the Steel Stacks Campus is under construction already and shortly there will be a closing and the groundbreaking for the PBS portion of the site. And you can see that we are taking, you know, a large portion of the old Bethlehem Steel site and we've turned over --- already over four acres to nonprofits

with more to come. And we'll be helping to see revitalization on the western end of the site.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is a little rendering of the steel stacks projects. Again, we donated over four acres in the fall of '09 so they can begin their building process. Their center is going to have a performing arts center with 450-seat cabaret, a 4,000 square foot function room, and a two-screen arts cinema, music pavilion which they're anticipating having over 50 free concerts a year, and a festival center in Phase II. This is a rendering of the PBS 39 Steel Stacks Project, should be underway sometime this summer. And they're looking for an opening I believe in May of 2011. That will feature two new television studios adjacent to the performing arts center, and a 29,000 square foot public broadcasting center anchoring the Lehigh Valley's 21st century town square. really exciting project for the local community.

And also the National Museum of Industrial History, they just completed their exterior renovation and restoration project, about two and a half million dollars, and they're moving in the next phase of their fundraising so they can do their fit out and exhibit installation. And they're hoping to also get open sometime in mid-2011, and that of course is contingent

on their fundraising. It's about a \$26 million project.

As one of our original statement of conditions we had agreed to work with the Steel Workers Archives Group. They are now up and operating inside of our building. The goal of the archives group is to create a permanent community center in South Bethlehem for the preservation of the history of the steelworkers, a wonderful facility. And I would encourage if any of the Board members are in the Bethlehem area we'd love to show you that facility. It's right up near our offices and they're a great group to work with.

Other future development projects on the site, the City of Bethlehem is getting ready to launch their project for a new visitors' center, the 21st century town square, as I mentioned, the Steel Stacks Plaza, which is the land out in front of the blast furnaces, and the festival plaza located between the festival center and the visitors' center towards the western end of the site. And that is the last of the slides.

But I wanted to also bring up one other issue that, you know, the Table Games Legislation really helped our company move forward towards its next phase of development on the site and with the approval of Table Games the company is very happy to announce

today that we've developed a timeline for the
completion of the hotel. We are in the final phases
of our design, our architectural planning and our
preconstruction phase and bidding, and we expect
construction to begin in May on the site with some of
the preliminary work and with the heavy-duty
construction going on all summer getting the building
enclosed before the winter and up and open. We expect
the hotel to be up and open by May of 2011. And that
concludes our portion of the presentation.

CHAIRMAN:

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you very much. Questions from Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

Tom Diehl, Assistant Enforcement Counsel, will handle questions with respect to the table game application. I have a presentation to do with respect to their license renewal as well as get a stipulation into the record. And then we also have to address Bethworks' Petition to Intervene.

CHAIRMAN:

Tom, please spell your name for the stenographer.

ATTORNEY DIEHL:

Tom Diehl, D-I-E-H-L, on behalf of the

Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC). Mr. DeSalvio, during your presentation you indicated that the expansion of table games would bring on approximately 3 393 new full-time equivalent positions. Could you please explain for the Board what that term means exactly and how it differs from jobs?

MR. DESALVIO:

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FTE is one full-time 40-hour work week. And so each one is counted that way. But you can have part-time employees as well as full-time employees. So, sometimes the numbers actually go higher when you add in part time. So, we like for the purposes of budgeting we use an FT equivalent as our way to 14 budget.

MR. DIEHL:

Thank you for that. In light of the fact that the Licensees keep getting better and better at anticipating our questions and doing an excellent job of addressing those, I have no further questions for this part of the presentation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

MR. SOJKA:

Mr. DeSalvio, I think you're aware that a 25 letter was sent to my office from individuals from

Bethworks now LLC regarding to the waiver that was
executed. And I notice that the waiver --- that you
executed the waiver pursuant to an agreement, Power of
Attorney agreement. My only question for you is that
do you feel that you're on solid legal footing with
regard to that agreement and that you have the
authority to execute that agreement on their behalf?

MR. DESALVIO:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, but I'd like to turn this over to Fred Kraus to maybe expand upon that further.

MR. KRAUS:

Well, I'll say yes.

MR. SOJKA:

There you go.

CHAIRMAN:

And should there be any type of legal action I expect that you would join in and protect your rights as well as --- and protect the Board from any undue legal action that may arise out of this?

MR. DESALVIO:

Yes. And let me elaborate very briefly on the prior answer. In the negotiation of the contribution agreement which was the basic original deal between Venetian Casino Resorts and Bethworks now, the contribution agreement so-called closed,

Bethworks kept ownership of the land until the License was awarded. And then there was an obligation to close under the contribution agreement, contribute the 3 land to the entity that was awarded the License, and then to enter into two limited liability company agreements. It would be pretty traditional that if one member is nominated as the managing member of a limited liability company as Sands Pennsylvania, Inc. was under the Gaming --- Bethworks Sands/Bethworks 10 Gaming, LLC, that within the scope of its management responsibilities one of which was to pursue a table 11 game opportunity, and that's spelled out in the LLC 12 13 agreement, that you'd have a general requirement of 14 cooperation in the agreement for the minority member 15 to fill out whatever, you know, papers, documents, that the managing member thought were necessary. 16

And so the power of attorney is granted in the default of the minority member filling out the papers.

And so we acted pursuant to a very clearly expressed Power of Attorney provision in the agreement.

MR. SOJKA:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm fine with that answer. And my only other comment was that I'm happy to see that the hotel construction is beginning. That keeps me from having to do anything further with regard to that, and

I appreciate you making that announcement to the Board today.

MR. DESALVIO:

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Nan, we'll now hear your presentation on the renewal of the License.

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

I'm having technical difficulties. you. Pursuant to Section 1304 of the Gaming Act, the Board may issue a Category II slot machine license to an Applicant, its affiliate, intermediary, subsidiary, or holding company that is not otherwise eligible for a Cat I license. And the person seeking to locate a licensed facility, the city of a first class, a city of the second class, or revenue or tourism enhanced location.

On December 20th, 2006, the Board approved Sands Bethworks Gaming, LLC for its Category II Slot Machine License and on August 8th, 2007, the 21 Board issued the License. Sands opened to the public on May 22nd, 2009. Under Sands' original plan which was approved by the Board they were to construct not only a gaming facility but also a 300-room hotel and a 200,000 square foot retail facility. On January 15th,

2009, Sands petitioned the Board to temporarily suspend the construction of the hotel and retail facility. This petition was approved at the Board's February 3rd, 2009 meeting.

3

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

On March 16th, 2010, the Board approved Sands Op Nine Petition. At the completion of Op Nine Sands will have 3,032 slot machines available for play. This is more than the number of slot machines in operation at the licensed facility on October 1st, 2009. The approved gaming floor is currently comprised of 132,315 square feet. Prior to passage of 12 the recent amendments to the Gaming Act, Section 1326 provided that slot machine license was valid for one year from the date of Board approval of the license. The 2010 amendments have extended the license renewal period to three years.

Sands, its affiliates, and Principals have timely submitted the renewal applications. the Board's Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement has conducted Sands Bethworks Category II renewal background investigation. The Bureau's regional director for the central region, Mike Rosenberry, 23 testified at the February 3rd, 2010 public hearing that Sands has fully cooperated with BIE during the license renewal investigation process, and that BIE's

1 renewal investigation had not uncovered any issues relating to Sands, its affiliates, Principals or 3 employees that would preclude it from being licensed by the Board. Director Rosenberry is present today --- this morning, to answer any Board questions. The parties have entered into a 6 stipulation to admit three additional OEC exhibits into the record. At this time OEC would like to move all exhibits into the record. The Bureau of 10 Investigations and Enforcement has not identified any issues that would preclude the Board from renewing 11 12 | Sands Bethworks Gaming, LLC's Category II slot machine 13 operation license. And at this time if the Board would like 14 15 me to address the Petition to Intervene and the concerns OEC has with respect to that petition? 16 17 CHAIRMAN: Can we hold on that for one second? 18 19 ATTORNEY DAVENPORT: 20 Sure. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Does Sands have any questions of OEC on 23 the Petition to Renew? MR. DESALVIO: 24 25

No.

MR. KRAUS:

No, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Any Board questions on the renewal certificate or the table game certificate?

Let's address those first before we move on to the Petition to Intervene. Commissioner McCabe?

MR. MCCABE:

Yeah, I do have a couple. Maybe more for BIE. You're in the background and you guys can answer too, but was there any involvement with the Ho family over in Macau or Singapore, SL MGM, and --- okay. When we suspended in February 2009 the requirement for the hotel and the shopping mall, how long did we suspend that for? Did we put any contingencies, stipulations, or ---?

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

There were some conditions that were placed in the Board's Order. Unfortunately I don't have it in front of me this morning. Going from memory one of the conditions were that Sands was supposed to meet monthly with FIU. At some point in time when FIU believes that the conditions, economic conditions and the financing is such that we believe that they should go forward with the hotel, the retail

space, and the convention center, we would recommend that they petition the Board and start to move forward with those projects.

MR. MCCABE:

Okay. So now I turn my attention to the Sands then. Based on what I'm hearing and with the table games coming, you're starting the construction on the hotel, plan on having that hopefully completed and in operation by 2011?

MR. DESALVIO:

Right.

MR. MCCABE:

What's your plans for the mall and is the mall --- have you rented out or have commitments, letters of commitments, from any retailers for that mall, the mall space?

MR. DESALVIO:

With regard to the mall, as most --- I'm sure all of you know that the retail world was really turned upside down in this latest economic crisis.

We're not yet seeing enough activity from the retailers to warrant completion of the mall. As a matter of fact there's very few mall spaces being constructed throughout the whole country, and they're estimating that approximately 150,000 stores closed

1 nationwide this year. So I don't think the mall --and we don't believe as a company that the mall is yet ready for prime time for development. We are starting to see maybe some signs of life. We've had some inquiries, but we have no letters of commitment. so right now I would say that the mall is on hold.

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will tell you that they're on the event center space there was a recent article that you probably saw in the Morning Call that talked about a potential partnership. Although I cannot go into any real details on it, I will tell you that we've had some discussions with a group that may be interested in partnering with us on the event center space. if that were to come to fruition we would report back to the Board. So there's some activity on the event space. Not a firm commitment but just some activity that we are currently running down. And I think it's a little premature on the mall side.

MR. MCCABE:

I had heard or read someplace, I'm under the impression that there's like 150,000 square feet of retail space has already been rented out to some anchor companies and some --- I'm not going to mention names, but have, in fact, said that they will come to your mall once it's opened?

MR. DESALVIO:

Well, we had originally before we stopped development of the mall we were in the process of pre-opening leasing. And at the time we suspended it we had started working on approximately 15 store leases. But as soon as the economy turned they basically all backed out which then necessitated us stopping. There was no sense at all for the company to finish the physical space and then not have tenants obviously be inside the mall.

First of all, it's not effective use of company capital. And second of all, it would just look very odd to guests coming in to see this large mall walkway with no stores. So they basically backed out. And at that time we asked for your permission on the suspension. So it's really not ready yet. I can't tell you the activity is strong enough yet that it would necessitate the completion of the mall, but we hope to get there. Whether it's us or even possibly bringing in a mall partner which we're certainly willing to do.

MR. MCCABE:

Okay. And then maybe for Fred or somebody, we're still hearing murmurs, discussions, rumors that Sands is looking to sell Bethlehem and

that once they get the table license they're going to sell it. There was an article in the paper about that two, three meetings ago and I think you issued a press release that at that time said it was not true. But that's still out there. Can you address that again?

MR. DESALVIO:

have.

That was addressed, I believe it was on March 1st, that we put out a press release. And our Chairman stated that basically the rumors were untrue. And we've heard nothing about it ever since and we've just continued to move forward with our current plans. So, as far as we're concerned we put that to bed on March 1st.

MR. MCCABE:

Okay. I think that's all the questions I

CHAIRMAN:

Commissioner Sojka?

MR. SOJKA:

MR. DESALVIO:

I've got a few. In your presentation dealing with dealer salaries, you indicated a range of \$38,000 to \$40,000 including salary and tips. Can I ask what calculation you might have used for salary and tips and what those base salaries actually are?

The base salaries in the table 1 Sure. 2 games area, it's usually in the range of about \$5 an hour because they really gather most of their income 3 via a collected pool of tips. Customers are obviously generous in many cases at the tables. Those tips are then pooled together and distributed out to the dealers. So the vast majority of their income at casinos all over the country are from --- more from the tip portion. And again, they range --- I'm just 10 going to give an approximation of, you know, it could 11 be a \$5 an hour type salary. But primarily it's a tip 12 position.

MR. SOJKA:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These are jobs that do carry benefits?

MR. DESALVIO:

Yes, they do.

MR. SOJKA:

Are the benefits then calculated on the base salary, or are they calculated on the base salary plus the percentage from the tip pool?

MR. DESALVIO:

We don't actually pro rate the benefits based on the income of the individual. So that if you are a full-time employee at the Sands at any salary level you receive the same benefits package. So we

don't --- it doesn't matter whether you're, you know, \$5 an hour plus a high tip or in a restaurant position or you're an executive with the company. It's all the same across the board.

MR. SOJKA:

2.

3

5

6

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. That's fine. I was pleased that you're interacting in a proactive way with the universities that surround you. I wouldn't go so far as to say the finest university in the Commonwealth is there, but some of the finest are cheek by jowl with your facility. And that could be a potential problem I think you're heading off. But there may also be a 12 potential benefit to both you and the university because you provide or potentially could provide opportunities for studies of economic impact, development, sociological studies, and so on. there any plan to have ongoing interaction with those universities in those areas?

MR. DESALVIO:

We have ongoing interaction with the universities in a number of ways. We're not currently working on any either research or economic impact studies. Doesn't mean that we couldn't in the future. But we do --- we have a very good rapport with all of the local colleges and we get around to see them. Wе

see them at many of the community events. And again, we're trying to be very proactive on this issue of underage gambling.

MR. SOJKA:

1

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Okay. It is a potential opportunity. You talked about the development around your facility, the PBS situation, the museum, the concert hall, and It seems to me that the beginning, one of the so on. lead groups you were talking to were the Moravians, the Moravian community. What happened to them?

MR. DESALVIO:

The Moravian community is obviously a very strong component of Bethlehem's history. We do maintain a relationship. Doug Caldwell, who is the former head of the Central Moravian Church and I have met on a number of occasions to --- again, we don't expect the Moravian community to embrace everything there is about gambling, but we want to make sure that we are known as a good community partner. Chris Tomford who is president of Moravian College and I 21 meet fairly regular as well so that we can understand what the issues are. His concerns are students in his particular location. He's located right in the heart of Bethlehem so there are crossed paths in the issue of problem and underage gambling. But again, we try

to maintain those relationships through the college and the Central Moravian Church.

MR. SOJKA:

1

2.

3

4

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But the early suggestions that possibly there might even be tours of the Moravian emanating from your facility, those things are gone?

MR. DESALVIO:

No. It's actually interesting you bring that up, because this particular holiday season we worked with the historic Bethlehem partnership on providing joint motor coach bus tours. So we had groups that came to the Sands, spent a half day at the Sands, and then they would intersect with the 14 historical Bethlehem partnership group and they would provide a tour of the historic parts of Bethlehem including the Moravian community. That actually was quite successful this holiday season and we plan on expanding it next year.

MR. SOJKA:

Excellent. That was what I think I was really trying to dredge up from my memory.

MR. DESALVIO:

Thank you.

MR. SOJKA:

When you first opened before there were

these additional entities in this old brownfield which is now slowly being converted to something quite different there were some immediate traffic issues because of where you're located and the roads that lead in there. Now, obviously the overall traffic pattern is increasing and you're talking about putting a hotel in. What's the interaction with the municipality and the dealing with potential traffic issues?

MR. DESALVIO:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are right now in the process of the final completion of our \$20 million road improvement project out in front of the Sands. We widened Route 412 to four lanes. We are in the process right now of widening the end of the Mincy Trail Bridge which connects north and south Bethlehem. That work will be completed this fall. We are going through a repaving initiative where we're doing a Milan overlay of the remainder of Third Street in Columbia. We actually made improvements in the nearby community of Freemansburg at Washington and Cambria intersection which is a major intersection point for those that want to come to the casino. We are putting in a new permanent traffic signal and doing some other paving work. All of the road improvements, I would say, were

```
41
  about 85 to 90 percent complete. And by this fall we
  expect that all of our commitments that were made to
3
  both PennDOT and the City of Bethlehem will be
   completed. And again, it was about $20 million worth
   of roadwork.
6
                MR. SOJKA:
 7
                 That's the Sands' $20 million?
8
                MR. DESALVIO:
9
                 That's correct.
10
                MR. SOJKA:
11
                That's not joint?
12
                MR. DESALVIO:
                 That's correct.
13
14
                 MR. SOJKA:
15
                 The contractors to do that work?
16
   number?
17
                 MR. DESALVIO:
18
                       The primary contractor was Haines
                 Yes.
19
  and Kibbelhouse. And they are located just south of
20
   us I believe in --- I think they're in Bucks County.
21
                MR. SOJKA:
22
                 Okay.
23
                 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
24
                 And on the traffic issue?
25
                 MR. DESALVIO:
```

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Original traffic study included of course the hotel, because that was part of the planned development. And so did the numbers that were in the traffic study were taken directly from our marketing projections unlike --- so I wanted them to be consistent. You know, sometimes you might see a presentation where the projected visitation of the marketing study differs from the projected visitation of the traffic study. Ours were exactly the same. We wish we had the amount of traffic that we projected in our original traffic study.

MR. SOJKA:

Thank you for that. Last question and you may not be able to answer this. But even if you care to share an anecdotal impression. I have some familiarity with that area that you have helped renovate and it had in it a significant number of small, you might even call them mom-and-pop kind of pizza parlors, sub shops, local places that were sort of typical of supporting a manufacturing facility that was no longer there and then sort of picked up college activity and neighborhood activity. Now, you have Emeril Lagasse and you have high-end hamburger places

and you have bars. Do you have any sense of the impact you may have had either positive or negative on those other outlets for food?

MR. DESALVIO:

Actually I'd say it's been positive because of the amount of traffic that's been generated at the facility. And I see this every day as we go up and down both Third and Fourth Street. A number of new restaurants have opened. The area on Fourth Street I like to compare it to if you've ever been around the Brown campus in Providence there's an area called Thayer Street that has a lot of ---.

MR. SOJKA:

I know it well.

MR. DESALVIO:

There's some really very cool, very hip new shops, stores, cafes, jazz clubs. And all of this is starting to pop up in and around the Third and Fourth Street area in South Bethlehem. So while there's still a lot of vacancies and some open storefronts we are seeing some activity. And I think had we not had this massive economic meltdown I think we'd actually even see more. But I'm starting to see new life again. There was two or three new restaurants that just opened in the last 30 days so

there's definitely some signs of life in South Bethlehem.

MR. SOJKA:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Other questions? Commissioner Trujillo?

MR. TRUJILLO:

Just a couple. And happily like enforcement counsel I appreciate your pre-quessing some of our questions. I think we've seen enough of each other over the last few months that it makes it a little easier. A couple of things more in the way of observation than request. In your spend on contractors the total spend, you know, the \$120-plus million, and then the concern I have on that issue is that only about \$3 million of it was with minority and women-owned businesses. And one based upon your record with --- in terms of responding to our requests over the last couple of hearings, I don't doubt that that is for lack of interest or desire to have a greater spend with minority and women-owned businesses, but I would just encourage you to do better because you're certainly doing well on the hiring generally.

And then the same comment as you drill

down into the management-level employees. Again, you 2 seem to do well on the hiring generally, but I do 3 think that there are substantial steps that you could take both to improve the hiring of management-level employees, minority and women-owned --- minority and women management employees, and the same with respect to ramping that \$3 million number because it strikes me as well as you're doing with the minority hiring generally to have --- to be at less than three percent 10 on your spend doesn't compare as favorably. So it's not a question because I know that you're working at 11 12 it. But I would really encourage you to work harder 13 at it.

MR. DESALVIO:

And we will.

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TRUJILLO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Other questions? Commissioner Ginty?

MR. GINTY:

I have one. On your staffing plan, you have allocated one supervisor per six tables. With that all sorts of figures thrown at us. You're basing it on a table games utilization model. Is that an industry model, or is it proprietary to Sands?

MR. DESALVIO:

operations, but I would not be surprised if the other operators don't use something completely similar to it. It really looks at as a table games supervisor watches games, typically the most important judge of how much staffing you need is based on occupancy and how many people you're looking after. What has changed recently is the technology associated with table games operations.

We are installing a unit, a table game unit through the Bally system at every single table game. And what's happened over the years is those systems now do everything that used to be done manually. You now use a player rating card. You swipe it. You can very easily see who's on the game and enter it so that the days of having to do a lot of manual rating and the work that used to be done in the pit has really gone away. And therefore it has actually lessened the requirement for the amount of supervision that's currently needed at the pit. So right now we feel very comfortable that we can protect the integrity of the game with an operation based on one supervisory personnel for every six games.

Now, we may increase that in the

higher-limit games. So then again I think what's going to wind up happening from what we've been told, we'll be submitting a staffing model similar to what we did for security with table games. And that we'll be submitting that model to the Board to review.

MR. GINTY:

6

7

10

11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And finally, does Nevada or any other gaming jurisdiction specify what the ratios should be? We're in the process of putting our ranks together as you know.

MR. KRAUS:

Nevada does. For the record, Fred Kraus,

K-R-A-U-S. I apologize, I neglected to spell my name

before. New Jersey does. It's changed many times

over the years. You can have alternate plans of

supervision in New Jersey where the number of

supervisors goes down for certain periods of time.

Nevada does. New Jersey doesn't. Singapore does not.

MR. GINTY:

Would you share your model with our staff just for their background?

MR. DESALVIO:

We'd be happy to.

MR. GINTY:

Question again on your expectations of

the effect of table games on slot revenues?

2 MR. DESALVIO:

We've taken a look at that and we actually support the conclusion that the innovation study showed and that was it was a roughly we thought about a three percent or maybe three and a half percent increase. I know Mr. Finamore talked about that earlier. You get people that are in groups where you get table and slot players together. We think we're missing some of that market. So we will expect to see those groups now that are going to Atlantic City or Connecticut or other places visit our place. So we're hoping to get about a three, three and a half percent increase in slots.

MR. GINTY:

And do you do any modeling on that, or is it just ---?

MR. DESALVIO:

The modeling work actually that the innovations group did I thought was excellent. I looked at their report, and you know, I know that there's other people that have looked at Iowa. Somebody brought that up earlier. Ten percent increase when they added table games. I think that's a little aggressive. We try to be more conservative

in our estimates so we'd be comfortable in the three, three and a half percent range.

MR. GINTY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

I have one quick question. Or go ahead,

MR. MCCABE:

One of the reasons I voted for your project was I was very impressed with your plan for this whole brownfield area, what you were going to do, understanding that it was a long-term plan and was going to be done in phases. Are you still committed to that plan? Are you still going to build the mall?

MR. DESALVIO:

Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ken.

MR. MCCABE:

Are you still going to ---?

MR. DESALVIO:

Absolutely. We are committed --- we are committed to the original plan that we provided to the Board which was completion of all of the assets. I did mention earlier though, we are more than willing to introduce the concept of partnering. And if that helps us get it done quicker, that would be wonderful.

MR. MCCABE:

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

CHAIRMAN:

One quick question on the hotel. mentioned I think in her comments it was a 300-room hotel. Is that what you're talking about also?

MR. DESALVIO:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you very much for your presentation.

MR. DESALVIO:

Thank you very much to all the Board 14 members.

CHAIRMAN:

Lastly in way of this hearing area I'd like to have the representatives from Bethworks now, please come forward. I know that the Board has some questions and also the OEC. And that's again on the Petition to Intervene.

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, again, 23 members of the Board. Ray Quaglia, Q-U-A-G-L-I-A, from the Ballard Spahr Firm here for the Petitioner on 25 Intervention, Bethworks Now. With me is my partner

51 1 well known to the Board, Adrian King, K-I-N-G, and one 2 of the members of Bethworks Now, Michael Perrucci, P-E-R-R-U-C-C-I. Mr. Chairman, if we could have an 3 opportunity I would say less than five minutes to be 5 heard before the Board? 6 CHAIRMAN: 7 Yeah. I see four people. I heard three names. 9 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: 10 I'm sorry. I misspoke. Mr. Fischbein 11 snuck up on me. 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Spell his name. 14 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: 15 F-I-S-C-H-B-E-I-N. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 And Mr. Fischbein is ---? 18 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: 19 Another one of the members of Bethworks. 20 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please keep it brief, but we'll 21 22 certainly give you five minutes and then we'll turn it 23 over to Nan for her questions and then any questions from the Board. 2.4 25 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And members of 1 2 the Board, I beg your indulgence. I know it's been a long morning. It is not uncommon in the commercial 3 context for disputes to arise between majority and minority interests. More often than not those are resolved by the parties without the need to involve the courts or any other third-party adjudicators. Frankly that is what we had hoped and expected would occur with the current dispute between Bethworks and 10 the Sands. Unfortunately the Sands has forced our hand. And the reason we are here today airing our 11 12 dirty laundry and complicating the Board's life is because the Sands has failed to obtain from Bethworks 1.3 14 the acknowledgement required by the statute in the Act 15 that it is Bethworks' sole prerogative to provide.

And I'm speaking specifically of the acknowledgement and waiver of rights that is mandated by Section 13 A(b)(11), which states that the Petition for Table Games include a waiver of certain rights, quote, on a form prescribed by the Board which is signed by the Petitioner and acknowledged by each of the Petitioner's Principals. Section 1315(a)(8) in turn requires as a condition of authorization that the Petitioner demonstrate compliance by clear and convincing evidence with the waiver requirements of

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section 1312A(b)(11), including of course the acknowledgement of a waiver of certain rights by each of its Principals.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Bethworks is a Principal of Sands. own a ten percent interest in the entity. acknowledgement as a matter of Pennsylvania law is a distinct legal thing. It is not a ministerial act. It is a judicial act. And it is expressly required by statute to be executed by the person or entity who purports to be acknowledging whatever it is that must be acknowledged. In this case, the waiver of rights.

The Sands initially appeared to understand and recognize that. Ms. Eicher sent to Bethworks a form of acknowledgement and waiver of rights from the Board with the request that Bethworks execute it saying the Sands needed Bethworks' acknowledgement to move forward with table games. quite bluntly in her e-mail that in effect we can't go forward unless and until you sign this acknowledgement. That never happened. Bethworks has 21 not to this day executed and does not sitting here today agree to waive its rights under the statute for refund that's relevant to Section 1312A(b)(11).

What the Sands did instead was purport to exercise its punitive Power of Attorney and sign a

waiver or acknowledgement on behalf of Bethworks. Now, I will tell you, we were not told of that. sitting here today to this day we have never seen a 3 copy of the acknowledgement that was supposedly submitted on Bethworks' behalf. A copy wasn't even shared with us.

The real problem with that is that by invoking this contractual Power of Attorney, the Sands has implicated in this the LLC agreement which is the source of an ongoing and protracted dispute between the parties with accusations on both sides. We submit that it is not the place of the Board nor should the Board be inclined to exercise jurisdiction over that dispute. And we strongly encourage the Board to avoid wading into that realm.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

2.4

25

Unfortunately because the Sands has explicitly invoked the contract as the basis for their purported authority to execute the waiver, it is necessarily the case as Commissioner Coy made reference earlier to a first-year law student with 21 respect to the pointer, well, a first-year law student could tell you that a party that is in violation of terms of a contract is not entitled to avail itself of those contractual provisions. And that's what we have here.

It is Bethworks' position, and the members can give the Board chapter and verse if they're inclined, that the Sands is in violation of various provisions of the agreement. Even if you assume that Pennsylvania law were to permit someone the Sands to execute an acknowledgement on behalf of Bethworks, they're certainly not entitled to do that under the contract unless and until they're, in fact, in compliance with the contract and the contract authorizes them to do so. The waiver, the Power of Attorney provision here provides for decisions in the ordinary course of business, business decisions. It's understandable for the reasons that Counsel for the Sands explained that they wouldn't necessarily want to have to go out and have all the members approve every time they hire or fire somebody.

1

2

3

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is something very different. This is a waiver of fundamental rights that could be valued at tens of millions of dollars. We submit the Power of Attorney provision by its terms does not apply to such a waiver. And while I appreciate that Mr. Kraus has assured the Board that he is comfortable in his position I can assure you that Bethworks and its Counsel are equally comfortable in theirs. And that is something it now appears is going to have to be

worked out in an appropriate forum, be it arbitration, be it the Courts. I submit it is not this Board.

One final point is the question that Mr.

4 Petri raised and in particular his request about
indemnifying the Board. I want to emphasize that the
very last thing that Bethworks wants here is to
somehow wind up pitted in a dispute with the Board.

We have no quarrel with anything that the Board or its
staff have done. The staff reasonably relied on the
waiver that was provided by Bethworks on the
assumption that that was a valid waiver. As we've
made clear today it is not.

Now, we're offering two suggestions for the Board that I think will expedite the resolution of this matter with a minimum of inconvenience to everybody. The first is that the Board proceed to vote on the Sands Bethworks application for authorization to conduct table games, but condition any approval on the submission of a valid acknowledgement executed by Bethworks.

The second alternative, a little more dramatic but I submit procedurally feasible, would be for the Board to decide that they're to hold today, that the application of Bethworks for --- of Sands for authorization is not complete insofar as it lacks one

of the waivers or acknowledgements that's required by Section 13 A(b)(11) and in effect keep open or reset the 60-day statutory clock for a decision unless and until a valid acknowledgement and therefore complete petition is submitted. And that's all we have.

CHAIRMAN:

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Office of Enforcement Thank you. Counsel, questions?

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

I'll have some questions later, but I'd like to just point out several things. I believe there's several issues here. There's an issue of timing. There's an issue of subject matter jurisdiction, and there's also an issue of whether the waiver is valid and that Sands has waived its rights, and whether they're standing in this matter for Bethworks Now.

According to Section 493 A(12)(a) of the Board's regulations the decision to grant a Petition to Intervene in a proceeding is within the sole discretion of the Board. The Board may grant the Petition to Intervene if it determines that the person 23 has an interest in the proceeding which is substantial, direct and immediate. And if the interest is not adequately represented by the party to

the proceeding in this case, Sands, and that the person may be bound by the action of the Board in the proceeding.

1.3

With respect to the timing, according to the regs, Petitions to Intervene may be filed at any time following the filing, in this case, a petition seeking Board action, but no later than 30 days prior to the date set for the hearing unless in extraordinary circumstances for good cause shown the Board recognizes or authorizes later filing.

Bethworks has not shown that good cause for giving the Board little more than a day's notice. The actual Petition to Intervene was filed with the Hearings and Appeals at 4:50 p.m. on Monday night. We received it yesterday morning when we arrived for work. We have not had time to fully investigate this matter much less file an answer or allow Sands to respond to this adequately.

The gaming ap was amended on January 7th. At that time Bethworks knew or should have known that Sands would be filing a Petition Seeking a Table Game Operations Certificate and that the Petition would be required to include a waiver form as required under Sections 1312A(b)(11), and 1315(a)(8) of the amended Act. And that the waiver form must be signed by Sands

and acknowledged by each of Sands' Principals.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Furthermore as attached Exhibits D and E to Bethworks' Petition to Intervene are e-mails that they purported from Holly Eicher, General Counsel for Sands Principal or for --- I'm sorry, for Sands Bethworks, the e-mails were purportedly sent to the Principals asking them to sign the waiver no later than January 27th, and has attached the waiver form. Those e-mails were sent on January 25th. So at that point they should have had direct knowledge of the waiver requirements.

On February 19th, Sands filed the petition which included the waiver forms and Appendix 11. At the very least by this date because the petition and at least the Appendix 11 which included the waiver was public, Bethworks knew or should have known that Bob DeSalvio signed the waiver on their behalf.

The public input hearing was held in Bethlehem on March 11th. And I believe at the public input hearing the waiver issue was also addressed. So even though this waiver form was purportedly sent to Bethworks almost two and a half months ago, Bethworks waited until just a day and a half before today's 25 hearing to intervene.

Bethworks points to the Board's decision back in I believe it was August 2007, of Greenwood Gamings trying to intervene in the October 2007 public input hearings for Cat III applicants. However, that can be distinguished because in that case Greenwood filed their Petition to Intervene about 46 days before the public hearing. The Board originally denied Greenwood's Petition on the basis that the hearings were merely to determine eligibility for the Cat III applicants, and that there was a special procedure already in place for Greenwood to have input at the October 16 and 17 hearings.

In this case Bethworks filed the Petition to Intervene Monday afternoon, late Monday afternoon, less than two days before today's hearing. Bethworks has not shown a good cause for the delay on this petition.

With respect to subject matter
jurisdiction, Section 212 of the Gaming Act, the Board
has a general and sole regulatory authority over the
conduct of gaming or related activities, and shall
ensure that the integrity of the acquisition and
operation of slot machines and associated equipment
shall have the regulatory authority over every aspect
of the authorization operation of slot machines.

According to Section 401(a)(4) of the Board's regs,
the Board will have exclusive jurisdiction over all
matters within the scope of its powers under the
Gaming Act.

5 The Petition to Intervene involves an LLC agreement between Sands and Bethworks and is outside the jurisdiction of the Board. As required by the Act, the Licensee, Sands Bethworks, has signed the waiver acknowledging that Sands as well as its 10 principals, owners, affiliates, officers and directors waive the right to receive any portion of slot machine 11 12 license fee paid by Sands Bethworks for its slot 13 machine license, and that the right if any to sue for 14 the return of any portion of slot machine license paid 15 by Sands.

So therefore OEC respectfully recommends the Board deny this Petition to Intervene.

CHAIRMAN:

19 Thank you. Questions from the Board.

20 Commissioner Trujillo?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Mr. Chairman, may I have an opportunity

23 to respond?

16

17

18

21

22

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

No. Commissioner Trujillo.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Quaglia, maybe you should have brought a movie on this because this is getting a little tough to ask. What I would like to first understand, just as a preliminary matter, is what interest in this proceeding Bethworks Now is claiming in this proceeding?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Excellent question, Commissioner. Thank you for the opportunity. The interest in this proceeding is that Bethworks as an investor, a ten-percent owner of Sands, to whom has been allocated a significant portion, over 40 percent of the \$50 million initial license fee, may or may not want to exercise its rights under the statute to try to get back some of that money. Now, if a binding waiver exists and is held by the Board to exist, short of appealing the Board's decision, which again was our worst case scenario, we would essentially be deprived of our right without ever having had the opportunity to weigh in on that.

And just again to bring it back and to tie into Counsel's point, we are not the ones who are invoking this contract that we agree is beyond the Board's jurisdiction. We're saying under the statute

we were required and had the right to execute a waiver on our own behalf. That hasn't happened.

MR. TRUJILLO:

What I'm trying to understand is for this proceeding ---

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. TRUJILLO:

--- and in this proceeding, as you know, there are eight elements that the Licensee has to meet in order for us to determine up or down, whether to grant or not grant the petition; right?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Correct.

MR. TRUJILLO:

So if, in fact, what we You're with me? have in this proceeding this Board needs to make a determination whether or not to grant the petition. In that decision what interest does Bethworks Now have?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Bethworks' interests, Commissioner 23 Trujillo, relate specifically to Section 1315(a)(8), 24 the eighth item of the eight enumerated items you 25 mentioned which is that Petitioner has executed the

waiver required under Section 1312A(b)(11).

2 MR. TRUJILLO:

All right. And if we find that the Petitioner has not executed the waiver as required, then we're bound to deny the Table Games Petition; is that right?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

No, that is not right. As I said before I think there are two alternatives that will serve Bethworks' concerns and be of hopefully limited complication to anyone else. The first one is the petition may be approved subject to a condition that an acknowledgement be submitted that was signed by Bethworks. Option number two is the petition could be deemed incomplete and reset or hold in abeyance the 60-day statutory clock pending the Board's receipt of a complete petition that would include a waiver executed by Bethworks as required by the statute.

MR. TRUJILLO:

If I heard you correctly earlier, you said, and I think I'm quoting you, that the staff reasonably relied on the waiver provided by Sands. I think I heard you right; did I not?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

Yes, correct.

MR. TRUJILLO:

1

2

3

6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. So the world as we know it today is that the Staff receives the waiver, it reasonably relied on Sands in accepting that waiver, and the Board as far as 1315(a)(8) is concerned has received an executed waiver by Sands. Do you agree with that?

ATTORNEY KING:

Can I answer that question? 8 I think the issue is at the time of the --- it's Adrian King, 10 K-I-N-G. At the time that the Board received the waiver and deemed it complete, it was not aware that 11 12 the Power of Attorney was purportedly exercised. 13 I'll point out, the LLC agreement which the Sands is 14 relying upon, requires notice be given to Bethworks 15 that the Power of Attorney is being utilized. notice has never been given. 16

So getting back to your point about the Staff reasonably relying, the Staff at that point had no reason to understand that the Power of Attorney was improperly used.

MR. TRUJILLO:

But Mr. King, do you think that the Board needs to inquire into every dispute or any dispute at all between the parties of a Licensee because otherwise every Licensee has multiple parties. There

are multiple agreements that regulate their conduct amongst themselves. And what I'm saying is a request here to do exactly what Mr. Quaglia said we shouldn't be doing which is regulating the conduct between you and Sands.

ATTORNEY KING:

3

6

11

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The answer to that is this. No, the Board should not be getting into that field. However, you have a particular portion of the statute that the 10 legislature passed, the governor signed. It is unique. It has to do with a Waiver of Rights and it 12 specifically gets into the issue of all principals. So ordinarily I would agree with you. You're not 14 supposed to get in to regulate these issues. Unfortunately we have a very unique portion of Act One that says all principals must execute this waiver and acknowledgement form. And in this case that hasn't 18 occurred and the Board has an obligation to uphold the statute and what the statutory requirement is.

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

And again, Commissioner, again, just to make the point again, we're not the ones who are sitting here raising the statute. The statute was implicated by the Sands when they purported to sign on Bethworks' behalf in contravention of the statute.

There's no other basis upon which the Sands could even claim authority to sign that acknowledgement on behalf of Bethworks other than the contract. So it is the Sands that has put the contract at issue.

2.4

And again, just to echo Mr. King's comment, if I could analogize this, and it is maybe not a fair analogy, but conceptually it simplifies it to a forgery. If a forgery of some sort is submitted as part of an application I don't suggest it is incumbent on the Board to go back to its Staff and say are you sure this isn't a forgery? I don't submit in a particular situation it's incumbent on the Staff to determine it's a forgery.

But if it is brought to the Board's attention before a vote as it is in this case, I submit that it is incumbent on the Board to recognize the actual state of affairs, not withstanding however reasonable its Staff's reliance may have been.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Well, I suspect --- I won't prejudge it but I suspect that if we were faced with a petitioner having submitted a fraudulently obtained document that at least as for me I'd be quite inclined to deny the Table Games Petition. And so in that case isn't that what you're asking us ultimately to do?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

No, sir. And in fact, I thought I conditioned my hypothetical by saying it was not entirely fair because I understand there's a difference here between a forgery and what transpired. I was just trying to make it conceptually more simple.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Well, I'm not real interested frankly in getting into the LLC agreement.

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

I agree.

MR. TRUJILLO:

I reviewed your petition and so --- but I don't think because I'm still stuck on what interest Bethworks Now has in this proceeding. And I still don't understand what interest of Bethworks Now is being compromised by any decision that the Board would make in granting or denying the petition. Does Bethworks Now not have the continuing right to go to Court for a breach of the LLC agreement? Sands is the single member as best I see it. They have fiduciary obligations. Your clients have the right to go to Court and sue for money damages if, in fact, they are harmed by any act of Sands.

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

I think the problem here, Commissioner, your points are all well taken and we acknowledge this is a complex issue. But I think the issue is that currently Bethworks would have arguably, and I appreciate its got its own thorns. But Bethworks would have a claim as it were for some refund of the portion of the \$50 million fee, at least a portion of it was allocated we said disproportionately to Bethworks.

1

2

3

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

If the Board grants the petition, approves the petition without condition, we have essentially --- we essentially have a preclusive decision that that waiver has occurred such that Bethworks which could go into court today, we might win, we might lose, and ask for a refund, would not be able to go into court tomorrow and ask for a refund of that amount. And if we were to go to court on some other matter or go to court to bring some kind of claim for money damages, that court would in effect have to decide what the Board has already decided, would implicitly be deciding by approving the petition without condition which is that the waiver was valid.

I don't know what happens, it makes my 24 head hurt, procedurally to think about what happens if we were to get a decision from the Supreme Court of

Richard Fischbein.

25

71 1 2 RICHARD FISCHBEIN, HAVING FIRST BEEN DULY SWORN, 3 TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 All right. And just hold on. Let me say this. This thing has gone far afield of where I want it to go. We're going to conclude it soon. I want you to be brief. We have a couple more Commissioners 10 that have questions and then we're going to be done. Are we clear? 11 12 MR. PERRUCCI: 13 Yes, sir. 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Fischbein. 16 MR. FISCHBEIN: 17 Well, let me just answer because this question keeps coming back. And I understand what 18 you're getting at. You just have to indulge me for 19 20 two minutes. We have --- Bethworks, has ten percent. 21 We're ten-percent partner. We have been allocated 42 22 percent of the license fee, the \$50 million license 23 fee. Our contract specifically says that they, the 24 90-percent holder, cannot compromise any debt 25 disproportionately to us. So in other words, as they

signed this agreement and they say we're waiving the \$50 million, they're waiving 42 percent of that is 3 ours while we're only a ten-percent partner. cannot do that under the contract. They can never do that. They can't do it with a waiver. They're specifically precluded from it.

So, therefore when they came and signed this, and it's going to be purported that --- and you're going to hold that there's a waiver of the \$50 million, 42 percent of that is ours, they can't do that. That's the interest that they cannot do and they cannot do it by this waiver or that waiver or this waiver or that waiver. And so when you ask the question, I quess you're asking a monetary question, what interest do we have. That's the interest that we have.

MR. TRUJILLO:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Well, let me just be clear. I'm not asking a monetary question. I'm asking a legal question of what your legal interest in this proceeding is. And I've heard you, and just to be clear, I understand you're saying that they're breaching their agreement with you under their LLC agreement as I understand you. Is that accurate, Mr. 25 Fischbein?

MR. FISCHBEIN:

1

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They're certainly doing that, but they're 2 3 doing it by using this waiver. They cannot do that. And you cannot facilitate that and let them do that. And because the statute requires that we sign, they have to give you a reason --- fine, the statute requires our signature. They have to give you a reason that it's not there. They gave you a reason. They said the contract says it. And we're saying the 10 contract never says it if they're waiving disproportionately our issues. So they have set this 11 before you. You're going to have to make a decision 12 1.3 of whether they have the right to do it or they don't have the right to do it. They do not have the right 14 15 to do it, and as our Counsel would be happy to give you a short brief to ---. 16

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Any questions from the Board?
Hold on, one second, Commissioner Ginty.

MR. GINTY:

Where is this allocation made?

MR. PERRUCCI:

May I answer that? And I'll try to be very brief, Chairman. I appreciate the time of the Commissioners. As you may recall, you saw my face. I

was the face of this project for many months. So what happened is when we got our first financial statements that we were supposed to get on September 30th of '09, we got it December 14th, right before Christmas, and we were shocked to learn that on the hotel that is only a steel girder, that we were being charged almost \$300 million of debt for that steel. And in that allocation they broke down the \$50 million to have \$21,607,000 allocated to the hotel debt which we are responsible to pay for. And these numbers are growing at \$3 million a month.

MR. GINTY:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But that is not before us. And it's not in the Petition for Table Games.

MR. PERRUCCI:

Well, we suspect the same thing will happen with the \$16 and a half million that ---.

MR. GINTY:

Well, sue them. I mean, ---.

MR. PERRUCCI:

You know, that's true, Commissioner, but we were led to believe in the statute that we had certain non-alienable rights that the legislature gave to us. We're very reasonable people. We're the ones that brought all the non-profit --- we've done a lot

on this project. After we got the waivers and showed them to our counsel, we were never put on notice that they signed. We would love to resolve this. 3 think we have a non-alienable right pursuant to the statute and the governor in addition to your regulations. And the reason that it's late and we appear here late was after we got these December numbers we flew out to Las Vegas on January 20th. we were led to believe that this would be wrapped up 10 in a week or two, and then it had to go to the top executive. And then it had to go to the board. And 11 12 it constantly to the point where this was April 7th 13 was upon us. I don't want to be here. This is the 14 most unfortunate presentation for us to ever have to 15 be before your Board.

All we're asking, sir, is that you look at the statute even though the petition was filed late, that we do have some non-alienable right. And we just simply wanted to be treated as a partner. We own ten percent of this casino. And we were never given the opportunity to sit down and have an effective conversation about these waivers. And our lawyers were never given that opportunity. So, unfortunately we find ourselves before you.

CHAIRMAN:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you. Commissioner Angeli.

MR. ANGELI:

1.3

Just a simple question. If you never intended for the Sands to act on your behalf why would you have given them a Power of Attorney to do so in the beginning?

MR. PERRUCCI:

We assumed that the Power of Attorney in the contract meant routine --- that they were running the day-to-day casino. You know, they had to sign invoices, contracts. We didn't think it meant --- like for example, this Power of Attorney was before this slot license. We never thought that they could sign our slot license application.

MR. KRAUS:

But there's a specific part which says they cannot ever, ever compromise an amount of money that we have disproportionate to them. They can't do it. We specifically reserved that right. And what they did was they said that's interesting, and then they signed this never telling us. So when you ask the question it's not us. It's them. How could they disregard the one thing that they couldn't do? It's the one thing they couldn't do.

MR. ANGELI:

77 I mean, I'm not a lawyer, but was that 1 2 stipulated in the Power of Attorney? 3 MR. KRAUS: It's stipulated in the contract. 4 5 MR. ANGELI: 6 But that's a separate document. MR. KRAUS: No, no, no, no. The Power of 8 Attorney is in the contract. 10 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: 11 Part of the agreement. 12 MR. KRAUS: 13 It's part of the agreement. It says we 14 can sign a Power of Attorney for this and this and 15 this and this. And then a separate section it says, however, we can never and will never compromise a debt 16 to our benefit that hurts you disproportionately. 17 18 so that's the one thing they can't do. 19 MR. ANGELI: 20 Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Commissioner McCabe? 23 MR. MCCABE: 24 And I don't want to get into the contract 25 discussions or problems. The first thing I want to

know is why is the filing so late? Why did you file Monday evening?

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

That is a good Yes, Commissioner. question. Late is not the word I would have used, sir. We first and foremost have been in discussions with Sands generally. The parties have been in discussions generally about their disputes as Mr. Perrucci just testified there was a summit held back in January. All of this was going on with respect to table game application. And Counsel seems to have assumed we were part of this process. We were not.

We have never seen the Table Game Petition that was filed. We have never seen the waiver that was executed on our behalf. We were cut out of this process. All we knew is we were having a business dispute with the Sands. We were in discussions with them to resolve it. And the next thing we know there's a table game hearing that's been --- or a hearing on a petition that's been scheduled for April 7th. We notified the Staff on March 29th. We sent a letter to the Staff setting forth our position. We attempted to work it out with the Sands 24 because as I've said and others have said this is not our preference to be here today. When it became clear

that we were not going to be able to do that, we very reluctantly filed this petition. Nothing in there is new to the Sands remotely. The Staff had notice from 3 at least the prior week. We were not part of this process to be able to protect our rights more promptly.

MR. MCCABE:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Now, for OEC, if the statute is --- to help me, if the statute calls for all principals to sign this waiver, can the Power of Attorney --- can the principals let the Power of Attorney --- does that supersede the statute? You know, can they get by signing that Power of Attorney? Do they give away that right, what the statute calls for?

MR. PETRI:

Certainly Sands seems to think so. has executed this document. As far as I'm concerned we don't have a dog in this fight. Basically it comes down to this. If these individuals get into a dispute --- the only thing I'm concerned with is that the 21 Board and the Commonwealth is protected. It's going to fall on Sands if anything is wrong with any of these documents.

MR. MCCABE:

Okay. And my last question for OEC.

1 understand that certain conditions to intervene have to be met, standing, timing, waiver, valid. If one of those conditions is not met and the other two have, you can still say no, that you haven't met --- do they have to meet all of them?

MR. PETRI:

3

6

20

21

22

23

24

25

They have to meet all the conditions. Now, the Board can conditionally approve --- what? The Board can conditionally approve as Mr. Quaglia 10 pointed to. But personally I don't think it's 11 necessary in this instance. I mean, the Board, I would assume, as Commissioner Trujillo said, thumbs up 12 13 or thumbs down on this. I mean, as far as I'm 14 concerned the main thing is that the Board is 15 protected. Sands has filed these documents. executed these documents. The matter's before the 16 17 Board. The parties' dispute, those are between the parties. I don't think that we should be involved in 18 a dispute between these parties. 19

MR. MCCABE:

And then last question for you. Aren't you going to make more money in the long run once table games come in?

MR. KRAUS:

Mr. Kraus.

81 1 MR. MCCABE: Yes or no, please. 2 3 MR. KRAUS: No. 4 5 MR. MCCABE: 6 The FBI in me is coming out. Yes or no, just the facts, ma'am. 8 MR. KRAUS: 9 No, sir. 10 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: No, the answer's no. 11 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Any other questions from the Board? 14 MR. MCCABE: 15 Just one that I --- again, I just don't understand, Mr. Quaglia, whether it would be 16 17 conditional or not conditional, how does that subsequently affect your ability to take legal action 18 19 if you're harmed? 20 ATTORNEY QUAGLIA: It's really a matter, Mr. Commissioner, 21 22 and I'm sorry that I have clearly failed to make this point clear. A decision from this Board which has 23

24 binding effect will prejudice the rights of Bethworks

25 to go to court and say that Sands violated the

contract because necessarily by endorsing what the 1 Sands has done, which is to invoke the contract as the basis for exercising the Power of Attorney, is the 3 imprimatur of this Board that Sands acted appropriately. And I am very sorry to be implicating the Board and its Staff in this, but with due respect to Mr. Petri, the Board does have a dog in this fight and the Board has a dog in this fight because Sands has put that dog in this fight by relying on a 10 contract instead of what the statute requires which is that the principals --- the principals themselves 11 12 acknowledge the waiver.

MR. PETRI:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe we need 30 or 60 days to cool off.

ATTORNEY QUAGLIA:

We would be amenable to that.

CHAIRMAN:

I'm willing to do that.

MR. MCCABE:

clarification. I just want to make it --- and Mr.

King, is your point that although Bethworks Now signed the Power of Attorney willingly early in this whole process as part of the LLC agreement and agreed to

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I have one more

allow Sands to proceed forward, that the statute --
that the language of the statute supersedes any Power

of Attorney that Bethworks Now might have previously

signed by having this specific acknowledgement

requirement at I guess 1313 --- 1312(11)?

ATTORNEY KING:

Yeah. We would agree with that. And again, I would come back to you just like they couldn't sign our application for us, the applications of these principals and the individuals. They can't sign the waiver and acknowledgement on their behalf as well.

MR. MCCABE:

Okay. I understand. I just want to make sure I understood the argument.

ATTORNEY KING:

17 Yes.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MCCABE:

Mr. Chairman, you know, we've been here this long and I'll stay a little longer. Mr. Petri, what is the deadline for us processing the application?

MR. PETRI:

It's a 60-day deadline. April 23rd is 25 the final date.

84 1 MR. MCCABE: 2 Does that give us any leeway though to be 3 able to consider it and because of this be able to start another 30 days? 5 MR. PETRI: 6 No, you have to make a decision one way or the other by April 23rd. 8 MR. MCCABE: 9 By April 23rd? 10 MR. PETRI: Or they have to basically refile. 11 12 ATTORNEY KING: 13 Unless the application is not complete in 14 which case the 60-day clock would wait to start until 15 it's complete. 16 MR. PETRI: 17 We've already deemed the application complete so the filing has occurred. 18 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Mr. King, did you or anybody represented 21 here at this table lobby for that provision be put in 22 Act One? 23 ATTORNEY KING:

Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN:

24

25

Thank you. Any other questions from the Board? We will reconvene. We're going to recess for executive session. We'll reconvene at approximately 1:30.

,

12 p: 13 Ga 14 an

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 12:54 P.M.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, was reported by me on 04/07/2010 and that I Alicia R. Brant read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Court Reporter