COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * *

IN RE: PHILADELPHIA ENTERTAINMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
PARTNERS, LP (FOXWOODS)

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

* * * * * * * *

BEFORE: Gregory C. Fajt, Chairman

Raymond S. Angeli, Jeffrey W. Coy,

James B. Ginty, Kenneth T. McCabe,

Gary A. Sojka, Kenneth I. Trujillo; Members

HEARING: Thursday, December 16, 2010

9:05 a.m.

LOCATION: Pennsylvania State Museum Auditorium

300 North Street

Harrisburg, PA 17120

WITNESSES: Don Marrandino, Scott Wiegand

Reporter: Cynthia Piro Simpson

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

2 APPEARANCES 1 OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL 2 3 CYRUS PITRE, ESQUIRE Chief Counsel 4 5 DALE MILLER, ESQUIRE 6 Assistant Enforcement Counsel Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board P.O. Box 69060 Harrisburg, PA 17106-9060 10 Counsel for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board 11 12 F. WARREN JACOBY, ESQUIRE 13 Cozen O'Connor 14 1900 Market Street 15 | Philadelphia, PA 19103-3508 16 Counsel for Philadelphia Entertainment and 17 Development Partners, LP 18 19 WILLIAM J. DOWNEY, III, ESQUIRE 20 Fox Rothschild, LLP 21 Midtown Building 22 Suite 400 23 1301 Atlantic Avenue 24 Atlantic City, NJ 08401-7212 25 Counsel for Caesars Entertainment Corporation

				3				
1	I N D E X							
2								
3	OPENING REMARKS							
4	By Chairman Fajt	5	_	7				
5	OPENING STATEMENT							
6	By Attorney Jacoby	7	_	9				
7	By Attorney Downey	10	_	12				
8	PRESENTATION							
9	By Mr. Marrandino	12	_	14				
10	By Mr. Wiegand	15	-	16				
11	STATEMENT							
12	By Attorney Jacoby	16	-	18				
13	By Attorney Pitre	18	-	22				
14	QUESTIONS							
15	By Board Members	22	-	50				
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

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

PROCEEDINGS

2 | -----

CHAIRMAN:

1

3

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Board would like to ask everyone to 4 please turn off their cell phones and PDAs. Joining us today is David Barasch, Ex-Officio Designee, representing Secretary of Revenue Dan Hassell, and Aviv Bliwas representing the State Treasurer's Office. Is Aviv here? Okay. And then joining us shortly will 10 be Secretary of Agriculture Russell Redding, but representing him in the interim is Dan Tufano. Is Dan 11 12 here? Don't see him. Okay. All members being present, I'll call today's meeting to order. As the 13 14 first order of business, please join me in the Pledge 15 of Allegiance.

16 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

CHAIRMAN:

I would now like to call up representatives of Philadelphia Entertainment and Development Partners and Caesars, formerly known as Harrah's, to update the Board on the present status of their discussions relative to PEDP's Category 2 License. The parties filed a series of petitions and supporting documents with both our Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) and the Bureau of Investigations and

Enforcement (BIE) on Friday. And we would like to hear from them today. I presume that we have Mr.

Downey representing Harrah's/Caesars and Mr. Jacoby representing PEDP. Before we begin, I'd like to ask Counsel whether they agree that Friday's filings with the OHA can be made part of the record.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Mr. Chair, yes, I think that we can agree that those filings should be made part of the record, please.

CHAIRMAN:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that?

Thank you. Mr. Jacoby, you're okay with

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Yes. We made a submission to Linda Lloyd with respect to certain selected redactions which she made, and we agreed that as redacted, it should be part of the record.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC), you guys are okay with that?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

No objection.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Okay. With that,

facility for gaming and an application with respect to any potential need to modify the design of the facility.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

With the definitive documents, the operative document is something called a Partnership Interest Purchase Agreement, and we attached to it probably too many documents for anybody's desires, but a series of transactional documents that related to the underlying transaction. We are here today to answer any questions and to ask the Board to allow us to continue with this process with BIE in their investigative role. We have been answering questions as they've been raised by BIE and various staff members. We are and continue to be available for that purpose.

We have received substantial indications of interest from individuals and organizations who would like to be considered for investment in the Class A equity raise. We already have, as you know, \$21 million committed by the Silver Trust and by Mr. Snider. We delivered a deck of what I'll call offering materials to BIE yesterday morning. depending upon the, I guess, determination by this Board today, it's our intention to then respond to all 24 the inquiries we've had in order to meet with people,

discuss the transaction with them as potential investors.

2.

We also have preemptive rights under our agreement. FDC has elected not to exercise its preemptive rights, which means 100 percent of the allocation will be available to WPI during the preemptive period. We have been talking with the partners in WPI. A number of them have expressed an interest in investing in the Class A. We have not proceeded with that until after this hearing. We felt it'd be premature. And we also wanted to sign the papers Friday and have a deck of offering materials that we are comfortable is consistent with what the deal is going to be. At this point, I'll turn the microphone over to Bill Downey, Counsel for Harrah's/Caesars. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Mr. Downey, before you begin, just to clarify my comments, the comment I made about entering the documents in the record, that was in the record of the Summary Judgment proceeding, is what I was talking about.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Understood.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Mr. Downey?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

1

2

23

2.4

25

3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Bill Downey for Bally's Midwest Casino and several subsidiaries, indirect and direct, of Caesars Entertainment Operation --- Corporation. With me today at counsel table are Don Marrandino, who is the president of Caesars Entertainment Corporation's Eastern Division, and Scott Wiegand, who is vice-10 president and Associate General Counsel of Caesars 11 Entertainment Corporation. Scott has been the primary 12 in-house counsel driving this --- the deal that you have in front of you today. 13 14 Mr. Chairman, as you know, on October 15 22nd, 2010, we entered into a Confidential Term Sheet, pursuant to which PEDP --- the partners in PEDP, 16

22nd, 2010, we entered into a Confidential Term Sheet, pursuant to which PEDP --- the partners in PEDP,

Caesars and Citizens, outlined a deal to recapitalize and restructure PEDP. On November 18th, as Mr. Jacoby has referenced, we came before you and described the general nature of the deal that was contemplated, and at your directive, drove hard to finalize our relationship with the term sheet parties.

On December 10th, 2010, the parties to the term sheet entered into a Definitive Purchase Agreement, and that same evening, filed three

petitions with the Board. The first was a Petition
for a Change of Control of PEDP, which describes in
detail the proposed structure of the deal, and also
includes an executed copy of the Purchase Agreement
into which the parties entered. The second is a
Modification Petition, which describes our proposed
revised facility, including construction of the
facility in phases. And the third was an Extension of
Time Petition seeking extension of the time in which
we must open the project to December of 2012.

11 The Purchase Agreement and certain documents attached as exhibits, including a New 12 13 Partnership Agreement, a Management Agreement and 14 Development Agreement, contemplate the 15 recapitalization and restructure of PEDP. Specifically, PEDP's deck, held by Caesars and 16 17 Citizens, will be restructured in their entirety. Equity investors, including Caesars, current partners 18 and contemplated new partners, will inject \$75 million 19 20 of new capital into the company. Just to put a finer 21 point on a reference that Mr. Jacoby made, we actually 22 have \$46 million of the \$75 million already committed. He omitted Caesars' commitment of \$25 million. 23

Caesars is going to arrange for approximately \$200 million in construction financing,

24

25

and Caesars proposes to acquire a one-third interest in the reorganized company, and will manage the project. I'm going to ask Mr. Marrandino to speak to you on the subject of the proposed phasing and facility plan.

MR. MARRANDINO:

Good morning. A really exciting project

CHAIRMAN:

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that ---.

Could you spell your name?

MR. MARRANDINO:

I'm sorry. It's Don Marrandino, M-A-R-R-A-N-D-I-N-O. Exciting project. We're looking to launch it as a Horseshoe, which is one of our primary brands under Caesars Entertainment. And I think it would be the first nationally-known brand in the Philadelphia market. We estimate this project being completed in multiple phases, with the opening estimated in the third quarter of 2012. And the project is extremely exciting for us in the phase that we're in right now.

It's going to be 151,000 square feet of 23 space that will have 64,000 square feet of gaming, 1,500 slot machines, 70 to 80 table games. And the 24 25 Horseshoe is known as the big limits place, along with Caesars in our company, so it's not unusual to see \$50,000 bet at a Horseshoe casino. From a parking perspective, we'll have close to 1,400 parking spaces. That's a ratio of .9 spaces to gaming position, which is right about where we like to build our properties.

And I think the amenities will be very nice. A steakhouse that's under design will have a balcony overlooking the river, looking to partner with a world-class chef to do something very nicely in the area. A noodle bar. We're going to have a tremendous sports bar that we think will work very well with the sports complex very close to us, and I think it will be a one-of-a-kind sports bar. And a center feature bar that will have great entertainment.

When this construction starts, we'll employ 650 construction workers, and when we open, we believe we'll hire 1,200 employees, and we think that 950 of them will be full time. From a gaming tax revenue, we project that we'll contribute about \$66 million in year one, and by year five, we'll ramp that up to about \$75 million. Phase 1B, as we're calling it, or Phase 2, will occur when it's commercially practical to get this project on, based upon the performance, but we've already master planned it and we think it will take about 22 to 24 months to

get Phase 1B up and running. And that would consist of about 183,000 square feet of gaming space --- I'm sorry --- total space, 87,000 of casino space. We'll be up to 2,200 additional slot machines and 90 to 100 table games. We'll have a parking garage that will be 2,200-plus parking spaces and also launch the World Series of Poker poker room at that time.

The traffic studies have been completed --- or the traffic counts, anyway, have been completed. And we're in the process of looking at the full array since SugarHouse is open, and we've seen that there's been some improvement in that road, so we continue to look at that. And the economic impact study has been prepared for the original project and revisions are in process and we're getting ready to get going on that. And we continue to work with our design team and the Keating Group to make sure that the guaranteed maximum price of the project is set.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Thank you, Mr. Marrandino. Mr. Chairman, I next want to introduce Scott Wiegand, who is going to discuss the status of our debt and equity efforts.

MR. WIEGAND:

Good morning. Scott Wiegand. It's spelled W-I-E-G-A-N-D. I'm the vice-president and

Associate General Counsel of Caesars Entertainment
Corporation. The documents that we've signed with
PEDP set out a plan for completion of the elements
necessary to commence construction. One of things
that needed to happen, of course, is completing out
the financing for the project. And our submission on
Friday included commitments from a couple of wellknown financial institutions, which indicate we
believe the debt financing will be available once the
steps are in place in the documents have been
achieved.

As Mr. Jacoby mentioned, the submission also included --- or recently we submitted a set of materials that PEDP will use in connection with the equity financing. The process for that will be that PEDP's financial advisors will receive an indication of interest from investors. Investors would review the information in the book and subscribe to the documents that are set out in that book. And the actual closing on the equity depends on how long it takes for us to complete our compliance investigations with respect to potential new investors and review towards license as necessary. We anticipate that the commitments for equity would be in place sometime before the closing of the equity, but that process

will be something that PEDP leads over the next month or two.

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

1

2

3

4

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'll try to put out more definition on the equity aspect of it. I know that's something of interest to the Board and the Staff. Regretfully, because we're dealing with security and we've got to be careful how we approach this, also, we're mindful of our obligations on the gaming loss in addition to the \$21 million committed to by the Silver Trust and Mr. Snider and the \$25 million --- and I apologize to 12 | Harrah's/Caesars, that they've already committed to do, which is \$46 million of the total raise of \$75 million. And I might add that if we didn't hit the \$75 million, Harrah's has provided a bridge loan of \$10 million to get us there while we're raising additional monies.

The preemptive right period expires in March 2011. We think that the raise of the money will be accomplished much quicker than that. However, we wanted to protect our people, the WPI people, and give them sufficient time to make up their minds, and that's why we ask for that time, and that's the date that's in the materials you have there, March 31st.

We, as you know, have engaged Blackstone

to assist us in our equity raise. Blackstone, the

Cozen firm, Latham and Watkins and Harrah's/Caesars

have worked diligently. Regretfully, when you're

dealing securities offering materials, by the time you

get done, all the disclosures and disclaimers about

risk and everything else, the thing is probably this

thick (indicating) at this point. And that was given

to BIE yesterday morning as a courtesy to have.

We would anticipate, subject to the Board's determination today, to be actively on the street tomorrow and thereafter, responding to all the indications of interest we've had from people, just inquiries, really. As I've said, there are a number of people within the WPI organization who've expressed willingness, in fact, a strong desire to invest substantial sums of money. I've talked with Cyrus about the need to make sure that everyone at WPI gets an equal opportunity to invest, and we intend to do that. We had a meeting with WPI about two weeks ago and we made that clear to our members.

I think Scott raises a very important point. We're very mindful of the need also that as part of the process, we have to go through various layers of due diligence on the people, both initially and then ultimately, because eventually, depending

upon the size of their investment, directly and indirectly in the licensee, they'll have to be licensed. We anticipate that most of the people we're talking to will be at that level of investment. As I said, we signed the deal Friday. The book was finished over the weekend once the deal got done. And we intended to be actively soliciting starting tomorrow depending upon the outcome of this meeting.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Mr. Chairman, we would entertain any questions that you or the Board might have.

CHAIRMAN:

2.4

Thank you. Before we get into Board questions, Enforcement Counsel, do you guys have any comments?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, I wish we were here about a year ago, because according to our timeline, that would have been the perfect timing for this. However, based upon the situation that we're in now, we've had an opportunity to review the documents that were submitted to us, not in any great, overt detail, but enough to have some sort of understanding of those documents.

Most notably, the Joint Petition for

Change of Control contained an executed agreement entitled The Partnership Interest Purchase and Exchange Agreement, and that document contains several exhibits that were not executed and contained blank spaces within various documents where information will be inserted at a future date and time.

The petition for the approval of modifications in the proposed permanent facility contained exhibits that illustrate the site plan for the proposed 1A and 1B of the facility and the timeline for the construction and the opening of Phase 1A of the facility, as well as a conceptual schedule for Phase 1B, along with two highly confident financing letters.

A review of the documents submitted as exhibits to the petitions, particularly those submitted with the Change of Control Petition, contemplate future negotiations or negotiations of future agreements, and the consummation of those future agreements are a pre-condition to performance and/or the occurrence of a closing of the Purchase Agreement. The executed Purchase Agreement is dependent upon future events, conditions and future definitive agreements, such as the completion of the due diligence period, obtaining various PGCB

approvals, obtaining various governmental permitting, the negotiation of and the obtainment of binding commitments for equity funding and the negotiation of and the obtainment of a binding commitment for project financing, just to name a few.

The pre-conditions to performance, in my opinion, does not make the Purchase Agreement a truly definitive document as it is dependent upon and contemplates agreements that must be reached in the future. The Purchase Agreement also does not contemplate or describe the funds that will be utilized or needed for the full buildout of Phase 1B or how the company plans to pay for or complete the construction of Phase 1B. This will also be dependent upon future agreements.

While the executed Purchase Agreement does embody the executed term sheet, there remains an uncertainty regarding the details of additional equity infusion and from specifically whom or where such an infusion will originate. Additionally, there are no binding commitments or details regarding the project debt financing. As mentioned, there are only two highly confident letters that were submitted. Those questions are not anticipated to be answered and those details are not anticipated to be forthcoming for

months, according to the information supplied in the exhibits.

2.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

At this time, of the \$275 million that will be needed for the completion of Phase 1A, \$46 million has been committed and dedicated by traceable sources, but the binding commitment of these funds are also dependent upon the consummation of future negotiations, agreements, transactions and The consummation of the transactions and approvals. agreements contemplated by the Purchase Agreement has not yet taken place. Until those consummations have taken place and the pre-conditions have been satisfied or waived, there can be no closing of the Partnership Agreement. Until the closing occurs, the parties have an obligation to proceed in good faith to accomplish those transaction agreements and goals spelled out in the Purchase Agreement. However, the agreement, in my opinion, is not definitive in that it contemplates future negations, future agreements and the satisfaction of future conditions that will not likely occur for several months. The failure to attain any of these goals on the part of the parties could be a potential reason for the termination of this agreement.

So, I know Mr. Jacoby and Mr. Downey

described this as a definitive agreement, and they
have their opinion of it. I have my opinion of it. I
don't think it's a definitive agreement. I think
there are more negotiations that need to be done. We
don't have any debt financing. They acknowledge that
that's something they'll be working on in the future.

On the far end, outside end, we're looking at as late
as May 2010 before we may have this whole thing
complete. I mean 2011.

CHAIRMAN:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Thank you. Questions from the Board?

MR. SOJKA:

Just a few.

CHAIRMAN:

Commissioner Sojka.

MR. SOJKA:

If you'd like. In the materials that you sent, there was some description of the charitable contribution component. That was a part of the initial granting of the license some years ago. The intent, of course, to come back to us now is with a project which is very comparable to the one that received the license. Could you review the entire situation on the charitable contribution, or the proposed charitable contribution, as the deal is being

structured now?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Yes, I will, Commissioner. Under
Condition 57 of the Statement of Conditions that was
signed by Foxwoods at the issuance of this license,
Mr. Snider individually and the Rubin Trust and the
Silver Trust agreed that any proceeds that they
received from the operation would be paid to charity.
And they each have signed a Deed of Trust, which we've
shared with the Board and with BIE.

Because of the conditions that have resulted and the need for additional capital and to and FDC's inability to continue the management of the operation, there's been --- this had to be of necessity. And in fact, if you read statement --- Condition 57, it contemplates that eventuality that that could happen. And because of that, there was a dilution of WPI and FDC's interests, and in turn, the interest of the charitable --- WPCC, which is the charitable unit under WPI.

And so what we tried to do --- and by the way, that commitment is still there for that interest, whatever that interest is in WPI going forward. And because of that, in the negotiations with Harrah's/Caesars, we tried to exact a separate

1 commitment to provide funds for charities.

Ironically, I believe that the current proposal under the agreement before you is much more beneficial from the standpoint of quantity and timing than the earlier arrangement because the earlier arrangement, and I'll go into the detail in a minute, Mr. Commissioner, provided only when proceeds were available, which means when they got distributions and when they got any sale proceeds, which, frankly, might have been six to eight, ten years out, realistically speaking.

Under the current arrangement, we have --- in addition to the prior commitment, it provides two things. It provides at opening, dependent upon cash availability, if not, there's a \$400,000 payment of a total payment of \$5 million initial contribution. Half of that would go to the Pequot Museum. That's something that FDC felt they were being diluted substantially, and that's a charity. And the other half would be designated by WPI, the charities that they designate.

In addition to that, and this is --- I think that's substantial, first of all, but more importantly, two percent of non-operating revenues basically an amount equal to the management fee that Harrah's is getting, is to be paid to charities on an

annual basis designated by WPI. There's a provision during the first seven years that at least \$500,000 of those payments would go to the Pequot Museum. 3 This is They wanted to have that to benefit the for FDC. museum and the tribe and everything else and its charity. And that continues indefinitely until there's a change of control --- I guess if there's a sale of the operation, there's certain provisions. So, I would say that, if anything, the current 10 arrangement for charities, both quantitatively and from a time standpoint --- it quantitatively is vastly 11 12 improved over what was contained in the statement of conditions. 13

MR. SOJKA:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Pequot Museum is not housed in the State of Pennsylvania; is that correct?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

It is not. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN:

Commissioner Trujillo?

MR. TRUJILLO:

What I would like to do is maybe break my questions up into two general areas. One of them is the transaction itself, but then I also --- in following up with Commissioner Sojka's questions, I'd

like to discuss --- and I'm --- just for your
reference, I'm just looking back at the original
adjudication on Category 2 licenses. And it's, I
think, fair to say that there was a --- I believe it's
a fair characterization to make the following general
statements.

The Board, in granting the license, stated that one of the things that made the PEDP project stand out is the following. One, Philadelphia Entertainment has a strong partner in Foxwoods, an investment-grade business with years of experience in the gaming industry, diversity in its ownership, and at least 42 percent of the profits will flow to an irrevocable charitable trust to be used for charitable purposes in the Philadelphia area.

So, with respect to the charitable trust, I think any fair review of the transcripts and the testimony by the representatives of PEDP and the review of the adjudication, it was clear that --- at least as I read it, that the representations made to the Board were that the charitable trust proceeds were intended to go to charities serving children in the Philadelphia area. So, as I read, I think it was around page 80 of the Partnership Agreement, the only commitment that I saw --- solid commitment was that

1 the first \$3.5 million would go to the Pequot Museum in Connecticut. Am I reading that correctly, Mr. 3 Jacoby?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

4

5

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

from.

No, sir. Under the provisions in the Purchase Agreement, \$2.5 million of the first \$5 million initial contribution goes to Pequot. other \$2.5 million goes to charities designated by WPI. I thought you said \$3.5 million, and I'm just correcting that.

MR. TRUJILLO:

12 I believe I read \$3.5 million, but that's --- I'll accept your ---. 13

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Let me explain, perhaps, where that came

MR. TRUJILLO:

Certainly.

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

The provision with respect to the annual contributions provide that the Pequot Museum has the right to receive a cumulative amount of \$3.5 million from them at the rate of \$500,000 a year for seven 24 years, and I think perhaps that's where you saw the \$3.5 million, as a commitment to Pequot with respect

to the annual contributions. Any amount in excess of that --- I mean, I'm not going to project revenues. Otherwise, I'll get sued as to offering securities 3 here. But let's assume --- and it's net operating revenues, so I think it's much more substantial than, for example, net profits, getting to distributions to investors after interest, after everything else comes This is net operating revenue. Two percent off it. of that every year goes to the charities designated, and we think that's very substantial. 10 In fact, probably on a present value basis, and we could 11 12 probably try to come up with some analysis, I think 13 it's much more substantial than paragraph 57, the Statement of Conditions. 14

And those obligations, Mr. Commissioner, still continue. Whatever commitments WPPC made, whatever interest they still hold, the proceeds will go has they commit it, so there's no change to that. But as I said, if you look at paragraph 57, I think it contemplates that there might be a dilution and the commitment that whatever the awarded amount was continues to go to charity, which we're doing.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

We would rather not be before you today, 24 having a dilution that we're having, but we're trying to deal with what we're trying to do and salvage this

project. And we think this is --- frankly, we think this is much more positive thing for the charities in any event than what they would have had, because if you just do a pro forma analysis of when distributions might be coming out to investors and how much they might be, I think what we have here is much more substantial.

MR. TRUJILLO:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Can you point me anywhere in the document or any of the documents that indicate that any of the charitable contributions will be made to Philadelphia area charities serving children?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Yes. The trust documents for the Silver Trust and the Rubin Trust provide for that. provide for how they're to be distributed. We've, in fact, I guess since one of our last hearings, in one of our meetings with BIE and the Bureau, have discussed that. And I know there was a concern about 501(c)(4), and we discussed about how to deal with their concerns on that issue, but if you read the trust documents, which I assume are available to you 23 --- if they're not, I'll arrange to get them to the 24 Board. I believe BIE has them. But that's in there, the commitment to local community and to various

things, including education.

MR. TRUJILLO:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I understand that, Mr. Jacoby, but that relates to the WPI portion, not to the portion entirely under the transaction.

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

We are prepared if that is an issue. We're not trying to subvert the process. We're prepared, if that's an issue, to make the appropriate commitments with respect to the designation of the annual payments as well to satisfy your concerns that the money is being administered in a manner consistent with --- contemplated by the Statement of Conditions as well. We're not trying to subvert that.

MR. TRUJILLO:

With respect to Philadelphia Entertainment having a strong partner in Foxwoods, under the contemplated transaction, can you tell me what Foxwoods' status is within the project?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Foxwoods today or Foxwoods going forward --- at closing, under the Purchase Agreement, Foxwoods 23 will terminate the Management Contract, and their Licensing Agreement they'll continue as a limited partner, having the same limited partnership interest

that WPI has. As far as what their role might be, 1 from a standpoint of advisory, I'll have to defer to Harrah's/Caesars, but the general partner will be an 3 affiliate of Harrah's/Caesars going forward after 5 closing.

MR. TRUJILLO:

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

I understand. What's the extent of the limited partnership interest upon closing if it closes according to your documents?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Both FDC and WPI each have a 1.25-percent 12 interest in the equity of restructured PEDP.

MR. TRUJILLO:

So it's a 1.25 down from the 30-percent interest; am I correct?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

That's correct.

MR. TRUJILLO:

And with respect to any identified equity, do you have any identified and committed 21 minority participation in your equity component?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

That's a fair question. I think it was 24 raised also last time, and we're very mindful of it. And as I said, I spoke with Cyrus subsequent to that.

We have four members of WPI who themselves are minorities. At least of two of them have expressed a 3 desire to invest in the Class A. We have not gone out and actively solicited because we didn't have offering materials until this weekend. And we were waiting, as I said, for this hearing. And we've spoken to Blackstone after the last hearing. One of the members of the Board here asked the question about diversity, and we've made it clear to Blackstone that they need 10 to include in the groups to which they make offers 11 groups that are diverse and try to maximize their 12 participation.

MR. TRUJILLO:

So I take it from that that the answer's

15 no?

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Well, the answer's no. I think I was clear before that we've made no --- other than Mr. Snider and the Silver Trust, the Class A has not been raised or solicited because we didn't have a signed deal on Friday. And their commitment was made to get the deal done. That was part of the deal --- the negotiations, but beyond that, though, we'll start making offers tomorrow --- or soliciting offers tomorrow.

MR. TRUJILLO:

What I would like to ask a little bit about now is on the transactional side. As I read the what I consider to be fairly standard highly confident letters, page two of the highly confident letters do has they typically do, say that there's no commitment to debt finance. So, as I read the documents, there is zero debt commitment as we sit here today; am I correct?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

I think that's correct. There's no hard commitment for the debt financing. I think the document says --- as is typical, sets out a plan that you begin to work against and upon completion of the steps necessary for any debt financing source to evaluate. At that point, I think the letters that were submitted indicate that at least we believe that that debt financing will be available when those steps are completed.

MR. TRUJILLO:

And with respect to the equity component which Harrah's is committing, what's the total figure that is a hard commitment today?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

For equity is \$25 million.

MR. TRUJILLO:

\$25 million?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Yes.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Now, you're aware, are you not ---?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Mr. Commissioner, just one point of clarification.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Yes, please.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

While the equity number is \$25 million as is committed, I don't want to lose sight of the fact that there is a \$10 million backstopping us so that if the Class A were to come up \$10 million short, albeit characterized as debt on interim basis, that could extend to a \$35 million number, which would eat away \$10 million of the equity hole.

MR. TRUJILLO:

I understand. And in fact, that goes right to where I was next going, which is, you understand, do you not, that Harrah's, being licensed already with another facility in Pennsylvania, is limited to the extent of what it can own? Mr. Downey,

obviously, you're well aware of that. And so as I 2 read the documents, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems to me that after year four, there 3 will be approximately --- as I read it, post year four, there are some put options that are available to the Class A equity holders; am I correct? In those put options, the entity that can decide whether to exercise them or to whom they are exercised is Harrah's --- or Caesars; am I also correct on that? 10 ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Not exactly.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Okay.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

The second half, I think, was accurate.

I think that ---. 16

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

The mechanism is as follows. Obviously, whenever you find yourselves in a deal with a large player, you're concerned about being locked in liquidity. And it's not just --- frankly, the C's also have the put right as well. So, basically, what 23 we negotiated, frankly, for the benefit of what we thought were potential A's, including the two going in, and the C's, was the ability to create some

liquidity if they wanted to get out, not that they had to.

And the put option is set up in such a way that if Harrah's/Caesars, for regulatory purposes, cannot own additional equity, that the investors get preferred interests equal to the redemption value that are brought out over time. They continue to maintain their vote and control whatever percentage vote goes with that. And then basically, at that point in time, if Harrah's is not subject to regulatory constraint, they can own that interest in the future. If not, they'd have to bring somebody else in to own it.

Otherwise, it remains in limbo.

MR. TRUJILLO:

2.

And Mr. Jacoby, I'm not worried about the prefs on the folks who are putting their options over to Harrah's. What I'm concerned about is on the other side, which is hearkening back to Wittgenstein. The world as we know it today, it is, in fact, that Harrah's would be permitted from owning more than its one-third share. But as I see the documents, if all of the put options are exercised, Harrah's, in effect, could have control over 100 percent of who gets to exercise or who gets to purchase off of those put options. Am I reading it wrong?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Are you keeping score control as the ability to vote? The ability to vote ---.

MR. TRUJILLO:

No, no, no. I'm not talking about vote. I'm talking the way the document reads says that Harrah's will identify third parties --- either they will exercise it or identify the third parties to be able to exercise the put option.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Commissioner, I would probably say that somewhat differently. First of all, Harrah's has no option on the put; right? The put is in the hands of the Class A and Class C holders. That comes in and we've got to deal with it, and that's how I would characterize it.

We have the obligation rather than right --- I guess you can characterize it as a right, but we have the obligation to find someone who can hold that interest while preserving our obligations and our status under the statute as we know it today. poignantly aware of that. I mean, as you can probably 23 tell from the document, we went through some tortured exercises in ensuring that while we understand that there are these moving parts --- and the option that

can be exercised by Citizens is another example. We had to structure this so that we are able to account for the fact that, through no fault of our own, we could one day wake up and have interest looming that could implicate our ownership control, however you want to define the concept.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What we did and were very careful to do was ensure that every one of those primary indicia remains at or below the one-third threshold so that, although we can have conversations about --- and frankly if we were having this conversation in August, maybe we would have approached Cyrus and had this discussion. Does it matter that our capital account rises or falls below the one-third threshold? We're not in a position to have to have any of those conversations at this point. Our capital accounts are set through this system. Our rights to distributions are set through this system. Our rights to allocations are set through this system. Our rights to vote equity are set through this system. At no point under this structure that you have in front of you are we in danger of crossing that threshold inadvertently on the equity side.

MR. TRUJILLO:

And I understand that. I completely

understand that you've --- you know, from a draftsmanship standpoint, I think that you're quite correct that you've carefully carved that out. The concern I have, and you might maybe understand why that would be from the regulatory side, is that since the law prohibits you from owning more than the third, the concern on our side is control. Even it's not equity ownership, it's still an issue. So, if there's anything else you'd like to say on that. I just wanted to understand it from your perspective.

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Mr. Trujillo, I guess I would just --you know, to the extent that you are asking, is
Harrah's responsible for identifying a buyer, the
answer is yes. It would be incumbent upon us to find
someone who passed muster. And frankly, if that were
to become an issue in terms of who the party was and
whether there was an affiliation that implied control,
we would have to deal with that in the context of our
discussion with your staff, frankly.

MR. TRUJILLO:

I don't know. Mr. Wiegand, maybe this is on you. And I understand some of the sensitivities you may have as --- well, not a public company. In the last couple of weeks, it was fairly broadly

reported that you were going to market, and in fact, you've brought before us, I quess, Mr. Downey, about 3 three months ago, two months ago, documentation anticipating going public with approximately half a billion dollars worth of stock, which then was cancelled. And part of what was made, I think, pretty abundantly public was the extent of your debt load and --- which was, as I recall, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$20 billion-some. So can you tell me 10 where Harrah's stands today, not on a cash flow basis, but just with respect to, you know, its capacity to 11 12 take on additional responsibility with this kind of a 13 project?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Yes. That process really didn't affect our interest or ability to execute in this particular transaction at all. Our balance sheet, I think, is sufficient to handle all obligations in connection with this transaction.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Mr. Chairman, that's all I have.

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Commissioner if I can ---.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Certainly.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just one point on the last ---. We submitted --- Mr. Wiegand is constrained by some securities limitations in terms of what he can and can't say on that subject. We did, on a confidential basis, submit to your staff a further explanation, but given the nature of what we can say publicly and what we can't say publicly, we can't elaborate on that. I did, however, communicate with your staff on the subject.

MR. TRUJILLO:

I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN:

And I assume when you say our staff, are you talking about our staff or BIE?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

The Board staff.

MR. TRUJILLO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Commissioner Ginty?

MR. GINTY:

This is for Mr. Marrandino. I believe you projected that if this deal went forward, you anticipated tax revenues starting at \$66 million, and

your projections, going to \$75 million?

MR. MARRANDINO:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That was tax.

MR. GINTY:

Tax. Can you break that down in terms of how much of that would be going to Philadelphia and --- I believe there's also an obligation to the school district in Philadelphia.

MR. MARRANDINO:

Commissioner, I don't think we have that degree of granularity on those --- on the breakdown of 12 those numbers. What I can tell you is that we did not include sort of a --- you know, the 12-percent side. We didn't include -- this is straight gaming tax. This isn't the one-and-a-half-percent administrative --- it is a straight gaming tax number. We did not do the breakdown at this point.

MR. GINTY:

If I recollect, though, you're --- by statute, is it, you're obligated to --- is it \$5 million to the Philadelphia School District?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

Of the charitable contribution?

MR. GINTY:

No, no. In the nature of the tax.

MR. MARRANDINO:

I don't remember off the top of my head.

MR. GINTY:

1

2

3

4

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

obligated to do that as SugarHouse is. If the deal were to go forward, when would you anticipate the 650 construction jobs to begin? You know, you don't have to be precise. Are we talking, you know, mid 2011 or ---?

MR. WIEGAND:

During the second half of 2011 is what the schedule indicates currently.

MR. GINTY:

Okay. And I believe you indicated that once the construction was done, you would employ approximately 1,200 individuals, and that would be in the initial stage of construction? The initial opening, I guess.

MR. MARRANDINO:

Operations, yes.

MR. GINTY:

The initial operations.

MR. WIEGAND:

That's correct.

MR. GINTY:

That's all the questions I have.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Any other questions? I have just a couple quick ones. Mr. Jacoby, this is probably for you. In the --- and again, I wasn't here when the original --- I didn't vote on the original license, though I was probably present. PEDP, it's my understanding, made an estimate that their charitable contributions would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$300 million over ten years. Are any of you knowledgeable on that and whether that statement was, in fact, made?

ATTORNEY JACOBY:

I don't know whether the statement was made. I wasn't here at the time, not that that's an excuse for me to say. I guess conceivably, depending on what you project as the exit values over that period, it was conceivable when you consider the fact that WPCC owned 42 percent of WPI, so they had about 28 to 30 percent of the total scheme. So, conceivably, depending on what multiple assumptions they made, that could have been. I'd just be speculating, Mr. Commissioner, and I apologize.

CHAIRMAN:

All right. Again, my point there is

that, you know, that's a pretty significant 1 2 contribution, and I respect your comment earlier that you can't look into your crystal ball and predict what 3 the charitable contributions will be under the current makeup, but that was a pretty significant number. secondly, I just have a couple of quick questions on the physical plant issues, and I don't know who wants to answer those. But I want to make sure that, you know, I understand what the original deal was versus 10 what the current physical plant is. So if you'll bear with me for a second. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The original license grant and the original proposal, as I understand it, was Phase 1 was to begin in February of 2007. The original proposal was to open in November of 2008, total cost of about \$525 million. The approximate square footage of the original facility was 390,000 square feet, about 90,000 on the gaming floor, 3,000 slot machines, a 2,000-seat showroom, entertainment lounge and retail shops, a 600-seat buffet, a 4,200 square --- or 4,200-space parking garage and 300 surface parking spaces. That was Phase 1. Phase 1 of the current proposal, which obviously is contingent upon city approvals, 151 square feet, again, versus 390; 1,500 slot machines versus 3,000; 13,072 surface parking spaces compared

to 4,200 parking spaces in a garage, plus 300 surface parking spaces, and there is no provision for a showroom, entertainment lounge or retail shop. Am I accurate in that characterization?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

Mr. Commissioner, yes, I think largely you're accurate. I would point out that one of the requests that we're making to you is that we be aloud to phase what otherwise would have been the Phase 1, I think at the long end of the tunnel. The other, the more comparable is where we would be at 1B, because we do acknowledge that we are, in fact, seeking permission to phase the project.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. And just to be clear that there is no commitment on your part to do Phase 1B? No firm commitment?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

I think that's fair. It is a market-driven commitment. That's fair.

CHAIRMAN:

Right. Okay. Any other questions
Commissioner Trujillo?

MR. TRUJILLO:

Mr. Chairman, just following up on your

question on the charitable contributions. And I'm 1 2 looking at page --- thanks to Steve Jobs and Apple computers, to page 31 of the transcript of the 3 suitability hearing for PEDP. And I'm quoting from Mr. Agarwal, who testified on PEDP's behalf as follows. As the notion of gaming --- I quote Mr. Agarwal. As the notion of gaming in Pennsylvania progressed from concept to reality, several members of Washington Partners saw past the obvious business 10 opportunity. They saw a unique way to establish a funding mechanism that would channel millions of 11 dollars to underserved people in our region. 12 13 that end, the lead local partners in Foxwoods Casino 14 Philadelphia, which include the Rubin Family 15 Charitable Foundation, the Silver Family Charitable Trust and Ed Snider, have irrevocably committed 100 16 17 percent of their profits, which accounts for 42 percent of the entire project's profits, to charitable 18 19 purposes in perpetuity. The primary focus of this 20 charitable giving will be to support underprivileged children in the Philadelphia area and South Jersey. 21 22 These profits include profits not only from gaming 23 operations, but also from the restaurant, retail and hotel development at this site. This amount is 24 25 projected to total in excess of \$300 million over ten

years. As a group, the local partners could not let 1 this moment and opportunity to do more for the 3 underserved people in South Jersey and Philadelphia pass us by. End quote. 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Any other questions? Commissioner Angeli? 8 MR. ANGELI: 9 I'm just trying to kind of clarify 10 something. It's a \$275 million project. committed money right now is \$46 million, but of that 11 commitment, there's \$10 million that's coming ---12 there's a shortfall or is that \$46 million --- what is 13 14 committed right now? 15 ATTORNEY DOWNEY: \$46 million of the \$75 million is 16 17 committed, but there is an additional \$10 million that 18 is ---. 19

MR. ANGELI:

The ten is not part of the \$46 million?

ATTORNEY DOWNEY:

Correct.

20

21

22

23

MR. ANGELI:

24 Okay. That's in addition. And you're 25 expecting the other \$29 million to be raised from yet-

50 Okay. And then there's left 1 \$200 million, which is going to be debt financed, and 2 3 that has yet to be committed or do we know where that's come from? 5 MR. WIEGAND: Yeah, that's correct. It has yet to be 6 committed in an unconditional way. 8 MR. ANGELI: 9 Okay. Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. 12 Thank you very much. 13 14 HEARING CONCLUDED AT 10:02 A.M. 15 16 17 CERTIFICATE 18 I hereby certify that the foregoing 19 proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Fajt, was 20 reported by me on 12/16/2010 and that I Cynthia Piro Simpson read this transcript and that I attest that 21 22 this transcript is a true and accurate record of the 23 proceeding. 24

25