#### COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### GAMING CONTROL BOARD

\* \* \* \* \* \* \*

IN RE: PETITION FILED BY MOUNT AIRY CASINO FOR

APPROVAL OF A CORPORATE RESTRUCTURING

PETITION FILED BY MOUNT AIRY CASINO FOR APPROVAL TO

AMEND THE BOARD'S ORDER

PETITION FILED BY MOUNT AIRY CASINO FOR A MODIFICATION

OF ITS STATEMENT OF CONDITIONS

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

PUBLIC HEARING

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE: WILLIAM H. RYAN, JR., CHAIRMAN

Gregory C. Fajt, James B. Ginty, Keith R.

McCall, Anthony C. Moscato, Gary A. Sojka,

Kenneth I. Trujillo; Members

Jennifer Langan, Representing Robert M.

McCord, State Treasurer

Robert Coyne, Representing Daniel P.

Meuser, Secretary of Agriculture

HEARING: Wednesday, May 23, 2012

10:00 a.m.

Reporter: Kayla Bolze

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

		4
1	I N D E X	
2		
3	OPENING REMARKS	
4	By Presiding Officer	6 – 8
5	PRESENTATION	
6	By Attorney Sklar	8 – 26
7	By Attorney Pitre	27 - 30
8	By Attorney Davenport	30 - 33
9	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	34 - 61
10	CLOSING REMARKS	
11	By Presiding Officer	61
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

				5	
1		EXHIBITS		J	
2					
3			Page	Page	
4	Number	Description	Offered	<u>Admitted</u>	
5	One	Binder of 27 Exhibits			
6		Related to Mount Airy's			
7		Petition for Approval of			
8		A Corporate Restructuring	33	33	
9	Two	Binder of 9 Exhibits			
10		Related to Mount Airy's			
11		Petition to Modify it's			
12		Independent Audit			
13		Committee Charter	33	33	
14					
15	MOUNT AIRY EXHIBITS:				
16	One	PowerPoint Presentation	3 4	3 4	
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25	EXHIBITS NOT ATTACHED				

## PROCEEDINGS

2 -----

# CHAIRMAN:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Bill Ryan, the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. Before we begin, I would ask everyone to please turn off cell phones, PDAs and other electronic devices. Thank you.

Joining us today is Jennifer Langan representing State Treasurer Rob McCord and Robert Coyne representing the Secretary of the Department of Revenue, Dan Meuser. Thank you both for coming.

Quorum of members being present, I will call today's meeting to order. First order of business, I would ask everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

17 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

#### CHAIRMAN:

To begin we have three public hearings scheduled for this morning. Because all of the scheduled hearings involve Mount Airy business and there appears to be substantial overlap between them, what we would like to do is consolidate these hearings into one, thereby cutting down on what I'm sure would otherwise be some redundancies in the presentations.

With that being said, I would also ask the parties to not necessarily jump around on the subject matter of one petition to the next, but address these matters in as organized a fashion as you can to make it as easily understandable to everybody as we can and for the sake of a record that is as clear as it can be. Do the parties have any objection to this approach? Mr. Sklar?

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

 $\mathtt{No}$  .

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

None whatsoever.

# CHAIRMAN:

At the conclusion of the hearing we will go right into our regularly scheduled meeting. Can I please have all the persons from Mount Airy who will be participating in each of these proceedings come forward? And I think you're all forward.

Before we begin, I would ask all persons participating please identify yourselves before speaking. Also, if you can spell your name for the benefit of the court reporter, that would be appreciated. And as I think everybody knows, anyone who is going to speak who is not an attorney should be sworn by the court reporter. So Mount Airy, you may

petitions before you today. The first is a Petition
for Approval of a Corporate Restructuring. There is
two aspects to that petition. One is the sale of
six-sevenths of the ownership interest in Mount Airy
to six trusts that were established by Lisa DeNaples'
siblings. And the second aspect is the Withdrawal of
Louis DeNaples's Principal License Application. And I
have a PowerPoint that will run through that gets into
the basis for that petition.

The second petition is a Petition to Modify the Board's September 23rd, 2009 Order. And in particular, certain restrictions were placed on Mount Airy and Mr. Louis DeNaples, and we're asking that those restrictions be lifted.

The third petition is Mount Airy's

Petition to Modify its Statement of Conditions and

specifically to amend it a Slotting Community Charter.

And I don't know if you have a preference. If you want me to go through each petition and then turn it over to the Enforcement Counsel or if you just want me to run through each of the petitions.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Why don't we run through each of the petitions. I think it would probably be easier that

way.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Sure. So, I'll just run through the

4 slides briefly. Mount Airy was issued its Category 2

5 Slots License in July 2007. At that time Mount Airy

6 was 100 percent owned by Louis DeNaples. Right around

7 that time in late 2007 for estate planning purposes,

8 Mr. DeNaples, his intent was always to pass the

9 ownership onto his children and grandchildren. So,

10 that was always, you know, in his mind.

And the first step in that estate planning really occurred in September 2009. We filed a petition earlier in 2009 for Louis to transfer his 100 percent interest to a trust that was established by Lisa DeNaples. And the reason why he did it in steps --- and like I said, the intent was always ---. Louis had his seven children and Louis is 71. So the intent on an estate planning point of view always is getting the assets out of your estate as quickly as possible. So the intent was always to pass it on to his seven children.

In 2009 Lisa was the only child who was licensed by the Board, so at that time we decided let's do this in stages because it was going to be --- everyone understands the background investigations

associated with Principals is pretty extensive and time consuming. So the first step was to transfer the interest to Lisa's Trust. And Lisa is the sole Trustee and the sole beneficiary of her trust. There's additional beneficiaries that can come in, which are her nieces and nephews when and if they're licensed by the Board. And I'll get into that.

That's step two.

So, that transfer took place with Board approval in September 2009. As part of the sale, the ---. Like I said, the intent was always ---. Lisa's Trust obligation is to transfer six-sevenths of the ownership in Mount Airy to the other sibling trusts when and if they are licensed. So that was a specific requirement that was written into the agreement of sale originally back in 2009.

Lisa Trust purchased a 100 percent interest. The first price was determined pursuant to an appraisal that was obtained by an independent, well respected appraisal company and Lisa Trust took the ownership subject to the existing first lien debt.

Lisa delivered a note to Louis in the amount of the purchase price. The note is not secured by Lisa Trust's interest in Mount Airy. And just for the sake of clarity, Lisa Trust --- there's a holding

company in between Lisa Trust and Mount Airy #1, LLC, which is the Licensee. There's Mount Airy Holdco. So Lisa Trust owns 100 percent of Holdco, Holdco owns 100 percent of Mount Airy #1, LLC.

Over the past several years, Louis

DeNaples has made various loans to Lisa Trust for

different corporate purposes, including the Table Game

License fee and costs associated with installing the

table games.

So here, this slide depicts the current existing ownership of Mount Airy. Right now Lisa is the sole --- like I said, the sole Trustee. She's the manager of Mount Airy #1, LLC; the manager of Mount Airy Holdco, LLC. She has the full authority right now and is the only person who has the authority to act on behalf of buying the company. There's an audit committee that's currently in place. There's three independent audit committee members. And we'll get into that with the third petition that we discuss.

Day-to-day management is vested in John Culetsu, who is the General Manager; and Ed Granci, who is with us here today, Chief Financial Officer for the senior managing. So they essentially run the day-to-day operations in consultation with Lisa, but day to day is really --- on the casino side is John

and Ed.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 So, now we move to step two, which is the 3 subject of today's petition. The Petition is requesting Board approval to transfer one-seventh of the ownership interest in Mount Airy Holdco to each of the sibling trusts which are listed on this slide. And let me say, right now each of these six sibling trusts are established or in place. The initial Trustee is Lisa. She's the initial sole Trustee. 10 With Board approval, her brother, Dr. Louis DeNaples, Jr. and her sister, Donna Dileo will be added as 11 Trustees to each of those trusts. 12

The terms of the sale to the --- and I refer to its additional sibling trusts, are essentially the same as what Lisa --- when Lisa Trust acquired her interest. They will assume one-seventh of the outstanding debt that's on the Lisa Trust Note that was delivered to Louis. And again, those notes are not going to be secured by the ownership interest in Mount Airy. So, I just want to be clear with that. To the extent that there is a default under that note, there is no ability for Louis DeNaples --- and I'll get into the aspect with the refinancing interest incurred, that note was actually collaterally assigned to JP Morgan. And I'm getting ahead of myself. But

at the end of the day there is no ability for whoever is the holder of that note, there's no ability to seize Mount Airy.

So, this next slide depicts what the proposed ownership structure is if the Board grants the approval with the transfers and licenses. Each of the trusts and trustees, beneficiaries, et cetera. Anyone associated with this structure. All the applications for the entities and individuals have been submitted to the Board's staff and extensive investigation has occurred, interviews, et cetera. And I'll let Enforcement Counsel address that.

If the restructuring is approved by the Board, Mount Airy will be governed by a management committee which will be comprised of Lisa DeNaples, Dr. Louis DeNaples, Jr. and Donna Dileo. They will act as a Board of Directors dealing with high level types of events, refinancings, significant capital expenditures, anything that a typical Board of Directors would be involved in. That's what they will be invested in. They will not be involved with day-to-day operations. Day-to-day operations will be continued with John and Ed leading the existing team that's in place.

The second aspect of the Petition for

Approval of Corporate Restructuring is the Withdrawal of Louis DeNaples' Principal License Application. As you know, the Principal --- there's already specific requirements under the Act and the regulations for who is required to be licensed as a Principal or Key Employee. What you see on this slide are essentially the criteria synthesized for those individuals that fall into the category of a Principal or Key Employee.

So, Mr. DeNaples, as we sit here today he is not --- has no direct, indirect beneficial contingent --- any type of ownership interest in Mount Airy or its affiliates whosoever. Not a director, officer or employee of Mount Airy. He's not a lender to Mount Airy. He's not a financial backer to Mount Airy and he's not a guarantor of Mount Airy's debt. Previously, prior to the refinancing that closed on April 19th, Mr. DeNaples was a financial guarantor of the old debt. With the refinancing he is no longer a financial guarantor.

As I've said, the refinancing closed on April 19, 2012. There is currently \$165 million of new 1st lien debt. You can see on the chart there down at the bottom, the old 1st lien debt was \$271 million. The \$106 million reduction in debt was 40 percent. Very, very significant. And if you have any

questions, Ed is --- will certainly answer any questions. It goes without saying, Mount Airy's in a much better financial position with that 40 percent reduction in debt.

The loan is secured solely by Mount Airy's assets. There is no one else, Mr. DeNaples, anyone, who is backing the debt with a guarantor of the debt. Solely for Mount Airy is standing on its own right now.

The other aspect of the refinancing is

---. We can go back to this slide. Well, what
happened to the balance of the old 1st lien debt. Mr.

DeNaples personally assumes that debt. And solely
guaranteed by his personal assets, he is solely
responsible for repaying that personal loan. There's
no recourse against Mount Airy. In fact, there's
absolutely no ties to Mount Airy on the personal loan.

The last aspect of the refinancing, which I mentioned before, was the collateral assignment of the Lisa Trust Note. And essentially, what happens —— or would happen, was Louis was the recipient under the Lisa Trust note of any payments for the purchase price and the additional loans that he had made. He has collaterally signed that to JP Morgan. So, he has assigned all of his interests, rights to receive any

payments under the Lisa Trust Note to JP Morgan. He's given them an irrevocable Power of Attorney. payments, to the extent there's any payments that are 3 permitted or that can be made they'll go through --not paid out to Lisa --- to Holdco to Lisa Trust to Louis, and then to JP Morgan. It's distributed to Mount Airy Holdco, and under the documents, Holdco is required to make the payment directly to JP Morgan. So those will never see a penny on the payment under 10 the Lisa Trust Note. They'll go directly to JP 11 Morgan.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the way this works is it ties in with the 1st Lien debt. Obviously, the lenders on the 1st Lien debt want to get their payments before anything else --- any other cash goes out. And I don't want to continue in the public forum. I'd be happy to get into it if you want to go into a closed session, but there's certain dollar thresholds where there's excess cash flow under the 1st Lien credit agreement where there's permitted distributions to Mount Airy Holdco. In those circumstances Mount Airy Holdco, under the collateral assignment, will make those payments directly to JP Morgan on account of the Lisa Trust Note which was collaterally assigned.

The last aspect of the collateral

assignment, Louis DeNaples and JP Morgan agreed that to the extent that there are any payments that are made on account of the Lisa Trust Note, he's going to get a dollar-for-dollar credit on that personal loan that he's taking back. It's an agreement that those two parties reached. They could have said no credit, they could have said two times credit. decided between the two of them that we're going to give you a dollar-for-dollar credit. And that's what the agreement is right now.

3

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

So that is the first petition. The second petition is to modify the Board's September 23, 2009 Order. Let me take everyone back. When Louis was --- his license was suspended when he was indicted back in February of 2008. There were restrictions that were placed. His license was suspended and there was certain restrictions that were put in place on both Mr. DeNaples and Mount Airy.

As you know, the district attorney ultimately withdrew the charges and we petitioned the 21 Board at that time to --- when the charges were withdrawn, to vacate the suspension and lift the restrictions. It was an agreement raised between Louis and the district attorney with the Withdrawal Agreement it was called and the Withdrawal Agreement

provided for certain restrictions on Mount Airy and Louis DeNaples.

1.3

And I came before you ---. And there was a provision in the last paragraph in the Withdrawal Agreement that it's subject to whatever action the Board takes and will modify the Withdrawal Agreement to the extent that the Board deems inappropriate. So ultimately with whatever the Board says. Everyone recognizes the Board's in control here in terms of Louis's licenses. And I remember, Mr. Ginty, that you and I had a discussion about that. And I think ultimately, the Board decided, well, if Louis reached these terms with the district attorney he should live with them with the Board. And essentially, the Board took those restrictions and put them in an Order that was dated June 3rd, 2009.

Then subsequently, we came back again and asked the Board to lift the restriction --- there was some additional restrictions with the Trustee that was in place, Dr. Ceddia. So we came back a second time and said, can we dissolve the trusteeship? And that was memorialized in the September 23rd, 2009 Order. The Board still maintained certain restrictions on Mr. DeNaples and Louis. In April of 2011 the agreement with the district attorney was amended, and it

specifically said that there is no restrictions or prohibitions on Mr. DeNaples.

In May of 2011 Dauphin County Court of Common Pleas entered an Order expunging the records relating to the initial charges that were filed by the district attorney. On September 19, 2011 the same Court issued a second Order making clear that the Withdrawal Agreement is of no force and effect. So, the whole basis for the Petition that's before you today is the source, and the whole reason why those conditions and restrictions were initially put in place sourced from the DA agreement. That is entirely gone, so I think it's now appropriate for the restrictions to go away as well.

Now, with that being said, if you look at the --- there's four restrictions that are in place currently. And some of the things, it goes without saying that Mr. DeNaples would need licensed in any event as Principal if he was going to, for example, serve as a director or officer of Mount Airy. It goes without saying that he needs licensed if he's going to receive money from the casino. He needs to get licensed, there's no dispute about that.

But I think that it's --- Louis should go
back in the Petition as if the charges were never

brought. He should be treated like any other person.

And there's no need, I don't think, to have these
restrictions in place because everyone knows for these
things to occur, he's got to be licensed. It's just
unnecessary and Louis DeNaples is being singled out if
these restrictions are kept on him. And frankly, I
don't know that they would be put in place for anybody
else. And I just think it's unnecessary given the
events that have transpired.

The third Petition is to amend the Audit Committee Charter. Now, I'm going to take you back to the initial license hearings in late 2006. It was actually Mount Airy who proposed and came up and said we think it's a good idea to have an Audit committee in place. Louis DeNaples is --- at that time was the sole owner. We think it's a great idea to have an Audit Committee.

The purpose --- and we still believe this to be the case, the purpose of an Audit Committee in the context of the Gaming company is to be that independent sounding board for some of the key departments in the casino and the outside auditor. For those people, if they suspect something wrong is taking place or strawed (phonetic) there's something amiss, they need to have an independent body to go to

without fear of reprisal who then can take action and go to the Board and go to Enforcement Counsel.

So we think it's entirely appropriate to keep. I'm not arguing that the Audit Committee should go away by any stretch of the imagination. What we're asking in the modifications are more I think to --- I think that it went too far, the current Audit Committee Charter.

And the Audit Committee Charter that's in place currently is --- the way that came about was in October of 2007. It was actually a Board meeting up in the Scranton area. And the Board adopted a general policy for Audit Committee criteria. It was imposed on Mount Airy --- I think Mount Airy was the only casino company at that time --- where it was go into the statement conditions that their Audit Committee Charter has to provide with that policy that was adopted back in October of 2007.

Subsequent to that, as I'm sure you're aware, in March of 2008 the Board published a regulation memorializing that policy that was adopted. There was significant comment and opposition to that proposed regulation, which ultimately was pulled and was never adopted by the Board.

So all we're asking at this point in time

that at a later date if the Board approves a restructuring with this management committee that's going to be in place with Board approval, I don't know 3 that. I think that --- I think that may be of service to audit people who are not taking that step at this point. All we're asking is the current charter be amended. And also, that if Enforcement Counsel, as part of --- in their answer they wanted some additional criteria put in to beef the independents 10 criteria for each of the Audit Committee members, 11 which we did not oppose. We think it's a good idea to 12 have the independents in the Audit Committee. We're 13 not opposed to that substantively, and I'm happy to get it done. I don't know how much detail. I'm just 14 15 going to get a view of the changes that were 16 requested.

## CHAIRMAN:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First you're going to do what ---?

#### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

The current charter specifies the compensation that the Audit Committee members are to receive. I don't think it's necessary for the charter itself to ---. And frankly I don't think that the October 2007 policy even mandated that. I think it was Mount Airy who came up with that great idea. I

just don't think it's appropriate to have it in a charter to specify a compensation. I think it's for the company to negotiate that with the Audit Committee members themselves, and whatever they can agree to I think should be fine. Should be mandated in the Audit Committee itself --- the charter itself.

1.3

The two other things that I'm going to mention. One is there's a requirement now that the Audit Committee understand and ensure compliance with the internal controls of Mount Airy. As I'm sure you know, that there is approximately 60 pages in the regulations covering internal controls. Mount Airy's internal controls themselves fill at least a three inch binder. I don't think it's appropriate for the Audit Committee to be the experts for internal controls.

And remember, I've come back to ---.

Really, the purpose for a gaming company audit

committee is that oversight to be that independent

sounding board. So to understand and to be downsided

(phonetic) with internal controls, I think it's

unnecessary for the Audit Committee to do that. The

outside auditors are now required annually to test the

internal controls. There's an internal audit team in

Mount Airy. I just don't think it's necessary. I

think it goes too far for the Audit Committee to have that duty and responsibility potentially being with the internal controls.

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The other thing that we're --- that I'm going to touch on is with respect to the outside The current policy requires that the auditors. auditors be nationally recognized. I'm not sure if anyone other than the big four accounting firms could meet that requirement. As you know, Mount Airy does not have one of the big four that are --- Ms. Connelly (phonetic) is its auditor. The Board has approved Demetrius, who is the current auditor, on a couple of occasions already. So we're asking that the charter be revised just to say that the outside auditor has to have sufficient experience in order to conduct the audit, and the Audit Committee themselves will be the ones who make that determination and ensure that the independent auditor satisfies that criteria. So those are the ones that I'll be happy to ---.

# CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sklar, how many other changes does Mount Airy propose?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

I would say that there's --- I think that 25 the other changes are more refining the language in

the charter, as opposed to substantive changing. There's two other things that I can mention. One is 3 for changes in the charter itself for determining one of the Audit Committee members. The proposed change is that Mount Airy --- if they decide to terminate or if they want to change the charter, that we'll submit that proposed change to Enforcement Counsel. And if Enforcement Counsel says no, it's got to go before the court, we'll be happy to file one whole petition. we just want to have the flexibility that if there's a 10 minor change, a couple words for whatever reason we 11 want to change the charter, they'll have to go through 12 13 a formal process and Enforcement Counsel be able ---14 be the betting of that change to determine whether 15 it's --- rises to a level. And that's all we have in our 16 17 presentation. Like I said, we're happy to answer any questions the Board asks. Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Mr. Pitre, any questions of Mount Airy? 21 ATTORNEY PITRE: 22 No, we've taken care of all our 23 questions, asked and answered them through our process over the last years I quess we've been doing this. 24

<u>CHAIRMAN</u>:

25

Do you have a presentation to make?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

I have brief comments, and we do have some things we'd like to enter into the record.

#### CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Go ahead, sir.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Okay. Subsequent and pursuant to the Board's September 23rd, 2009 Order regarding Mount Airy #1, LLC second amended Petition for Approval of a Corporate Restructuring, an agreement of sale between Louis A. DeNaples and the Grantor-II Trust of Lisa DeNaples was executed and completed, which resulted in 14 Grantor-II Trust of Lisa DeNaples, accounting for 100 percent owner of Mount Airy. At that time the Board's Order contemplated in paragraphs two and seven that there will be a possible debt refinancing or additional restructuring, which would include additional trusts, and that Board approval would be necessary to accomplish such a restructure.

Also pursuant to the Board Orders, prior to and subsequent to the sale, Mr. Louis A. DeNaples, Sr. was allowed to make various loans to the Grantor-II Trust of Lisa DeNaples for various These loans resulted in a limited or purposes.

restricted recourse promissory note being executed by and between the Grantor-II Trust of Lisa DeNaples and Mr. Louis A. DeNaples. And since that time, this note has been amended and assigned to JP Morgan with limited recourse provisions in place.

The initial pleadings in this present matter were filed with Board on March 28th, 2011. The original and initial restructuring filing dates back to late 2007. And since that time there have been several filings by Mount Airy and the OEC as well as numerous discussions between the parties, which at the time included representatives of Mr. Louis DeNaples and Mount Airy's original lender, JP Morgan, regarding the ownership restructuring and the debt refinancing of Mount Airy #1, LLC.

These discussions led to detailed agreements that the parties believed were provided for the financial viability and independence of Mount Airy, without the need of further financial support or the financial guarantee of Mr. Louis A. DeNaples. Additionally, the proposed restructuring would complete that which was originally contemplated.

Based upon the recently completed refinancing, associated agreements, OEC no longer objects to the restructuring or the withdrawal of the

renewal application of Louis A. DeNaples, and has 1 2 entered in to a joint stipulation with Mount Airy and 3 filed the same for the Board's consideration. relates to Mount Airy's petition to amend the Board's Order, should the Board approve the restructuring and allow the withdrawal of Mr. Louis A. DeNaples, OEC would recommend additional conditions to be placed upon Mount Airy and its Principals, as well as keeping those restrictions implemented by the Board's 10 September 23rd, 2009 Order. In any event, we do not believe that it is necessary, nor is the time right to 11 12 relieve Mount Airy of any of these restrictions.

We have also entered into a joint stipulation as it relates to an Audit Committee, and we believe that it provides for the efficient independent oversight of the operations of Mount Airy and have filed a copy of that stipulation for the Board's consideration. If the Board so chooses, we are ready to provide the Board any additional recommended conditions and restrictions should the Board decide to approve the restructuring.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Additionally, we have another exhibit to enter into the record, the already pending petitions that we can either enter into the record in global or individually for the Board's pleasure. We will answer

at this time any of the Board's questions you have.

## CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why don't we do it now?

## ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

Good morning, Chairman. Nan Davenport, Deputy Chief Enforcement Counsel. I'll read off the proposed conditions. The Trustees of each of the children's trusts, which consists of the Grantor-II Trust of Lisa A. DeNaples, the Grantor-II Trust of Louis A. DeNaples, Jr., the Grantor-II Trust of Diane Dileo, Grantor-II Trust of Anne DeNaples, the 12 Grantor-II Trust of Dominica DeNaples, and the trust for the benefit of the children, Margaret Mary Glodzik and the trust for the benefit of the children, Nicholas DeNaples. You must notify the Board and the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement (BIE) within five business days prior to the acquisition of sale or assets or other investments.

The Board shall approve any changes of trustees or beneficiaries of the children's trusts. The trustees of each of the children's trusts shall provide a quarterly report certified audit trustees and all activity that receipts and disbursements in, for, and by each trust. If there has been no activity during the month, it should be so stated.

activity reported shall include copies of all documentation related to each transaction.

Number four, that the children's trusts may not invest in any entities in which Louis A.

DeNaples has any ownership interest, or any entity in which he has control.

Number five, that the children's trusts,

Mount Airy #1, LLC, or Mount Airy Holdco may not

provide Louis A. DeNaples directly or indirectly any

remuneration, cash, or property distributions from any

of the children's trusts, Mount Airy, or Holdco

without prior Board approval.

Number six, Mount Airy should provide the Financial Investigation Unit with copies of the following reports and documents, as required under Section 501 of this \$165 million credit agreement within the same time frame as stated in that section. And that would include the monthly reports, as required under Section 501(a), the quarterly financial statements required under Section 501(b), the compliance certificate required under Section 501(d), the notice of default required under Section 501(f), the notice of litigation required under Section 501(g), the financial plan required under Section 501(i), the notice regarding material contracts

1 required in Section 501(1), the annual collateral verification required under Section 501(o), and the 12 month budgets required under Section 501(q).

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Number seven, that Lisa A. DeNaples must immediately notify the Board or BIE either upon the amended restated and consolidated promissory note with limitation of recourse, which is dated April 19, 2012, in return to Louis A. DeNaples been reassigned or be amended in any fashion. The collateral assignment and agreement to pay as it relates to the involved note dated May 19, 2012 may not be amended without prior approval of the Board. Number eight --- I'm sorry, April 19th, 2012.

The trustees of each of the children's trusts must immediately notify the Board and BIE of default by any of the trusts that are required to take any part of the amended, restated and consolidated promissory note with limitation of recourse dated April 19th, 2012.

And number nine, Mt. Airy shall continue to provide the Financial Investigation Unit with monthly financial statements.

In addition to these conditions and 24 restrictions, OEC is of the opinion that the restrictions and conditions implemented by the Board's September 23rd, 2009 Order will require the licensure of Louis A. DeNaples, and as such, recognizes such restrictions and conditions remain in place until such time that Louis A. DeNaples has submitted an application for a Principal licensure and the Board has issued such a license or otherwise ordered. Thank you.

At this time I'd like to move ---. We
have two binders containing exhibits. A binder
containing 27 exhibits relating to Mount Airy's
Petition for Approval of A Corporate Restructuring, as
well as a binder containing nine exhibits relating to
Mount Airy's Petition to Modify its Independent Audit
Committee Charter. I'd like to move that into the
record.

We would also ask for both binders to remain confidential. Even though the binders contain some petitions and answers, part of the petitions and part of the answers are confidential. The petitions and answers are already available for public inspection by the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA).

#### CHAIRMAN:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Mr. Sklar, any objection to the admission of those documents?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

No objection.

# CHAIRMAN:

Anything further, Mr. Pitre?

#### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

## CHAIRMAN:

Any response, Mr. Sklar?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

None. I would just ask that the

PowerPoint be entered as an exhibit. 11

#### CHAIRMAN:

13 Questions from the Board. Who wants to

14 start? Ken?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

15

16

18

19

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

Michael, first let me say, I --- as you 17 know, I can be about as granular here as anybody can be on some of the petitions. So, I'm kind of --- that urge on my part. And what I'd really like to do is 20 try to understand precisely the bigger picture of 21 what's going on. I think I do, but I want to make 22 sure that I have it, at least in my mind, straight. 23 And then I just wanted to understand also --- I feel a

24 bit like we're being asked to swallow an ocean that

25 goes to a cup of coffee.

As I understand the requests, my big picture understanding is a desire by Mr. DeNaples to not be subject to the Board as a Principal and not be 3 a party to the License. To turn over ownership to his children through appropriate trusts, documents, and transactions which have had good tax money involved, and in short extricate himself from not just the operations. I think that that's from the ownership --- any ownership control of --- control over Mount 10 Airy. So that's good how I read it. But perhaps if you can tell me I'm right/wrong. But the big picture 12 --- is it that you are trying to get accomplished 13 here?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

1

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Essentially it's to fulfill Louis's initial desire with estate planning is to --- I mean, the ownership aspect, like you said, is already out of his hands. And now the intent was for it to be shared by the seven kids and grandkids, et cetera. So that's really what's going on here. Louis, I think, even dating back to December 2006 when he stated on the record, owning interest in running --- I don't know anything about running a casino. I'm going to put in experienced people to run the operations. And with the ownership at the time of licensure, he was 100

percent owner. Now, we just want to complete his wishes with the estate planning. And that's essentially all.

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the things that I just want to understand --- the transactions, although they're documented in a large part as arms length transaction, by and large don't strike me as arm's length transactions. For example, the notion that somebody unconditionally assuming that --- you take that --some of the things that he's done in the past. don't think that in the ordinary course of business you would want to do that. I think even the sale as it's structured --- the conditional sale, the Lisa Note, those transactions are obviously to relatives. You're making transactions to accomplish some of the goals, but they're not arm's length transactions. And so because of that, that brings in, at least in my mind, some questions about any ongoing potential for his continued or down the road involvement in either --- not necessarily the day to day management, but at least if the Board has more ultimate, bigger decisions, that they might be made by Mount Airy. So, I start from the premise ---. think you're quite right that there's nothing in the

statute that quote, unquote, requires this under the 1 2 stipulations as I read it. You can believe that there's no, quote, unquote, requirement this 3 transaction was approved --- these three petitions approved, that Mr. DeNaples be licensed. However, as I read the statute, it is still well within the court's discretion to require that licensure. think I'm correct. Is that your understanding, Mr. Sklar?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think you're right. I think that the 12 Board has the ability to require whoever they deem appropriate to be licensed. But let me address a couple of things you said. In terms of arm's length, the initial sale --- I don't know about --- I may agree with you that it's not arm's length. I can tell you though, that there was a great sensitivity with the estate planning gift tax consequences of the sale. So, the purchase price wasn't just picked out of the air ---.

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

I know that the purchase price is derived from both market value less the debt. And then consequently as I read that, that was being sensitive to it not being an outright gift at the time.

aware of that.

1

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

## 2 <u>ATTORNEY SKLAR:</u>

So is it something where, you know, two independent parties sit down and say all right, I think it's worth \$100 and someone says no, it's \$150. I think it's quite so securely based on the results of the appraisal.

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

And I understand. As I understand it, is that the lawyers who lawyered it were trying to ensure that it passed mostly with the IRS, because ultimately they're probably more important on this than anybody around here. So, if the petitions are granted and three siblings become the management committee, I understand you said they do not have day-to-day control, rather they have a Board of Directors type of role; is that correct?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

That's correct.

## MR. TRUJILLO:

So, who then would hire the CEO and the

22 CFO?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Ultimately, that management committee would be responsible for hiring, firing, et cetera,

all of the senior management.

### MR. TRUJILLO:

1.3

Much like what Ms. DeNaples has currently in an individual capacity; am I accurate?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

That's right. And I would ask Lisa to comment. Since September 2009, when the sale occurred and Lisa became 100 owner, Lisa makes 100 percent of the decisions. There is no one who has the ability to correct her, to do anything. At the end of the day, all stops with Lisa. She makes the decisions.

And if the Board approves the restructuring and her brother and sister come on it's going to be the same thing. They're all adult professionals, they're experienced. Lisa can comment on her brother and sister, what their background is. But they're all adults, all professionals, all have a lot of experience, frankly, running businesses. So, they're going to be in charge 100 percent. And if Lisa can state that right now, since September 2009 she makes the decisions, that's it.

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

In the event the Board does not --- well, strike that.

On the dollar-for-dollar reduction of the

1 Note, as I understand it, maybe you can explain it to me, the dollar-for-dollar reduction on the Note. you explain to me how that's going to work?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sure. To the extent that there is a payment that's made on the Lisa Trust Note for permitted distribution of Mount Airy, then that distribution will get paid over directly to JP Morgan. JP Morgan will then give Louis a dollar-for-dollar credit on his personal loan debt, that balance that he took on personally and transferred the refinancing.

## MR. TRUJILLO:

And as I understand, there is no current balloon or other principle payment requirement that Am I accurate? I've seen.

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Correct. Yes, there is no balloon payment. It's interest only. It's being accumulated 18 right now.

## MR. GRANCI:

Well, there's certain covenants into this credit that required us to pay down principle based on a percentage of excess cash.

## CHAIRMAN:

Which loan? Which loan are you talking

41 about, the Lisa Trust Loan? 1 2 MR. TRUJILLO: 3 No, no, no. The Louis Note. 4 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 5 The Louis personal? 6 CHAIRMAN: I'm talking about the ---. ATTORNEY SKLAR: 8 9 He's talking about the first --- Louis's personal loan. There is a payment schedule that's in 10 11 place. MR. TRUJILLO: 12 13 That, I'm aware of. But the Correct. 14 Lisa Note, there is no ---. 15 ATTORNEY SKLAR: There's no principle payments, interest 16 17 accrues. 18 MR. TRUJILLO: 19 And so at what point in time would there 20 be any principle payments --- principle paid down? 21 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 22 The Lisa Trust Note balloons in --- it 23 has a five year term. 24 MR. TRUJILLO: 25 Okay. So, either it'll be paid down in

42 five years or it'll be refinanced, I assume? 1 2 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 3 Correct. 4 MR. TRUJILLO: 5 All I'm looking at is a refinance, the likely refinance, or potentially refinanced. I mean, well, is it expected to be dollar-for-dollar reduction and would remain in the event of the refinance? 9 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 10 The answer is to the extent that if Louis' personal loan is still outstanding, there would 11 12 be. But the likelihood is that Louis' loan is going 13 to be gone --- personal loan will be gone around the time that the Lisa Trust Note matures. 14 15 MR. TRUJILLO: And how would it be gone? 16 17

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

18 One way or another either it's --- either he's going to have --- he's going to pay it off or 19 20 he's going to refinance that personal loan.

## MR. TRUJILLO:

Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

## CHAIRMAN:

24 Greq?

21

22

23

25 MR. FAJT:

```
1
                 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sklar,
2
   since you raised the issue I will ask Ms. DeNaples and
   also Mr. Granci ---.
3
 4
                 MR. GRANCI:
5
                 Granci (corrects pronunciation),
6
   G-R-A-N-C-I.
                 MR. FAJT:
8
                 Thank you. Question. Ms. DeNaples, does
   your father, since the Board Order of September of
10
   2009, has he called you to offer advice on casino
11
   operations?
12
                 MS. DENAPLES:
13
                 My father has never had day-to-day
14
   operations since day one --- or involvement.
15
                 MR. FAJT:
                 And has he called you to offer advice ---
16
17
                 MS. DENAPLES:
18
                 No.
19
                 MR. FAJT:
20
                 --- on casino operations?
21
                 MS. DENAPLES:
22
                 No.
23
                 MR. FAJT:
24
                 Has he ever directed you to do anything
25 | within the casino vis à vis management issues?
```

44 1 MS. DENAPLES: 2 No. 3 MR. FAJT: Mr. Granci? 4 5 MR. GRANCI: 6 I haven't seen him. 7 MR. FAJT: Same questions. Has Mr. DeNaples called 8 you to offer his advice on casino operations? 9 10 MR. GRANCI: 11 No, he hasn't. 12 MR. FAJT: Has he ever directed you to do anything 13 14 related to the management of the Mount Airy Casino? 15 MR. GRANCI: No, he has not. 16 17 MR. FAJT: 18 Thank you. Cyrus, a couple questions for you. If I understand your position, OEC's position, 19 20 you're okay with the restructuring of the debt as 21 outlined by Mr. Sklar here today, but you do not agree 22 --- I don't want to put words in your mouth, but tell 23 me if I'm wrong, you do not agree to modify the September, I believe, 2009 Board Order or to amend the 24 25 Audit Committee Charter; is that correct?

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, with regard to the Board Order, no, we don't think they should --- the restrictions should be lifted.

### MR. FAJT:

Okay.

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

As it relates to the Audit Committee
Charter, we did provide, and we gave it to Mr. Cook,
an amended charter that we drafted jointly with Mr.
Sklar that follows the joint stipulation and will be
amenable to. But that would obviously take the Board
to approve that. So, if the Board chooses to amend
the charter, we've given an amended charter to Mr.
Cook to provide to the Board. If the Board chooses
not to amend the charter, then the charter that's in
place right now will remain in effect.

And I didn't want to interrupt while

Commissioner Trujillo was questioning Mr. Sklar, but

with regard to the note, there was some discussion

amongst staff, there was some disagreement with regard

as to whether the note would require the licensure of

Mr. DeNaples because of the dollar-for-dollar benefit.

I ultimately disagree and think that it offers no

benefit to him. Mr. DeNaples is walking away with a

significant amount of debt as based on this restructuring.

That was something that we were adamant about, that Mount Airy had to have --- carry only so much debt in order for it to remain viable. That was done with us acquiescing to the fact that if the debt was reduced to a certain level where we felt it would be operated viably without the personal guarantee of Ms. DeNaples, then that would be one reason that we could see that he would no longer be needed. If you remember when we lifted the suspension --- the suspension was lifted, one of the main reasons we wanted him to remain, because he was the financial guarantor. That is no longer the case.

Now, as it relates to the note. Those are monies that Mr. DeNaples lent to Lisa Trust while he was licensed by this Board. Those loans were approved by this Board. BIE investigated, traced the source of those funds. They all came from legitimate sources, so we feel comfortable with the money that was lent. Now, going forward, any payment that Lisa Trust makes on that --- if the Board allows Mr. DeNaples to withdraw, it's our position that the date of that withdrawal, any interest that accumulates after that Withdrawal should not be paid over until

he's licensed.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So basically, if the note exists as it 2 3 exists today --- exists at \$100 on the day that he's allowed to withdraw, then that's the amount that can be paid until he is licensed. We do know how much exists as of April 19th. I've asked Mr. Sklar to provide us a figure if the Board so inclines to allow Mr. DeNaples to withdraw, and that figure would be --we'd look into that, and that figure would be the cutoff for the amount of payments that could be made 10 under that note without any licensure by the holder of 11 that note. 12

Now, as Mr. Sklar said, and he's correct, that that note has been assigned to JP Morgan. JP Morgan is the holder of that note, and Holdco is required to pay over to JP Morgan any distributions that would normally go to the trust to pay off --- to pay that note. We don't see any problem with that. JP Morgan, we've been dealing with them for a long time. We had some going back and forth with them. They agreed to allow the limited recourse provisions to remain in there so that no one outside the trust holds an equity interest or can grab an equity interest in Mount Airy.

That limited recourse was specifically

put in place to protect Mount Airy and to ensure that it would remain operationally viable, not only for the benefit of the trust, but also the benefit of the 3 Commonwealth. Because as we all know, when we've had the renewal hearings a lot of questions surrounded the significant debt that Mount Airy was carrying and stability of the payment. We feel comfortable now that those problems have been eliminated.

### MR. FAJT:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Last question for Ms. Davenport. You had mentioned that you would proffer that there are additional conditions put on the trust, as I understood it, an annual list of receipts and disbursements, any transfers of assets, and things of that nature. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought I remembered that there are other casinos in Pennsylvania that also have trusts involved, and Neil Bluhm comes to mind at the Rivers Casino; am I correct, as far as ---

## ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

Correct.

#### MR. FAJT:

--- that there are trusts involved there? 24 Are these same types of conditions placed on those trusts that Mr. Bluhm has in the Rivers Casino?

# ATTORNEY DAVENPORT:

I'll defer that to Cyrus, since it's outside my realm.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

No, those same conditions are not placed on those trusts.

### MR. FAJT:

Thank you.

## CHAIRMAN:

10 Ken?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

### MR. TRUJILLO:

Just a little bit of follow up on that.

## CHAIRMAN:

Sure.

#### MR. TRUJILLO:

Since Mr. DeNaples' original licensure in 2006 or '07, we had the intervening Dauphin County indictment and that was, as I understand it, that is no longer. Has there been anything since 2006 to the present that creates any issues with respect to --- I guess what I'm trying to understand is had what 22 | happened with Dauphin County, had that not happened 23 would we have had all these conditions? Would we have 24 had everything going on that's been going on with Mr. 25 DeNaples over the last five years?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Probably not. I mean, that was the suspension. Our suspension was the starting point to a lot of things.

### MR. TRUJILLO:

Okay.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

24

25

### CHAIRMAN:

Gary.

## MR. SOJKA:

10 I do have just a question or two, and mine are going to be of a different sort, particularly 11 of Mr. Trujillo's, because I don't have that level of 12 13 granularity. Let's go back to where --- and please 14 treat me like I was nine years old, because that's the 15 level which I can remember this. I do see all of the discussion agglomerating around this refinancing. 16 There was a large amount owed. Now, for the reasons 17 you've clearly stated, a smaller amount is owed by 18 19 Mount Airy, the difference is absorbed by Mr. DeNaples 20 personally. And I understand that no recourse is scheduled for him, for whatever reason, unimaginable 21 22 as it may be, Mr. DeNaples defaulted on that part, Mount Airy would be unaffected; is that correct? 23

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

That's correct.

## MR. SOJKA:

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That's the step that gets Mr. DeNaples out of the situation. But now I'm troubled because I just don't understand the word credit. When he gets credit dollar-for-dollar by payments made by Holdco, what does that mean? Is his debt reduced?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Yes.

### MR. SOJKA:

So it's conceivable then, that if things move at the pace that I think people are proposing, when we say how does Mr. DeNaples go away and you say well, he might pay it down, can we assume that this is really set up so that proceeds coming from Mount Airy will first pay down Mr. DeNaples's debt and cause him to be out of this picture before they pay down the Mount Airy debt?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Absolutely not.

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

No.

#### MR. SOJKA:

Okay. What does that credit mean?

That's proceeds above the debt service that Mount Airy

owes JP Morgan, could then be also applied to Mr.

DeNaples' debt?

# 2 <u>ATTORNEY SKLAR:</u>

Think about it this way. The first and foremost under the existing credit agreement that Mount Airy entered into on April 19th, they have to pay their debt service period, to the extent that under the credit agreement any distribution can be made from --- that there's excess cash flow. There's certain parameters for when distributions could be made. So put aside anything with Louis, the personal loan. There's certain circumstances where excess cash flow could be distributed by Mount Airy to Holdco, and then it would flow to the Lisa Trust.

#### MR. SOJKA:

So Lisa Trust, and if we go through the restructuring, the other six trusts in addition?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Correct.

#### MR. SOJKA:

So to the extent that that occurs, that happens and that permitted, rather than Holdco distributing it to Lisa Trust because of the collateral assignment of the note, payments for those distributions will get paid from Holdco to JP Morgan on account of the Lisa Trust note?

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Yes.

## MR. SOJKA:

Okay. Now, tell me about the credit.

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

The credit is essentially a deal that
Louis negotiated with JP Morgan on his personal loan,
where the two parties came to an agreement and said
okay to the extent a dollar is paid on the Lisa Trust
note we'll give you credit on your personal loan.

### MR. SOJKA:

Tell me what that word credit means.

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

It means that if --- let's put on hypothetical numbers. If the Lisa Trust note gets \$10 and Louis' personal loan is \$100, if there's excess cash flow from Mount Airy of a dollar, it gets distributed to Holdco. Holdco pays that dollar to JP Morgan. That \$10 principle gets reduced down to \$9, and because of the agreement with Louis and JP Morgan on the personal loan, that \$100 gets reduced to \$99.

#### MR. SOJKA:

Okay. So if there is anyone that's --it truly is at the --- that JP Morgan offered to make
this thing happen. Essentially, it sounds like a

two-for-one paydown.

1

3

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# 2 <u>ATTORNEY SKLAR:</u>

It was a negotiation between the two parties. Like I said, it could have been we'll give you for every dollar --- it could have been \$2, could have been three, could have been five, it could have been zero.

#### MR. SOJKA:

That's their business decision. But the point is, it's not anymore a zero sum gain. The amount of debt actually is getting reduced --- the total amount of debt, including Mr. DeNaples, Sr.'s personal debt, plus the Mount Airy debt, really starts to go down faster than you might at first realize because of this credit.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, it's not the Mount Airy debt.

### MR. SOJKA:

They have to pay the Mount Airy debt?

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

They have to pay the Mount Airy debt first, correct.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Then I want to know what the credit is.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

The dollar for dollar?

#### MR. SOJKA:

Yeah.

1

2

3

4

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

That, as I understand it, is only 5 with regard to the payment of the note. Now, that's why I said that if the Board allows Mr. DeNaples to withdraw, then on that date whatever that number is is the money he's entitled to. Now, pursuant to Section 10 1312 of the Act, the Board has the discretion to allow the divestiture of an applicant and you have a 11 12 licensee, the money that they paid over, as long as it 1.3 doesn't exceed the amount that is owed, the Board has 14 discretion to allow that to happen. If the Board 15 allows these loans, grants it, said it was okay, loans were made, it's an obligation that the trust owed to 16 whoever is the holder of that note. Regardless if 17 it's Mr. DeNaples or JP Morgan or anyone else, the 18 19 holder of that note is entitled to the monies that are 20 owed on that note. But if money was paid over, that 21 obligation was on the books by the trust. Not on the 22 books of Mount Airy, but on the books of the trust. 23 If for some reason there is a 24 disbursement and the trust received that disbursement,

that disbursement automatically goes to JP Morgan to

pay down that note that is owed by the trust. And then JP Morgan says okay, Mr. DeNaples, because the note is being paid down, we're going to reduce your debt dollar-for-dollar on the payment of this note that you assigned to us. So as Mr. Sklar said, it's an agreement between Louis and JP Morgan. I don't know how he got him to agree to it, but God bless him.

#### MR. SOJKA:

That's the kind of problem I was having.

But Mr. Pitre, I will say you do have the potential of another career. You can talk to nine year olds.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Considering I have one.

## MR. SOJKA:

Mr. Chairman, all the questions I've had have been asked and have been answered. Thank you.

### CHAIRMAN:

Jim?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### MR. GINTY:

I have a couple. Mr. Sklar, first of all, I must compliment you on your presentation. It's a very difficult transaction --- even for a nine year old. I have three questions.

One is how would you characterize the nature of the transaction with Mr. DeNaples assuming

57 the debt of the Lisa Trust? What is the nature of that transaction? 3 ATTORNEY SKLAR: I'm not following your question. 4 5 MR. GINTY: 6 If Mr. DeNaples assumed that \$100-some million --- a million dollars in debt that the Lisa Trust owed to JP Morgan? 9 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 10 Before the refinancing, Mount Airy's debt was approximately \$271 million, which was reduced 11 to \$165 million. That differential, Louis took on by 12 himself. 13 14 MR. GINTY: 15 And what is the nature of that transaction? 16 17 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 18 It's not an investment. Most of the time 19 no payments. 20 MR. SOJKA: 21 Wouldn't it be a gift? 22 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 23 It's a gift in the sense that Mr. 24 DeNaples I think went above and beyond, stepped up to 25 the plate. I don't know how many other people in his

position ---.

2

1

## MR. GINTY:

3

No, no. I'm not suggesting it otherwise.

4

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

5

But essentially, he took it upon himself for the benefit of Mount Airy to assume to make this work.

8

## MR. GINTY:

9

10

I don't want to get you in trouble with the IRS, but I mean, it's an unusual transaction.

11

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

12

13

Essentially, he assumed --- someone had to assume that portion of the debt in order for JP 14 Morgan as the original lender ---.

15

#### MR. GINTY:

16

17

I understand all that. And by the way, I'm very comfortable if it is a gift.

18

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

19

We feel it's a gift for us.

20

## MR. GINTY:

21

And that's fine. I mean, I've just been

22

23

struggling here trying to understand the nature.

24

Secondly, a small point. Now, when you were talking

25

about amending the Audit Committee's Charter you're

requesting that the Board --- internal control.

quess you're talking in those terms of gaming type of 1 control, not the traditional financial accounting 3 controls that audit committees are responsible for; am I correct?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Correct. I'm talking about specifically the gaming.

#### MR. GINTY:

One last point. In responding to a question by Mr. Trujillo concerning our discretion under the Act in determining who shouldn't be licensed. You aren't suggesting that our discretion is unfettered?

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Absolutely not.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

### MR. GINTY:

I have no further questions.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Any other questions?

## MR. TRUJILLO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Cyrus, I'll confess, I originally looked at the reduction of Mr. DeNaples' debt as a benefit to him. Therefore, my initial inclination was he's a beneficiary of that 25 transaction, that perhaps there is something that

almost required not the licensure, not something that

--- so I believe how I'm understanding it now is that

that benefit to him is a benefit that is secondary or

tertiary from anything that's going on at Mount Airy.

In other words, the relationship is Mount Airy to JP

Morgan, there is a pay down. It's coincidental to

that pay down. In other words, there's no contractual

relationship between Mount Airy and Mr. DeNaples that

reduces his debt. The contractual relationship is

between Mr. DeNaples and JP Morgan; correct?

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

That's correct.

## MR. TRUJILLO:

Okay. Because that was troubling me substantially, and I thought that might almost get us to where he needed to be licensed. But you also said earlier that you struggled kind of with the same notion --- or maybe it wasn't relating to that reduction, but if he's not a guarantor, he's not an owner, not any of the required bases for a principal licensure, how did you, I guess, resolve in your own mind, or you know, at OEC that he was not, quote, unquote, required to be licensed as a principal?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

He doesn't have any control. He doesn't

own anything. Aside from that, he doesn't benefit in any fashion other than the note that he currently 3 holds that was assigned to JP Morgan. MR. TRUJILLO: 4 5 What we just discussed; right? 6 ATTORNEY PITRE: What we just discussed. 8 MR. TRUJILLO: 9 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 10 you. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Any other questions from the Board? 13 Questions from Ex-Officio members? Okay. Ladies and 14 gentlemen, that will conclude this public hearing. 15 And at this time, the Board will take a five minute recess, and coming back we will begin our public 16 17 meeting. So we'll be back in about five minutes, at 11:25. 18 19 20 HEARING CONCLUDED AT 11:22 A.M. 21 22 23 24

25

## CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Ryan, was reported by me on 05/23/2012 and that I Kayla Bolze read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Court Reporter