COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING

* * * * * * *

BEFORE: WILLIAM H. RYAN, JR., CHAIRMAN

Gregory C. Fajt, James B. Ginty, Annmarie

Kaiser, Keith R. McCall, Anthony C.

Moscato, Gary A. Sojka, members;

Christopher Craig, Representing Robert M.

McCord, Robert Coyne, Representing

Secretary to Department of Revenue Daniel

P. Meuser, Matthew Meals, Representing

Secretary of Agriculture George Greig

HEARING: Tuesday, January 29, 2013

LOCATION: Strawberry Square Complex

Second Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101

WITNESSES: None

Reporter: Jennifer T. Alves

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

		3
1	I N D E X	
2		
3	OPENING REMARKS	
4	By Chairman Ryan	4
5	PRESENTATION	
6	By Ms. Yantis	5 – 6
7	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	7 - 17
8	PRESENTATION	
9	By Attorney Yocum	17 - 20
10	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	20 - 24
11	PRESENTATION	
12	By Attorney Cassel	24 - 25
13	By Attorney Sherman	26 - 28
14	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	28 - 29
15	PRESENTATION	
16	By Attorney Cook	29 - 36
17	By Ms. Hensel	37 - 48
18	By Attorney Armstrong	49 - 51
19	By Attorney Fenstermaker	52 - 60
20	CLOSING REMARKS	
21	By Chairman Ryan	61
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

2 ------

CHAIRMAN:

Ladies and gentlemen, we will now commence our regular meeting. The Board held an Executive Session yesterday just prior to this meeting. The purpose of yesterday's Executive Session was to discuss personnel matters and to conduct quasi judicial deliberations relating to matters being considered by the Board today. The Executive Session, which just ended was held to conduct quasi-judicial deliberations relative to the hearings held earlier this morning.

The first order of business will be consideration of a motion to approve the minutes and transcripts of the December 12th, 2012 and January 9, 2013 meetings. May I have such a motion?

MS. KAISER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the minutes and transcripts of the December 12th, 2012 and January 9th, 2013 meetings.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

1 ALL SAY AYE

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? Motion carries. Next Claire Yantis, our Human Resource Director. Claire.

MS. YANTIS:

Good afternoon, Chairman and members of the Board. The Office of Human Resources has two motions for your consideration today. First we have one new hire for consideration, Mr. Sean Fitzgerald has been selected for the position of Casino Compliance Representative at Parx Casino. Mr. Fitzgerald has completed the PGCB interview process, background investigation and drug screening and is being recommended for hire by Director of Casino Compliance, Jerry Stoll. Unless you have any questions I ask that the Board consider a motion to hire Mr. Fitzgerald as indicated.

CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments of the Board?

Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the applicant as proposed by the Director of Human Resources.

CHAIRMAN:

6 Second? 1 2 MR. MOSCATO: 3 Second. 4 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 5 6 ALL SAY AYE 7 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Motion carries. 8 9 MS. YANTIS: 10 Second we have a new policy for your consideration. In advance of this meeting the Office 11 of Human Resources has provided you with a draft, PGCB 12 policy, policy number 418 PGCB Internship Program, 13 14 which outlines and formalizes expectations regarding the evaluation and selection of PGCB interns. 15 I would be happy to entertain any questions regarding proposed 16 17 policy 418. 18 CHAIRMAN: Any questions, comments from the Board? 19 I certainly do. First of all, as a preliminary this 20 21 is an intern program for paid interns in the summer; is that correct, Claire? 22 23 MS. YANTIS: 24 Correct. It would be about an eight 25 week program for paid internships across Bureaus.

CHAIRMAN:

And we don't have such a program now and have not had since the inception of the Board; is that correct?

MS. YANTIS:

Correct. Not formalized.

CHAIRMAN:

Any comments?

MR. SOJKA:

I would comment on this. I've had a long, long history with interns because I'm a university person. Internships are extremely popular in a university environment. Students are extremely anxious to get them. They're a good way for students to learn and it's a nice way sometimes to get support in the summer. I've seen internship problems be tremendously successful and sometimes substantially less so, and there is a direct correlation between the degree of planning, forethought, oversight and management with the success of an internship.

They work well when they're thoroughly planned, when all parties fully buy in, when there's regular oversight and someone takes clear responsibility for the functioning of the total program. When this idea first came up I think with no

criticism it was a casual idea. It was one that had some appeal and we began to deal with this. And I think what we've done is build a substantial amount of structure, potential oversight and management that would favor such an internship being successful if we had it I think a great deal of credit goes to Claire Yantis who worked out the first proposal about how this would work.

But I think we also treated this as a kind of model process because Claire sent it forward. The personnel committee, the Board looked at it. We decided to give it a serious reworking and I know I spent substantial hours reworking Claire's document, sending it back to her, she incorporated changes. We then sent it forward again to the whole Board and asked for input. Specifically we got very good input I think from Commissioner Moscato who thought carefully about this and hopefully Claire has been able to --- and we responded back and forth by e-mail and I think Claire wrote that into the situation.

As a result of all this I think we have the best proposal for an internship that we're likely to be able to produce. That's not a problem for me.

Now comes the problem and I think you have to look at an internship and look at all the moving parts. And

there are three. There's the institution that provides the interns, the college or university, there is the intern him or herself and there is the host institution. All three I think need to be on board and see the clear benefits for the program to work effectively.

The program we're putting in front of us today --- the program that is in front of us today, I think is okay from the point of view of colleges and universities. They have nothing to lose and I think if they send the students off to us into a program of that kind they can have reasonable confidence that in the time spent even though they're not given credit they can assume that when a student comes back, not only will the student have been paid, the student will have had a meaningful experience. I think the students would benefit clearly from this because they would get some compensation.

Summer jobs are not easy to get and I think we would give them a kind of tutorial structured program with substantial oversight by members of our staff who would have to devote time, energy and effort to seeing to it that the assigned tasks were done and that the students gained the benefit that they should gain. That leaves the third entity, the host

institution and here it's a little different. Often recipients of internships are either corporations or they're parts of state government. There's clear reasons why those benefit. Okay? Corporations really want the brain power. They want the focus of bright young minds who sometimes bring an academic slant, and there are numerous examples of corporations and businesses advancing because of the input of students as interns.

I think in state government it makes perfectly good sense because the state government supports educational endeavors. It supports the state universities, the Commonwealth universities, it worries about education at the high school and the secondary school level and college interns are students. And the legislature and the various offices of state government can justify what they do on the grounds of fostering education within the Commonwealth. But then you come to this agency. It's an odd one. It's a state agency on one hand, but on the other hand the resources come from the Licensees. They pay for this.

Today we heard several of our Licensees groping, struggling, dealing with new competition, new challenges to them. They have expenses. They have

expenses in personnel, expenses in facility, expenses in advertising, and marketing and so on. And one of their expenses is to pay for their regulation. Our response to that question I think from the inception of this Board has been to try to provide appropriate, appropriate regulation and to try to be as best we can efficient and cost effective. This agency finds itself right now at a moment when we are actively reducing force. We're contemplating how we will have fewer people on the payroll to do our assigned tasks for the purpose of keeping, if you will, regulation a bargain in Pennsylvania because we are charged with being efficient. That's one issue.

Another issue is we have personnel who have not gotten pay raises that we would like to give them and that's been an issue. And so I worry about what it means to the morale of our agency if while we're reducing force we bring in people and pay them to do jobs that we've not actually figured out that we need to have done primarily for the purpose of supporting students and educating students. It strikes me that it is somewhat outside our mission. If this was a different time, if we were a stable agency with our structure worked out and we weren't reducing force, if we had our finances all figured out

so that we were paying our people with raises on a regularized basis that we can all feel good about, if we saw that we had a clear educational component I think a program of the kind we have in front of us would be very good.

But here's my problem. I don't see this as the moment and I don't see how we can change the moment. I think we've written a very good proposal to support something that at this time we should not support. So, that's the difficult position in which I find myself.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions, Claire, just to get it on the record. How many interns do you anticipate us hiring in the coming summer?

MS. YANTIS:

The way the program and the policy is structured is that --- the first thing that's done is a steering committee of Executive Management, myself. The Executive Director would actually solicit proposals from the Bureaus to see if there would be a need for interns. From there compared to our budget, and looking at our funding and resources we would determine the number of interns. If we were to get it

up and running for this summer I don't anticipate it being more than one or two, possibly three, but it would be dependent on those proposals and evaluation by a steering committee of those proposals and then the funding attached to that.

MR. FAJT:

pay?

My second question, what is the rate of

MS. YANTIS:

It would be \$10 an hour, so we're looking at interns working 37 and a half hour work week over an eight week period at \$10 an hour. So, you're looking at approximately \$3,800 per intern.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you very much and thank you, Gary, for your comments.

CHAIRMAN:

I suppose I should add my comments. And I have to say I agree a hundred percent with what Gary has said. I think it's important for us to recall that we don't have an intern program because we haven't felt the need to have one. And I am convinced after having spent about a year and a half with the Board that the reason is we don't need one. We don't have really productive work for interns to do. Maybe

I'm an old fashioned kind of guy, but the purpose of an intern is to come in in the summer, come in at a time when there are too many tasks and not enough people and get some help while at the same time learning an experience as a student, preferably for college credit, but also perhaps --- or instead of perhaps credit them for income.

But that's not the situation that I see with the Board. I just don't see the need. I don't know how we will keep any interns busy. I really don't. I think they would have to be --- make work projects and I agree with Gary also that the policy and procedure put together is remarkably good. I also think it requires a lot of Claire and her staff and Human Resources. It requires a lot of all of the Directors to make sure --- well, what are we going to have these interns do? And it's going to require a lot of the mentors required by the policy and procedure who have to stay on constant --- in a constant and supervisory role here.

That is not a need we have and the reality is that --- I think the Board understands that and I think the main thrust behind the proposal is, well, it does enable young people to learn about government. And that's a laudable goal, but given the

relatively small size of our agency our goal to me is just one goal and that is to regulate casinos. We are not an educational institution. It is not our job to educate young people. It is our job to regulate and to do so efficiently, as efficiently as we can. And I don't think this program, as well meaning as it is, is beneficial for our agency. I agree with Gary.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

An individual student may find a benefit. Eight weeks, short period of time. What we do in the agency, okay, it may not be brain surgery, but it is arcane. I don't see a student learning much at all in an eight week period of time just based on what I've seen during the time I have been with the So, I think that is something we should take Board. into consideration. And finally another important point made by Gary I would underline. Whatever the funding is --- and certainly the funding could grow beyond what it may be in the beginning, but we have an obligation to pay close attention to the funding and many of our non-union management employees haven't done real well in the department of getting raises for Well, this is may be the fifth year.

And I think we have to husband our resources. We don't have enough of them and the money spent here my view is --- could be better spent

rewarding those employees we do have in a way that perhaps we couldn't otherwise. So, that's my position. Again, I understand the position of those who support it. I know it's with the best of motives. I just do not think it's in the best interest of the agency. Annmarie?

MS. KAISER:

Just to reiterate some of the points that were made. I can certainly understand and appreciate the interest in providing students with educational opportunities in the workforce. However, given the current economic climate and budgetary restrictions I don't think it would be financially prudent to do it at this time. If there is a strong need demonstrated to have interns and should that need be determined, I would support looking into a program where students would get credit, but I don't think we demonstrate that need at this time.

CHAIRMAN:

Anyone else? Tony?

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I would ask at this point that we table this.

MR. GINTY:

25 Second.

17

CHAIRMAN:

There is a motion that we table it. All

3 in favor?

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Board.

4 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you all. Thank you, Claire. Good morning, Doug.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Good afternoon. Chairman and members of the Board, our first agenda item relates to Proposed Regulation, which Assistant Chief Counsel, Susan Yocum, is here to present.

ATTORNEY YOCUM:

Good afternoon Chairman, members of the

CHAIRMAN:

Susan, how are you?

ATTORNEY YOCUM:

I'm good. How are you today? I have one proposed rulemaking for your consideration today. It's 125-168. To provide some context on this rulemaking, once we finally finalized all of our table gaming regulations we created working groups amongst agency staff from the various Bureaus to determine --- to do a comprehensive look at our existing regulations

to determine where amendments would be prudent to make. 125-168 is a product of those collective evaluations. It addresses revisions on chapters in subparts G, which is Minority and Women's Business Enterprises, I which is compulsive and problem gambling and J, which is exclusion of persons.

The amendments to Minority and Women
Business Enterprises are essentially technical in
nature. The Bureau that oversees the verification of
the minority and women owned businesses was amended
and additionally we amended our regulations to conform
to the statute regarding reviews versus audits of
reports of compliance for diversity. With respect to
the Office of Compulsive and Problem Gambling we've
amended the double signature requirements for
individuals who've requested to come off the voluntary
self-exclusion list upon their --- upon the expiration
of their term of exclusion.

We've also added a removal mechanism for individuals on lifetime exclusion. It's a very narrow mechanism in which they can come off the list if they voluntarily excluded to be on it for a lifetime. They would have to petition the Board, but they may not do so for a period of ten years following their signing to be on lifetime exclusion. They also have to

demonstrate to the Board that there's good cause as to why their name should be removed from the voluntary self-exclusion list. This amendment will also allow the Office of Compulsive and Problem Gambling to establish an alternative location for individuals requesting to be removed from the voluntary self-exclusion list other than our Harrisburg office, our regional offices, which are located in Harrisburg, Scranton, Conshohocken and Pittsburgh.

There was an issue of travel, specifically, you know, people from Erie having to travel all the way to Pittsburgh to sign off to come off of the list once their term of exclusion was over. Our Director of Office of Compulsive and Problem Gambling will be creating criteria regarding when an alternative location assigned to come off would be --- could be utilized.

Lastly, we are transitioning four statements of policy into --- for the regulatory review process. Two of the statements of policy have been in existence for years and should be transitioned through the regulation process. There are provisions on advertising requirements and the allowance for limited --- the disclosure of limited demographic information regarding persons on the voluntary

1 self-exclusion list. Both of those provisions will be
2 moved into the regulations on compulsive problem
3 gambling.

We also are converting a statement policy on the Conditional Licensure Gaming Junket Enterprises you approved at the last meeting as well as amending the requirement that two individuals sign for jackpot credit meter payoffs. I'd be happy to answer questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions, comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Proposed Regulation number 125-168 as described by the Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) and that the regulation be posted to the Board's website.

MR. SOJKA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

21 All in favor?

22 ALL SAY AYE

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

MR. GINTY:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN:

Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize.

MR. GINTY:

Would you indulge me a few moments to make a statement?

CHAIRMAN:

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{You take as much time as you want to,} \\ \mbox{Mr. Ginty.}$

MR. GINTY:

I support the majority of the proposed regulation, but I do not support that portion of the regulation that those who have placed themselves on the lifetime exclusion list have to wait ten years before they can petition the Board for removal from the list. I have, in other cases that have come before the Board, taken issue particularly with the lifetime exclusion provision of our regulation.

In my view the procedures we utilize in placing people particularly on the lifetime exclusion list are inadequate to ensure fairness to the individual and quite frankly any modicum of what one would consider due process, particularly for a lifetime deprivation of the right or privilege to enter a casino. As far as I'm aware the process

utilized here would not be accepted in any other context. I would note that the exclusion has extraterritorial effect because casinos will apply the exclusion in all of their casinos both nationally and worldwide.

2.

I would also note that to my knowledge in no other context is an individual denied an opportunity to petition to have a restriction removed including cases where one may have lost his license because of a drunk driving conviction, manslaughter or what have you. The right to petition in my view is just inherent in the rights and privileges of the country. Now, I recognize that in adopting the ten year provision here that, you know, the proposed regulation makes some progress in permitting somebody to remove themselves from the list. But in my view I still think ten years is too long and I particularly still have issues with the process that exists.

I would favor a shorter period and a change in our procedures that would permit an individual some period of reflection before placing himself or herself on the lifetime exclusion list.

One should not be required to suffer a lifetime exclusion based on what might well be a momentary compulsion. Now, I do not for a minute --- in making

the statement I do not for a minute diminish the need for this Board to address problem gambling. And in fact, I think the Board has done an admirable job in addressing the issue of problem gambling, but we should not in any event let our exuberance in addressing the problem of gambling tread on what I consider basic fairness and a fundamental right to due process in petition. That's my statement.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Jim. Any comment?

MS. KAISER:

I have a comment. I'm probably at the other end of the spectrum where I have concerns about making any changes to the lifetime exclusion, but I thought that the ten years was a very reasonable approach to give someone a time period and for them to come to the Board and explain why they should be taken off the list. So, I thought it was a more reasonable compromise and I just wanted to thank the staff for their excellent work.

CHAIRMAN:

Anyone else? Okay. I think what we can say is that the motion passes, however, the record should note the descent by Mr. Ginty with respect to the issue of the removal time. Is that accurate, Jim?

MR. GINTY: 1 2 That's accurate. 3 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. 5 MR. FAJT: 6 Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to note if 7 it's appropriate that we have looking from the audience Mr. Ginty on the left and our esteemed 8 9 colleague on the right. So, thank you Annmarie. 10 ATTORNEY YOCUM: 11 Thank you. 12 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: Our next agenda item is a Local Law 13 Enforcement Grant, which Assistant Chief Counsel, 14 Allison Cassel is here to present. 15 16 ATTORNEY CASSEL: 17 Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN:

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good afternoon, Allison.

ATTORNEY CASSEL:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, I have one application for a Local Law Enforcement Grant for you today. The Philadelphia District Attorney's office has applied for a grant totaling \$250,000. District Attorney's office was previously approved for

25

```
a Local Law Enforcement Grant in 2008 and 2011.
1
2
   you know, this grant is being sought pursuant to the
3
   Gaming Act, which provides for the funding of local
   law enforcement agencies to be used for the
   investigation and enforcement of illegal gambling in
   the Commonwealth.
7
                  The application has been reviewed by
   appropriate staff and has been determined to be in
8
   compliance with the grant program and is recommended
9
10
   for approval.
11
                  CHAIRMAN:
12
                  Any questions or comments from the
   Board, Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?
13
14
                  MR. GINTY:
                  Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
15
16
   approve the Local Law Enforcement Grant as presented
17
   by the OCC.
18
                  MS. KAISER:
                  Second.
19
20
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  All in favor?
21
22
   ALL SAY AYE
23
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Opposed? The motion carries.
24
25
   you, Allison.
```

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Today the Board has two Petitions before it for consideration. Each of the matters was heard earlier today during public hearing. In addition the Petitions, the responses of the Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) including proposed conditions on any approvals of the petitions and any other evidentiary matters have been provided to the Board in advance of this meeting. The first matter coming before the Board is that of Mount Airy Casino. And this is the Petition for the Approval of a Casino Floor Reconfiguration, which has the effect of reducing the number of slot machines by 200 on the casino floor.

If the Board is inclined to grant the relief the OEC has requested the approval be subject to eight conditions, which were outlined in their Answer provided to the Board. Additionally both Mount Airy and the OEC have requested that the exhibits to their petitions be maintained as confidential. The record is closed and will be ready for the Board's consideration. For the record, the OCC I would recommend that the matter esteemed confidential be kept that way.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you, Doug. Any questions

1 or comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May
2 I have a motion?

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve Mount Airy #1, LLC's petition as described by the OCC. I further move that the Board approve Mount Airy's and Enforcement Counsel's request to maintain exhibits to their pleadings as confidential.

MR. GINTY:

11 Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

14 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

The second petition is Presque Isle
Downs' Petition to Reduce the Number of Slot Machines
and Table Games as was also heard earlier today.

Presque Isle is requesting to reduce the number of
machines by 311 and also to remove seven banked table
games from its floor. As Mount Airy, Presque Isle has
made the request due to today's economic conditions
influenced primarily because of increased competition

in the Ohio area.

If approved the OEC has proposed 11 conditions to be placed on Presque Isle, all of which were, again, outlined in a --- in the Answer and records provided to the Board in advance of this meeting. Again, the OCC would believe it appropriate to treat the exhibits to the pleading as confidential as also requested by Presque Isle. That would also go to the financial investigation unit analysis attached to the OEC's Answer. The record is closed. The matter is now ready for the Board's consideration.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. GINTY:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move that the Board issue an Order to prove Presque Isle Down's petition as described by the OCC and I guess I need to make a motion in terms of protecting confidentiality.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Make it clear on the record that it would be appropriate, yes.

MR. GINTY:

Do I have to do that by motion or just ---? And I further move that the Board order the

1 exhibits to the pleadings filed in this matter be
2 maintained as confidential.

CHAIRMAN:

Second?

MS. KAISER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

10 CHAIRMAN:

11 Opposed? The motion carries. Thanks,

12 Doug.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Next presenting Withdrawals and Reports and Recommendations is Deputy Chief Counsel, Steve Cook.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Hello. The Board has received eight unopposed Petitions to Withdraw the Applications of Individuals or Businesses. The persons and entities subject to these Petitions are as follows, and I'll note for the benefit of the court reporter that I'll provide her a listing of the spellings. The persons and businesses this applies to are Jeffrey E. Hartmann, InterTech Computer Products, Inc., Pendum,

LLC, Michael Fries, Jerome Smith. Eric M. Turner, 1 2 Lindenmeyr Munroe and Moses Tawil. The OEC has no objections to these withdrawals as such if the Board 3 were inclined to grant same and in doing so without 5 prejudice. 6 CHAIRMAN: 7 Questions, comments from the Board? ExOfficio members? May I have a motion? 8 9 MS. KAISER: 10 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue Orders to approve the withdrawals and surrenders 11 12 as described by the OCC. 13 MR. MCCALL: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

17 ALL SAY AYE

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Next before the Board for consideration are three Reports and Recommendations received from the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA). I would note for the record that the Reports and Recommendations as well as the entire evidentiary

record have been provided to the Board in advance of this meeting. And additionally each person has been notified that the Board will be taking up their matter today and if they would like they could come to the Board meeting and briefly make a presentation to the Board.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If any of these people are present I'd ask that they come forward when their name's The first Report and Recommendation announced. pertains to Christopher Bowman. Mr. Bowman submitted an application for a Gaming Employee Permit on March 26th, 2012 seeking work as a table games dealer at the SugarHouse Casino. Mr. Bowman indicated on his application that he had never been charged with a crime and that he had never defaulted on a financial obligation. However, it was subsequently discovered during BIE's investigation Mr. Bowman, in fact, had these --- at least one criminal conviction. failed to file certain federal tax returns with the Internal Revenue Service and also had an outstanding financial judgment relating to a student loan upon which he defaulted. On October 9th, 2012 the OEC Counsel issued a Notice of Recommendation of Denial for these reasons. Mr. Bowman received that notice and requested a hearing. A hearing was subsequently

scheduled, however, he failed to attend and the 1 2 hearing was conducted in his absence. After OEC and 3 BIE put on evidence supporting all of the allegations made a Report and Recommendation was issued recommending that Mr. Bowman's application be denied. 5 And that is the recommendation before the Board. 7 CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments for the Board? 8 Eχ Officio members? May I have a motion? 9 10 MR. MCCALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 11 12 adopt the Report and Recommendation of the OHA regarding the Gaming Employee Permit of Christopher 13 14 Bowman as described by the OEC. 15 CHAIRMAN: Second? 16 17 MR. MOSCATO: 18 Second. 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 21 22 CHAIRMAN: 23 Opposed? Motion carries. 24 ATTORNEY COOK: 25 The next Report and Recommendation

pertains to John Carns. Mr. Carns was issued a Gaming Employee Registration --- I'm sorry, a Non-Gaming Employee Registration on May 5th, 2012 ---. Oh, excuse me. It was Gaming Employee Permit. May 5, 2012. And was employed as a Table Games Dealer at the Meadows Racetrack and Casino. On August 10, 2012 the Bureau of Casino and Compliance became aware that Mr. Carns had been arrested and charged with one felony count of endangering the welfare of children and one felony count of aggravated assault.

misdemeanor offenses including recklessly endangering another person, endangering the welfare of children and two summary offenses. These charges stem from an incident in which it was alleged that Mr. Carns pointed a weapon at an off duty Sheriff's Deputy while Mr. Carns was in the company of a child. Generally it was alleged to be road rage type situation. While some of these charges have been dropped at least one of the felony remains pending. Mr. Carns is scheduled for trial in March 11, 2012 (sic).

Upon the request of the OEC the

Executive Director issued an emergency suspension of

Mr. Carns' Gaming Permit on November 5th. On November

8th the Board referred the matter to the OHA to

conduct an evidentiary hearing on the validity of the 1 2 emergency suspension. That hearing was then held on November 19th and while both Mr. Carns and the OEC 3 appeared to present testimony, Mr. Carns basically 5 alleged only that he was innocent until proven guilty, 6 but did not really say anything to the underlying 7 factual allegations. As a result of Mr. Carns' failure to refute the allegations in the felony charge 8 --- at least one felony charge remaining pending the 9 10 Report and Recommendation was issued recommending that 11 the emergency suspension remain in place. That's the recommendation before the Board and OCC would support 12 13 that.

CHAIRMAN:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation of the OHA regarding John Donald Carns Gaming Employee Permit as described by the OCC.

MR. FAJT:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY COOK:

CHAIRMAN:

And final Report and Recommendation before the Board today pertains to Erickson Urtecho. On August 7th, 2012 the OEC filed a complaint requesting that Mr. Urtecho be placed on the Board's Exclusion List for cheating. Specifically while playing Texas Hold'Em Poker at the Parx Casino Mr. Urtecho removed a \$25 chip from a \$100 bet on a losing hand. Subsequently the dealer and other players at the table confronted Mr. Urtecho. He conceded that he, in fact, took the \$25 chip and paid it back into the pot.

A hearing was requested by Mr. Urtecho and it was held on October 16th, 2012. Although he was properly served, Mr. Urtecho didn't attend that hearing and OEC commenced the hearing before the Hearing Officer in his absence. At the hearing evidence of the cheating incident was put into the record as well as information about Mr. Urtecho having several criminal convictions in New Jersey, one of which is for underage gaming. And also information that he was placed on the New Jersey Exclusion List in

2009. Upon receipt of all this information the 1 2 Hearing Officer issued a Report and Recommendation 3 adopting --- approving OEC's recommendation that this gentleman be placed on the Exclusion List and that is the recommendation before the Board. 6 CHAIRMAN: 7 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 8 9 MR. FAJT: 10 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation regarding the 11 12 petition to place Erickson Urtecho on a PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OCC. 13 14 MR. GINTY: 15 Second. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 All in favor?

18 ALL SAY AYE

19

24

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

21 ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Thank you. That concludes all the

23 matters from the OCC.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you both. Next will be Susan

Hensel, Director of Licensing. Good afternoon, Susan.

MS. HENSEL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Chairman Ryan and members of the Board. Before the Board today will be motions regarding one Manufacturer Applicant, one Manufacturer Designee Applicant and one Supplier Applicant as well as 436 Principal Key Gaming and Non-Gaming Employees. In addition there will be the consideration of 14 Gaming Service Provider Applicants.

The first matter for your consideration is the issuance of Conditional Manufacturer Licenses. Angel Playing Cards Manufacturing Company Limited is the maker of playing cards and is an applicant for a Conditional Manufacturer License. It is headquartered in Japan. Angel Playing Cards USA, Inc. plans to sell Angel Playing Cards and is an applicant for a Manufacturer Designee License. It is headquartered in Washington State. Pursuant to the Board's regulations the Board may issue a Conditional Table Game Manufacturer or Manufacturer Designee License provided the applicant submits a completed application, is licensed in good standing in a gaming jurisdiction whose manufacture standards are recognized by the PGCB, submits a written statement from a facility indicating the facility may do business with the

company, passes a preliminary criminal history investigation and pays the licensing fee prior to being licensed.

The Bureau of Licensing has provided you with preliminary background investigation and suitability reports for those applicants and the reports indicate that these criteria has been satisfied for these companies. Should the Board approve Angel Playing Cards Manufacturing Company Limited's license the company has asked that the Board allow it to pay a reduced licensing fee of \$10,000 rather than the full \$50,000 licensing fee.

Under the Gaming Act the Board may modify the licensing fee for a Table Game Manufacturer if it determines that the fee will unreasonably limit table game devices or associated equipment.

Consistent with this provision of the Act the Bureau of Licensing has adopted a policy regarding a reduced licensing fee. Under the policy a reduction of the licensing fee to \$10,000 is warranted if there are between one and ten manufacturers of a product and the anticipated sales are between \$100,000 and \$250,000 over a 12 month period. Angel Playing Cards

Manufacturing Company Limited is one of several manufacturers of playing cards and it anticipates that

its projected average yearly gross sales will be between \$100,000 and \$250,000. The Bureau of Licensing therefore recommends that the Board grant the request for a \$10,000 licensing fee.

I have provided you with draft orders and ask that the Board consider the approval of these licenses separately beginning first with Angel Playing Cards Manufacturing Company Limited as well as its request for a reduced licensing fee.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. With respect to Angel Playing

Cards Limited's license any comments from Enforcement

Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. GINTY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the conditional Table Games Manufacturer License of Angel Playing Card as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

CHAIRMAN:

25 Second?

	4	0
1	MS. KAISER:	
2	Second.	
3	CHAIRMAN:	
4	All in favor?	
5	ALL SAY AYE	
6	CHAIRMAN:	
7	Opposed? The motion carries.	
8	MS. HENSEL:	
9	And next would be the Manufacturer	
10	Designee License for Angel Playing Cards USA, Inc.	
11	CHAIRMAN:	
12	Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?	
13	ATTORNEY PITRE:	
14	Enforcement Counsel has no objection.	
15	CHAIRMAN:	
16	Questions or comments from the Board?	
17	Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?	
18	MS. KAISER:	
19	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board	
20	approve the Conditional Table Games Manufacturer	
21	Designee License for Angel Playing Cards USA, Inc. as	
22	described by the Bureau of Licensing.	
23	MR. MCCALL:	
24	Second.	
25	CHAIRMAN:	

41

All in favor? 1 2. ALL SAY AYE 3 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion carries. 4 5 MS. HENSEL: 6 Next is a Supplier Application for 7 Keystone Gaming Technologies, Inc. is being recommended for abandonment. This company filed an 8 application with the Board, but failed to cure 9 10 deficiencies after being given notice and an opportunity to resolve those deficiencies. The Board 11 12 has the authority to declare an application abandoned if the applicant fails to complete the application 13 14 process. A company whose application is abandoned is free to reapply at any time. I ask that the Board 15 consider the order declaring Keystone Gaming 16 17 Technologies, Inc.'s application abandoned. 18 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 19 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 21 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 22 CHAIRMAN: 23 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 24

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move for the Board 1 2 approve the abandonment of Keystone Gaming 3 Technologies Inc.'s Supplier Application described by the Bureau of Licensing. 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Second? 7 MR. MOSCATO: Second. 8 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 All in favor? 11 ALL SAY AYE 12 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion carries. 13 14 MS. HENSEL: 15 Also for your consideration is the approval of Principal and Key Employee Licenses. 16 17 Prior to this meeting the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a Proposed Order for two Principle and eight 18 Key Employee Licenses for Category 1, Category 2 and 19 20 supplier licensees. I ask that the Board consider the 21 order approving these licenses. 22 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 23 24 ATTORNEY PITRE: 25 Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

43 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Any questions or comments from the 3 Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 4 MR. MOSCATO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 5 6 approve the issuance of Principal and Key Employee 7 Licenses as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 8 MR. SOJKA: Second. 9 10 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 11 ALL SAY AYE 12 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 Opposed? The motion carries. 15 MS. HENSEL: Next for your consideration are 16 17 Temporary Principal and Key Employee Licenses. to this meeting the Bureau of Licensing provided you 18 with an order regarding the issuance of Temporary 19 20 Licenses for two Principals and five Key Employees. 21 ask that the Board consider the Order approving these 22 licenses. 23 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 24

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SOJKA:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the issuance of Temporary Principal and Key Employee credentials as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

10 MR. FAJT:

11 Second.

CHAIRMAN:

13 All in favor?

14 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

MS. HENSEL:

In addition are Gaming Permits and Non-Gaming Registrations. Prior to this meeting the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a list of 343 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted Temporary or Full Occupation Permits and 67 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted registrations under the authority delegated to the Bureau of Licensing. I ask that the Board consider a motion approving the Order.

45 CHAIRMAN: 1 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 2 3 ATTORNEY PITRE: Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 7 8 MR. FAJT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 9 10 approve the issuance of Gaming Employee Permits and Non-Gaming Employee Registrations as described by the 11 Bureau of Licensing. 12 13 MR. GINTY: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 16 17 ALL SAY AYE 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Opposed? The motion carries. 20 MS. HENSEL: We also have for your consideration 21 22 withdrawal requests for Gaming and Non-Gaming 23 Employees. In each case the permit or registration is no longer required. For today's meeting I have 24 25 provided the Board with a list of seven Gaming and two

	46
1	Non-Gaming Employee Withdrawals for approval and I ask
2	that the Board consider the Order approving those
3	withdrawals.
4	CHAIRMAN:
5	Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?
6	ATTORNEY PITRE:
7	Enforcement Counsel has no objection.
8	CHAIRMAN:
9	Any questions or comments from the
10	Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?
11	MR. GINTY:
12	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
13	approve the withdrawals as described by the Bureau of
14	Licensing.
15	CHAIRMAN:
16	Second?
17	MS. KAISER:
18	Second.
19	CHAIRMAN:
20	All in favor?
21	ALL SAY AYE
22	CHAIRMAN:
23	Opposed? The motion carries.
24	MS. HENSEL:
25	In addition we have an Order to certify

```
the following Gaming Service Providers, City Center
1
   Wholesale, LLC, Skyliner Travel and Tour Bus
2
3
   Corporation and the Grove Media, LLC. I ask that the
   Board consider the Order approving these Gaming
   Service Providers for Certification.
5
6
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?
7
8
                  ATTORNEY PITRE:
                  Enforcement Counsel has no objection.
9
10
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Any questions or comments from the
11
   Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?
12
13
                  MS. KAISER:
14
                  Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
   issue an order to approve the application for Gaming
15
   Service Providers Certification as described by the
16
17
   Bureau of Licensing.
18
                  MR. MCCALL:
19
                  Second.
20
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  All in favor?
21
22
   ALL SAY AYE
23
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Opposed? The motion carries.
24
25
                  MS. HENSEL:
```

Finally we have an Order regarding 1 2 Gaming Service Provider Registrations. The Bureau of 3 Licensing provided you with an Order and an attached list of 11 registered Gaming Service Provider Applicants. I ask that the Board consider a motion 5 6 approving the Order registering these Gaming Service Providers. 7 8 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 9 10 ATTORNEY PITRE: 11 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Any questions or comments from the 14 Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 15 MR. MCCALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 16 17 issue an Order to approve the applications for Gaming Service Provider Registration as described by the 18 Bureau of Licensing. 19 20 CHAIRMAN: Second? 21 22 MR. MOSCATO: 23 Second. 24 CHAIRMAN: 25 All in favor?

49 ALL SAY AYE 1 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 Opposed? The motion carries. MS. HENSEL: That concludes the matters of the Bureau 5 6 of Licensing. 7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Susan. Mr. Pitre? 8 9 ATTORNEY PITRE: 10 Good afternoon, Chairman, members of the Board. We have six matters for the Board's 11 consideration this afternoon. They consist of four 12 revocations and two involuntary exclusions. 13 Armstrong will present the first revocation matter for 14 the Board's consideration. 15 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Good afternoon, Jim. ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 18 Good afternoon, Chairman, Commissioners. 19 20 Before you is the Motion to Consider Revocation of 21 Edward Robinson's Gaming Permit. On July 11th of 2012 22 the OEC filed a revocation complaint with the Board 23 against Mr. Robinson. The basis for the complaint was

Mr. Robinson being investigated by the Pennsylvania

State Police at SugarHouse Casino on February 12th of

24

2012 for the theft of gaming chips at SugarHouse Casino while he was employed there as a security officer.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commissioners, on February 12th at 11:50 p.m. a SugarHouse Casino patron identified as Tiffany Roland stole \$1,175 in gaming chips from another patron by grabbing the victim's chips off of a Black Jack table and fleeing the casino. As Ms. Roland fled the casino she dropped some of the chips. Robinson was employed as a SugarHouse Casino security officer and after receiving an alert of the theft proceeded in his role and went out to the casino parking lot, apprehending her in the parking lot. The police and SugarHouse personnel only recovered \$550 in gaming chips from Ms. Roland. Surveillance evidence showed that Mr. Robinson picked up several chips dropped by Ms. Roland while he was pursuing her.

Mr. Robinson did not return the chips he recovered. When confronted the next day about not returning the chips Mr. Robinson admitted to picking up some chips valued at \$25 each and that they were at his home. He agreed to return them the following day. Mr. Robinson returned some chips, two \$25 chips on February 14th and gave the SugarHouse security department a written statement admitting that he stole

two \$25 gaming chips. Mr. Robinson was not charged criminally with the theft, but he was terminated from SugarHouse Casino for his conduct. \$575 in gaming chips were never recovered for the victim.

Commissioners, Mr. Robinson was properly served by regular and certified mail with the revocation complaint. Mr. Robinson did not request a hearing regarding the complaint. Mr. Robinson was also properly served by the OEC's request for this default --- this judgment upon default and has responded to it in any way. Based on the following information we ask that you revoke his credential at this time. Thank you. Glad to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Edward Robinson in the hearing room?

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

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the Revocation of Edward Robinson's Gaming Employee Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. SOJKA:

25 Second.

2.3

52

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

3 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Jim.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

The next five matters will be presented

12 by Assistant Enforcement Counsel, Cassandra

13 Fenstermaker.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

15 Good afternoon, Chairman, members of the

16 | Board. I'm Cassandra Fenstermaker. That's,

 $17 \mid F-E-N-S-T-E-R-M-A-K-E-R$. The first matter I have for

18 your consideration today is the revocation of William

19 Ainsworth's Gaming Employee Permit. On December 3rd,

20 2012 the OEC filed a complaint for revocation against

21 | William Ainsworth who was issued a Gaming Employee

22 Permit and was employed as a security officer at

23 Rivers Casino. On or about November 20th, 2012 Mr.

24 | Ainsworth pled guilty to more than 70 felonies related

25 to illegal contact with minors and child pornography.

He was not employed by the Rivers at the time of his 1 2 arrest. The Enforcement Complaint was served on Mr. 3 Ainsworth by first class and certified mail. not respond to the complaint within 30 days and therefore pursuant to Board regulations all facts 5 alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted. 6 7 The OEC filed a request for default judgment on January 3rd, 2013 and at this time 8 9 requests that Mr. Ainsworth's Gaming Employee Permit 10 be revoked. 11 CHAIRMAN: Is William Ainsworth in the hearing 12 13 room? Any questions or comments from the Board? ExOfficio members? May I have a motion? 14 15 MR. SOJKA: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the 16 17 Board issue an Order to approve the revocation of William Ainsworth's Gaming Employee Permit as 18 described by the OEC. 19 20 MR. FAJT: Second. 21 22 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 23 ALL SAY AYE 2.4 25 CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

2.

The next matter I have is with respect to Gerald McNeil. On November 5th, 2012 the OEC filed a Complaint for Revocation against Gerald McNeil who was issued a Non-Gaming Employee Registration and who was previously employed as an EVS Attendant at SugarHouse. On or about June 15th, 2011 while Mr. McNeil was still employed at SugarHouse BIE was notified by the Pennsylvania State Police that Mr. McNeil was arrested and charged with several felonies related to illegal contact with minors.

The OEC requested an emergency suspension of Mr. McNeil's license on June 16th, 2011, which has been in place ever since. On September 14th, 2012 Mr. McNeil pled guilty to criminal use of a communication facility and child pornography. The Enforcement Complaint was served on Mr. McNeil by first class mail. He did not respond to the complaint within 30 days and therefore pursuant to Board regulations all facts alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted. The OEC filed a request for default judgment on December 18th, 2012 and at this time requests that Mr. McNeil's Non-Gaming Employee Registration be revoked.

55 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Is Gerald McNeil in the hearing room? 3 Any questions, comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion? 5 MR. FAJT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 6 7 issue an Order to approve the revocation of Gerald McNeil's Non-Gaming Employee Registration as described 8 9 by the OEC. 10 MR. GINTY: 11 Second. 12 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 13 14 ALL SAY AYE 15 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion carries. 16 17 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER: The next three petitions that I have for 18 your consideration are all related, so if it's okay 19 20 with you I'm going to give a brief synopsis and then 21 go through the details of each petition individually. 22 CHAIRMAN: That's perfectly fine with us. 23 24 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

Thank you. Joseph Candidi was issued a

Gaming Employee Permit and was employed as a Slot Host at Harrah's. Mr. Candidi is alleged to have engaged in two activities that in the OEC's opinion warrants the revocation of his license and his exclusion from Commonwealth casinos. First, he was keeping tips that were supposed to, according to Harrah's internal controls, be shared with other slot hosts. Second, he was collecting already redeemed free slot play coupons that he found lying throughout the facility and was then issuing generic Reel rewards, and reel is spelled, R-E-E-L, to a patron Kerline Aslam in that same amount.

2.

Ms. Aslam redeemed more than \$10,000 in generic Reel rewards that according to Harrah's she was not entitled to based on her level of play. Mr. Candidi was charged with two counts of theft by deception and Ms. Aslam was charged with theft by unlawful taking, theft by deception, receiving stolen property and associated conspiracy charges. They are both awaiting trial on the pending theft related charges. So, with respect to Joseph Candidi's revocation on October 3, 2012 the OEC filed a Complaint of Revocation against Joseph Candidi.

The Enforcement Complaint was sent to Mr. Candidi by first class and certified mail. He did

not respond to the complaint within 30 days and therefore pursuant to Board regulations all facts alleged deemed in the complaint are admitted. The OEC filed a request for default judgment on January 8th, 2013 and at this time requests that Joseph Candidi's Gaming Employee Permit be revoked.

CHAIRMAN:

And is Joseph Candidi in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board?

MR. SOJKA:

I have one. This business of not putting money in a tote jar that's obviously bad workplace behavior. You're cheating your fellow employees, but don't --- isn't there a tax calculated on that as well? And so isn't he by keeping that not just stiffing his colleagues, he's clearly breaking the law when he does that.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

He's stiffing the Commonwealth and the federal government also, yes. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Any questions Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. GINTY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

issue an Order to Approve the Revocation of Joseph 1 2 Candidi's Gaming Employee Permit as described by the 3 OEC. 4 CHAIRMAN: Second? 5 6 MS. KAISER: Second. 7 8 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 9 10 ALL SAY AYE 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Opposed? The motion carries. 13 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER: With respect to Kerline Aslam. 14 On 15 October 3rd, 2012 the OEC filed an Exclusion Petition against Kerline Aslam. The Petition was sent to Ms. 16 Aslam by both first class and certified mail, she did 17 not respond in the filing in any way, and therefore 18

19 pursuant to Board regulations all facts alleged in the

20 complaint are deemed admitted. The OEC filed a

21 request for default judgment on January 8th, 2012 and

22 at this time asks that Kerline Aslam be placed on the

23 Board's Excluded Persons List.

24

CHAIRMAN:

Is Kerline Aslam in the hearing room?

Questions or comments from the Board? Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?

MS. KAI<u>SER:</u>

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to Approve the addition of Kerline Aslam to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board's Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

12 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

And finally for your consideration

Joseph Candidi's exclusion on October 3rd, 2012 the

OEC filed an Exclusion Petition against Joseph

Candidi. The Petition was sent to Mr. Candidi by both

first class and certified mail. He did not respond to

the filing in any way and therefore pursuant to Board

regulations all facts alleged in the complaint are

deemed admitted.

The OEC filed a request for default judgment on January 8th, 2013 and at this time

```
60
   requests that Joseph Candidi be placed on the Board's
 1
 2
   Exclusion List.
 3
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Questions or comments from the Board?
 4
   Ex Officio members? May I have a motion?
 5
 6
                  MR. MCCALL:
                  Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
 7
   issue an Order to approve the addition of Joseph
 8
   Candidi to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board
 9
10
   Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.
11
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Second?
12
13
                  MR. MOSCATO:
14
                  Second.
15
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  All in favor?
16
17
   ALL SAY AYE
18
                  CHAIRMAN:
19
                  Opposed? The motion carries.
20
                  ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:
21
                  Thank you.
22
                  ATTORNEY PITRE:
                  Thank you.
23
24
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  Thank you, Cassandra.
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, meeting held before Chairman Ryan was reported by me on 1/29/2013 and that I Jennifer T. Alves read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.