### 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; John J. McNally,

III; Anthony C. Moscato; Members

Jorge Augusto, representing George Grieg,

Secretary of Agriculture

Robert P. Coyne, representing Daniel P.

Meuser, Secretary of Revenue

Jennifer Langan, representing Robert

McCord, State Treasurer

HEARING: Wednesday, July 17, 2013, 10:03 a.m.

LOCATION: Strawberry Square

Second Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17106

WITNESSES: Rosemarie Cook, Gilbert Morrissey

Reporter: Jolynn C. Prunoske

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

```
3
                     APPEARANCES (cont'd)
1
2
3
   MICHAEL D. SKLAR, ESQUIRE
4
   Levine, Staller, Sklar, Chan, Brown and Donnelly, PA
5
   3030 Atlantic Avenue
   Atlantic City, NJ 08401
      Counsel for Sugarhouse
8
9
   KEVIN C. HAYES, ESQUIRE
10
   Doherty Hayes Law
   1000 Bank Towers
11
12
   321 Spruce Street
13
   Scranton, PA 18503
14
       Counsel for Valley Forge Convention Center
15
       Partners, LP
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

			4
1	I N D E X		
2			
3	OPENING REMARKS		
4	By Chairman	6 –	8
5	PRESENTATION		
6	By Mr. O'Toole	8 –	9
7	By Mr. Bott	9 –	11
8	By Attorney Yocum	11 -	13
9	By Attorney Cook	13 -	19
10	By Ms. Hensel	19 -	3 0
11	By Attorney Armstrong	31 -	35
12	By Attorney Sklar	35 -	3 9
13	WITNESS: ROSEMARIE COOK		
14	TESTIMONY		
15	By Ms. Cook	39 -	45
16	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	45 -	61
17	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	61 -	6 4
18	PRESENTATION		
19	By Attorney Stuart	64 -	65
20	By Attorney Hayes	66 -	67
21	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	67 –	69
22	PRESENTATION		
23	By Attorney Stuart	70 –	71
24	By Attorney Hayes		72
25			

ĺ			7
1	I N D E X (continued)	5	
2	INDEX (CONCINCE)		
3	WITNESS: GILBERT MORRISSEY		
4	TESTIMONY		
5	By Mr. Morrissey	72 - 74	
6	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	75 - 78	
7	PRESENTATION		
8	By Attorney Fenstermaker	79 - 80	
9	CLOSING REMARKS		
10	By Chairman	80 - 81	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

#### PROCEEDINGS

### CHAIRMAN:

Good morning, everyone. I'm Bill Ryan,
Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.
Before we begin, I would like to ask everyone to
please turn off cell phones, PDAs and other electronic
devices. Thank you very much. With us today is Jorge
Augusto, representing Secretary of Agriculture George
Greig, Jennifer Langan, representing State Treasurer
Robert McCord, and Bob Coyne, representing the
Secretary for the Department of Revenue Dan Meuser.
Thank the three of you for coming. Everybody on the
Board, all seven of us being here, we'll call today's
meeting to order. First thing will be the Pledge of
Allegiance. I would ask everyone to rise.
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

#### CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. First announcement, the Board held an Executive Session yesterday. The purpose of which was to discuss personnel matters and conduct quasi judicial deliberations on the matters being considered by the Board today.

I would also like to announce that the

Board will be holding a license renewal public input hearing with respect to Mountainview Thoroughbred Racing Association's operation of the Hollywood Casino at Penn National Race Course.

2.

This hearing will be held on August 20th, 2013 beginning at 9:30 a.m. at the East Hanover Township Municipal Building, 8848 Jonestown Road, Grantville, Pennsylvania. Anyone who wishes to present oral or written testimony, which will become part of the evidentiary record in this matter can now register by clicking on the special link on the quick links section of the home page on the PGCB website, www.gamingcontrolboard.pa.gov. The deadline for registration to speak at the hearing is noon on August 19th, 2013. Anyone wishing to speak at these hearings can also register by calling the Board Secretary Mickey Kane at (717)346-8325. Again, this must occur by noon on August 19th.

Additionally, written comments can also be made part of the record in that proceeding by faxing or mailing such comments to the Board with a fax timestamp or postmark no later than August 19th, 2013. The address for the Board is Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, Attention Board Secretary, P.O. Box 69060, Harrisburg, PA, 17106. The fax number is

(717)346-8350.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our first real order of business will be a motion to approve the minutes and transcript of the June 5th Board meeting. May I have such a motion?

#### MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the minutes and the transcript of June 5, 2013 meeting.

# CHAIRMAN:

10 Second?

### MR. MOSCATO:

12 Second.

### CHAIRMAN:

14 All in favor?

15 ALL SAY AYE

### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries. Next will be our Executive Director, Kevin O'Toole. Good morning, Kevin.

### MR. O'TOOLE:

Good morning, Chairman and members of the Board. I would like to express my appreciation to Commissioners Kaiser, Moscato and McNally for their work in overseeing the approval of the opening of Lady Luck Casino at Nemacolin Woodlands Resort. The casino

opened on July 1st, 2013 after two successful test periods. At the ribbon cutting ceremony on July the 1st, representatives from both Nemacolin Woodlands Resort and Isle of Capri Casinos expressed their appreciation for the work our staff performed in helping to insure that all regulatory requirements were met by Lady Luck Casino prior to its opening.

2.

Additionally, I would like to note that Liz Lanza, our Director of the Office of Compulsive and Problem Gambling, was invited to participate at the annual conference of the National Counsel on Problem Gambling, which is meeting this week in Seattle, Washington. Liz is making a presentation on the experiences in Pennsylvania regarding the administration of our self exclusion program. Other panelists discussing this topic are casino regulators from Maryland, Ohio and Arizona. When Liz returns, I will have her give the Board an update on the key issues discussed at this conference. Thank you.

### CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

Ex-officio members? Thank you, Kevin. Next, we will hear from Joe Bott, representing our Human Resources

Department. Joe?

#### MR. BOTT:

Good morning, Chairman, members of the 1 2. The Office of Human Resources has one motion 3 for your consideration today. Ms. Pamela Gaskins has 4 been selected for the position of Casino Compliance 5 Representative at Harrah's Chester and has completed 6 the PGCB interview process, background investigation and drug screening. As such, she is recommended for hire by Director of Casino Compliance Jerry Stoll. 9 Unless you have any questions, I ask the Board to 10 consider a motion to hire Ms. Gaskins as indicated. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Any questions or comments from the 13 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 14 MR. MOSCATO: 15 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 16 approve the applicant as proposed on the condition 17 that the necessary background investigation and drug 18 testing be completed. 19 MR. FAJT: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All in favor? 2.3 ALL SAY AYE 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 Opposed? The motion carries. Thank

you, Joe. Next, Chief Counsel, Doug Sherman together with Susan Yocum.

### ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

2.

Good morning, Chairman and members of the Board. We have just a few items for you today. The first of which is a Temporary Regulation and Statement of Policy, which, as you noted, Assistant Chief Counsel Susan Yocum will present.

#### ATTORNEY YOCUM:

Good morning, Chairman and members of the Board. The two agenda items for you today are a Temporary and a Statement of Policy. The first is the Temporary 125-173, which will add Raise It Up Stud Poker to the complement of table games available for play. This is a banked poker game based on a player's five card hand. Included in this regulation are the layout requirements, the permissible wagers and the payout odds. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Questions, comments from the Board?

22 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

#### MR. FAJT:

 $$\operatorname{Mr.}$  Chairman, I move that the Board adopt Temporary Regulation 125-173 as described by the

Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) and that Temporary
Regulation 125-173 be posted on the Board's website.

MR. GINTY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY YOCUM:

The next is the Statement of Policy 125-174, which will add the six card bonus wager, which is a million dollar payout for a player's six card royal flush. This will be added to the games of Four Card Poker, Let It Ride, Texas Hold'em, Ultimate Texas Hold'em, Mississippi Stud and Crazy Four. This side wager is currently available to play in Three Card Poker. Also added will be the five card progressive wager to three card poker and that's based on a player's three cards and the dealer's three cards to make the best possible hand. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have on this one.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

25 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

	13
1	MR. GINTY:
2	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
3	adopt Policy Statement 125-174 as described by the OCC
4	and that Policy Statement 125-174 be posted to the
5	Board's website.
6	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
7	Second?
8	MS. KAISER:
9	Second.
10	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
11	All in favor?
12	ALL SAY AYE
13	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
14	Opposed? The motion carries.
15	ATTORNEY YOCUM:
16	Thank you.
17	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
18	Thank you, Susan.
19	ATTORNEY SHERMAN:
20	Next presenting Withdrawals and just two
21	Reports and Recommendations today is Deputy Chief
22	Counsel Steve Cook.
23	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
24	Good morning, Steve.
25	ATTORNEY COOK:

Good morning. The Board has received five unopposed Petitions to withdraw the applications or surrender the credentials of five individuals and one business. The persons and entities or one entity subject to these Petitions are as follows; Leonardus Suverein, Thomas Happ, Gerald Deifer, 889 Global Solutions, Limited, Gilbert Victor Cohen and Patrick Olson.

The Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) has no objections to these Withdrawals and, in one case, a Surrender. As such, if the Board were to grant same, it would be doing so without prejudice.

### CHAIRMAN:

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

### MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue Orders to approve the Withdrawals and Surrender as provided by the OCC.

### MR. MCNALLY:

Second.

#### CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

24 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

#### ATTORNEY COOK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first Report and Recommendation

before the Board today pertains to Bruce Hammer. Mr.

Hammer was issued a Gaming Employee Permit on October

4th, 2011 and worked as a Table Games Dealer at

Presque Isle Downs Casino.

On May 7th, 2013, the OEC filed a request for an emergency suspension of Mr. Hammer's Gaming Permit upon learning that he had been arrested on April 21st, 2013 and charged with various criminal offenses stemming from an alleged DUI vehicle accident that occurred on that date, April 21st. These charges included a felony charge of Aggravated Assault by Motor Vehicle while Driving Under the Influence. is alleged that Mr. Hammer struck another vehicle while intoxicated, which initially resulted in injury to both passengers of the other vehicle, one of which was critically injured. Subsequently, the passenger who was in critical condition passed away and Mr. Hammer's charges were amended to include one count of felony Homicide by Vehicle while DUI and one count of Involuntary Manslaughter.

The Board's Executive Director signed the Emergency Order on May 7th, 2013, suspending Mr.

Hammer's Gaming Permit.

A hearing in this matter was held on May 30th, 2013 before the Board's Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA). Mr. Hammer appeared via video conference at the hearing and OEC obviously also attended and offered exhibits and testimony. Essentially, OEC takes the position in this matter, that given the serious nature of Mr. Hammer's criminal charges, the suspension was warranted and should continue. Mr. Hammer argued at that hearing that while he was essentially charged with serious offenses, he was innocent until proven guilty and the charges in and of themselves did not impact his ability to work as a dealer --- table games dealer.

Upon completion of the hearing, a Report and Recommendation was issued by the Hearing Officer.

That Report and Recommendation recommends that the suspension continue and that is the recommendation present before the Board.

### CHAIRMAN:

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

### MR. MCNALLY:

 $$\operatorname{Mr.}$  Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation from the  $\operatorname{OHA}$ 

regarding the Gaming Employee Permit of Bruce E.

Hammer as described by the OCC.

### CHAIRMAN:

Second?

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

### CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

# CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

### ATTORNEY COOK:

The second and final Report and Recommendation before the Board today pertains to Andrew Kelley. Mr. Kelley was issued a Non-Gaming Employee Registration on June 18, 2008 for a position as an EVS Attendant at Harrah's Philadelphia Casino and Racetrack. Subsequently, BIE was notified by the Pennsylvania State Police that an arrest warrant had been issued for Mr. Kelley and he was, in fact, arrested on February 7th, 2009 and charged with two felonies and five misdemeanors relating to an alleged assault during a domestic dispute. The charges included firearms violations.

The OEC filed a request for Emergency

Order of Suspension back in 2009. This Order was signed by the Executive Director on February 13th, 2009.

2.

Subsequently, at a hearing on the Emergency Suspension occurred in March 2009. A Report and Recommendation was thereafter adopted by the Board continuing the Emergency Suspension.

guilty relative to this occurrence to one felony firearm charge and as a result of Mr. Kelley's felony conviction, the OEC has now filed a Complaint to revoke Mr. Kelley's Non-Gaming Registration. A hearing was held regarding this matter on April 3rd, 2013. Both OEC and Mr. Kelley appeared and offered evidence. During the hearing, Mr. Kelley did not dispute the felony conviction, however, he did dispute the underlying facts supporting that conviction. He also put into the record that he is attempting to put this matter behind him. He is studying for his GED and hopes to attend culinary school.

Notwithstanding that evidence by Mr.

Kelley, the Report and Recommendation issued by the Hearing Officer recommended that the revocation, in fact, occur and that is the recommendation before the Board.

# CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

11

12

15

16

18

21

22

23

24

25

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

#### MR. MOSCATO:

Yes, sir. I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation from the OHA regarding the Non-Gaming Employee Registration of Andrew Kelley, as described by the OCC.

### MR. FAJT:

10 Second.

### CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

13 ALL SAY AYE

#### 14 CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? Motion carries.

### ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

17 That concludes all matters of the OCC.

#### CHAIRMAN:

19 Thank you both. Next, Susan Hensel,

20 Director of Licensing. Good morning, Susan.

# MS. HENSEL:

Thank you, Chairman Ryan and members of the Board. Before the Board today will be motions regarding the renewal of a Table Game Manufacturer and a Table Game Manufacturer Designee, as well as 631

Principal Key Gaming and Non-Gaming Employees and a Gaming Service Provider Qualifier. In addition, there will be the consideration of six Gaming Service Provider Applicants.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

The first matter for your consideration is the renewal of a Table Game Manufacturer License for GPI Mexicana S.A. de C.V. GPI Mexicana is headquartered in Senora, Mexico. It manufactures a variety of table game products, including cards, dice, chips and gaming table layouts and furniture. The Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement (BIE) has completed its investigation and the Bureau of Licensing has provided you with the renewal background investigation and suitability report. I've provided you with a draft Order and ask that the Board consider the renewal of a Table Game Manufacturer License for GPI Mexicana.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

#### CHAIRMAN:

 $\hbox{Any questions or comments from the} \\ \hbox{Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?}$ 

### MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the Table Game Manufacturer License renewal for GPI Mexicana S.A. de C.V., as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

#### MR. GINTY:

Second.

### CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

### MS. HENSEL:

The next matter for your consideration is the renewal of a Table Game Manufacturer Designee License of Gaming Partners International USA, Inc., also known as GPI USA. GPI USA is a Las Vegas based company that supplies and repairs GPI Mexicana's table game related products. The BIE has completed its investigation of this company and the Bureau of Licensing has provided you with a background investigation and suitability report. I have also provided you with a draft Order and ask that the Board consider the renewal of the Table Game Manufacturer Designee License for GPI USA.

#### CHAIRMAN:

2.2 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 1 2 ATTORNEY PITRE: 3 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Any questions or comments from the 6 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? MR. GINTY: 8 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 9 approve the Table Game Manufacturer License renewal of 10 Gaming Partners International USA, Inc. as described 11 by Bureau of Licensing. 12 CHAIRMAN: Second? 13 14 MS. KAISER: 15 Second. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 18 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Opposed? The motion carries. 21 MS. HENSEL: 22 Also for your consideration is the 23 approval of Principal and Key Employee Licenses and a 24 Gaming Service Provider Qualification. Prior to this 25 meeting, the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a

proposed Order for nine Principal and two Key Employee 1 2. Licenses for a slot machine operator and manufacturer 3 Licensees and one Gaming Service Provider Qualifier 4 for High Concrete Group, LLC. I ask that the Board 5 consider the Order approving these licenses and 6 qualifications. CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 8 9 ATTORNEY PITRE: 10 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Any questions or comments from the 13 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 14 MS. KAISER: 15 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 16 approve the issuance of Principal and Key Employee Licenses and the Gaming Service Provider Qualification 17 18 as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 19 MR. MCCALL: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All in favor? 2.3 ALL SAY AYE 2.4 CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

25

# MS. HENSEL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

2.4

25

Next for your consideration are Temporary Key Employee Licenses. Prior to this meeting, the Bureau of Licensing provided you with an Order regarding the issuance of temporary licenses of 16 Key Employees. I ask that the Board consider the Order approving these licenses.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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? 14

#### MR. MCCALL:

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

#### MR. MCNALLY:

20 Second.

# CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

2.3 ALL SAY AYE

### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

#### MS. HENSEL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

In addition are Gaming Permits and Non-Gaming Registrations. Prior to this meeting, the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a list of 409 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted Temporary or Full Occupation Permits and 167 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.

### CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

16 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

#### MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the issuance of Gaming Employee Permits and Non-Gaming Employee Registrations as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Second?

### MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

26 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 All in favor? 3 ALL SAY AYE 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Opposed? The motion carries. 6 MS. HENSEL: In addition, we have recommendations of denial for two Gaming and two Non-Gaming Employee 9 Applications. The Bureau of Licensing has provided 10 you with Orders addressing these applicants who the 11 OEC has recommended for denial. The applicants failed 12 to request a hearing within the specified time period. 13 I ask that the Board consider the Orders denying the 14 Gaming and Non-Gaming Employee Applications. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 17 ATTORNEY PITRE: 18 Enforcement Counsel would request denial 19 in each instance. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 22 2.3 MR. MOSCATO:

the denial of the applications as described by the

Yes, sir. I move that the Board approve

24

25

27 Bureau of Licensing. 1 2 MR. FAJT: 3 Second. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 All in favor? 6 ALL SAY AYE CHAIRMAN: 8 Opposed? The motion carries. 9 MS. HENSEL: 10 Also for your consideration are 11 withdrawal requests for Gaming and Non-Gaming Employees. In each case, the permit or registration 12 13 is no longer required by the applicant. For today's 14 meeting, I provided the Board with a list of 19 Gaming 15 and four Non-Gaming Employee Withdrawals for approval. 16 I ask that the Board consider the Order approving the 17 list of Withdrawals. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 21 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 22 CHAIRMAN: 23 Any questions or comments from the 2.4 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 25 MR. FAJT:

28 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 1 2 approve the Withdrawals as described by the Bureau of 3 Licensing. 4 MR. GINTY: 5 Second. 6 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 Opposed? The motion carries. 11 MS. HENSEL: 12 In addition, we have an Order to certify the Gaming Service Provider, Vision Entertainment 13 14 Group, LLC. I ask that the Board consider the Order 15 approving this Gaming Service Provider for certification. 16 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 19 ATTORNEY PITRE: 20 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Any questions or comments from the 23 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 2.4 MR. GINTY: 25 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

29 issue an Order to approve the application for Gaming 1 2. Service Provider Certification as described by the 3 Bureau of Licensing. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Second? 6 MS. KAISER: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 All in favor? 10 ALL SAY AYE 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Opposed? The motion carries. 13 MS. HENSEL: 14 Finally, we have an Order regarding 15 Gaming Service Provider Registrations. The Bureau of 16 Licensing provided you with an Order and attached to 17 it is five Registered Gaming Service Provider 18 Applicants. I ask that the Board consider the Order 19 registering these Gaming Service Providers. 20 CHAIRMAN: 2.1 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 22 ATTORNEY PITRE: 2.3 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 Any questions or comments from the

30 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 1 2 MS. KAISER: 3 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 4 issue an Order to approve the applications for Gaming 5 Service Provider Registration as described by the 6 Bureau of Licensing. MR. MCCALL: 8 Second. 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 All in favor? 11 ALL SAY AYE 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Opposed? The motion carries. 14 MS. HENSEL: 15 That concludes the matters for the 16 Bureau of Licensing. 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Thank you, Susan. Next will be Cyrus Pitre, our Chief Enforcement Counsel. 19 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 21 We have five matters for the Board's 22 consideration this morning, four of which are Consent 23 Agreements and one Revocation. The first matter is a 24 Consent Agreement between the OEC and HSP Gaming, LP. 25 Mr. Jim Armstrong, Assistant Enforcement Counsel, will

present the matter on behalf of the OEC.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you. Good morning, Chairman and Commissioners. The next matter on the agenda for the Board's consideration is a Consent Agreement reached between the OEC and Sugarhouse Casino in regard to Sugarhouse Casino conducting business with a company that was on the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list. The Bureau of Licensing referred a possible violation of the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list to the OEC. An investigation conducted by the BIE confirmed that Sugarhouse Casino violated the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list when they conducted business with Emerson Network Power, a information technology services company. Emerson Network Power was placed on the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list on October 21st, 2009. The company's failure to timely address multiple deficiencies with its application led to it being placed on the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list. September 20th, 2011, Sugarhouse made a disbursement to Emerson Network Power for their services in the amount of \$26,859.26.

Since then, the company has successfully

petitioned the Board to be removed from the list and 1 2. is now properly registered with the Board as a publicly trading company to conduct business with Pennsylvania Slot Machine Licensees. If approved, 5 this will be the first penalty assessed against Sugarhouse for violating the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Provider's list.

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The OEC and Sugarhouse Casino respectfully request that the Board approve the Consent Agreement and Stipulation Settlement, which requires Sugarhouse to institute policies and training to prevent similar violations of the Board's Prohibited Gaming Service Providers list and that Sugarhouse pay a civil penalty of \$5,000 and a fee of \$2,500 with regard to costs incurred by Board staff in regard to this matter. I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Counselor.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. Michael Sklar, S-K-L-A-R, on behalf of Sugarhouse Gaming. Just one additional thing, Sugarhouse has amended its internal controls to add an additional safeguard to make sure this type of

incident doesn't occur in the future and just to note that this incident occurred in 2011, there hasn't been any similar incidents since.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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

### MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to adopt the Consent Agreement between the OEC and HSP Gaming, LP, as described by the OEC.

### MR. MCNALLY:

12 Second.

# CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

15 ALL SAY AYE

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

#### ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you. The next matter on the agenda for the Board's consideration is a Consent Agreement reached between the OEC and Sugarhouse Casino in regard to a subject on the Board's self-exclusion list being permitted to gamble at Sugarhouse Casino. On February 21st, 2013, the Board's Casino Compliance Bureau reported to the OEC

that a person on the Board's self-exclusion list was 1 2 observed gambling at a Craps game at Sugarhouse 3 The investigation revealed that the selfexcluded person arrived at the casino on Monday, 4 5 February 18th and remained at the casino for at least 6 three days until he was recognized by Sugarhouse personnel as being a subject on the Board's selfexclusion list. Surveillance coverage showed that the self-excluded person played Craps off and on at three 9 10 tables. He alternated between tables, but was observed in pit four for almost the entire time. 11 The 12 self-excluded person placed himself on the Board's 13 self-exclusion list on January 4th of 2012. 14 Sugarhouse personnel confiscated \$3 in gaming chips 15 from the self-excluded person and he was turned over to the State Police who charged him with a 16 17 misdemeanor, defiant trespass.

The self-excluded person was previously found twice to have violated the Board's self-exclusion list at Sugarhouse Casino. The first occurred on January 16th of 2012, shortly after he placed himself on the Board's self-exclusion list, and the second occurred on July 3rd, 2012. The second violation was the basis for a Consent Agreement between Sugarhouse Casino and the OEC, which the Board

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

approved on December 12th of 2012. The self-excluded person who placed himself on the self-exclusion list for one year, on March 22nd this year, he successfully petitioned the Board to be removed from the self-exclusion list. The OEC and Sugarhouse Casino respectfully request the Board to approve the Consent Agreement and Stipulation of Settlement, which requires that Sugarhouse institute policies and training to prevent similar violations of the Board's self-exclusion list and pay a penalty of \$15,000 and to also pay \$2,500 in costs with regard to costs incurred by Board staff in regard to this matter.

I'll be glad to answer any questions.

#### CHAIRMAN:

2.

Mr. Sklar, you have some explaining to do here.

### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Yes. First, Mr. Chairman, with me this morning is Rose Cook, who's the Vice President of Gaming at Sugarhouse Casino.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Is she going to speak, Mr. Sklar?

Perhaps we should have her sworn as a witness? Could you stand, ma'am, please? Could you state your name, spell your last name and your position with the

36 1 casino. 2 MS. COOK: 3 Yes. Rosemarie Cook, R-O-S-E-M-A-R-I-E, 4 last name Cook, C-O-O-K, Vice President of Gaming at 5 Sugarhouse Casino. 6 CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the witness be sworn? 8 ROSEMARIE COOK, HAVING FIRST BEEN DULY SWORN, 9 10 TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 11 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Sklar, go ahead. 14 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 15 I'm aware that this is extremely 16 troubling to the Board and I'm sure your --- it's met 17 with great skepticism, puzzlement as to how this could 18 possibly ---. 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Incredulity? 21 ATTORNEY SKLAR: 22 Yes. Again, especially with this guy 23 given the history. I want to establish, first, that 24 this individual has absolutely no value to Sugarhouse.

He's cost the casino a lot of money. He was evicted,

25

based on the last incident, in July of 2012, and an eviction by Sugarhouse means there's a lifetime ban. He can never come into Sugarhouse Casino or he's not supposed to.

So, this is not the case of the casino or employees turning a blind eye because this is a valuable player, he's worth a lot to the casino. We have absolutely no interest in him being in the casino, that's historic and on a going forward basis.

Next thing is, this is a troubling area, a difficult area, I should say, for the Licensees, with the self-excluded. It's not the underage gambling where there's strict liability and if the underage is caught in the casino, the casino is held accountable period. The regulations requirement on Licensees are to establish procedures designed to identify self-excluded patrons. As in this case, the patron doesn't --- there's no opportunity where he's presenting an ID or he has a player's card that's being presented where it's unremarkable to play. He's not playing \$10,000 a hand, he's not trying to cash \$10,000 a hand. This individual cashed, in each of the instances, cashed \$100 each time, that was it.

will get into this in greater detail, when employees

So, in terms of recognition, and Rose

are taught, you know, how do you recognize self-excluded patrons, one of the things is the play, the amount of plays, is he chasing his losses. Is he borrowing money? Is he getting agitated? This guy came in, bought in for \$100, and that was it, and continued to play with that same amount of money for the entire time in both incidents. He was unremarkable in appearance, he was dressed like a million other guys who are in the casino.

2.

In this particular incident that's the subject of the hearing this morning, he was --- the vast majority of the time, he wasn't playing. He was in there for approximately 70 hours. He played for 17 hours and it was very intermittent. Again, Rose will get into a lot more detail with that.

So, again, I understand the difficulty of the Board trying to understand how this could happen, but it really comes down to where there's not an opportunity where an ID was presented, it comes down to reasonableness. What did the casino do? And did what they do, was it reasonable?

After the first incident, his picture was posted in the back of the house, outside of the table games department, security had it, surveillance had it, and really that's what you have to go on. Is

someone going to see that photo and then is the 1 2. opportunity there and you can put that photo, match it to the face and that's what occurred here.

3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ultimately, the way this guy was caught this last go 4 5 around, honestly, it was happenstance. Surveillance saw this individual had an electronic device and they 6 thought maybe he was cheating. They zoomed in and they were able to pick up the patron's name and then they plugged it into the database and found out this 9 10 is a self-excluded guy and then they apprehended him, 11 but that's how it occurred. It was not based on the 12 facial recognition or someone remembering this guy 13 from the past, unfortunately.

You know, again, come back to the Sugarhouse does not want this guy's beginning. business and it's not turning a blind eye. All the employees, you know, were aware and it just this is what occurred and ultimately, he was discovered and it was self reported and he was issued a trespass citation. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Rose and she can go into some of the details.

Α. Good morning, Chairman Ryan ---

## CHAIRMAN:

Good morning.

25 --- members of the Board. Rosemarie Cook, Vice Α.

President of Gaming, obviously, before you today as a representative of Sugarhouse. I assure you, we're not proud of this moment. This is not the type of meeting that I or anybody from the casino would like to have to come and sit through.

2.

None of us feel good about it. We wish more than anything that we could have found this person sooner than we did. We go to great lengths to try to observe and comply with all the regulations. We have a good overall record of identifying repeat offenders. For example, in the last 90 days, we have been able to identify approximately 23 people on property that were either prior evictions or something with gaming related through system alerts or through the visual recognition that Michael was just talking about by staff.

After our last incident with this person, we placed an alert board outside the table games office with pictures of repeat offenders because obviously, we're not going to --- we can't post over 5,000 people on that list, so we really thought we really need to focus in on making sure that we don't have these guys that have come in and been caught, that we don't have that happen again.

I know that board works because on July 1st, you

know, just as recently as July 1st, we were able to catch someone in the casino that a table games person recognized strictly by seeing his picture on that board, so I know it's of value to us and I know it's working. You know, I wish I could tell you we could recognize every offender that walked in the door, but with 5,000 to 10,000 people a day through the building, it's just not plausible.

2.

At no time, like Michael said, did we intentionally allow him to play. I assure you it was not a case of being asleep at the wheel and I'm sure when you read the report, that's, you know, that's probably what you were thinking and I understand that. We have no motivation to want anybody like that in our facility. We value our reputation and our integrity, which is why it was a self reported incident. We knew it was not going to be looked upon favorably, but doing the right thing was more important to us. So, here are the facts about how it happened.

He came in on President's Day, which, of course, is a very busy holiday in our casino. He's a low level player, bought for \$100 and wagered the table minimum on the pass line, not even betting every roll, so there was nothing really remarkable there or notable about his play. He was dressed average and he

looked average, nothing remarkable or notable about his look. You've been given some pictures of Craps players at the time he was in the casino to kind of help paint picture for you to understand that. It is confidential and that's certainly not distributed to anybody else.

2.

He looked different than the picture we had posted. He appeared to have gained weight. His arms were covered and concealed so we couldn't see the tattoo that was on his arm, you know, as one way to try to identify. His hat was down below his eyebrows, so they weren't visible. I also have submitted to you a picture comparison so you can see the picture that we had posted versus what he looked like during that last play for your consideration and review.

He spent 76 percent of the time off the tables, not in action. Of the time that he did play, the majority of that play was in very short durations, two minutes to 12 minutes. Thirty-eight (38) times he played that we have recorded through surveillance. Of those 38 plays, only one time was he actually there during a shift change. Because I don't know if you recall, but one of the other things we put in place after the last time here was, not only the Board, but also all of our supervisors, regardless of the amount

that somebody has bought in, what kind of average bet they had, it doesn't matter, if they have been on that game for eight hours and there's a shift change taking place, it's that supervisor's responsibility to make sure that they tell the next supervisor, you know, coming in, this person's been here eight hours already, regardless of it they're rated, you know, So, what their buy in is, what their average bet is. that was in place. It never really mattered here. There was only one time of the 38 that there was an actual shift change that took place while he was playing and during that time, he had only played about an hour and a half when that shift time change took place, so there was really no communication necessary there.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, you know, nothing remarkable. He didn't draw attention to himself in any way. He didn't bother anybody. He wasn't drinking any alcohol, no disturbances. He was just in and about. In our annual responsible gaming training, we're taught warning signs to look for, appearing un-kept, an increase in the size of bets or the amount of money spent, unusual rituals around play, you know, I have to stay in this spot, don't come near my money, you know, don't touch me type of things, emotional swings

where anger usually comes out or blaming the staff for their losses. He didn't meet any of this criteria.

There was no red flags and nothing remarkable.

2.

2.4

He was recognized by surveillance, like Michael said, who had zoomed in to see what he was doing with his hands below the table because they do, throughout the gaming day, both security and surveillance, do these check points on the floor of every single person playing or on the floor, looking for these types of things. When he spotted his hands, he saw it was an iPad, that's when he zoomed in further and saw his name on the iPad and, like Michael said, that was when, you know, he recognized what was going on and knew who it was and then immediately contacted security to take him to the heart of the house.

When he got there, he told security he had only put himself on the exclusion list for one year and that had expired January 4th, so he thought he was within his rights to be coming in there and playing at that time. He thought it was fine. He was told the procedures and how he had to go in, himself, and take himself off, that it wasn't an automatic removal based on the date and he has since removed himself from that list.

All that said, it doesn't matter to us. He's

permanently evicted from our property. We don't care if he's on a list, off a list. We want nothing to do with this customer. We're going to continue to do our best to identify any excluded or evicted patrons, you know, even as the list has grown, and through the use of the tools we have.

You know, I look at this and I can't help but feel if there was some type of stiff penalty for the individual defying the Order, they would think twice about violating their conditions. We recognize the value of this program. We have and will continue to be vigilant in all of our compliance and I thank you for allowing me to speak.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Ms. Cook, if I can ask a question. What was he doing the other 76 percent of the time he wasn't at the table?

A. It varied between going to the men's room, walking around the property. He was in the slot area some of the time, he was outside of the tables, you know, in that general area, some of the time.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Did he leave the building?

A. Not that we know of.

1

2.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

# CHAIRMAN:

Did he indicate, when security talked to him afterward, why he was there all that time? Did he indicate any specific reason why he wanted to hang around your establishment for a couple of days?

A. No.

# CHAIRMAN:

Any other questions from Board members?
MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the explanation. I think that does, you know, help somewhat, but I have to tell you, when I read this, I was outraged. I was outraged.

establishment for three days, I assume wearing the same clothes, hasn't showered, you know, walking around at 4:00 in the morning, 4:00 in the afternoon, you know, the crowds may be different, but I would assume at, you know, 8:00, 9:00, 10:00 in the morning, you know, there's not a whole lot of patrons there. Maybe I'm wrong, and you can correct me if I am, but how somebody can stay in your facility for three days and not be recognized and I get your point about, you know, he wasn't at the table, but he was somewhere. Your facility isn't that big and prior to this, he was in the casino in the last infraction for four days.

I just cannot believe that somebody doesn't recognize that. And look, we're not without culpability here. We have casino compliance representatives there and I've asked Kevin O'Toole to look into that and report to the Board, as to what our people were doing, but I just ---. It boggles my mind that somebody can be in your facility for three days in one instance, four days for another, a known compulsive gambler on the list, and not be recognized. It's disheartening to me.

We spend a lot of time and effort in our compulsive gambling program. It's an issue that this Board struggles with, as you are well aware, and I just --- it boggled ---. My mind is boggled that nobody recognized this guy. Can you address that?

A. Yes, and I understand how you feel, and obviously, after the fact you look back and we, at a minimum, were embarrassed, as you can imagine. His appearance was different. He definitely had gained some weight. When you see the photo, you can see the fuller face, but it ---.

#### MR. FAJT:

It doesn't matter what he looked like back when he was on ---. This guy's in your casino for three days. He's there another time period for

four days, at eight o'clock in the morning, seven o'clock in the morning. There can't be that many people in the casino. This guy --- somebody has got to say I saw that guy yesterday. I saw that guy four hours ago.

A. Well, we do have a lot of customers that are in every day, so it's not unusual in our casino to see somebody the next day and the day after that and the day after that. It is a local market.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

1

2.

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rose, if you could just ---. Rose and I had a number of discussions about this. Reiterate the issue with the turnover in staff and to your point, Commissioner Fajt, about how can he be in there for multiple days. Talk a little bit about the staff turnover and whether there would be --- one shift would tell the next shift. At what point would that happen? Because it's an important thing to understand. You raise a good point, obviously, this doesn't make sense. It doesn't sit well with you intuitively, you say well, how could this possibly be? So, Rose, if you could explain that a little bit more with the shift changes and turnover. Well, you know, he played multiple tables and, you know, he played for very short times most of the

time. There was a couple of times he played --- I think at one point he played three hours on his very first play, a little over that. So, that was ---.

## MR. FAJT:

I thought he played on two tables in the same pit area.

A. He played --- there's actually four tables in that area.

# MR. FAJT:

But in the same pit area?

A. In the same area, yes. All of his play was within that area because he plays Craps. That's where he was, but he wasn't always in that area for that other 76 percent of the time. So, he would be from game to game to game, a few minutes here, and then there might be a gap of five hours before we saw him again on another game and he would play for five minutes there and then there would be a gap of maybe 40 minutes and then maybe during that 40 minutes, now you got a shift change, so he's nowhere in --- you know, he's not on any tables, he's not in anybody's conversation, he's not on anybody's radar in the gaming area because we're only looking at the layout and the customers on the rail playing the game of Craps.

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just think that the issue is, in terms of, well, if I'm on a shift at 10 o'clock one morning and I see this guy and then the next morning he's there, that's not necessarily causing a red flag because there's a number of players that are there on a daily basis. So, then you say okay, shouldn't there have been communication between shifts to say well, he was there 10:00 a.m., 10:00 p.m., 10:00 a.m. and the communication shift to shift, there has to be some kind of reason why something remarkable about this person where you would say to the next pit manager, well, take a look at this guy, he's, you know, gambling like crazy, he's been here, you know, continuously for my shift for eight hours playing, keep an eye on him. There was just nothing that would cause that from shift to shift for someone to say, well, keep --- look at that guy.

## MR. GINTY:

He was there for three days, doesn't he have to sleep? I mean, maybe doze for a half hour or an hour or something. He can't stay awake for three full days and, you know, that means he's either in the men's room and sleeping in the thing or he's sleeping at a slot machine and --- I mean, you got security

people that regularly make their rounds. I mean ---.

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Nothing in the surveillance indicated that he was, you know, sleeping in a bathroom and that's certainly --- or sleeping at the tables or slot machines. I mean, that certainly would have been a red flag, no one would have permitted him just to essentially loiter. There's no indication that that occurred.

## MR. MCNALLY:

But in addition to that, you're putting a lot of emphasis on the folks that are in the pits and they're the first line, but you also went through multiple shifts of your security and multiple shifts of your surveillance and I reject the fact that just because someone's not in the pit area, you don't have responsibility for monitoring your floor so the same guy in the same clothes ---.

#### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

But from security and surveillance's perspective, they're looking at it from, all right, is this person being disruptive, is he potentially cheating. There was nothing remarkable about this guy where someone, you know, from surveillance shift to surveillance shift, where they would say, listen, keep

an eye on this guy.

# MR. MCNALLY:

What's remarkable is the guy could be on his feet for 72 hours in your facility. That's pretty remarkable. I mean, that's dance marathon type of stuff. Send him up to the Four Diamonds Foundation in State College.

# CHAIRMAN:

Ms. Cook, is he now allowed into your

10 casino?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

12

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 A. No.

## CHAIRMAN:

Why?

A. Well, this last time, you know, it was criminal trespass because he had already been evicted. We really don't have any interest in him at all. There's no value to this man.

## CHAIRMAN:

Okay.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Mr. Chairman, when the patron is evicted and --- so in July of 2012, the first incident, he was evicted. Along with that eviction, there is a current lifetime ban and that was in place and continues to be in place to this day.

## CHAIRMAN:

Ms. Cook, do you have any possible solution to this problem? Is there anything you haven't done yet that you think --- and you also, Mr. Sklar, can answer this --- that you think, perhaps, you will do in the future to prevent this? Or in your view, is --- have you done everything you can?

A. I'm open to suggestions.

# CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sklar?

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

I don't think that Sugarhouse is going to sit back and throw their hands up and say, listen, we've done all that we can. As Rose mentioned, since the last incident, the table game supervisors have been informed to keep an eye out for guys, or patrons, who are here a long time, make sure you let the next shift know, but again, it's got to be in context where there's some kind of red flag. I mean, I think that the whole purpose of putting the responsibility on the casino Licensees, I understand, is to help self-excluded patrons to help themselves. Here, where there is no tell tale signs of problem gaming, it's very, very difficult with this kind of incident for someone ---. It basically boils down to the

recognition, and a visual recognition of this guy.

That's what it boils down to. Unfortunately, as Rose said, everyone wishes he was recognized earlier.

## CHAIRMAN:

Cyrus, if this person, same facts exactly, just walked into the casino, as far as anybody knows, for the first time and other than that the facts are exactly as have been related to us by the parties, could --- I know the casino could tell him to leave, but should the casino tell him to leave?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

# CHAIRMAN:

Why?

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

I mean, basically, we're running into the same situation that we ran into on the first Consent Agreement we reached with this same individual where the individual was at the casino for a prolonged period of time and he was on the self-exclusion list.

#### CHAIRMAN:

What if he's not on the self-exclusion list, not on any list just walks in?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, the casino could tell me to leave,

but I don't think there would be basically a reason
for them to tell him to leave, unless they believe he
exhibited signs of compulsive and problem gambling.
Based on his level of play, you know, that's not
indicative. The only thing that's indicative is that
he likes to hang out at the casino.

## CHAIRMAN:

Okay.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Mr. Chairman, Rose can back me up, I think that is the issue. Is there tell tale signs of problem gaming? If there is, then staff is taught that yes, they should engage, you know, under their procedures.

## CHAIRMAN:

We all agree this is a difficult factual situation.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

We took all these things into consideration. I mean, this is the third time this individual --- first time, his spouse called there. That was the first time. Okay. He had just been put on the list, that one we let go by, no big deal. Second time, he's there for four days.

# CHAIRMAN:

Cyrus, not to interrupt you. Do you have any suggestion to Ms. Cook?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

If she wants to purchase --- I don't know if they want to spend the money and start purchasing biometric equipment, I mean face scan equipment or something like that. Outside of that, I mean, that's pretty costly. I think we only have --- I'm not going to say what casinos have it in the state, but it does exist.

A. We would need to make sure that all of the people on the exclusion list or self-exclusion list, that we have electronic files that we can get uploaded.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah, yep.

A. I don't know if we're there yet.

## ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah. And outside that, I mean, given the size of Sugarhouse, that presents a bigger problem. I mean, you look at all the other casinos, even our CAT3s that have hotels, the CAT1s that have the racing side, we have large facilities. I mean, it's just a small gaming area like Sugarhouse in addition to the restaurants, all of the gaming floor, so that also puts them in a different light than

others. I'm not going to say that the other casinos don't have patrons that stay there, you know, for maybe the same length of time, but the properties are so huge, I mean the person could go to a hotel, they could go shopping, I mean, there are other places they can be other than on the casino floor. Here, we have an individual that is consistently on the casino floor.

## MR. GINTY:

I'm curious. When his wife called in, how did you identify him? I'm sorry, this if for ---.

12 A. For the very first time?

2.

# MR. GINTY:

When the wife called in?

A. She gave a description and security and surveillance scanned the floor and found him.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Just let me --- on Cyrus' point in terms of the size of the facility. I can see it both ways. I mean, a smaller facility --- and Rose can testify, she told me earlier --- they get 5,000 to 10,000 people coming through the facility, so it's very congested, which makes it more difficult to single out and identify patrons as opposed to a larger facility where it's spread out and it's a lot easier to

identify patrons. So, I'm not so sure --- I think it works both ways.

## MS. LANGAN:

2.

2.4

How often do you update the photos of people who have been evicted or on the self-exclusion list?

A. Well, the actual photos of the people on the self-exclusion list, when they, you know, when they come to us from PGCB they are kept --- you know, they're printed and kept in note binders, because at this point in time the State doesn't have like an electronic version, you know, of this. So, that's why the --- and speaking about the biometric software would be great, but we couldn't even use it yet because we need that, so we update every time we get --- we update that book. Now, as far as repeat offenders, we always have the most recent photo on our little board outside of the table games, you know, area in the back of the house.

# MS. LANGAN:

And that photo comes from the casino or does it come from ---?

23 A. That comes from our surveillance.

# CHAIRMAN:

25 Keith.

# MR. MCCALL:

When I review all of the surveillance footage, it seems that he has a gray hoodie on in all of the pictures, except for the last, on the third page, 2/19 at 10:08, it shows that he has a different outfit on. At least, I think I can see the gray hoodie underneath, but it looks like he changed or has different clothing on. That would be your last page of pictures. Is that him in the burgundy jacket?

A. No, that is not him.

# MR. MCCALL:

It's certainly not the other guy standing there.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

A. He is not necessarily in each one of these photos at the Craps games that you have. He is definitely in the photo on the front where we show him as we have him posted to look for and how he actually looked that day. The other photos of the Craps tables were really to show how unremarkable he looked on that game, because that time of the year everybody's got a jacket on and most people wear a gray zip-up hoodie and

that's what those were.

2.4

## MR. MCCALL:

And you ascertain that he actually gamed for how many minutes in that whole three day period?

A. In that whole three day period, out of the 70 plus hours he was here ---.

## MR. FAJT:

I think you said 17 hours.

A. Seventeen (17) hours was actual game.

# MR. MCCALL:

Wouldn't it concern you, though, that

--- what was he up to for the other 60-some odd hours
just roaming around your casino doing what? What was
he doing? I mean, wouldn't that concern you that
somebody is just kind of walking around your casino
with all that time on his hands? This is all
supposition, you know, but he could be following a
person. He could be, you know, casing your place. I
mean, there's a lot of things that could be going on
here. And again, that is all supposition on my part
but I think you should be concerned about that, as
well, not just the fact that, you know, is he a
problem gambler and of course you don't think he is
but I think there's other issues here that we have to
be cognizant of as well.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

I think you're right and that's exactly it. There wasn't anything that he was doing that caused surveillance, security to say this guy is following someone, he's casing someone out.

A. And the first time there was something that caused us to look further, that's when surveillance zoomed down when they saw him pull out an electronic device below the table, you know, that caught their attention. Prior to that, he was doing nothing that caused anybody to look at him.

## CHAIRMAN:

I take it during this entire time,
ma'am, no patron came in, out perhaps, came up to
staff and said hey, that guy's been here. I was here
two days ago, I just came back and he's still here?
A. No. We would definitely react to that.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Any other questions from the Board? Ex-officio members? I think what we're going to do right now is take a ten minute recess. I'd just like to meet with my colleagues for a few minutes. It's now about three minutes after 11:00. We'll reconvene at 11:15. Thank you.

25 SHORT BREAK TAKEN

# CHAIRMAN:

We'll return to the matter we were considering when we recessed. And I guess at this point, what I will do is seeing no indication that anyone on the Board has anymore questions, no questions from ex-officio members and the parties also having completed, I will ask for a motion.

## MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to reject the Consent Agreement between the OEC and HSP Gaming, LP, as described by the OEC and that we send it back to the OEC for additional review in light of the concerns cited by the Board today.

15 CHAIRMAN:

16 Second?

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

19 CHAIRMAN:

20 All in favor?

21 ALL SAY AYE

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

22 CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you

24 all, appreciate it.

25 ATTORNEY PITRE:

63 Next matter that we have for the Board's 1 2 consideration is a motion to consider a Consent 3 Agreement between the OEC and Valley Forge Convention Center Partners, LP. Mr. Glen Stuart, Assistant Enforcement Counsel, will present the matter on behalf of the OEC. Kevin Hayes is here on behalf of Valley Forge. 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 Good morning. 10 ATTORNEY HAYES: 11 Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Kevin 12 Hayes, H-A-Y-E-S, of Doherty Hayes, on behalf of 13 Valley Forge Casino Resort. Mr. Chairman, with me 14 here today is the Executive Director of Security, Gib 15 Morrissey who will likely be offering testimony. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Sir, could you stand? Could you state your name and your position and spell your last name? 18 19 MR. MORRISSEY: 20 My first name is Gilbert, G-I-L-B-E-R-T, 21 last name Morrissey, M-O-R-R-I-S-S-E-Y. I'm the 22 Executive Director of Security at Valley Forge Casino. 23 CHAIRMAN: 24 Ma'am, could you swear the witness? 25

GILBERT MORRISSEY, HAVING FIRST BEEN DULY SWORN,

TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:

2.

\_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Hayes?

ATTORNEY STUART:

Mr. Stuart.

CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Stuart. Go ahead.

ATTORNEY STUART:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first

Consent Agreement pertains to Valley Forge allowing a self-excluded individual to gain access to its gaming floor, to remain on the gaming floor and to place wagers on two separate occasions. Specifically, on March 11th, 2013, Valley Forge allowed an individual on the self-exclusion list to gain access to the casino floor, to remain on the casino floor and to place wagers. The individual obtained a daily access pass by being a patron of a Valley Forge amenity. The individual was on the casino floor for approximately 12 minutes, had won a \$3,056 jackpot at the time of his discovery. As a result, the Pennsylvania State Police charged this individual with trespass. On May 6th, 2013, Valley Forge remitted the \$3,056 won by

this individual to the Board in accordance with 58 Pa. Code 503a.3 Subsection H.

2.

Again, on March 17th, 2013, Valley Forge allowed this individual to gain access to the casino floor, to remain on the casino floor and to place wagers. The individual obtained a daily access pass by being a patron of a Valley Forge amenity. The individual subsequently wagered at a slot machine for approximately 16 minutes before exiting the casino floor. Upon the individual's attempt to re-enter the casino a few minutes later, a Valley Forge security officer recognized the individual from the March 11th incident and identified him as a self-excluded individual.

There's no evidence that that the individual acquired any winnings during his play at Valley Forge on this date. PSP subsequently escorted this individual off the property and again cited him for trespass.

The terms of the Consent Agreement require Valley Forge to pay \$7,500 civil penalty and remit \$2,500 to the Board for investigative fees associated with this Consent Agreement. This Consent Agreement is now ripe for the Board's consideration.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Hayes?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## ATTORNEY HAYES:

Mr. Chairman, all of the facts which

Attorney Stuart has just provided are accurate. There

are a few additional facts that I think are important

for the Board to know.

This individual approached our Valley Services, which is our player services desk, and indicated that he would like --- he has a players' club card, the representative there at that time requested his identification, he did not produce it, but provided the name of his brother. Again she refused to provide him the players' club card. made a purchase of a \$10 gift card and was given an access card. Upon her own suspicion, she looked up the brother's name on the self-excluded list and discovered his name and immediately contacted the security office --- the security department who apprehended him. Unfortunately, 12 minutes had elapsed from that point in time, he had gotten on the floor and had won. All the funds were remitted to the fund.

With regard to the --- after that incident, the security department had circulated his photograph within the department. He returns the

following week, he goes --- this individual purchases a \$10 gift card, is given an access card. He did not try to obtain a membership or a players' club card, gets on the floor, was on the floor for approximately 16 minutes, exits the floor and when he tries to re-enter, the security guard had recognized him because of the circulation of his photograph and immediately contacted the PGCB and the State Police.

# CHAIRMAN:

2.

Any questions from the Board?

# MR. MCCALL:

Just a question. It seems to me that we're finding these guys when, in fact, we should be kind of patting them on the back. It seems to me that, you know, your employees went over and above the call of duty to identify this guy and, you know, I don't think we should be, you know, creating disincentives for your employees doing the job that they're supposed to be doing. This seems to me that your player service representative went over and above the call of duty. I'm just wondering if we can, at least, consider --- you know, I don't think we should be fining them. I think we should be saying, you know, thank you for a job well done in this circumstance.

## CHAIRMAN:

I have to agree, Cyrus, with what my colleague said here. I can't think of anything wrong that was done here by Valley Forge. I understand the concern because the person was there twice, but this person got caught twice, real fast, and the first time, the woman could have --- and as Keith said, we don't want to discourage what she's doing or what she did. The reality is she didn't just say who cares. She got involved and because she got involved when she didn't have to, here they are. It seems to me that maybe we're being a little harsh.

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

And I have no problem with that. The bottom line, if you recall, when we were going through the whole access plan, the Board --- where there was some discussion about whether we should check self-exclusion list for people when they're sold gift cards, when they're given access to the casino. And at that time, I told the Board that if it happened, we'd bring the matter before the Board so that the Board could set the precedence in how they wanted to handle these matters. And now that you've expressed that and the Board sees fit to reject the Consent Agreement, I have no problem with that and we'll

69 address future violations or non-violations in the 1 same fashion if the Board sees fit to set the 2 3 precedence in this matter with regard to Category 3 4 Licensees. 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Thank you, Cyrus. Any other questions? Again, difficult issue. 8 ATTORNEY PITRE: 9 No, that's perfectly fine. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 We all understand what we're trying to 12 do here, but I have to agree with Keith. Okay. Motion? 13 14 MR. MOSCATO: 15 Yes, sir. I move that the Board issue an Order to reject the Consent Agreement between the 16 17 OEC and Valley Forge Convention Center Partners, LP, 18 as described by the OEC. 19 MR. FAJT: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All in favor? 23 ALL SAY AYE 24 CHAIRMAN: 25 Opposed? The motion carries.

## ATTORNEY STUART:

1

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2. Thank you. The second Consent Agreement 3 pertains to two underage individuals gaining access to 4 Valley Forge's gaming floor, remaining on the gaming 5 floor, wagering on the gaming floor, and consuming 6 alcoholic beverages while on the gaming floor. Specifically, March 17th, 2013, two 20 year old individuals entered Valley Forge's gaming floor. One 9 individual used his father's Seasonal Dining Club 10 Membership Card and the other used a daily access pass 11 obtained from an unknown person. Valley Forge 12 security failed to request proper identification from 13 either individual prior to entry, although both 14 individuals appear to be under the age of 30. 15 individuals were served alcoholic beverage by a Valley Forge cocktail server who also failed to request 16 17 identification from either individual. 18 While on the gaming floor, one

While on the gaming floor, one individual actively wagered at a slot machine, however, there is no evidence that this individual won any money. The other individual did not place any wagers. The individuals were on the casino floor for approximately 27 minutes prior to their discovery.

As a result, the Pennsylvania State Police cited one individual with one count of

prohibited acts under 4 Pa. C.S. Section 1518(a)(13) for entering and remaining on the gaming floor of a licensed facility by an individual under the age of 21 and one count of prohibited acts under 4 Pa. C.S. Section 1518(a)(16) for consuming alcohol on the gaming floor of a licensed facility by an individual under the age of 21. Both charges are summary offenses.

2.

2.4

PSP cited the other individual with one count of prohibited acts under 4 Pa. C.S. Section 1518(a)(13.1) for wagering at a slot machine on a gaming floor of a licensed facility by an individual under the age of 21, as well as one count of prohibited acts under 4 Pa C.S. Section 1518(a)(16), for consuming alcohol on the gaming floor of a licensed facility by an individual under the age of 21. Both charges are summary offenses.

Valley Forge also evicted both individuals from its facility. The terms of the Consent Agreement require Valley Forge to pay a \$15,000 civil penalty and to remit \$2,500 to the Board for investigative fees associated with this Consent Agreement. This Consent Agreement is now ripe for the Board's consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Hayes?

# ATTORNEY HAYES:

Mr. Chairman, clearly, we have the failure of three employees to fulfill their duties. There are two security guards who should have checked IDs that failed to do that. We have one server, the same server served alcohol to both of those individuals. All had received extensive training. For instance, the server had received at least four different policies which she had to acknowledge and sign off on, which involve checking ID and underage service. All three have been disciplined. One resulted in actual termination because of the fact that he was on a probationary period from a previous violation of company policy.

I think it would be important for the Board to hear from Mr. Morrissey about specific actions that his department has taken since the time of this incident to address and prevent future incidents like this.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Morrissey?

A. As Mr. Hayes stated, it was a failure on the security department. We failed to check the identification of both individuals on approaching the

turn styles. With that, I took a look at the video and examined why this failure happened. This failure happened because the guards --- one, it wasn't busy, so there's really no excuse. He should have recognized that the individuals were under the age of 30, as is our policy.

2.

2.4

So, what I did to take preventative action with that, at every single pre-shift, we have three different shifts, we explain the fines and ramifications at all pre-shifts. The next step we took, we trained all officers on acceptable forms of IDs. We actually created a PowerPoint presentation and did every single officer individually so that they understand what's acceptable.

The next thing we did was we redid our security training manuals with updated procedures, which included valid identification. I also noticed when I observed the video, we have Token Works ID scanners that were sitting there at the time and not being utilized, so now it is a mandatory policy that that Token Work ID scanner is used for every person that appears to be under the age of 30. That scanner is actually utilized today and that policy will stay in effect.

The other thing we did was I contacted some

friends at the State Police, because I'm a retired lieutenant from the State Police, and asked them to facilitate us with fraudulent ID training. That was conducted for my entire staff on 5/16/2013. That training was very well received by our members to identify what would be fraudulent ID in the State of Pennsylvania, as well as other surrounding States.

2.

And the last thing we instituted was, one of the things we wanted to do was get our officers thinking a little bit because, you know, different people have different looks, so we instituted a guess my age game. That occurs every Friday. We post pictures up of people every Friday outside of the security office and all three shifts compete against each other. I foot the bill for dinner and lunch at the end of the month for the winning shift, but it's a good interactive way to get them thinking of what an individual's age is. Those are the things that we instituted, sir.

#### ATTORNEY HAYES:

Mr. Chairman, just one more item. With regard to the food and beverage employee who obviously violated company policy here, the entire department has recently, since this incident, undergone RAMP training. To be commended was the bartender, who, when these two individuals tried to obtain their

second drinks, despite the fact that they were already on the floor, still requested they produce ID. When they failed to do it we immediately contacted security. And we certainly commended him for his role in apprehending these two minors.

# CHAIRMAN:

2.

Was experience an issue between the first and second?

# ATTORNEY HAYES:

What I can tell you and I think --- this individual bartender has --- was the one when we had prior underage was the one who identified as well.

He's been an outstanding employee in that respect.

## MR. MCNALLY:

Just one question. You addressed a number of things that you did with regard to the age, but how did the individual use his father's Seasonal Dining Club Card? Is that scanned in? Would that show the father's age?

# ATTORNEY HAYES:

When it's scanned in at the entrance all that is determined is that it's valid, not expired.

All we can --- based on the investigation by the Casino Compliance Officers, State Police and our own security, there's no indication that the father had

intentionally provided him with the card. We had at least once instance where we knew the person was on property and had provided the unauthorized person with their membership or access card and that person was evicted. That wasn't the situation here, but obviously, the father would never have been issued the membership card unless he had provided his ID, his ID had been swiped and his ID had been confirmed. His name would have been embedded on the membership card. All of his information would be embedded on the card.

# MR. MCNALLY:

2.

Is it the same name? I'm John, III, so is it --- did the father and the son have the same name?

## ATTORNEY STUART:

Yes, he does. It's actually John, III.

## ATTORNEY HAYES:

The name probably would've appeared the same even if you had ID. There would have been some confusion.

A. Same name as the individual who bought the card.

#### MS. LANGAN:

Just one question. When you talk about eviction, are they evicted until they're 21 or are they evicted lifetime?

A. They are evicted permanently from the casino.

CHAIRMAN:

Tony?

MR. MOSCATO:

Clarification, Mr. Morrissey.

Some people do look older than their

A. Yes, sir.

# MR. MOSCATO:

age. For example, you know, I've always looked this way. When I was in college, you know, people thought I was a professor. Did these two youths look like they were --- did they look older than they appeared or did they look like they were 20?

A. One of them had facial hair and honestly, sir, the reply to that would be up to the interpretation of the actual officer. Those officers make that determination, so both of them thought they might have been of age, they kind of had a feeling that they were close. If they had the feeling that they were close, the new policy is that they swipe the ID card no matter what.

Our age challenges since these events have happened, especially on our busy nights, on Friday and Saturday nights, have spiked from 200 up to 500, 600, some nights 700 ID checks per night.

Registration. Assistant Enforcement Counsel,
Cassandra Fenstermaker, will present the matter for
the Board's consideration.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

## ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of I'm Cassandra Fenstermaker, that's F-E-N-S-T-E-R-M-A-K-E-R. I have for your consideration today a complaint for the suspension of Jerome Jordan's license. On May 10th, 2013, the OEC filed a complaint for suspension against Jerome Jordan, who currently holds a Non-Gaming Employee Registration. OEC filed the complaint after BIE learned that Mr. Jordan had been arrested and charged with assault related offenses, theft related offenses and firearms offenses. The Enforcement complaint was sent to Mr. Jordan 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 in the complaint are deemed admitted. The OEC filed a request for default judgment on June 26th, 2013 and at this time requests that Jerome Jordan's Non-Gaming Employee Registration be suspended.

# CHAIRMAN:

Is Jerome Jordan in the hearing room?

80 Questions or comments from the Board? 1 2 Ex-officio members? Can I have a motion? 3 MR. GINTY: 4 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 5 issue an Order to approve the suspension of Jerome 6 Jordan's Non-Gaming Registration as described by OEC. MS. KAISER: 8 Second. 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 All in favor? 11 ALL SAY AYE 12 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you 13 14 very much. Thank you, Cyrus. 15 Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes 16 today's meeting. Our next scheduled public meeting 17 will be on Wednesday, August 21st in this room. 18 meeting will begin at 10:00 a.m. Any final comments 19 from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a 20 motion to adjourn? 21 MS. KAISER: 22 Mr. Chairman, I move to adjourn the 23 meeting. 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 Second?

		81
1	MR. MCCALL:	
2	Second.	
3	<u>CHAIRMAN</u> :	
4	Thank you.	
5	* * * * *	
6	MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:35 A.M.	
7	* * * * *	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

# CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman William Ryan was reported by me on 7/17/2013 and that I Jolynn C. Prunoske read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Jolynn C. Puinoske