COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING

* * * * * * * *

BEFORE: WILLIAM H. RYAN, JR., CHAIRMAN

Gregory C. Fajt; Annmarie Kaiser; Keith R.

McCall; John J. McNally, III; Anthony C.

Moscato; David W. Woods, Members

Jennifer Langan, representing Robert

McCord, State Treasurer; Robert Coyne,

representing Daniel Meuser, Secretary of

Revenue

HEARING: Wednesday, April 9, 2014

10:01 a.m.

LOCATION: Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

Strawberry Square Complex

Harrisburg, PA 17101

Reporter: Rhonda K. Thorpe

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

ı					
1	I N D E X		3		
2					
3	OPENING REMARKS				
4	By Chairman	4 – 6			
5	PRESENTATION				
6	By Mr. O'Toole	6 - 7			
7	By Mr. Kile	7 – 9			
8	QUESTIONS FROM BOARD	9 - 18			
9	PRESENTATION				
10	By Ms. Yantis	18 - 19			
11	By Mr. Rhen	20 - 22			
12	By Attorney Sherman	22 - 31			
13	By Attorney Cook	32 - 36			
14	By Ms. Hensel	36 - 48			
15	By Attorney Armstrong	48 - 54			
16	By Attorney Miller	55 - 57			
17	By Attorney Fenstermaker	57 - 60			
18	By Attorney Roland	61 - 67			
19	CONCLUDING REMARKS				
20	By Chairman	67 - 68			
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

PROCEEDINGS

2 -----

CHAIRMAN:

Good morning. My name is Bill Ryan.

I'm Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

Before we begin, I would ask everyone to please turn off or at least put on silent your cell phones or other electronic devices. Thank you very much.

With us today is Jennifer Langan, representing State Treasurer Robert McCord; and Bob Coyne, representing Dan Meuser, the Secretary for the Department of Revenue. Thank you both for being here. All the members of the Board are present; therefore, I will formally call today's meeting to order. And I would ask everyone to please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. First, as always, some announcements. The Board held Executive Sessions on March 19th and April 1st for the purpose of conducting quasi judicial deliberations related to the awarding of a Category 2 Slot Machine License in the City of Philadelphia. We also held an Executive Session yesterday, April 8th,

for the purpose of discussing personnel matters and to conduct quasi judicial deliberations relating to matters being considered by the Board this morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would also like to, once again, remind everyone that the Board has scheduled a public input hearing concerning Endeka Entertainment's application for a Category 1 Slot Machine License at a facility proposed to be built in Lawrence County. The hearing will be held on May 8th, 2014, beginning at 10:00 a.m., at the Mahoning Township Community Center, 4512 West State Street, Hillsville, Pennsylvania. The purpose of the hearing is to permit individuals to learn more about the proposal, as well as to make comments about the proposal. Anyone wishing to speak at the public input hearing must register by May 6th, 2014. You can register by visiting the Board's website or by calling the Board Secretary, Mickey Kane, at (717)346-8325. All are welcome to submit written comments. Those comments should be addressed to the Board Secretary and can be mailed to PA Gaming Control Board, P.O. Box 69060, Harrisburg, PA, 17106. All comments received, whether written or oral, will become part of the record in the Endeka license application proceedings.

Next we will have consideration of a

motion to approve the minutes and transcript of the February 26th meeting. May I have such a motion?

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the minutes of the transcript of the February 26th, 2014 meeting.

CHAIRMAN:

Second?

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

13 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

Next we'll have our Executive Director's

17 Report, Kevin O'Toole. Kevin?

MR. O'TOOLE:

Good morning, Chairman and members of the Board. With me today, as you all know, is Kevin Kile, our Director of Racetrack Operations. We're very fortunate at the Board to have an Executive like Kevin, who is very knowledgeable and experienced in horse and harness racing.

Kevin has been the primary researcher

and author of all seven of our benchmark reports, which cover the racetrack industry in Pennsylvania, so I've asked Kevin to give a brief summary of the Seventh Annual Benchmark Report.

MR. KILE:

Good morning, Chairman and members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN:

Morning, Kevin.

MR. KILE:

As you all know, one of the primary objectives of the Gaming Act is to assist the horse and harness racing industries in Pennsylvania.

Approximately 11 percent of revenue generated from slot machine gaming was earmarked for the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Fund in 2013. As a result, more than \$209 million was earmarked specifically for the horseracing industry, to enhance purses, assist breeding operations and provide health and pension benefits for horsemen. In addition, the Category 1 Slot Machine Licensees are continuing to improve the infrastructure of the racetracks by investing \$6 million in 2013 and approximately \$52 million to date to improve the stable and backside areas of their racetracks. This has resulted in much needed

improvements to barns and related structures, which has enhanced the living and working conditions for horsemen and their employees.

This year's Benchmark Report closely examines trends and total dollars wagered on horseracing. Total dollars wagered on races held in Pennsylvania, also known as live racing handle, was four percent higher in 2013 compared to the same time period in 2012. This is due solely to an increase on wagering on Pennsylvania races by patrons outside the Commonwealth. In other words, racing fans located in neighboring jurisdictions wagered more on live races held at the six tracks here in PA.

At the same time, it's very important to note that the racing industry faces significant challenges. Although live racing handle increased slightly in 2013, taxable handle continues to steadily decrease year over year. In fact, taxable handle decreased by approximately eight percent in 2013 compared to the same time period last year. And this is mainly due to decreases in simulcast wagering on races held outside of the state. This trend is not unique to Pennsylvania, as wagering via simulcast has been on the decline throughout the rest of the country as well. As the information within this report

suggests, however, revenue generated from slot machine gaming continues to provide an overall positive impact on Pennsylvania races and continues to benefit agriculture within the Commonwealth. The report is available for public review and can be accessed from the Board's website directly on our homepage. Thank you very much. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you all have.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

MR. MOSCATO:

Just one, Bill. Kevin, a very nice

13 report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. KILE:

Thank you.

MR. MOSCATO:

Just one question, though, that regards the number of foals that are being born with both the thoroughbred and the standardbred.

MR. KILE:

Yes, sir.

MR. MOSCATO:

The number of foals seems to be down while the number of breeders seems to be on the increase.

MR. KILE:

Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

MR. MOSCATO:

Is there any correlation for that?

MR. KILE:

There is. The plus side is that more people are investing in Pennsylvania breeding throughout the state, as evidenced by the number of breeders who are receiving awards.

As you know, in the last couple of years the economy has been slow. And in the horse breeding industry, you do not realize an instant gain in the year in which the foal is born. So, due to downturns in the economy several years ago, the breeding industry is now seeing the impact of that, as we see less investment several years ago, and now we have less horses being bred which are racing at the tracks. As the economy improves, we expect that figure to increase or stabilize up to where it was three or four years ago.

MR. MOSCATO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. MCCALL:

I have one question.

CHAIRMAN:

Sure.

MR. MCCALL:

Kevin, one question as well. I'm wondering, do we track attendance numbers at these facilities to see how many people are attending? I know we don't probably get into the demographic of who's attending as far as age. You know, are we tracking young people to these races or not, and you know, is there a measure that we have to maybe talk to the operators to, you know, work on getting more people into these tracks, these facilities?

MR. KILE:

Attendance is tracked by the operators and reported to the Pennsylvania Horse and Harness Racing Commissions. Over the several past years, attendance has been rather stagnant. I believe it increased in 2012, but we may have saw another decrease in 2013.

The manner in which attendance is tracked at the casinos now is difficult, given that we do have casino patrons entering the casino as well.

So, right now I believe, according to the Racing Commission, that attendance is tracked by program sales, which can be rather difficult to have an accurate figure for actual attendance figures of folks

who are actually going to the races. It can be improved. Attendance definitely is a major factor, and we do track that. However, we also have to keep in mind that there's many other avenues to wager on racing beyond going to the track. You can wager on racing at the off-track wagering facilities throughout the Commonwealth, by phone wagering services offered by other racetrack operators and via internet. So, that also has a direct and indirect impact on attendance as well.

MR. MCCALL:

And the only way we collect handle is if the bet is in Pennsylvania, on a Pennsylvania horse or a Pennsylvania racetrack; correct? If I'm betting --- if I'm in Pennsylvania betting on a race in Jersey, we'll get handle on that; correct?

MR. KILE:

Correct.

MR. MCCALL:

But if somebody, conversely, is betting in New Jersey on a race in Pennsylvania, we don't get any handle on that?

MR. KILE:

The racetrack operator retains a portion of that wager, some of that wager ---.

			13
1		MR. MCCALL:	
2		Does any of that come to the	
3	Commonwealth?		
4		MR. KILE:	
5		Yes.	
6		MR. MCCALL:	
7		It does? Okay. So someone betting,	
8	again, in Cal:	ifornia on a Pennsylvania race?	
9		MR. KILE:	
10		That's not taxable.	
11		MR. MCCALL:	
12		Okay. Thank you.	
13		MR. KILE:	
14		The opposite is true.	
15		MR. MCCALL:	
16		The opposite is true; correct?	
17		MR. KILE:	
18		It's taxable, correct.	
19		<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>	
20		Dave?	
21		MR. WOODS:	
22		Just one question here. Race days	
23	versus non-rac	ce days on page three says in 2013 race)
24	days were 16 p	percent higher than compared to non-rac	ce
25	days. Not hav	ving seen the previous report, is that	a

trend that's been going on for the seven reports that you've been involved in.

MR. KILE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

We started tracking that several years ago, and we began to incorporate that again this year just to see if that trend was actually continuing. It's an important statistic to note. I mean, given that racing does provide an additional amenity in the casinos, in addition to conventions, hotels, restaurants, concerts that may be going on in the facilities, any offering that the casino can give the general public has a direct impact on gaming itself, such as slot machines and table games. So, this is a very important statistic to note. However, it's important to also note at the same time that it's holding all other factors constant. So, it doesn't take into consideration peak time, such as when racing is scheduled or other casino-related promotions that might have been taking place at the same time.

MR. WOODS:

So, we don't actually have a chart, though, that would show this over the last five to seven years?

MR. KILE:

No, but I can prepare that for you.

MR. WOODS:

2.2

2.3

We'd be interested in just a general impression if it's always up and if it's significant in a double digit or if this is unusual. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Greg.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Kevin, I think most members of the Board and people in this room are aware of the issues surrounding the funding of the Horse and Harness Racing Commissions now and that their funding via the horseracing is down. And could you explain, because we do live stream this --- there are people on the outside that may not be aware of that --- can you explain to the Board and the public how that money is calculated, where that money comes from, and talk a little bit about the decrease in that money to fund the Horse and Harness Racing Commissions over the last couple years? And I hate to put you on the spot. If you don't have that, we can do it later. But if you could just talk in generalities that would be fine.

MR. KILE:

Yeah. In general, I can give a brief overview. Horseracing in Pennsylvania and the

regulation of horseracing in Pennsylvania is funded right now, a hundred percent, by a portion of total dollars wagered within Pennsylvania. So, anywhere within Pennsylvania that a wager is placed, regardless of where the race takes place, is taxable within Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania Horse and Harness
Racing Commissions are funded a hundred percent by
that taxable revenue. So, as taxable revenue
decreases or taxable wagers decreases throughout
Pennsylvania, that has a direct impact on resources
available for the regulatory agency that's responsible
for horse and harness racing to carry out their duties
properly and strongly.

Decreases in revenue via simulcast wagering, as I mentioned before, is not unique to Pennsylvania, but it's creating very significant challenges because, again, it's limiting the resources available to be able to regulate industry itself.

Will simulcast wagering increase in the future? It hasn't for many years. So, it is a very significant challenge. And for everybody that's involved in the regulation of racing and the racing industry itself, needs to be cognizant of that and take appropriate action hopefully in the future.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you.

2.4

CHAIRMAN:

Kevin, a lot of people involved in the industry and the regulation of the industry don't like talking about it, but the reality is that the industry has been facing challenges for a number of years. And from everything I know, which admittedly isn't a whole lot, that challenge continues. Would that be an accurate statement?

MR. KILE:

It is. Although the live racing product is doing --- is stabilized due to slot machine gaming, in my opinion, the overall --- I guess the overall health of the industry nationwide, including Pennsylvania, is struggling.

CHAIRMAN:

And in fact, it probably would be accurate to say that, perhaps due to the revenue that the casinos produce, the industry is in better shape relatively in Pennsylvania than in a lot of other states.

MR. KILE:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN:

And in fact, there seems to be an indication from the fact that there's more interest outside the state to bet over simulcast on Pennsylvania races than interest within the state to bet on races elsewhere, that a quality of racing relative to the quality of racing --- the quality of racing here in PA relative to the quality of racing elsewhere probably is improving.

MR. KILE:

Absolutely. That's a trend we've seen for the last six, seven years.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you, Kevin. Anybody else? Thank you both.

Next our Human Resources Director, Claire Yantis. Good morning, Claire.

MS. YANTIS:

Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. The Office of Human Resources has one motion for your consideration today relative to the hiring of two individuals. First, Mr. Charles Leister has been selected for the position of Statistician with the Bureau of Gaming Laboratory Operations. Second, Mr. Michael Reardon has been selected as an Information Technology Generalist in the Office of Information

19

```
Technology. Both Mr. Leister and Mr. Reardon have
1
2
   completed the PGCB interview process, background
3
   investigation and drug screening and are recommended
4
   for hire by Chief Technology Officer Michael Cruz.
5
   Unless you have any questions, I ask that the Board
6
   consider a motion to hire these individuals as
   indicated.
                  CHAIRMAN:
9
                  Any questions or comments from the
10
   Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?
11
                  MR. MOSCATO:
12
                  Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
13
   approve the Applicants, as proposed by the Director of
14
   Human Resources.
15
                  MR. MCNALLY:
16
                  Second.
17
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  All in favor?
18
19
   ALL SAY AYE
20
                  CHAIRMAN:
2.1
                  Opposed? Motion carries.
22
                  MS. YANTIS:
23
                  Thank you.
2.4
                  CHAIRMAN:
25
                  Thank you, Claire. Next will be Dave
```

Rhen, our Director of Financial Management, for his report. Good morning.

MR. RHEN:

Good morning. Today's report covers expenses reported by PGCB through the third quarter of fiscal year 2013/'14. Spending to date this fiscal year totaled \$25,493,000 as of March 31st. Spending for the third quarter was \$9,271,000. Payroll expenses in the first three quarters totaled \$21,938,000 or 86.1 percent of total spending for the fiscal year, with salaries totaling \$19,911,000 and benefits totaling \$7,731,000 or 54 percent of salary expenses. Payroll for the third quarter alone was \$8,082,000.

Operating expenses reported in the third quarter totaled \$1,189,000, bringing the year-to-date total of operating expenses to \$3,387,000. Operating expenses were 12.8 percent of third-quarter spending and 13.3 percent of overall year-to-date spending.

Rentals and leases totaling \$1,377,000 is a large category of operating expenses to date and represents 40.7 percent of operating expenses for the year. The third-quarter rental expense was \$485,000.

The second largest category of operating expenses for the year is services, which contributed

\$258,000 to the quarter's operating expenses and \$978,000 year to date. This category represents 28.9 percent of year-to-date operating expenditures. Expenditures in the third quarter included IT consultant services of \$27,924, financial advisory services utilizing the Category 2 Applicant background investigations of \$49,100, software license costs of \$23,366 and interagency billings of \$22,000 for payroll preparation services this fiscal year.

The third largest category of year-to-date operating expenses was other operating expenditures, which accounted for \$359,000 or 10.6 percent of the total. Subscription costs for date of services using background investigations are the majority of this category. Recurring telecommunication costs of \$310,000 were the majority of our utility costs, which comprised 9.1 percent of operating expenses this year. And finally, travel expenses totaling \$244,000 represented 7.2 percent of operating expenses for the year. That concludes my report. And I'd be happy to take any questions if there are any.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? Thank you, David.

MR. RHEN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Appreciate it. Next, Office of Chief Counsel (OCC), Doug Sherman. Good morning.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. Today, the Board's agenda has one report and two petitions before it for consideration. Each of the matters will be considered on the documents. And the Board has, in advance of the meeting, been provided with the entire record in each case.

The first matter before the Board is the report received from the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) relative to a Rule to Show Cause previously issued by the Board and served upon James D. Schneller and Eastern Pennsylvania Citizens Against Gambling. At issue is whether Mr. Schneller and his group should be allowed to continue to practice and conduct business with the Board based upon their general moral opposition to gambling.

Not including filings attempted to be made with the Board's Clerk, which were returned as procedurally defective, since 2011, Mr. Schneller and the Eastern Pennsylvania Citizens Against Gambling

have filed no less than 26 separate Petitions to Intervene, to stay proceedings, and to have Board decisions reconsidered. The underlying basis of these attempts to become a party in the various proceedings has been the asserted moral and religious opposition to gambling. The Board has consistently found that such opposition does not support intervention in the proceedings, and the Commonwealth Court has upheld the Board repeatedly on that same basis.

Notwithstanding the continued lack of standing, as well as admonitions from both the Board and Commonwealth Court, given his careless and oftentimes indecipherable pleadings and speeches to the Board, Mr. Schneller has continued to make filings with this Board without a legally sufficient basis for doing so and with complete indifference toward the Board and the Court's prior precedent.

Most recently, Mr. Schneller has filed six Petitions to Intervene in the Category 2 licensing proceedings in Philadelphia, upon the same moral opposition. The Board denied those petitions at its September 18th, 2013 meeting.

On the same date, the Board issued a Rule to Show Cause, directing Mr. Schneller and his group to appear before the Board's OHA and explain why

they should be allowed to continue to practice before the Board. After continuances requested by Mr. Schneller, the Rule to Show Cause hearing was held on January 17th, 2014. Both Mr. Schneller and the Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) appeared at the hearing and addressed the Hearing Officer.

In addition, both parties filed posthearing briefs. And the transcript of that hearing,
along with the briefs and all materials filed, along
with the report, which contains Findings of Fact of
the hearing, have been submitted to the Board prior to
this meeting. And it's now appropriate for the Board
to take up a motion considering the continued ability
of Mr. Schneller to practice before this Board.

CHAIRMAN:

Board?

Any questions or comments from the

MR. FAJT:

I'd like to make one comment, Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Board, I think, reluctantly, you know, takes the move that we do today. We have bent over backwards to be hospitable and respectful to Mr. Schneller over the years. He has appeared before this Board numerous times, as Chief Counsel has outlined. And the thing that really

kind of started pushing me the other day was when we 1 2 had --- or a couple months ago was when we had lawyers 3 for the opposing parties to Mr. Schneller come before this Board and talk about the amount of money that 5 they had to expend to respond to his speeches, arguments and pleadings before this Board. And it got me to thinking about the amount of time that this Board, both as a Board and also as our lawyers and 9 other folks in the Agency have spent on these matters. 10 And again, reluctantly I think we are at this point, 11 but enough is enough, and I'm prepared to vote to ---12 in favor of this motion. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Keith?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCCALL:

Just a point of clarification for the record. This motion is pretty surgical, though, isn't it?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Yes, it is.

MR. MCCALL:

It only applies to Mr. Schneller for any arguments that he makes before this Board based on morals and religion. If he wants to argue suitability or any other facts that come before the Board, he

would still have that opportunity. We're just saying you can't make this argument before this Board based on moral and religious concerns; is that correct?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

That's exactly right. The requirements for legal standing to participate before an administrative board like this would be that they have to establish the existence of a direct, substantial interest of Mr. Schneller separate from that of, you know, what the general population would have or something more like his moral opposition. He would have to show that the matter that is at issue before the Board that he would want to intervene in, if granted, would actually cause some type of tangible or punitive harm to him.

MR. MCCALL:

Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIRMAN:

Anyone else? I haven't been on the Board as long as my colleague, Mr. Fajt, has, but I've been on the Board long enough to know that what he says is true. And what you have just said, Mr. Sherman, is also true. And I would concur completely that enough is enough. And I would simply ask you, have you or, to your knowledge, has anyone else in the

agency ever had contact with any human being who claims to be a member of the Eastern PA Citizens Against Gambling?

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Not other than Mr. Schneller. He is the only individual who has ever come on behalf of the organization. He has been asked in the past to identify the members. He has steadfastly refused to do that, claiming that their anonymity is necessary to protect their rights. We note that we have identified other groups that allegedly is associated with, litigating matters in other courts, unrelated to gaming. And curiously, those groups also are identified as having 150 anonymous members, also.

CHAIRMAN:

All right. Any other questions?

MR. MCNALLY:

Just a question real quick. You know, I want to make sure that everybody understands here and outward, this motion that we're making, this decision, is not to diminish Mr. Schneller's position, his moral beliefs about gaming. I think we take that all very seriously because our number one purpose here is to protect the public. So, I just want to make sure the people understand that we understand it, but we can

take judicial notice that on virtually everything we do Mr. Schneller is going to object. So, with that in mind, I just wanted to make that point.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, John. Anyone else?

Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that, based upon Mr. Schneller's past conduct before this Board, as summarized by the OCC, I move that the Board bar Eastern PA Citizens Against Gambling and James Schneller from practicing before this Board.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

17 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

The next matter and somewhat ironic and yet a cleanup from things that are hanging out there is a petition by James Schneller and Eastern Pennsylvania Citizens Against Gambling. Actually, it's an appeal of the OHA's January 14th, 2014 Order,

29

```
which denied a request to stay the Category 2
1
2
   licensing proceedings in Philadelphia. Again, the
3
   asserted basis was the general opposition to gambling.
   As the Board has barred Mr. Schneller and Eastern
 4
5
   Pennsylvania Citizens Against Gambling from using that
   as a basis for standing before the Board, we would
6
   recommend that the Board consider a motion to deny his
   appeal as moot.
9
                  CHAIRMAN:
10
                  Any questions, comments from the Board?
11
   Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?
12
                  MR. MCCALL:
                  Mr. Chairman, I'd move that the Board
13
14
   deny James D. Schneller and Eastern Pennsylvania
15
   Citizens Against Gambling's appeal as moot, as
16
   described by the OCC.
17
                  MS. KAISER:
18
                  Second.
19
                  CHAIRMAN:
20
                  All in favor?
21
   ALL SAY AYE
22
                  CHAIRMAN:
23
                  Opposed? The motion carries.
2.4
                  ATTORNEY SHERMAN:
25
                  The final petition before the Board
```

today is Jason Hannon's Petition for Removal from the Board's Exclusion List.

By way of background, on December 3rd, 2011, Mr. Hannon left his 12-year-old son unattended in his car at Hollywood Casino for 30 minutes while he gambled inside the facility. As a result of the incident, Mr. Hannon was permanently evicted from Penn National Hollywood Casino and charged with one count of disorderly conduct, to which he pled guilty one week later.

Upon learning of the incident, the OEC filed a petition on January 3rd, 2012, requesting that Mr. Hannon be placed on the Board's Exclusion List. Subsequently, Mr. Hannon requested a hearing, which was held during February of 2012. And at that hearing, Mr. Hannon testified and explained his actions, as well as placed a substantial amount of evidence into the record concerning his good character.

Upon completion of the hearing, the Hearing Officer issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that Mr. Hannon be placed on the Exclusion List but be allowed to petition for removal after one year. The Board adopted that recommendation on April 11th, 2012.

It has now been nearly two years since 1 2 his placement on the list, and Mr. Hannon is now 3 requesting to be removed from the Exclusion List. The 4 OEC has no objection to the request, and it's ready 5 for the Board's consideration. 6 CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments from the 8 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 9 MS. KAISER: 10 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 11 grant Jason Hannon's request to be removed from the Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OCC. 12 13 MR. FAJT: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 All in favor? 17 ALL SAY AYE 18 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Motion carries. 19 20 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 21 Next, presenting Surrenders and one 22 Report and Recommendation is Deputy Chief Counsel 2.3 Steve Cook. 24 ATTORNEY COOK: 25 Good morning.

CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Good morning, Steve.

ATTORNEY COOK:

The Board has received two unopposed petitions to surrender licenses, specifically the Principal License of Francesco Dominic Cecchini, who has resigned from his position on the Board of Directors of GTECH, as well as the Principal Entity License of Cannery Casino Resort Finance Corp., an affiliate of Washington Trotting Association, which has now dissolved. The OEC has no objection to either of these surrenders. As a result, 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. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the surrenders, as described by the OCC.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

25 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Next before the Board for consideration is one Report and Recommendation received from the OHA. The Report and Recommendation pertains to an individual with the initials L.F. and her petition to recover winnings while on the Self-Exclusion List. The Report and Recommendation, along with the complete evidentiary record in this matter, has been provided to the Board in advance of this meeting.

Additionally, L.F. has been notified that the Board would take up the matter today and that she had the right to come forward and briefly address the Board. If this woman is present in the room today, I would ask her to come forward at this time.

Briefly, L.F. is requesting the Board issue an Order allowing her to collect a jackpot that she won at a Pennsylvania casino while still on the Self-Exclusion List. On March 1st, 2012, L.F. entered Parx Casino, met with a Casino Compliance representative, and requested to be placed on the Board's Voluntary Self-Exclusion List for a period of one year.

The Casino Compliance representative

conducted the mandatory interview with this woman and completed all of the required procedures, which included a checklist explaining what happens when one is placed on the list, as well as an explanation that if one is placed on the list for a year, as this woman was recommending, that she is not automatically removed from the list after a year but remains on the list until she requests removal. A copy of the checklist and the paperwork that was reviewed with L.F. was given to her at the conclusion of the meeting.

On September 9th, 2013, 18 months after being placed on the Exclusion List, but prior to requesting removal from the list, L.F. was at Parx Casino and won a \$10,000 jackpot while gambling. Parx refused to pay the jackpot and, instead, as required by Board regulations, the money was provided to the Board to support compulsive and problem gambling programs. As a result of this action, L.F. filed the petition at issue.

A hearing was held on January 14th, 2014, before a Board Hearing Officer. At that time, L.F. testified that she had been to Parx and gamed on several occasions during her one-year exclusion and even after her one-year exclusion but while still on

the list. During her testimony she essentially blamed Parx and the Board for not noticing her being on the floor prior to winning the \$10,000 jackpot and essentially indicated that it was both the Board, staff's and Parx's fault that this situation had arisen.

The Report and Recommendation subsequently issued --- in that Report and Recommendation the Hearing Officer recommends that L.F. not be allowed to obtain this jackpot in that she was, in fact, still on the Self-Excluded List at the time the jackpot was won.

the Report and Recommendation, basically reiterating her prior arguments, as well as indicating that, as somebody with a compulsive gambling problem, she didn't have the competence needed to essentially enter into a contract with the Board and with the casino to not enter onto the casino. She really couldn't help her actions.

The Report and Recommendation, as well as those exceptions, are presently before the Board. The OCC would recommend that the Board agree with the Hearing Officer and uphold the Report and Recommendation. The matter is now ripe.

1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 3 4 MR. WOODS: 5 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 6 adopt the Report and Recommendation, as described by the OCC and that L.F. be precluded from receiving 8 winnings at issue. 9 CHAIRMAN: Second? 10 11 MR. MOSCATO: 12 Second. 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 All in favor? 15 ALL SAY AYE 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Opposed? The motion carries. 18 you, gentlemen. 19 Next, we'll have Susan Hensel, the 20 Director of the Bureau of Licensing. Good morning,

21 Susan.

22

MS. HENSEL:

23 Thank you, Chairman Ryan and members of 24 the Board. Before the Board today will be motions 25 regarding Slot Machine and Table Game Manufacturers,

as well as 520 Principal Key Gaming and Non-Gaming Employees. In addition, there will be the consideration of 12 Gaming Service Provider Applicants.

The first matter for your consideration are the renewals of Manufacturer Licenses. For each Applicant, 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 Reports. The Applicants are Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. for Slot Machine and Table Games Manufacturer Licenses and Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Limited for a Table Game Manufacturer License.

Aristocrat Technologies is a Nevada corporation that manufactures, among other products, slot machines and table game management systems.

Aristocrat Technologies Australia is an Australian corporation, which also produces slot machines and other gaming-related equipment.

With respect to the Table Game

Manufacturer License, Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.

has asked that the Board grant it a reduced licensing

fee. The fee for renewal of a Manufacturer License is

\$90,000 for a three-year renewal. Under the Gaming

Act, the Board may modify the 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 reduced licensing fee policy, which has previously been presented to the Board. Aristocrat has requested a reduced fee of \$10,000 for a three-year renewal, which is consistent with the Bureau's policy. The Bureau of Licensing recommends that the Board grant the reduced fee.

I have provided you with draft Orders and ask that the Board consider approval of the licenses described, as well as the reduced table game licensing fee for Aristocrat Technologies. I ask that you consider the licenses separately, beginning with the Slot Machine and Table Game Manufacturer Licenses for Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.

CHAIRMAN:

2.1

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?

	39
1	MR. MOSCATO:
2	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
3	approve the Slot Machine and Table Game Manufacturer
4	Licenses for Aristocrat Technologies, Inc., as
5	described by the Bureau of Licensing.
6	MR. MCNALLY:
7	Second.
8	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
9	All in favor?
10	ALL SAY AYE
11	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
12	Opposed? The motion carries.
13	MS. HENSEL:
14	Next would be Aristocrat Australia Pty
15	Limited.
16	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
17	Any?
18	ATTORNEY PITRE:
19	Enforcement Counsel has no objection.
20	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
21	Thank you. Question, comments from the
22	Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?
23	MR. MCNALLY:
24	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
25	approve the Slot Machine Manufacturer License for

40 Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Limited, as 1 2 described by the Bureau of Licensing. 3 MR. MCCALL: Second. 4 5 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 6 7 ALL SAY AYE 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 Opposed? Motion carries. 10 MS. HENSEL: 11 Also for your consideration is the approval of Principal and Key Employee Licenses. 12 Prior to this meeting, the Bureau of Licensing 13 14 provided you with a proposed Order for one Principal 15 and three Key Employee Licenses for Category 1 and 16 Manufacturer Licensees. I ask that the Board consider 17 the Order approving the licenses. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 2.1 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. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 1 2 approve the issuance of Principal and Key Employee 3 Licenses, as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 4 MS. KAISER: 5 Second. 6 CHAIRMAN: 7 All in favor. ALL SAY AYE 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 Opposed? The motion carries. 11 MS. HENSEL: 12 Next, there are Temporary, Principal and 13 Key Employee Licenses. Prior to this meeting, the 14 Bureau of Licensing provided you with an Order 15 regarding the issuance of Temporary Licenses for seven Principal and 13 Key Employees. I ask that the Board 16 17 consider an Order approving the licenses. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 2.1 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 MS. KAI<u>SER:</u>

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 1 2 approve the issuance of Temporary, Principal and Key 3 Employee credentials, as described by the Bureau of 4 Licensing. 5 MR. FAJT: 6 Second. CHAIRMAN: 8 All in favor? 9 ALL SAY AYE 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 Opposed? The motion carries. 12 MS. HENSEL: 13 There are also Gaming Permits and 14 Non-Gaming Registrations. Prior to this meeting, the 15 Bureau of Licensing provided you with a list of 386 16 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted Temporary 17 or Full Occupation Permits and 83 individuals to whom 18 the Bureau has granted registrations under the 19 authority delegated to the Bureau of Licensing. I ask 20 that the Board consider a motion approving the Order. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 23 ATTORNEY PITRE: 2.4 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 25 CHAIRMAN:

43 Any questions or comments from the 1 2 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? Board? 3 MR. FAJT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 4 5 approve the issuance of Gaming Employee Permits and 6 Non-Gaming Employee Registrations, as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 8 MR. WOODS: 9 Second. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 All in favor? 12 ALL SAY AYE 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 Opposed? Motion carries. 15 MS. HENSEL: 16 Also for your consideration are 17 Withdrawal Requests for Gaming and Non-Gaming 18 Employees. In each case, the license, permit or 19 registration is no longer required. For today's 20 meeting, I provided the Board with a list of 20 Gaming and 7 Non-Gaming Withdrawals for approval. I ask that 21 22 the Board consider the Order approving the 2.3 Withdrawals.

CHAIRMAN:

2.4

25

Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments from the

5 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
approve the Withdrawals, as described by the Bureau of

9 Licensing.

1

2

3

6

10 CHAIRMAN:

11 Second?

MR. MOSCATO:

13 Second.

14 CHAIRMAN:

15 All in favor?

16 ALL SAY AYE

17 CHAIRMAN:

18 Opposed? The motion carries.

MS. HENSEL:

In addition, we have an Order to certify

21 the following Gaming Service Provider, Lighthouse

22 | Electric Company, Inc. I ask that the Board consider

23 the Order approving the Gaming Service Provider for

24 certification.

25 CHAIRMAN:

45 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 1 2 ATTORNEY PITRE: 3 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Ouestions or comments from the Board? 6 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? MR. MOSCATO: 8 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 9 issue an Order to approve the applications for Gaming Service Provider Certification, as described by the 10 11 Bureau of Licensing. 12 MR. MCNALLY: Second. 13 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 16 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Opposed? The motion carries. 19 MS. HENSEL: 20 Next for your consideration are Gaming Service Provider Registrations. The Bureau of 21 22 Licensing provided you with an Order and attached list 23 of ten registered Gaming Service Provider Applicants. 24 I ask that the Board consider the Order registering 25 these Gaming Service Providers.

1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 3 ATTORNEY PITRE: Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 4 5 CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments from the Board? 6 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 8 MR. MCNALLY: 9 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 10 issue an Order to approve the applications for Gaming 11 Service Provider Registrations, as described by the 12 Bureau of Licensing. 13 MR. MCCALL: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 All in favor? 17 ALL SAY AYE 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Opposed? The motion carries. 20 MS. HENSEL: 21 Finally, we have a recommendation of 22 denial for Philadelphia Music Connection, Inc.'s 23 Gaming Service Provider Application. Prior to this 24 meeting, the Bureau of Licensing provided you with an

order addressing this Applicant, who the OEC has

25

47 recommended for denial. The Applicant failed to 1 2 request a hearing within the specified time period. Ι 3 ask that the Board consider the Order denying 4 Philadelphia Music Connection, Inc.'s Gaming Service 5 Provider Application. 6 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 8 ATTORNEY PITRE: 9 Enforcement Counsel would continue to 10 request denial in this matter. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Any questions or comments from the 13 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 14 MR. MCCALL: 15 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the denial of Philadelphia 16 17 Amusement Connection, Inc.'s Gaming Service Provider 18 Application, as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 19 MS. KAISER: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All in favor? 2.3 ALL SAY AYE 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 Opposed? The motion carries.

MS. HENSEL:

That concludes the matters of the Bureau of Licensing.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Susan. Next, we have the OEC. Cyrus?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

We have nine matters for the Board's consideration today, one Revocation and eight Involuntary Exclusions. The first three matters on the agenda will be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel Jim Armstrong.

CHAIRMAN:

Good morning, Jim.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

17 James Armstrong for the OEC. It's A-R-M-S-T-R-O-N-G.

Good morning, Chairman, Commissions.

The first matter before you is a motion to consider the revocation of Mr. Christopher Roulhac's Gaming 19

20 Permit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

21

22

23

24

25

Commissioners, on August 19th of 2013, the OEC filed a Revocation Complaint with the Board against Mr. Roulhac. The basis of the complaint was Mr. Roulhac committing thefts while employed by SugarHouse Casino as a bartender at the Lucky Red Bar. On April 30th of 2013, Mr. Roulhac came under suspicion that he was stealing from SugarHouse Casino. He was placed under surveillance. The investigation revealed Mr. Roulhac was improperly ringing up sales and placing the money in his tip jar. The Pennsylvania State Police were notified, but at the request of SugarHouse personnel, he was not charged criminally.

2.4

Mr. Roulhac was terminated from
SugarHouse Casino and is not presently employed in the
Pennsylvania Gaming Industry. Mr. Roulhac was served
by regular and certified mail with the Revocation
Complaint. Mr. Roulhac did not request a hearing in
regard to the complaint. Mr. Roulhac has now properly
been served by the OEC's request for judgment upon
default, and he has not responded in any way. Based
on the foregoing, the OEC requests the Board revoke
Mr. Roulhac's Non-Gaming Employee Registration at this
time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Chris Roulhac in the hearing room?

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

MS. KAISER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

issue an Order to approve the revocation of Chris Roulhac's Non-Gaming Employee Registration, as described by the OEC.

MR. FAJT:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you. Chairman and Commissioners, the next matter on the agenda is a motion to consider a Board Order to add Borys Boretsky to the Board's Involuntary Exclusion List.

On August 14th of 2013, the OEC filed a petition for placement on the Exclusion List with the Board against Borys Boretsky. The basis for the petition was Mr. Boretsky being charged by the Pennsylvania State Police a number of times with theft and trespassing at SugarHouse Casino, Parx Casino and Harrah's between 2008 and 2013.

On February 19th of 2013, Mr. Boretsky was captured on surveillance coverage stealing a voucher valued at \$330.35 from a patron playing slots

at SugarHouse Casino. The patron had inadvertently left the voucher in one machine and left the machine to play another. When he did this, Mr. Boretsky went up to the machine and cashed out the forgotten voucher. Pennsylvania State Police investigated the theft and recovered the patron's money. The patron did not want to prosecute Mr. Boretsky. Mr. Boretsky was permanently evicted from SugarHouse Casino.

2.4

The Pennsylvania State Police
investigation revealed that Mr. Boretsky was involved
in four other similar stealing incidents over the past
five years, two occurring at Parx Casino and two
occurring at Harrah's. The Pennsylvania State Police
recommended Mr. Boretsky to the Bureau of Casino
Compliance and the OEC for placement on the Board's
Exclusion List. Mr. Boretsky was properly served by
regular and certified mail with the petition. Mr.
Boretsky did not request a hearing in regard to the
petition. Mr. Boretsky was properly served with the
OEC's request for judgment upon default and has not
responded in any way. Based on the foregoing, the OEC
requests that the Board place Mr. Boretsky on the
Board's Involuntary Exclusion List at this time.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Borys Boretsky in the hearing room?

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

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of Borys Boretsky to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OEC.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

12 ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the next matter is a motion to consider a Board Order to add Michael Ware to the Board's Involuntary

Exclusion List. On August 23rd of 2013, the OEC filed a petition for placement on the Exclusion List with the Board against Mr. Ware. The basis for the petition was Mr. Ware being charged by the Pennsylvania State Police a number of times with theft and trespassing at SugarHouse Casino.

On May 8th of last year, the

Pennsylvania State Police reported to the Bureau of Casino Compliance that they investigated and charged Mr. Ware with theft and trespassing on six occasions at SugarHouse Casino for stealing from patrons and trespassing at SugarHouse Casino between January 15th of 2012 and May 4th of 2013. Mr. Ware has been permanently evicted from SugarHouse Casino. Mr. Ware was charged five times with trespassing and with three charges of theft. He has been convicted a number of times. Mr. Ware also failed to appear in Court last summer and Bench Warrants were issued for his arrest. On August 21st of 2013 he was arrested again at SugarHouse Casino for trespassing. He was turned over to the custody of the Philadelphia Police, based on the warrants that were outstanding for him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Commissioners, Mr. Ware was properly served by regular and certified mail with the petition. Mr. Ware did not request a hearing in regard to the petition. And Mr. Ware was properly served with the OEC's request for judgment upon default, and he has not responded to it in any way. Based on the foregoing, the OEC requests that Mr. Ware be placed on the Board's Involuntary Exclusion List at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

54 Is Michael Ware in the hearing room? 1 2 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 3 4 MR. WOODS: Mr. Chairman, I'd move that the Board 5 6 issue an Order to approve the addition of Michael Ware to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OEC. 9 CHAIRMAN: Second? 10 11 MR. MOSCATO: 12 Second. 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 All in favor? 15 ALL SAY AYE 16 CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion carries. 17 18 ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 19 Thank you. 20 ATTORNEY PITRE: 21 The next matter on the agenda will be 22 presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel Dustin 2.3 Miller. 24 ATTORNEY MILLER: 25 Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of

the Board. Dustin Miller on behalf of the OEC. The next matter today is a request for placement on the Board's Excluded Persons List involving Jemal Kavtuashvilli.

The OEC filed a petition to place Mr.

Kavtuashvilli on the Exclusion List for cheating while playing Spanish 21 at Parx Casino on August 3rd and 4th, 2013. At approximately 1:15 a.m. in the morning on August 4th, 2014, Mr. Kavtuashvilli was caught past posting a \$50 Match the Dealer wager while playing Spanish 21 at Parx Casino. The dealer spotted Mr. Kavtuashvilli's past post and refused to honor the wager. Mr. Kavtuashvilli was ejected from the casino for a 48-hour period for his actions.

The Parx Casino surveillance department subsequently reviewed Mr. Kavtuashvilli's wagering activity prior to the incident. The review found that Mr. Kavtuashvilli either past posted or capped wagers on eight separate occasions before being caught. The illegal wagers allowed Mr. Kavtuashvilli to win \$910 that he should not have won.

Mr. Kavtuashvilli returned to Parx

Casino on August 6th, 2013 and was arrested by on-site

Pennsylvania State Police for his illegal wagers on

August 3rd and 4th. Mr. Kavtuashvilli was charged

with eight criminal violations of the Gaming Act for his actions on August 3rd and 4th.

On December 2nd, 2013, Mr. Kavtuashvilli entered the ARD program for a one-year period to resolve these criminal charges. A condition of Mr. Kavtuashvilli's placement in the ARD program was that he not be allowed to enter any Pennsylvania casino.

The petition to place Mr. Kavtuashvilli

on the Exclusion List was properly served upon Mr.

Kavtuashvilli to his home address by both certified and first-class mail. Mr. Kavtuashvilli did not respond to the filing in any way. Due to Mr.

Kavtuashvilli's failure to respond, the averments in the petition are deemed to be admitted as fact and his right to a hearing has been waived.

On March 6th, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter judgment upon default. The matter is now before the Board to consider the placement of Jamel Kavtuashvilli on the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Jamel Kavtuashvilli in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. MOSCATO:

57

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 1 2 issue an Order to approve the addition of Jamel 3 Kavtuashvilli to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List, 4 as described by the OEC. 5 MR. MCNALLY: 6 Second. CHAIRMAN: 8 All in favor? 9 ALL SAY AYE 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 Opposed? The motion carries. 12 ATTORNEY MILLER: 13 Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Thank you. 16 ATTORNEY PITRE: 17 The next two matters on the agenda will 18 be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel 19 Cassandra Fenstermaker. 20 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER: 21 Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of 22 the Board. I'm Cassandra Fenstermaker, 23 F-E-N-S-T-E-R-M-A-K-E-R. I have today for the Board's 24 consideration two Exclusion Petitions which arise from 25 the same incident at Harrah's Philadelphia Casino and

Racetrack. So, with your permission, I'll address the facts together, and then present each petition individually for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN:

That's fine.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

On September 21st, 2013, a patron contacted Harrah's to report a missing cell phone. A surveillance review discovered that Thao Thanh Ha had found the cell phone in question and had given it to Phong Hoang Truong, who then placed it in his jacket pocket. The two were questioned by the Pennsylvania State Police regarding the theft, at which time it was determined that Mr. Truong had presented false identification to Harrah's security and was under the age of 21.

As a result, on December 13th, 2013, the OEC filed a petition to place Thao Thanh Ha on the Board's Exclusion List as a result of her actions while patronizing Harrah's Casino. The complaint was sent to Ms. Ha by first-class and certified mail. Ms. Ha failed to respond to the complaint in any way, and therefore, all facts alleged in the complaint are deemed admitted. A request to enter judgment upon default was filed on February 10th, 2014. And at this

time, the OEC requests that Ms. Ha be added to the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Thao Thanh Ha present in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of Thao Thanh Ha to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OEC.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

Now, the petition regarding Phong Hoang Truong. On December 13th, 2013, the OEC filed a petition to place Phong Hoang Truong on the Board's Exclusion List as a result of his actions while patronizing Harrah's Casino. A complaint was sent to Mr. Truong by first-class and certified mail. Mr.

Truong failed to respond to the complaint in any way
and, therefore, all facts alleged in the complaint are
deemed admitted.

A request to enter judgment upon default was filed on February 10th, 2014. And at this time, the OEC requests that Mr. Truong be added to the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Phong Hoang Truong present in the hearing room? 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 approve the addition of Phong Hoang Truong to the PGCB's Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OEC.

MS. KAISER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

21 ALL SAY AYE

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

And the final three matters on the Board's agenda will be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel Michael Roland.

ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Michael Roland, R-O-L-A-N-D, with the OEC. The next matter is a request to place Joseph Croughin on the Board's Excluded Persons List. The OEC filed a petition to place Mr. Croughin on the Exclusion List because he gained access to the gaming floor at Sands Casino while under the age of 21. Mr. Croughin was 19 at the time.

A surveillance review indicated Mr.

Croughin was asked for identification, provided it, and it was successfully scanned by security when he gained access to the floor. It was later discovered that he used another individual's legitimate identification card. Mr. Croughin was on the gaming floor for a total of five hours and five minutes. He was served and consumed seven unknown beverages. He engaged in both table game play and slot machine play. And the petition was properly served upon Mr. Croughin

to the address listed on the criminal complaint filed against him. And that was, again, by both certified and first-class mail. Mr. Croughin did not respond to the filing in any way. And due to Mr. Croughin's failure to respond, the averments in the petition are deemed to be admitted as fact, and his right to a hearing has been waived.

On February the 4th, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter judgment upon default. The matter is now before the Board to consider the placing of Joseph Croughin on the Board's Excluded Persons List.

Mr. Croughin was charged first under our Act, Title 4, specifically under Section 1518(a)(13). He was also charged under the Vehicle Code for exhibiting or displaying another person's driver's license. And he was also charged under the Crimes Code with disorderly conduct. He has entered a guilty plea to all three of those.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Joseph Croughin in the hearing room?

Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio

members? May I have a motion?

MS. KAISER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of Joseph

Croughin to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board's Involuntary Exclusion List, as described by the OEC.

MR. FAJT:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY ROLAND:

The next matter is a request to place
Najila Smith on the Board's Excluded Persons List.
The OEC filed a petition to place Ms. Smith on the
Exclusion List because she gained access to Sands
Casino gaming floor after entering through the
licensed facility's bus entrance while she was still
20 years of age. Ms. Smith removed one of the
security ropes from the stanchion and entered the
gaming floor while Sands security officers were busy
assisting other patrons. Ms. Smith was originally
denied access to the casino when her identification
was inspected and scanned by the Sands security
officers, revealing that she was only 20 years of age.
Ms. Smith was on the gaming floor for approximately
eight minutes. She did not consume any alcoholic

beverages, nor did she game during that time. After providing multiple fake names and addresses, Ms. Smith was transported to Northampton County Prison and was unable to post collateral in the amount of \$445. Ms. Smith spent 12 days in Northampton County Prison, and jail time compensation was agreed upon by the Magisterial District Judge.

The petition was properly served upon Ms. Smith to the address listed on the criminal complaint and her driver's license by both certified and first-class mail. Ms. Smith did not respond to the filing in any way. Due to Ms. Smith's failure to respond, the averments in the petition are deemed to be admitted as fact, and her right to a hearing has been waived.

On February 4th, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter judgment upon default. The matter is now before the Board to consider the placement of Najila Smith on the Board's Excluded Persons List.

Despite her actually gaining access to the gaming floor, the only charge that was filed against her was public drunkenness. And in the recitation of facts, you heard me indicate that she did not consume alcohol during the eight minutes on the gaming floor. She actually showed up to the

facility already intoxicated. She has since entered a guilty plea to that charge.

CHAIRMAN:

Is Najila Smith in the hearing room?

Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio

members? May I have a motion?

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of Najila Smith to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion list, as described by the OEC.

MR. WOODS:

13 Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

16 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY ROLAND:

And the last matter we have is a request to place Yadira Torres on the Board's Excluded Persons List. The OEC filed a petition to place Ms. Torres on the Exclusion List because she was allegedly involved in passing 35 counterfeit \$50 bills at Sands Casino.

A soft count manager initially discovered 17 of those

counterfeit bills while conducting a table count. The counterfeits were identified by two reoccurring serial numbers. All 35 of the counterfeit bills were ultimately discovered in the drop boxes of three table games which Ms. Torres and a male partner gamed. The surveillance conducted a review of the tables where the counterfeits were passed, and video footage presented Ms. Torres and her partner buying in with the counterfeit money.

The petition was properly served upon Ms. Torres to the address listed on the criminal complaint by both certified and first-class mail. Ms. Torres did not respond to the filing in any way. Due to Ms. Torres' failure to respond, the averments in the petition are deemed to be admitted as fact, and her right to a hearing has been waived.

On March the 13th, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter judgment upon default. The matter is now before the Board to consider the placement of Yadira Torres on the Board's Excluded Persons List.

Ms. Torres was charged first with forgery, then theft by deception, conspiracy of both. The disposition of the case, those charges are still pending. And her partner is going to be coming before you shortly.

There was a problem with service. So, I just wanted

67 to assure the Board we have both of them. 1 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 Thank you. Is Yadira Torres in the 4 hearing room? Any questions or comments from the 5 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 6 MR. WOODS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the addition of Yadira 8 Torres to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List, as 9 10 described by the OEC. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Second? 13 MR. MOSCATO: 14 Second. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 All in favor? 17 ALL SAY AYE 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Opposed? The motion carries. 20 you. 21 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 22 Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN: 24 Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes 25 today's meeting. Our next scheduled public meeting

```
will be on Wednesday April 30th. The meeting will
1
2
   begin at 10:00 a.m. Any final comments from the
3
   Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion to
4
   adjourn?
5
                  MR. MOSCATO:
6
                  Mr. Chairman, it pleases me to make a
   motion to adjourn this revered panel.
8
                  MR. MCNALLY:
9
                  Second.
10
                  CHAIRMAN:
11
                  Thank you all very much. And ladies and
12
   gentlemen, thank you.
13
14
               MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:00 A.M.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Ryan was reported by me on 4/9/2014 and that I Rhonda K. Thorpe read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.