### COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### GAMING CONTROL BOARD

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

IN RE: GTECH USA, LLC; GTECH CANADA, LLC; GTECH CORP.

and IGT CONCERNING PROPOSED CHANGE OF CONTROL

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

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 State Treasurer Robert

McCord; Robert Coyne representing

Secretary of the Department of Revenue

Daniel Meuser

HEARING: Wednesday, December 10, 2014

10:05 a.m.

LOCATION: Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

Strawberry Square Complex, Second Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101

Reporter: Cynthia Piro-Simpson

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

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	OPENING REMARKS	
4	By Chairman	5 - 6
5	PRESENTATION	
6	By Attorney Jones	7
7	By Mr. Orchard	7 - 10
8	By Attorney Jones	10 - 13
9	QUESTIONS	
10	By Attorney Roland	14 - 23
11	COMMENTS	
12	By Attorney Roland	23 - 25
13	QUESTIONS BY BOARD	25 - 32
14	CLOSING REMARKS	
15	By Chairman	32 - 33
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

### PROCEEDINGS

2 | ------

### CHAIRMAN:

1

3

23

24

25

Thank you very much. Before we get into 4 5 our regular agenda we will have one public hearing. The public hearing involves the Joint Petition of 6 GTECH USA, LLC; GTECH Canada ULC; GTECH Corp and IGT concerning a merger of IGT into the GTECH companies. I will note at the outset the Board's primary concern 10 with this proposed transaction is that once 11 consummated the market leading provider of slot machines to Pennsylvania casinos, IGT, will be 12 13 affiliated with GTECH, which is the company that 14 operates the Commonwealth's central control computer 15 system, the system charged with monitoring slot 16 machines in Pennsylvania. As a result I would ask the 17 parties to not only explain the proposed transaction, 18 but also to please provide the Board with any and all 19 measures put into place to preserve the integrity of 20 the central control computer system. I see all representatives of GTECH and IGT and OEC are also 21 22 present.

I would ask anyone who is a non-attorney and who is going to speak or testify to please be sworn before we begin. Are there any, Counsel? All

# 1 ATTORNEY JONES: 2 Understood, will do. Luke Orchard, Vice 3 President and Chief Compliance Office of GTECH, 4 Matthew Cedor, Regional Vice President, U.S. 5 Operations for GTECH. Gary Cherwinski, the Account 6 Development manager in Pennsylvania and Jeff Barbin, he's an attorney with Phelps Dunbar and is counsel for DeAgostini who is the shareholder in GTECH. We'd like to thank the Board and its 10 Staff for the hard work they've done in getting us 11 here and letting us present to you this wonderful 12 transaction that we're all excited about. Both 13 companies are looking forward to the combination. 14 With that I then turn it over to Mr. Orchard to go 15 through a little bit of the history of GTECH. 16 MR. ORCHARD: Thanks, Marie. 17 18 MR. ORCHARD: 19 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, 20 again for the record my name is Luke Orchard. 2.1 CHAIRMAN: 2.2 Keep your voice up, sir. 2.3 MR. ORCHARD: 2.4 I'm Chief Compliance Officer for GTECH.

Again, I'll just reiterate Marie's thanks for being

25

here and for being here today and the Staff's efforts to get us here today. It's been tremendous. Just very quickly I understand that Pennsylvania and this Board is no stranger to GTECH or GTECH's operations, but I will summarize very quickly about some of the things we do and where we are.

2.4

We are a company, group of companies really, of about 8,500 employees. We have some sort of infrastructure and some sort of business in approximately 114 counties around the world. From a regulatory perspective we hold slightly over 400 licenses, or suitabilities or registrations in some way, shape or form that allows us to conduct various gaming operations around the world. We have those licenses attached to approximately 18 legal entities within our group.

We have a parent company of GTECH, SPI, which is publicly traded on the Milan Stock Exchange. Our head office --- our corporate head office is in Rome, Italy. Our U.S. headquarters is in Providence, Rhode Island, which I'm sure everybody is familiar with. We have a major shareholder DeAgostini and DeAgostini is a company that traditionally invests in regulated industries and the regulated businesses.

As a group the way we face the market as

a group of companies, we regionalize rather than
operating by divisions. In other words, we face the
market with three separate regions. We have the
Italian region operating as Italian Concession
operator, lottery operator. We have what we consider
the Americas region, which is North and South America
and we have the international region, which is pretty
much the rest of the world.

We have a product and services organization that supports those regions in supplying whatever gaming content, whatever gaming technology in various aspects of our business that we do, whether that be lottery operation, lottery technology, central system support and technology, commercial casino gaming of the LTs and instant tickets. We also have several departments obviously at a corporate services group level function that we consider, for consistency reasons we operate across all regions.

Obviously, areas like treasury, internal order and compliance. We operate at a group level. We support all regions. We do not report into the commercial aspects or business aspects of those regions. We simply support and make sure that we operate at a consistent manner across all regions. I think that's it from my summary. I'm certainly ---

10

we're obviously going to be here to answer any
questions as we go through the presentation. And I'll
pass it back to Marie.

#### CHAIRMAN:

4

5

6

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Thank you.

## ATTORNEY JONES:

7 So, why we are here today is the transaction with IGT. So, here's some of the highlights. GTECH is going to pay a total 10 consideration of \$18.25 per share for the acquisition for a total of \$6.4 billion. IGT shareholders are to 11 12 receive 75 percent in cash and 25 percent in stock. 1.3 The new combined company will have operating 14 headquarters in Rome, Providence and Las Vegas, so 15 they'll be throughout the world. 16

And the new holding company will be listed on the New York Stock Exchange as the current company, GTECH SPA will be listed from Milan. So, they are expected to close in the first quarter of 2015 and we're on track for that closing. And everything seems to be in order for that. This is an overview charts, with lines like this always make fun for everybody. This is sort of overview.

There has been a new company form. That is called Georgia Worldwide Limited. That will be the

publically traded company in the U.S. That name will change either at or slightly before closing and we don't know what the new name of the company is at this point. We're willing to take suggestions. Luke's been running a bunch of them. So, there is going to be a lot of corporate maneuvering, but NewCo will be listed in the U.S. Under that will be the current Licensees IGT and then the GTECH entities.

So, the result is a new global leader in end-to-end gaming. They will be the number one gaming lottery business, the number one gaming equipment supplier and the top tier on interactive and social gaming. So, there'll be a number of synergies that will occur and the combined company will grow in revenue based on the combination. Again, it's an exciting time for both companies with the value that will be added.

2.4

The next chart is a picture of the parent offerings and then where they'll be growing and combining as well. So, you can see some of the different divisions that they have. As the Chairman indicated in the beginning we are a Central System Provider, GTECH, and have been since the commencement of gaming in the Commonwealth.

We have a proven track record for

- There's been no issues either from a compliance. compliance standpoint either with the DOR or with the Board. Access to the Central System is restricted by the Department of Revenue, so there's actually one person at GTECH, the system administrator, who has day-to-day access to all reports. And that individual's access is monitored and DOR can prepare reports at any time as to what that individual did and did not look at it.
  - There are other individuals that have access, but that access is created by DOR and it is modified and shut off at different times by DOR. So, for instance, they're software developers. They may need to access the central system for a set fix and set period of time. DOR provides that access and then terminates it.

2.0

There's also the reports that I mentioned before, they're run on a regular basis by DOR to show the activity on the system. DOR reviews them with GTECH to make sure that the access is appropriate and they can also run those reports at any time without GTECH's knowledge. So, DOR can come in and say, okay, we need to see who looked at this. They go in and they pull that report and if there's an issue they would contact GTECH.

This is the way they audit and it's to keep everything in line. And, again, there's been no issues with access throughout the time that they've been running the system. Any individual that has access to the system is licensed by the Board, so there's that extra layer of protection there. So, we're not only responsible to DOR under the contract, but we're responsible to --- and compliant with the Board's requirement from that end. And those individuals are located in the Commonwealth, so, again, there's control features there.

1.3

2.1

2.4

access has been allowed to date and it will continue that way. There's been no reports generated that we're not authorized by DOR. And so in conclusion the merger is anticipated to create the largest end-to-end gaming company. We will continue to be compliant with all the requirements throughout the world and all of the licensure restrictions and with all of the regulators whether it's DOR or this Board.

They're going to be uniquely positioned to capitalize on opportunities and grow the business, and we feel that it's going to be a win/win situation for both our customers and the different gaming authorities.

### CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

Thank you very much. Cyrus, does the Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) have any questions or issues to raise at this time?

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Assistant Enforcement Counsel, Michael Roland, will ask our questions and I'll follow up, if need be.

### ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Michael Roland, R-O-L-A-N-D, Assistant Enforcement Counsel of the OEC. First I want to look at slide five and this is I guess going more towards the financial component of the merger. You have listed that you hope or the expectation is that you'll close some time by the end of the first quarter.

Just so we're all on the same page, that's March 31st of 2015. My question is about the \$18.25 per share price you have listed and the 75, 25 split for cash stock. Is that currently set in stone or is that subject to some flex before the March 31st --- anticipated March 31st deadline?

### ATTORNEY JONES:

I'm going to ask Jeff Barbin to answer

25 that.

### CHAIRMAN:

2.3

2.4

Sir, if you will, just for the court reporter's benefit, could you just state your name, your position?

### ATTORNEY BARBIN:

Jeff Barbin, I'm a lawyer and I represent GTECH and DeAgostini. I think the question was what consideration being paid at the onset of the merger, the original merger agreement allowed IGT members to select a mixed consideration. In other words, if you held a hundred shares you could choose all cash, all stock or some mixed consideration.

An amendment was done about a month ago, maybe six weeks or so ago that eliminated that ability to have a mixed consideration. And so all shareholders of IGT will get the same amount in cash and the same amount in shares. I hope I answered your ---.

#### ATTORNEY ROLAND:

It does, but because there was that amendment at this point you don't really anticipate another amendment taking place before that deadline?

### ATTORNEY BARBIN:

No, I do not.

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Okay. And so we're clear, when we look
the at the PowerPoint presentation you guys have here
today it references NewCo. That's actually Georgia
Worldwide Limited. They're the same?

### ATTORNEY BARBIN:

Yes.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

### ATTORNEY JONES:

Correct.

### ATTORNEY BARBIN:

That's correct.

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Okay. This is a little bit again on the financial component. This is about the Stock

Exchange. You took the time in your presentation to say that you're going to be delisting from the Milan Stock Exchange. At some point in time you're going to be going up on the New York Stock Exchange. How does that take place in conjunction with the actual merger? Does it happen before, after, simultaneously? Does it not matter?

# ATTORNEY BARBIN:

I'm sure it matters. It's my understanding that the Milan delisting will happen a couple of days before closing and then, obviously, there will not be any public trading on the new shares

1 until the closing occurs. That's how I understand it 2 to be. I can get some more clarification if needed.

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Okay. And then I think the concern that is really what everybody has has to do with this firewall, this block between GTECH and the new entity that you're going to be merging with and the flow of information. It's so important that way back when the very first Board meeting that the Gaming Control Board ever had back in December of 2004 the actual criteria were laid out of what the expectations of the central control computer system would be.

And I'm sure if you don't remember them as you sit here now at some point in time one of you or some of you saw what those expectations were. Is it your understanding as you sit here today none of those requirements that were set forth are going to be changed, or tampered with or altered in any way?

#### MR. ORCHARD:

Yes, that's our understanding.

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

And the maintenance of the actual system will not change in any way?

## MR. CEDOR:

Matthew Cedor, GTECH Regional Vice

President of U.S. operations. No, the current 1 2 maintenance and running of the system on a day-to-day 3 basis will not change at all. It's not affected by 4 the transaction. 5 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 6 Okay. And do you anticipate any 7 interruption of service or coverage time at all? MR. CEDOR: 9 No, none. 10 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 11 Okay. Ms. Jones, at some point in time 12 during our correspondence you provided a list of 13 individuals that actually have access to the central 14 computer system who have the ability to log in and 15 out. You said today that there's actually an 16 administrator who has constant access. That person

19 Does that sound right to you?

17

18

2.0

2.1

22

### ATTORNEY JONES:

Correct.

#### ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Your representation today is every one of those 20 individuals is licensed by the Gaming Control Board?

can be monitored, but I believe in the list that you

provided there were approximately 20 individuals.

### ATTORNEY JONES:

Correct.

2.4

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

If one of those individuals were to leave, or be replaced or a new person were added who ultimately makes that decision if they have access to the system?

#### ATTORNEY JONES:

The DOR would. The DOR through their job descriptions approves who has access to the system and that person would appropriately be licensed.

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

And I would assume that GTECH or whatever new companies they are under it at that time would have no problem making sure that that new individual was properly licensed to continue as the 20 are right now?

### ATTORNEY JONES:

Absolutely.

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

This may be too simple, but I'm going to try it anyhow. Obviously in the merger, you have a large company coming in and we talked about this a little bit beforehand, but what do you have in place --- and I think this is probably what the concern of a

lot of the people in the room are.

1.3

What do you have in place that stops person A under the current GTECH umbrella from contacting person B on the other side of that firewall, so to speak, to either give information, ask for information, exchange information? What is in place? Can you put into words what's in place, what kind of protections are there?

## MR. CEDOR:

We have procedures in place today.

First of all, the physical protection is that nobody outside of the Pennsylvania operation or those support individuals who have been licensed by the Gaming Board can have access to the system. So, no one from GTECH not involved in Pennsylvania has the ability to come into Pennsylvania and access the system in any way, shape or form.

Secondly, if anyone does request information from the system we have a procedure in place and a policy established with the Department of Revenue that that request is passed on to the Department of Revenue for approval. And if they approve it, then it's okay to move forward. If they don't approve it then the request is denied regardless of who the request may be from.

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

1.3

Maybe I'm leaning a little bit more towards what --- we've used the term internal controls and I realize saying internal controls is different for a company like yours because of the way DOR has control of the actual system. But I'm asking internally if someone were to contact Mr. Orchard and ask him to reach out to somebody else or ask him for information on the other side of the wall what have you guys put in house or is it something that's still a work in progress to say, these are the people that need to be made aware that someone tried to gain information or ---? Is that question clear? I don't know if I'm ---.

#### MR. ORCHARD:

I think it is clear and we have our --and Gary Cherwinski is here as well today. Obviously,
from a local standpoint he's the one locally
responsible for the operation here. If he were to
hypothetically receive a call to that request for a
start, he would know --- you know, anything like that
or any request that would go to directly to the system
administrator or to somebody else that may have that
access, they would go to him.

He would then take that to Matt. He

would know this is an unusual request and we would 1 2 look into that request. The answer would simply be no, but we would --- you know, we would obviously have 3 a record of that request and we would simply deny that request. We had discussion about whether or not we 6 have that extra layer from a compliance perspective and have the local operation simply inform me as the Chief Compliance Officer that that request was even That's probably the one step that we don't have 10 that we're quite happy to put into the policy, but that was an ongoing discussion. 11

### ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Okay. So, you guys would be --- and one of the conditions you saw in OEC's Answer is that these certain policies and procedures. And I believe we may have referenced them as internal controls are put in place.

#### MR. ORCHARD:

19 Yes.

4

5

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

## ATTORNEY ROLAND:

There's something reduced to writing. You're comfortable doing that, putting that forth for the Board approval for OEC, BIE, everyone to look at it and ---

#### MR. ORCHARD:

23 1 Absolutely. 2 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 3 --- and see what's going on? 4 MR. ORCHARD: 5 Absolutely. Yes. 6 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 7 Okay. Lastly, I assume this is the case, but I'm going to ask anyhow so we have it on the record. You guys made representation that as far as 10 financial backing you have letters of commitment that 11 are all in place from multiple entities. As you sit 12 here today I assume those are all still in place and 13 in good standing? 14 MR. ORCHARD: 15 They are, yes. 16 ATTORNEY PITRE: 17 No objections. 18 ATTORNEY ROLAND: 19 Mr. Chairman, that's all the questions 20 we have. We actually don't have a presentation, a 21 full presentation. We'd just like to put some 22 comments on the record at the appropriate time either 23 now or after the Board asks its questions regarding 2.4 the conditions that were in place.

CHAIRMAN:

25

Michael, why don't you put them on now?

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

That'd be fantastic.

### CHAIRMAN:

We may as well do that and then we can turn the matter over to the Board for any questions.

### ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Great.

# CHAIRMAN:

We may as well have all the information both sides have in front of us. Go ahead.

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Thank you. And just to summarize, on July the 15th, 2014 GTECH and International Gaming Technology, IGT as we refer to them today, entered into a merger agreement in which GTECH will acquire IGT in the future. That proposed merger was presented to this Board via a Joint Petition on September the 12th, 2014. The OEC has communicated with each of the involved Boards, Bureaus and the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue regarding the merger.

No concerns beyond the necessity of a secured firewall shielding data information provided to GTECH through the central control computer system from IGT have been raised. GTECH and IGT have been

1 cooperative and have addressed the inquiries made by
2 OEC and BIE and have provided written documentation
3 when appropriate.

In consideration of the materials previously provided combined with the additional clarification of today's presentation the OEC no longer objects to the proposed merger, however, OEC asks that any approval of the Joint Petition made by the Board be subject to the five conditions set forth in OEC's October 14th, 2014 Answer. Although, again, we don't have a presentation today or witnesses, we have Mr. Andrew Gutshall. He's with us from BIE's financial investigations unit in case his services are needed and we'd be happy to take any questions the Board might have.

### CHAIRMAN:

And again, we assume that GTECH has agreed to the five conditions; is that correct?

#### ATTORNEY JONES:

20 Yes.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

2.2

2.3

## CHAIRMAN:

Any questions from the Board? Greg?

#### MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions and actually one question and a couple of

- 1 comments. We are in a unique position today.
- 2 Pennsylvania, as we all know, is one of the very few
- 3 states in the nation that has a central computer
- 4 system and now that same company will be the largest
- 5 supplier of slot machines to the casino industry in
- 6 Pennsylvania. Having said that, I have never in my
- 7 long involvement with gaming in Pennsylvania, which is
- 8 now over ten years, have ever heard of a complaint
- 9 about GTECH.
- 10 And so as you appear here today I want
- 11 to congratulate you on that. People complain about a
- 12 lot of different things as you well --- are well
- 13 aware. And the fact that at least at my level I have
- 14 | never heard of a complaint about GTECH from any
- 15 operator or anybody else involved in gaming in
- 16 Pennsylvania is a testament to your professionalism.
- 17 Having said that, Mike, are you aware
- 18 | --- I raised this issue yesterday in the Executive
- 19 | Session. We were not aware that comments, but are you
- 20 aware of any concerns from the casinos themselves
- 21 about this potential wearing of two hats by GTECH now?

### 22 ATTORNEY ROLAND:

- There have been no concerns that have
- 24 been expressed. I mean, obviously once the petition
- 25 first came in the OEC reached out to all different

individuals looking for feedback and comments. And we received none as far as concerns. Nobody in any of the casinos have stepped forward and expressed a concern. At this point I would have to say no. It's just not there.

MR. FAJT:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Anyone else?

MR. MCCALL:

Just one.

CHAIRMAN:

Keith?

MR. MCCALL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is going to be to revenue. I don't know, Bob, if you can answer this or not on the record, but there's been many assertions that the Department of Revenue adequately monitors and audits regularly. Is that all as a matter of fact that you do regularly audit? You do know who accesses that computer? Do you have that type of knowledge, is that in fact what goes on?

## MR. MCCALL:

Yes. We have --- in the Department of Revenue we have an IT group that communicates directly

with the GTECH folks. We do have reports and as stated, we monitor them. I get to look at those reports with our IT folks. They're very boring, but that's because it shows --- there is a check and balance going on. We do have auditors that happen to work for the Department of Revenue who are a little more focused.

They look at information like that. We have no --- I have no personal knowledge of any audit that was conducted with regard to their operations. It hasn't been anything but, as Commissioner Fajt said, a very good relationship with the Department of Revenue. Indeed, before the meeting I met with their counsel and said, thank you very much. We're going through a large central computer system change out of equipment and they were the winning bidder.

And that is going very well from our perspective and from the Executive Director, Mr.

O'Toole. We've met and talked about scheduling that, so we're convinced that the precautions are there and they are very good partners with us with the central computer system.

CHAIRMAN:

John.

MR. MCNALLY:

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

Just some follow up on Commissioner

Fajt's question. With regard to the questions that
you asked of casinos, did you also question any
suppliers who compete with the applicants to determine
whether there were any concerns cited about creating
some sort of monopoly or unfair competition here in
Pennsylvania?

#### ATTORNEY PITRE:

1.3

2.4

We didn't reach out to any suppliers.

We did consult the history of the Act, which --- I

don't know if you guys recall, but initially there was
a portion of the Act that restricted a certain slot

manufacturer --- it was 1210, thanks, Mike --
restricted a slot manufacturer from having too big of
a concentration or a monopoly in the Commonwealth.

That never came close to being in fruition.

It was removed from the Act. Presently IGT has about 9,663 slot machines. Speed Low has about 171. The merger would give GTECH 37.22 percent of the overall slot industry in the Commonwealth. However, I don't see that being any type of major pitfall. The slot casino --- the casinos and the suppliers, everybody wants the best machine, the hottest machine.

I think we are always overly suspicious

in our review of things and that's to ensure that
everything is up to snuff. We basically want to
ensure that if there is a will or a way to do
something that we try to make it hard in that respect.
I think that the company's willingness to reduce those
policies to writing and submit those to us for
approval shows that they're serious about it so that

8 if something does go wrong we can hold them
9 accountable for it.
10 So, I don't --- to answer your guestion

So, I don't --- to answer your question, Commissioner McNally, I don't think that anybody's against this merger. I think OEC is probably the most suspicious group of people in the Commonwealth when it comes to gaming, so, you know, we always go above and beyond. And we look for the Board to reign us in when necessary, but we don't really have a problem with this merger. We just want to ensure that the proper controls are in place.

#### MR. MCNALLY:

Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

# ATTORNEY ROLAND:

Commissioner, if I could just add one thing Cyrus said about the percentage. When looking at Section 1210 he and I both sat down and discussed --- I believe it was actually referred generically as

the 50 percent rule. And Cyrus said today they would approximately have 38 percent of the machines in the Commonwealth.

And we actually even took the time to look at each individual facility and said, well, what if this section were still in place would there be that large of a percentage of hold in any given facility in the Commonwealth and every one of those we looked at it was nowhere close as well. Just a little bit, you know, additional information based upon what Cyrus has already presented.

### MR. MCNALLY:

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Appreciate that. In your presentation you report that you regularly report access to DOR. What triggers that report?

### ATTORNEY JONES:

The report's generated on a bi-weekly basis by DOR and they can actually prepare it at any time if they have a concern that someone was accessing the system.

# MR. MCNALLY:

Do you self-report if there's any particular access or request for access made?

### ATTORNEY JONES:

We do not self-report, so to speak.

```
32
   There has been one request for information that was a
1
2
   worldwide request where we wanted to have data from
3
   all of the central systems in which GTECH operates for
4
   a different scope and we went to DOR at that time and
5
   said is this something you would permit and they said
6
   no and we said, thank you, and did not do it.
                  MR. MCNALLY:
                  Thank you.
8
9
                  CHAIRMAN:
10
                  Anyone else? Any of the --- either of
11
   the Ex-Officio members have any questions? Okay.
12
                  MR. WOODS:
                  Mr. Chairman, is the presentation being
13
14
   put on the record?
15
                  CHAIRMAN:
16
                  Yes, it will be, yes. I assume the
17
   PowerPoint is moved ---.
18
                  ATTORNEY JONES:
19
                  Yes, I'd like to move it into evidence.
2.0
                  CHAIRMAN:
                  No objection?
2.1
2.2
                  ATTORNEY ROLAND:
2.3
                  No objection.
2.4
                  CHAIRMAN:
25
                  All right. It's admitted. Anything
```

33 1 else from either side? 2 MR. ORCHARD: 3 No. I'd just like to take the 4 opportunity again to thank this Board and thank you 5 for your kind words and again the Board for their ---6 Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board Staff, it's been very professional and very helpful. Thank you. CHAIRMAN: 9 Okay. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 10 ATTORNEY MICHAEL: 11 I'd like to express my gratitude from 12 IGT for the record. 1.3 ATTORNEY JONES: 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 You're welcome. Thanks very much. All 17 right. Ladies and gentleman, this concludes the 18 public hearing. At this time the Board will take a 19 ten minute recess and meet in Executive Session. 20 we will return at about quarter of 11:00. Thank you. We are in recess. 21 2.2 2.3 HEARING CONCLUDED 2.4 25

### CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Ryan was reported by me on 12/10/2014 and that I Cynthia Piro Simpson read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.