## 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 State

Treasurer Robert McCord

Robert Coyne representing Secretary of the

Department of Revenue Daniel Meuser

Jorge Augusto representing Secretary of the

Department of Agriculture George Greig

HEARING: Wednesday, August 6, 2014

LOCATION: Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

Strawberry Square, Second Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101

WITNESSES: Rose Cook

Reporter: Rhonda K. Thorpe

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

2

	2
1	APPEARANCES
2	OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
3	R. DOUGLAS SHERMAN, ESQUIRE
4	Chief Counsel
5	SUSAN YOKUM, ESQUIRE
6	Assistant Chief Counsel
7	DENISE MILLER-TSHUDY, ESQUIRE
8	Assistant Chief Counsel
9	OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT COUNSEL
10	CYRUS PITRE, ESQUIRE
11	Chief Enforcement Counsel
12	DALE MILLER, ESQUIRE
13	Deputy Enforcement Counsel
14	DAVID TEPPER, ESQUIRE
15	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
16	JAMES ARMSTRONG, ESQUIRE
17	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
18	CASSANDRA FENSTERMAKER, ESQUIRE
19	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
20	CARMELIA ESTRIPLET, ESQUIRE
21	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
22	PA Gaming Control Board
23	303 Walnut Street, Floor Five
24	Harrisburg, PA 17101-1825
25	Counsel for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

```
3
                 A P P E A R A N C E S (cont'd)
 1
 2
 3
   MICHAEL SKLAR, ESQUIRE
 4
   Levine Staller, Attorneys at Law
 5
   3030 Atlantic Avenue
   Atlantic City, NJ 08401
 7
       Counsel for Sugarhouse HSP Gaming, LP.
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		4
1	I N D E X	
2		
3	OPENING REMARKS	
4	By Chairman Ryan 6 - 7	
5	PRESENTATION	
6	By Ms. Yantis 7 - 9	
7	QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD 9 - 13	
8	PRESENTATION	
9	By Mr. Rhen 13 - 16	
10	By Attorney Yocum 16 - 17	
11	By Attorney Miller-Tshudy 17 - 20	
12	By Attorney Sherman 20 - 26	
13	By Ms. Hensel 26 - 38	
14	By Attorney Tepper 39 - 41	
15	By Attorney Armstrong 41 - 44	
16	By Attorney Sklar 44 - 45	
17	WITNESS: ROSE COOK	
18	TESTIMONY	
19	By Ms. Cook 45 - 46	
20	QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD 46 - 48	
21	PRESENTATION	
22	By Attorney Armstrong 49 - 52	
23	By Attorney Miller 52 - 55	
24	By Attorney Fenstermaker 55 - 58	
25	By Attorney Estriplet 59 - 61	

ı			
4			5
1	I N D E X (continued)		
2			
	PRESENTATION	<i>C</i> 1	
4	By Attorney Fenstermaker	61 - 62	
5	CLOSING REMARKS		
6	By Chairman Ryan	62 - 63	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## PROCEEDINGS

## CHAIRMAN:

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Bill Ryan, Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. Before we begin I would ask everyone to please turn off, or at least put on silence, cell phones and other electronic devices. Thank you. With us today is Jennifer Langan representing State Treasurer Robert McCord, Bob Coyne representing the Secretary for the Department of Revenue, Dan Meuser, and Jorge Augusto representing the Secretary of Agriculture, George Greig. I thank all of you for being here. All the members of the Board being present, I will call today's meeting to order, and first I would ask everyone to please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

#### CHAIRMAN:

We will now begin our regularly scheduled meeting. First an announcement, the Board held an Executive Session on July 9th to deliberate on the Category 2 License available for the City of Philadelphia. And the Board held an Executive Session on August 5th for the purpose of discussing potential litigation involving the Board, personnel matters, and

to conduct quasi-judicial deliberations relating to matters being considered by the Board today.

Next we will hear from Claire Yantis, our Director of Human Resources. Good morning, Claire.

## MS. YANTIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good morning, Chairman, Board members. The Office of Human Resources has one motion for your consideration today seeking to amend the PGCB classification and compensation structure. As you're aware the current PGCB classification and compensation structure was originally adopted by the Board in January of 2010, based on a comparison of data across public sector markets. Since 2010 the compensation ranges for the Executive and non-Union pay ranges have only changed once which was last year when the Board approved a two percent change to those ranges. Subsequently the Commonwealth's management pay range which is the primary comparator for our pay ranges has outpaced our change resulting in PGCB's pay ranges in some cases being several thousand dollars less than equivalent Commonwealth management pay ranges.

Based on my analysis of this comparative benchmark data, it is recommended that the PGCB age the compensation structure for the Executive and non-

Union pay ranges by 4.5 percent. Such a change will result in most PGCB pay ranges remaining just under comparable Commonwealth pay ranges. This increase will apply to all but the maximum salary amount of the top pay range of the Agency, for that pay range, Executive pay range A, the maximum salary within the range will remain where it was set by the Board in 2010. In addition to aging the pay range amounts, we are also requesting a change to three classifications on the classification structure.

First the classification of
Investigative Intake Manager in the Bureau of
Investigations and Enforcement (BIE) should be removed
from the non-Union pay scale. Due to recent
reorganization of work within BIE, it has been
determined that this position works at the same level
as current BIE Regional Directors, and is responsible
for a division within BIE. Based on this assessment
it is also recommended that the Regional Director
title change to more accurately reflect oversight of a
division.

Recently my office in conjunction with the Director of BIE has reviewed and amended classification specifications for positions within BIE. Through this analysis and review we have

combined aspects of the classification specifications for Deputy Director of BIE and Regional Director of BIE, and believe that the Deputy Director title is more appropriate for the work being done. Therefore the Regional Director classification should be removed from the classification structure, and the Deputy Director of BIE classification should be lowered from executive pay range B to executive pay range D.

And as a side note, these changes do not affect the salaries of the current staff working in those positions. I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding the proposed changes to the compensation structure.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments from the

Board?

2.4

# MR. FAJT:

One comment, if I could Mr. Chairman.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Greg.

# MR. FAJT:

Claire, just because these hearings are streamed live, and people watch them and maybe some of the folks in the room aren't aware of the importance of this aging of the pay ranges, let me kind of give

10

```
you my understanding and you can tell me whether I'm
1
2
   correct or not. But if we don't age our pay ranges
3
   within the Gaming Control Board we become
   uncompetitive with other agencies in the Commonwealth.
5
   For instance if we have somebody classified as a, you
6
   know, a Lawyer One, for lack of a better term, and
   they just move along and get a pay raise of two, or
   three, or four percent a year, and they get outside of
9
   their pay range for a Lawyer One, they can no longer
10
   get a pay raise that goes into their pension.
11
   then have to get a lump-sum amount as a pay raise; is
12
   that correct?
13
                  MS. YANTIS:
                  Correct. If the salaries go outside the
14
15
   pay range, any type ---
16
                  MR. FAJT:
17
                  Right.
18
                  MS. YANTIS:
19
                  --- of pay increase that we do doesn't
20
   affect their base pay ---
21
                  MR. FAJT:
22
                  Correct. Okay.
23
                  MS. YANTIS:
24
                  --- it only affects --- it's a one time
25
   lump-sum payment.
```

## MR. FAJT:

So, eventually, and we're seeing that now, is we become uncompetitive with say the LCB or state government as a whole because their pay ranges have been aged. And, therefore a Lawyer One in those agencies or in state government in general can continue to get pay raises that go into their pension calculation, whereas our employees are blocked from that.

## MS. YANTIS:

Correct. And the lump-sum payments do also go into pension calculations, ---

## MR. FAJT:

Okay.

#### MS. YANTIS:

--- but by not changing the base, if you're applying a percentage to the same number eventually your salary even with a lump sum added doesn't get any higher.

## MR. FAJT:

I get it.

#### MS. YANTIS:

The second problem becomes in recruiting. When we recruit into the minimum of the range, our minimums are much lower than comparable

positions elsewhere in the Commonwealth. It also comes into play for promotional opportunities. If we have somebody --- take an attorney for an example, at one level of attorney, if they go to promote into another agency, that range is higher. So, it comes to play in that way as well. So, it's recruitment, it's continuation along keeping place with inflation. And the third thing is that we do have Union contractual raises, and the Union scale by contract continues to change. So, if we don't age our compensation ranges eventually the Union scale will out pace our non-Union and Executive scales as well.

# MR. FAJT:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Any other questions from Board members? Ex-officio members? May I have motion?

## MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the amendment to the classifications and compensation structure as described by the Director of Human Resources

#### CHAIRMAN:

Second?

## MR. MOSCATO:

13

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

4 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

14

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries. Thank

7 you, Claire.

MS. YANTIS:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Next we will hear from Dave Rhen,

12 Director of Financial Management. Good morning,

13 David.

MR. RHEN:

Good morning. I'm here today to provide

16 a final report of Board expenses for fiscal year 2013-

17 14 which concluded on June 30th. Although the year

18 is complete, we still continue to process some

19 invoices. So, the expenses that I report today may

20 increase a bit, but not to a large extent.

21 Expenditures for the fiscal year totaled

 $22 \mid \$35,062,300$ , compared to the year before expenses

23 increased by \$1,157,754 or 3.4 percent. Personal

24 expenses accounted for 86 percent of the annual

25 expenses and totaled \$30,237,628. Although the full

complement remained unchanged from the year before, payroll expenses increased by \$1,956,802 or 6.9 percent above the prior year. Of this total, salaries increased by \$350,838 or 1.9 percent, and benefits increased by \$1,552,000 or 17 percent. Specifically the pension rate increased by 45 percent, and the health benefit rate increased 11 and a half percent above the prior year. These rising cost are not specific to the Board, and they affect all agencies across the Commonwealth.

Operating and fixed assets expenses totaled \$4,824,672, about 14 percent of the total agency expenditures. This was down \$799,000 or 16.6 percent. The largest single savings was for background database searches utilizing --- background database searches we put out approximately \$300,000. The reason for that was a new contract with a new vendor, and a reduction in background checks that we conducted.

The Agency also realized savings through lower fingerprinting costs for background investigations by eliminating all but one IT consultant and through the reduction of nonrecurring or intermittent costs incurred in the prior such as PC purchases, the Pittsburgh office move, and traffic

that we did not have in the year that we just completed. For the year the top three categories of operating expenses were rentals and leases at \$1,725,128 or 38 percent of operating expenses, services at \$1,176,978 or 26 percent of operating expenses, expenses, and other operating expenses at \$713,478 or 16 percent of operating expenses. These three categories combined accounted for nearly 80 percent of all our operating expenses for the year. Overall operating expenses were at their lowest levels last year since fiscal year 2005-2006.

Now turning to the current year, the year we just began July 1st, I just wanted to let the Board know that the fiscal year '14-'15 appropriation is \$37,990,000. The available budget is 2.9 percent higher than fiscal year '13-'14. Budget appropriation personnel costs alone are budget to increase \$2.1 million. Again, this is primarily for contractual employee raises. A 32 percent increase in the pension rate, and an eight percent increase in the health benefit rate. Operating at fix assist expenditures are budgeted at \$5.5 million. That's slightly less than the fiscal year '12-'13 expenditure levels which served as a base line for the current year budget.

That concludes my report. I'd be happy to take any questions if there are any.

## CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any questions from the Board?

Ex-officio members? Thank you, David.

## MR. RHEN:

Thank you.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Appreciate the information. Next we'll have Chief Counsel Doug Sherman.

## ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. We just have a few items for the Board today. The first is a Statement of Policy which Assistant Chief Counsel Susan Yocum is here to present.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Good morning, Susan.

## ATTORNEY YOCUM:

Good morning. The one agenda item today is a Statement of Policy 125-183 which will add additional side wagers to the game of Pai Gow and Craps. Included in this rulemaking are the dealing procedures and the payout odds. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

## CHAIRMAN:

17 Any questions or comments from the 1 2 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 3 MR. MOSCATO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 4 5 adopt Statement of Policy Number 125-183 as presented by the Office of Chief Council (OCC). MR. WOODS: 8 Second. 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 All in favor. 11 ALL SAY AYE 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Opposed? The motion carries. 14 ATTORNEY YOCUM: 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Thank you, Susan. 18 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 19 The next two agenda items relate to 20 Local Law Enforcement Grants which Assistant Chief 21 Counsel Denise Miller-Tshudy will present. 22 CHAIRMAN: 23 Good morning, Denise. 2.4 ATTORNEY MILLER-TSHUDY: 25 Chairman, members of the Board, I have

18 one Law Enforcement Grant to present to you today. 1 Ιt 2 is with the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office 3 for \$250,000. If approved this will be their fourth grant. The grant is sought pursuant to the Gaming Act 4 5 which provides finding of local law enforcement agencies to be used for investigation purposes and enforcement of illegal gambling in the Commonwealth. This application has been reviewed by appropriate 9 staff and is ready for your approval if ---. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 Okay. Any questions, comments from the 12 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 13 MR. FAJT: 14 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 15 approve the Local Law Enforcement Grant for Philadelphia's District Attorney's Office as presented 16 17 by the OCC. 18 MR. MCCALL: 19 Second. 20 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 21 22 ALL SAY AYE 2.3 CHAIRMAN: 2.4 Opposed? The motion carries. 25 ATTORNEY MILLER-TSHUDY:

I also have, for your consideration, revisions to the Board's guidelines for Local Law Enforcement Grants. These revisions will primarily allow the local law enforcement agencies to request grants for one year or two years. It will also increase the threshold to require local law enforcement agencies receiving the grants in excess of \$150,000 to submit to an audit of their grant expenditures. The changes will also allow grantees to use up to two percent of their grant for these required audits. And finally, this revision will allow a grantee to use up to 15 percent of the grant allocation towards certain capital expenditures.

2.4

The purpose of these provisions or these proposed changes is to facilitate the funding of Local Law Enforcement Grants in a way that allows our grantees to experience less interruption in the funding of their investigations and the enforcement of the laws involving unlawful gambling. Also provide them the opportunities to use more of their grant funds towards helping them carry out these responsibilities. So, I am presenting the revisions for your approval.

## CHAIRMAN:

Any questions, comments from the Board?

20 Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 1 2 MR. MOSCATO: 3 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 4 approve the revisions to the Local Law Enforcement 5 Grant Program Guidelines as presented by the OCC. 6 MS. KAISER: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 All in favor? 10 ALL SAY AYE 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Opposed? The motion carries. 13 ATTORNEY MILLER-TSHUDY: 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Denise. 16 17 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 18 Today we have on Petition on the agenda. 19 It's to be decided on the documents filed on record 20 and it is uncontested. The Petition is of Timothy Davis, and it's a request to remove him from the 21 22 Board's Involuntary Exclusion List. 23 Briefly, in May 2011, an individual who 24 at that time was believed to be Timothy Davis was 25 observed capping bets while placing Texas Hold'em

Bonus Poker at the Sands Casino. Upon being confronted by a Sands security, the patron identified himself as Timothy Davis, produced Davis' identification, and admitted to capping the bets, and then paid the amount back to the casino. Sands took steps to permanently evict the individual from their casino. And, subsequently based upon the identification provided the State Police charged Mr. Davis with several counts of theft related charges in July of 2011.

When that happened, OEC became aware of the filing of the charges, and commenced action to put Mr. Davis on the Exclusion List. However, when the real Timothy Davis found out about the criminal charges, he went to the Pennsylvania State Police in late 2009, explained to them that he had been the victim of identity theft. His wallet had been stolen, and that apparently the individual who produced his ID now had his identification and must have looked enough alike that security thought that it actually was Timothy Davis.

The State Police looked at the issue, agreed in fact this Timothy Davis was not the individual who had been capping the bets, and withdrew all of the charges. The problem we had was that

information of the withdrawal of the charges never got communicated to BIE and OEC. So, the exclusion process had gone forward.

1.3

And in February of 2012, this Board upon a default judgment placed Mr. Davis on the Exclusion List. In July of 2014, Mr. Davis, who lives in New Jersey, went to the Sands Casino, went in. I believe he tried to sign up for player's club card, was identified as being on the Exclusion List. Again, they kind of sorted out what happened, determined it related to those charges a couple of years earlier. Two days later Mr. Davis filed the request to be removed from the list. The OEC has not objected to the request, acknowledging that this was a case of misidentification because of the ID theft which had occurred to Mr. Davis. And that's the matter now before the Board, to remove his name from the list.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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

#### MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board grant Timothy Davis' Petition to be removed from the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board's Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OCC.

MS. KAISER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

5 ALL SAY AYE

2.4

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

The Board has eight unopposed Petitions to withdraw applications or surrender credentials of individuals or businesses before it. The persons and entities subject to these Petitions are Marie Foster, NEWave, Inc., Irwin A. Siegel, Steven Fasman, Living it Loving it, Limited, which also includes five applications of related individuals, Max International Converts, Incorporated, Pietro Boroli, and Gianmario Tondato DaRuos. The OEC has no objection to the Withdrawals and Surrenders. As a result, if the Board chooses to grant the requests, it would be doing so without prejudice. These matters are now ready for the Board's consideration.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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 Orders to approve the Withdrawals and Surrenders as described by the OCC.

## MR. WOODS:

Second.

## CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

ALL SAY AYE

## CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

## ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

And finally, the Board has before it, one Report and Recommendation received from the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA). The Report and Recommendation pertains to the placement of Jianming Li on the Board's Exclusion List. The Recommendation along with the full hearing record has been provided to the Board.

Briefly, by the way of background, in October of 2013, Mr. Li was accused of leaving his two children, one who was 13 years of age, almost 14, along with a two-year-old in his car in the garage at Harrah's Philadelphia while he went inside, gambled at a slot machine for a short period of time, and returned to his car about 25 minutes later. When he

returned he was met by security and the Chester Police. Security discussed the casino's policy with regard to unattended children, asked Mr. Li to leave the property for the evening. No criminal charges were filed in the incident, and Harrah's did not place him on its Exclusion List.

The Office of Enforcement Counsel (OEC) filed a Complaint in March of 2014, requesting he be placed on the Exclusion List. A hearing was held on May 22nd, at which both the OEC and Mr. Li appeared at the hearing. Testimony, a Stipulation of Facts was entered into the record which basically established that Mr. Li arrived at Harrah's with the two children. He left them in the car, in the parking garage on October 3rd for approximately 25 minutes. The Report and Recommendation before the Board is to place Mr. Li on the Exclusion List, and that matter is now before the Board.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Is Jianming Li in the hearing room?

Hearing no response ---.

#### MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman?

## CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

2.3

2.4

# 1 MR. WOODS: 2 I think it would be helpful for the Board to take some additional time to review this 3 4 Report and Recommendation, and if it's appropriate, 5 I'd like to move that we table this issue at this 6 time. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dave. Is there a second? 8 9 MR. FAJT: 10 Second. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 And again the motion is to table the matter and perhaps bring it up at our next hearing. 13 14 Any further comment or questions? All in favor? 15 ALL SAY AYE 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Opposed? The ayes have it, and the 18 motion prevails. 19 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 20 That concludes all matters of the OCC. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Thank you. Next, Bureau of Licensing, 23 Susan Hensel. Susan? 24 MS. HENSEL: 25 Thank you, Chairman Ryan and members of

the Board. Before the Board today will be motions regarding one Slot Machine Operator Renewal License, one Table Game Manufacturer, one Slot Machine Supplier, one gaming-related Gaming Service Provider, and 507 Principal Key Gaming and Non-gaming Employees. In addition there will be consideration of eight Gaming Service Providers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

The first matter for your consideration is for the renewal of the Mountain View Thoroughbred Racing Association, LLC, Category 1 License. license renewal hearing for this entity has been held, and the record is now closed. The Bureau of Licensing has provided you with a background investigation and suitability report regarding the renewal. result, the license renewal is ready for your consideration. No issues regarding Mountain View Thoroughbred Racing Association, LLC, have been identified by the Bureau of Licensing that would preclude renewal of the Category 1 License. provided you with a draft Order for this entity, and ask that the Board consider the Order to renew the Category 1 License for Mountain View Thoroughbred Racing Association, LLC.

## CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from the Enforcement

1 Counsel? 2 ATTORNEY PITRE: 3 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 6 MR. FAJT: 8 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 9 approve the renewal of Mountain View Thoroughbred Racing Association, LLC's Category 1 License as 10 11 described by the Bureau of Licensing. 12 MS. KAISER: Second. 13 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 16 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Opposed? The motion carries. 19 MS. HENSEL: Next is the renewal of a Table Game 20 Manufacture License for DEQ Systems Corporation. 21 DEO 22 manufactures various systems that support table game 23 activities. The BIE has completed its investigation

of this company, and the Bureau of Licensing has

provided you with a background investigation and

24

25

suitability report.

2.1

2.4

DEQ Systems Corporation has asked the Board that it grant a reduced licensing fee for its renewal license. The normal fee for a three year renewal of a manufacture license is \$90,000. Under the Gaming Act, the Board may modify the fee for a table game manufacturer if it determines that the fee will unreasonably limit the number of devices and 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. DEQ Systems Corporation has requested a reduced fee of \$10,000 for a three year renewal which is in line with the Bureau's policy. The Bureau of Licensing recommends that the Board grant the reduce fee.

I have provided you with a draft Order, and ask that the Board consider the renewal of the license described as well as the reduced table games licensing fee for DEQ Systems Corporation.

# CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?

# ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection to either request.

## CHAIRMAN:

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

#### MS. KAISER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the renewal of DEQ Systems Corporation's Table Game Manufacture License as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

## MR. MCCALL:

10 Second.

## CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

13 ALL SAY AYE

#### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

## MS. HENSEL:

Also for your consideration is the renewal of the Slot Machine Supplier License from Modern Gaming Pennsylvania, LLC. Modern is a New Jersey Corporation with its principle place of business in Pennsylvania located in Southampton. The BIE has completed its investigation, and the Bureau of Licensing has provided you with the renewal background investigation and suitability report. I have provided you with a draft Order, and ask that the Board

consider the approval of the renewal license for 1 2 Modern Gaming Pennsylvania, LLC. 3 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 4 5 ATTORNEY PITRE: 6 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. CHAIRMAN: 8 Any questions or comments from the 9 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 10 MR. MCCALL: 11 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the renewal of Modern Gaming Pennsylvania, LLC 12 13 Slot Machine Supplier License as described by the 14 Bureau of Licensing. 15 MR. MCNALLY: 16 Second. 17 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 18 19 ALL SAY AYE 20 CHAIRMAN: 2.1 Opposed? The motion carries. 22 MS. HENSEL: 23 The next matter for your consideration 24 is the approval of the Gaming Related Gaming Service 25 Provider Certification for Mara Enterprises, Limited.

Mara is a China based company that has developed the 2 table game Lunar Poker. The game has been previously 3 approved by the Board. The BIE has completed its investigation, and the Bureau of Licensing has 5 provided you with the background investigation and suitability report for this Applicant. I have provided you with a draft Order, and ask that the Board consider the approval of Mara Enterprise, Limited. 10 CHAIRMAN: Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? ATTORNEY PITRE: 1.3 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. CHAIRMAN: 15 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 16 MR. MCNALLY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve Mara Enterprises, Limited Gaming Related Gaming Service Provider Certification as described by the Bureau of Licensing.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Second?

## MR. MOSCATO:

25 Second.

1

4

11

12

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

33 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 All in favor? 3 ALL SAY AYE 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 Opposed? The motion carries. 6 MS. HENSEL: 7 Also for your consideration is the approval of Temporary Principal and Key Employee Licenses. Prior to this meeting the Bureau of 10 Licensing provided you with an Order regarding the 11 issuance of Temporary Licenses for 4 Principals, and 12 17 Key Employees. I ask that the Board consider the 13 Order approving these licenses. 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Any comment from Enforcement Counsel? 16 ATTORNEY PITRE: 17 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Any questions or comments from the 20 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 21 MR. MOSCATO: 22 Yes, sir. I move that the Board approve 23 the issuance of Temporary Principal and Key Employee 24 credentials as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 25 MR. WOODS:

34 Second. 1 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Opposed? The motion carries. MS. HENSEL: 8 There are also Gaming Permits and 9 Non-gaming Registrations. Prior to this meeting the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a list of 333 10 11 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted Temporary or Full Occupation Permits, and 134 individuals to 12 13 whom the Bureau has granted registrations under the 14 authority delegated to the Bureau of Licensing. 15 that that Board consider a motion approving the Order. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 18 ATTORNEY PITRE: 19 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 22 23 MR. WOODS: 24 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 25 approve the issuance of Gaming Employee Permits and

35 Non-gaming Employee Registrations as described by the 1 2 Bureau of Licensing. 3 MR. FAJT: Second. 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 All in favor? 7 ALL SAY AYE 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 Opposed? The motion carries. 10 MS. HENSEL: 11 Next there is a recommendation of denial 12 for four Gaming and one Non-gaming Employee 13 Applications. The Bureau of Licensing has provided 14 you with the Orders addressing the Applicants who the 15 OEC has recommended for denial. The Applicants failed to request a hearing within the specified time period. 16 I ask that the Board consider the Orders denying the 17 18 Gaming and Non-gaming Employee Applicants. 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 21 ATTORNEY PITRE: 22 Enforcement Counsel continues to request 23 denial in each instance. 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 Any questions or comments from the

36 1 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion? 2 MR. FAJT: 3 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board deny 4 the applications as described by the Bureau of 5 Licensing. 6 MS. KAISER: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 All in favor? 10 ALL SAY AYE 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Opposed? The motion carries. 13 MS. HENSEL: 14 Also for your consideration are 15 withdrawal request from Key Employees and Gaming 16 Employees. In each case the license or permit is no longer required. For today's meeting I've provided 17 18 the Board with a list of 2 Key Employees and 12 Gaming 19 Employees withdrawals for approval. I ask that the 20 Board consider the Orders approving these lists of 21 withdrawals. 22 CHAIRMAN: 23 Any comments from Enforcement Counsel? 2.4 ATTORNEY PITRE: 25 Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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

#### MS. KAISER:

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

#### MR. MCCALL:

Second.

## CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

12 ALL SAY AYE

### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

#### MS. HENSEL:

Finally, we have an Order to certify the following gaming service providers, C3 PPS, Inc.,

Dempsey Uniform and Linen Supply, Inc., E. GADS, LLC,

KHS&S Contractors of New Jersey, Inc., doing business as KHS&S Contractors, MayoSeitz Media, Inc., Metz

Concepts, LLC, doing business as Wolfgang Puck

Express, Mid-Valley Contracting Services Inc., and

Vincent Pools, Inc. I ask that the Board consider the Order approving the certification of these Gaming Service Providers.

	38
1	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
2	Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?
3	ATTORNEY PITRE:
4	Enforcement Counsel has no objections.
5	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
6	Any questions or comments from the
7	Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?
8	MR. MCCALL:
9	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
10	issue an Order to approve the applications for Gaming
11	Service Provider certification as described by the
12	Bureau of Licensing.
13	MR. MCNALLY:
14	Second.
15	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
16	All in favor?
17	ALL SAY AYE
18	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
19	Opposed? The motion carries.
20	MS. HENSEL:
21	That concludes the matters of the Bureau
22	of Licensing.
23	<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
24	Thank you, Susan. Next OEC. Cyrus?
25	ATTORNEY PITRE:
ļ	

Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. We have nine matters for the Board's consideration today consisting of two Consent Agreements, four Revocations, one Suspension, and two Involuntary Exclusions.

The first matter is a Consent Agreement between the OEC and Mr. Joshua Bogart. If Mr. Bogart is present I ask that he come forward. Mr. David Tepper is here on behalf of the OEC to present the matter.

# ATTORNEY TEPPER:

Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of the Board. David Tepper, T-E-P-P-E-R, with the OEC. I have for your consideration a Consent Agreement between the OEC and Joshua Bogart to withdraw Mr. Bogart's G2 Employee Application with prejudice. Mr. Bogart was issued a Gambling Employee Permit by the Board in November 2011. In August 2013, Mr. Bogart was promoted by his employer Sands to the position of Table Games Supervisor Dual Rate, a position requiring G2 Employee Permit.

During the background investigation for Mr. Bogart's G2 Employee Permit, BIE discovered that Mr. Bogart served as the guardian for his grandmother's estate. In June 2011 while Mr. Bogart

was serving as guardian he removed approximately \$37,000 from the estate, and used the money to gamble in Atlantic City. Mr. Bogart repaid the money to the estate. No criminal charges were filed in regards to this incident. In April 2014, The Sands filed a Petition to Withdraw Mr. Bogart's G2 Application, and the OEC filed an objection to this withdrawal. A hearing was scheduled before the OHA. Prior to the hearing being conducted, Mr. Bogart and the OEC entered into this Consent Agreement.

I've been in contact with Mr. Bogart, and he's relayed to me that he's currently employed in a Maryland casino and has to work today. He's aware of the terms and implications of the Consent Agreement and at this time the OEC requests the Board approve the Consent Agreement to withdraw the G2 Employee Permit Application of Josh Bogart with prejudice.

#### CHAIRMAN:

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 Consent Agreement between the OEC and Joshua Bogart regarding the withdrawal of his G2 Employee Application.

41 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Second? 3 MR. MOSCATO: Second. 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 All in favor? 7 ALL SAY AYE 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 Opposed? The motion carries. 10 ATTORNEY PITRE: 11 The next matter we have for the Board's 12 consideration is a Consent Agreement between the OEC 13 and Sugarhouse HSP Gaming, LP. Mr. Jim Armstrong will 14 present the matter on behalf the OEC, and 15 representatives from Sugarhouse are represented by Mr. Michael Sklar. 16 17 ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 18 Good morning Chairman, Commissioners. 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Good morning. 21 ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 22 The next matter on the agenda for the 23 Board's consideration is a Consent Agreement reached 24 between the OEC and Sugarhouse Casino in regard to 25 Sugarhouse Casino operating slot machines with

improperly set pay tables.

1.3

Commissioners, on August 23rd of last year the Bureau Gaming Laboratory Operations referred possible violations of the Gaming Act and the Board's regulations to the OEC. The review conducted by the Bureau of Gaming Laboratory Operations and the OEC confirmed that Sugarhouse Casino violated Section 1207.10 of the Gaming Act and the Board's regulations at Chapters 461 and 463.

Commissioners, on August 23rd of last year --- I'm sorry. On August 20th of last year, a Technical Field Representative assigned to the Board's lab review software in 31 slot machines and compared information as contained on Sugarhouse's gaming floor slot machine master list. The review determined that 12 of the 31 slot machines contained pay table settings that were different from those contained on Sugarhouse's gaming floor slot machine master list. The 12 affected slot machines were taken out of service, and a review of the matter was initiated.

It was determined that the 12 slot machines was set utilizing rejected pay tables that could potentially cause a theoretical payout of each slot machine to fall below the 85 percent minimum payout percentage. The 12 slot machines were serviced

by a Sugarhouse Slot Technician on March 25th of 2013. For nearly five months the pay table settings of the 12 slot machines were not set according to the slot machine modification request as submitted by Sugarhouse as a result contradicted the pay table settings on Sugarhouse's gaming floor slot machine master list.

reported that two new procedures will be followed by slot technical personal to protect against erroneous pay table settings. The new procedures involve, one, the verification of all slot technical services by the Slot Technician Manager or a second Slot Technician.

And all of Sugarhouse's slot machines will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to verify that all the slot machines have approved pay table settings that correspond to Sugarhouse's gaming floor slot machine master list.

Commissioners, if approved, this will be the first penalty assessed against Sugarhouse for violating provisions of the Act and Board regulations in regard to pay table settings on slot machines. The OEC asks that the Board approve the Consent Agreement and Stipulation of Settlement entered into between the parties. The terms of the settlement include a

provision that Sugarhouse shall institute policies and provide training, guidance, and reinforcements to its employees which will minimize the probability for improperly setting pay tables on slot machines.

Sugarhouse will also pay a civil penalty of \$58,000, and Sugarhouse will pay \$2,500 in costs incurred by the Board in regard to this matter. I will be glad to answer questions you may have.

## CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Mr. Sklar, ---

## ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Morning, Mr. Chairman.

## CHAIRMAN:

--- does Sugarhouse have any response?

#### ATTORNEY SKLAR:

16 Yes, briefly. Good morning, Mr.

17 Chairman, members of the Board. Michael Sklar,

18 | S-K-L-A-R, on behalf of Sugarhouse Casino. First,

19 just let me introduce Rose Cook is with me. She's the

20 | Vice President of Gaming at Sugarhouse, and Charlie

21 | Sanderson is the Director of Slot Performance.

22 As an initial threshold matter,

23 | Sugarhouse accepts responsibility for what happened

24 here. At the end of the day, the buck stops with

25 | Sugarhouse. They're supposed to ensure that the

correct pay tables are set on the machines. There are procedures that are in place. The Technician did not follow those procedures. There's no excuse, it was just they didn't follow them. The Technician involved was disciplined. As Mr. Armstrong mentioned, additional procedures have been adopted by Sugarhouse, and Rose can explain those a little more in detail to try to insure that a similar incident doesn't happen again in the future. Rose, why don't you ---?

#### CHAIRMAN:

And, why don't you stand if you will? So we can swear you in.

14 ROSE COOK, HAVING FIRST BEEN DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS
15 FOLLOWS:

16 -----

#### CHAIRMAN:

Ma'am, first could you just --- and you know the way we do it here, spell your last name and tell everybody ---.

A. Yes. Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of the Board. My name is Rosemarie Cook, C-O-O-K. I'm the Vice President of Gaming at Sugarhouse Casino. I think Michael really kind of explained everything, and the way it happened. We obviously want to mitigate

this type of thing from happening again, and in order to do that we really needed to take a deep look at our procedures. We did have procedures in place. They were not followed by the tech, but that didn't mean we shouldn't look further and see how can we try to prevent this going forward. We are doing self audits of our machines to make sure that they are set within approved guidelines. We have the second inspection and approval prior to putting a game back up on line, restarting it. In other words, after we've done any operating system changes, or any options have been cleared as well as anytime there's new software installed into those games at this point.

# ATTORNEY SKLAR:

Okay. We're available to answer any questions the Board may have.

### CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Any questions?

MR. MOSCATO:

Annmarie.

MS. KAISER:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN:

Annmarie?

MS. KAISER:

Yeah. I realize every situation is different that we handle, but I believe we have encountered this in the past with another entity. Is the fine that we're looking at in this matter in line with how we treated that other entity? I realize there could be some differences in terms of how long the games were on the floor, et cetera. I just want to make sure that we're kind of treating them equally.

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, the fine is reduced compared to the way that we treated the other entity, ---

### MS. KAISER:

Yeah.

### ATTORNEY PITRE:

entity. If the Board approves this fine, I've told the other entity that --- because they have other Consent Agreements in the pipeline, that I'm willing to look at one of those Consent Agreements as a possible compliance conference in order to put them on an even playing field with this entity. So, I am aware that the fine is reduced. The information that we have here is a lot more detailed than we had at that time. Now that we're aware of certain things, I'm going to put that other entity, with the Board's

```
approval, if the Board approves this Consent Agreement
1
2
   on the same level playing field. And I have spoken
   Mr. Kohler about that, because he was the
3
4
   representative of that entity. And he's expressed
5
   that he would be amenable to that if the Board if the
6
   Board approves this Consent Agreement.
                  MS. KAISER:
8
                  Thank you.
9
                  CHAIRMAN:
10
                  Okay. Any other questions? Ex-officio
11
   members? May I have a motion?
12
                  MR. MOSCATO:
                  Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
13
14
   issue an Order to approve the Consent Agreement
15
   between the OEC and Sugarhouse HSP Gaming, LP.
16
                  MR. WOODS:
17
                  Second.
18
                  CHAIRMAN:
19
                  All in favor?
20
   ALL SAY AYE
21
                  CHAIRMAN:
22
                  Opposed? The motion carries.
                                                  Thank
23
   you.
2.4
                  ATTORNEY PITRE:
25
                  The next matter that we have on the
```

agenda for the Board's consideration is a Revocation of Daniel Jelleyman's G2 Employee Permit. That matter is also going to be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel James Armstrong.

#### ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

With the Board's permission I can present item number four, Stephanie Latham as well since they both arose out of the same facts.

## CHAIRMAN:

Okay.

## ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Thank you. I have motions to consider the Revocations of Daniel Jelleyman and Stephanie Latham's Pennsylvania credentials, which is the next matter before the Board. These matters are being presented together because they are the same facts.

On April 28th of 2014 the OEC filed Revocation Complaints with the Board against Daniel Jelleyman and Stephanie Latham. The basis for the Complaints was Daniel Jelleyman and Stephanie Latham being investigated for a number of thefts from the count room at Sugarhouse Casino where Mr. Jelleyman was employed as a count room lead, and Ms. Latham was employed as a count room employee.

Chairman, Commissioners, the facts

determine that Mr. Jelleyman and Ms. Latham were recorded on surveillance coverage stealing damaged currency, and secreting it on their persons while working in the count room at Sugarhouse Casino. Mr. Jelleyman and Ms. Latham were taken into custody by the Pennsylvania State Police for the alleged thefts at Sugarhouse Casino, and they were both criminally charged with multiple counts of theft. They both admitted to conduct and gave the police written statements. Mr. Jelleyman admitted stealing approximately \$600 over a course of time, and Ms. Latham admitted to stealing approximately \$2,500. Mr. Jelleyman and Ms. Latham were both terminated from Sugarhouse Casino.

2.4

Commissioners, Mr. Jelleyman and Ms.

Latham were both properly served by regular and certified mail with the Revocation Complaints. Mr.

Jelleyman and Ms. Latham did not request hearings in regard to the Complainants. Mr. Jelleyman and Ms.

Latham were both served with the OEC's request for judgments upon default, and neither of them responded to those requests. And based on the foregoing, the OEC requests that you revoke both their credentials at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

All right. We'll take Daniel Jelleyman first. Is Daniel Jelleyman in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion?

#### MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the Revocation of Daniel Jelleyman's G2 Employee Permit as described by the OEC.

## MR. FAJT:

11 Second.

## CHAIRMAN:

13 All in favor?

14 ALL SAY AYE

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

#### CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries. Next,

Stephanie Latham. Is Stephanie Latham in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board? Exofficio members? May I have a motion?

## MR. FAJT:

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

## MS. KAISER:

52 Second. 1 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 All in favor? ALL SAY AYE 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Opposed? The motion carries. ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 8 Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 Thank you. 11 ATTORNEY PITRE: 12 The next matter that we have on the 13 agenda will be presented by Deputy Chief Enforcement Counsel, Dale Miller. It's the Revocation of Kevin 14 15 Siembida's Gaming Employee Permit. 16 ATTORNEY MILLER: It would be Dale Miller, M-I-L-E-R. 17 18 Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. Nice to 19 see you. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Good morning, Dale. 22 ATTORNEY MILLER: 23 This matter is a request for the 24 revocation of the Non-Gaming Employee Registration and 25 the Gaming Employee Permit of Kevin Siembida. On June

28th, 2011, Mr. Siembida was issued a Non-Gaming Employee Registration for his employment as a material handler at Presque Isle Downs, and then on September 21st, 2011 he was issued a Gaming Employee Permit when he transferred departments and became a member of the drop and count team at Presque Isle.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On February 26th, 2014, Mr. Siembida was arrest by the Pennsylvania State Police, charged with three counts of theft by unlawful taking or disposition, first degree misdemeanor offenses. The arrest stemmed from three incidents where Mr. Siembida was observed by surveillance cameras taking cash from the count room while in the performance of his duties at Presque Isle. In each incident Mr. Siembida dropped or pushed an object along with cash to the floor behind the count machine. He then crawled to the floor to retrieve the object and cash, and placed the cash in his sock. Total amount of money taken by Mr. Siembida was \$2,100. And, I might add that he was caught red footed, because they found the money in his socks, so ---.

On April 9th, 2014, the OEC filed an Enforcement Action against Kevin Siembida requesting that the Board revoke his Non-Gaming Employee Registration and his Gaming Employee Permit for

failing to maintain the suitability required for each license. OEC first attempted to serve the Enforcement Action at the address Mr. Siembida provided in his application, but that attempt was unsuccessful. And, the mail was returned to sender. Even though Mr. Siembida had a duty to notify the Board of change of address, he failed to do so. We then attempted to serve Mr. Siembida on April 17th, 2014, by using the address on the Criminal Complaint filed against Mr. Siembida, sending the documents to him by first class mail and certified mail. That attempt was successful because the first class mail was not returned. Mr. Siembida did not respond in any way, and due to his 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 June 26th, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter judgment upon default, and the matter is now before the Board to consider the Revocation of Kevin Siembida's Non-Gaming Employee Registration and his Gaming Employee Permit.

#### CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is Kevin Siembida in the hearing room?

Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio

members? May I have a motion?

55
MS. KAISER:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
issue an Order to approve the Revocation of Kevin
Siembida's Gaming Employee Permit and Non-Gaming
Employee Registration as described by the OEC.
MR. MCCALL:
Second.
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
All in favor?
ALL SAY AYE
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
Opposed? The motion carries.
ATTORNEY MILLER:
Thank you.
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
Thank you, Dale.
ATTORNEY PITRE:
The next matter on the Board's agenda
will be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel
Cassandra Fenstermaker. It's regarding the Revocation
of Teresa Cooper's Non-Gaming Employee Registration.
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
Good morning.
ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:
Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of

1 the Board. I'm Cassandra Fenstermaker,

F-E-N-S-T-E-R-M-A-K-E-R. I have a Complaint for the revocation of Teresa Cooper's Non-Gaming Employee Registration for your consideration today.

On April 28th, 2014, the OEC filed an amended Complaint to revoke the Non-Gaming Employee Registration of Teresa Cooper. BIE discovered that Ms. Cooper was convicted of bad checks on January 27th, 2014. The Complaint was sent to Ms. Cooper by both first class and certified mail. Ms. Cooper failed to respond to the Complaint in any way, and therefore all facts alleged in the Complaint are deemed admitted.

On July 3rd, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter default judgment, and at this time request that Teresa Cooper's Non-Gaming Employee Registration be revoked.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Is Teresa Cooper 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 revocation of Theresa Cooper's Non-Gaming Employee Registration as described

by the OEC.

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

MR. MCNALLY:

ALL SAY AYE

CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

The next matter I have for the Board's consideration is the Complaint for the Suspension of Travis Trower's Gaming Employee Permit. On April 25th, 2014, the OEC filed a Complaint against Travis Trower seeking the suspension of his Gaming Employee Permit as a result of his failure to comply with a special condition which had been placed on his license at the time that his Gaming Employee Permit was granted. The Complaint was sent to Mr. Trower by both first class and certified mail. Mr. Trower failed to respond to the Complaint in any way, and therefore pursuant to Board regulations, all facts alleged in the Complaint are deemed admitted.

On July 2nd, 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter default judgment in the matter, and at this time the OEC requests that Travis Trower's

58 Gaming Employee Permit be suspended. 1 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 Is Travis Trower in the hearing room? 4 Any questions or comments from the Board? Ex-officio 5 members? May I have a motion? 6 MR. MCNALLY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 8 issue an Order to approve the Suspension of Travis 9 Tower's Gaming Employee Permit as described by the 10 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 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER: 21 Thank you. 22 ATTORNEY PITRE: 23 The next matter that we have on the 24 Board's agenda is the placement of Gopal Ganti on the 25 PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List. That matter will be

presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel Carmelia Estriplet.

## CHAIRMAN:

Good morning.

## ATTORNEY ESTRIPLET:

Good morning, Chairman Ryan, members of the Board. Carmelia Estriplet, E-S-T-R-I-P-L-E-T, Assistant Enforcement Counsel for the OEC. This matter is a request to place Gopal Ganti on the Board's Exclusion List. On June 4th, 2014, the OEC filed a Petition to place Gopal Ganti on the Exclusion List for cheating while playing Texas Hold'em Bonus Poker at the Meadows Casino.

On December 10th, 2013, Mr. Ganti was caught capping his bet by placing an additional \$100 in chips on the anti-wager, and \$200 in chips on the flop wager. Mr. Ganti was paid \$1,000 in chips as result of his bet. He repaid his excess winning in the amount of \$500, and was charged with theft by unlawful taking with the intent to defraud and theft by deception/false impressions. The charge for theft by unlawful taking was nolle pros, and the charge for theft by deception/false impressions was held open pending on completion of the ARD program.

The Petition was sent to Mr. Ganti by

first class and certified mail, and Mr. Ganti failed
to respond to the Petition in any way. Therefore, all
facts alleged in the Petition are deemed admitted, and
his right to a hearing has been waived. A request to
enter judgment upon default was filed on July 9th,
2014, and at this time the OEC respectful requests
that Gopal Ganti be placed on the Board's Excluded
Persons List. And we're happy to answer any questions
that you may have at this time.

#### CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Is Gopal Ganti in the hearing room? Any questions or comments from the Board? Exofficio members? May I have a motion?

### MR. MOSCATO:

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

#### MR. WOODS:

20 Second.

# CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

23 ALL SAY AYE

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

2.4

25

## CHAIRMAN:

Opposed? The motion carries.

## ATTORNEY ESTRIPLET:

Thank you.

2.4

## CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

## ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER:

The final matter that we have for the Board's consideration today is a Petition to place Angela Taylor on the Board's Involuntary Exclusion List.

On May 15th, 2014, the OEC filed a Petition to place Angela Taylor on the Board's Involuntary Exclusion List. On March 7th, 2014, Ms. Taylor left her ten year old child in a vehicle while she gambled at Harrah's Philadelphia Casino and Race Track. The child was left unattended for approximately 20 minutes.

The Complaint was sent by both first class and certified mail. Ms. Taylor failed to respond to the Complaint in any way, and therefore all facts alleged in the Complaint are deemed admitted.

On July 3rd of 2014, the OEC filed a request to enter default judgment, and at this time requests that Ms.

Taylor be added to the Board's Involuntary Exclusion List.

### CHAIRMAN:

62 Is Angela Taylor 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: 5 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 6 issue an Order to approve the addition of Angela Taylor to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as 8 described by the OEC. 9 MR. FAJT: Second. 10 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 All in favor? 13 ALL SAY AYE 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Opposed? The motion carries. 16 ATTORNEY PITRE: 17 Thank you. 18 ATTORNEY FENSTERMAKER: 19 Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Thank you, both. Okay. I think that 22 concludes today's meeting. Our next scheduled Public 23 Meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 17th 24 beginning at 10:00 a.m. Any final comments from the 25 Board? Ex-officio members? May I have a motion to

```
63
 1
   adjourn?
 2
                   MR. FAJT:
 3
                   So moved.
 4
                   MS. KAISER:
 5
                   Second.
                   CHAIRMAN:
 6
                    Thank you very much, ladies and
 8
   gentleman. We are adjourned.
 9
10
                 MEETING CONCLUDED AT 12:00 P.M.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chairman Ryan was reported by me on 8/6/2014 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.

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908