COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GAMING CONTROL BOARD

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING

* * * * * * *

BEFORE: DAVID M. BARASCH, CHAIRMAN

Gregory C. Fajt; Richard G. Jewell; Keith

R. McCall; Anthony C. Moscato; William H.

Ryan, Jr.; David W. Woods; Members

Fred Strathmeyer, Jr., representing Russell

Redding, Secretary of Agriculture

Jennifer Langan, representing Timothy

Reese, State Treasurer

Robert P. Coyne, representing Eileen H.

McNulty, Secretary of Revenue

HEARING: Wednesday June 22, 2016, 10:03 a.m.

LOCATION: Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

Strawberry Square Complex, 2nd Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101

WITNESSES: Peter Marinari, Gerald Fretz

Reporter: Corey Elizabeth Summers

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

1	
2	A P P E A R A N C E S
3	
4	OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
5	R. DOUGLAS SHERMAN, ESQUIRE
6	Chief Counsel
7	STEPHEN S. COOK, ESQUIRE
8	Deputy Chief Counsel
9	
10	OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT COUNSEL
11	CYRUS PITRE, ESQUIRE
12	Chief Enforcement Counsel
13	DUSTIN L. MILLER, ESQUIRE
14	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
15	JOHN CROHE, ESQUIRE
16	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
17	KIM ADAMS, ESQUIRE
18	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
19	BENJAMIN FERRELL, ESQUIRE
20	Assistant Enforcement Counsel
21	GLEN A. STUART, ESQUIRE
22	Senior Enforcement Counsel
23	PA Gaming Control Board
24	P.O. Box 69060
25	Harrisburg, PA 17106-9060
26	Counsel for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board

```
3
1
                 A P P E A R A N C E S (cont.)
2
3
   BRYAN SCHROEDER, ESQUIRE
   Greenwood Gaming Services Company
   2999 Street Road
5
   P.O Box 1000
   Bensalem, PA 19020
      Counsel for Greenwood Gaming
9
10
   JEANNE BAKKER, ESQUIRE
11
   7 Mary Court
   Glen Mills, PA 19342
12
13
      Counsel for PHHA
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 Chairperson Barasch			6
5	REMARKS			
6	By Mr. O'Toole	7	-	8
7	REMARKS			
8	By Mr. Kile	8	_	9
9	PRESENTATION			
10	By Mr. Marinari	9	_	24
11	By Attorney Sherman	24	-	27
12	By Attorney Cook	28	_	42
13	By Ms. Hensel	42	_	53
14	By Attorney Miller	53	-	56
15	By Attorney Schroeder	5 6	-	57
16	By Mr. Fretz	57	-	59
17	By Attorney Miller	60	-	78
18	By Attorney Stuart	78	-	79
19	By Attorney Crohe	7 9	-	80
20	By Attorney Ferrell	8 0	-	81
21	By Attorney Adams	81	-	106
22	By Attorney Miller	106	_	107
23	By Attorney Stuart	107	_	110
24	By Attorney Ferrell	110	_	111
25	By Attorney Crohe	111	-	113

```
5
 1
                          I N D E X (cont.)
 2
 3
      CLOSING REMARKS
 4
        By Chairman Barasch
                                                          113 - 114
 5
 6
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN:

Good morning, everyone. I'm David
Barasch, Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control
Board. Before we begin, I repeat my longstanding
request that people silence their cell phone or
electronic devices. With us today is Fred
Strathmeyer, representing Russell Redding, Secretary
of Agriculture; Jennifer Langan, representing Tim
Reese, State Treasurer, and Bob Coyne, representing
Revenue Secretary, Eileen McNulty. Thank you all for
coming.

A quorum of the Board being present, I would call this meeting to order. First order of business, the Pledge of Allegiance.

17 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

CHAIRMAN:

The Board held an Executive Session yesterday, June 21st, for the purpose of discussing personnel matters, and to conduct quasi-judicial relations relating to matters before the Board today. Additionally, I would announce that within the next day or two the Board will be issuing a supplemental adjudication relative to the Category 2 Slots License

7

at Stadium Casino, LLC. As I'm sure most of the 1 2 people in the room are aware, the Supreme Court 3 remanded this case to the Board on two issues. 4 issues are addressed in our supplemental adjudication, 5 which will be promulgated in the next couple of days. 6 Next, we have a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27th meeting. 8 MR. RYAN: 9 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 10 approve the minutes of the transcript of the April 27, 11 2016 meeting. 12 MR. WOODS: Second. 1.3 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 All in favor? 16 AYES RESPOND 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 All opposed? Motion is adopted. Kevin? 19 MR. O'TOOLE:

Good morning, Chairman Barasch, members of the Board. For the Executive Director's report this morning we're going to have a presentation by the Pennsylvania Harness Horsemen's Association regarding their retirement savings plan. We have two representatives here today from PHHA, Executive

20

21

22

23

24

25

Director Peter Marinari and counsel, Jeanne Bakker. 1 2 And our Director of Racetrack Operations, Kevin Kile, 3 will give a brief introduction to the matter. Kevin? 4 CHAIRMAN: Well, if we could, before we proceed, 5 6 anyone who's going to be testifying --- speaking today, other than attorneys, should stand and identify themselves to be sworn by the court reporter. 8 9 MR. MARINARI: 10 Peter Marinari, Pennsylvania Harness 11 Horsemen's Association. 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Would you spell the name, please? 14 MR. MARINARI: 15 Sure, M-A-R-I-N-A-R-I. 16 17 PETER MARINARI, HAVING FIRST BEEN DULY SWORN, 18 TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 19 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Who else is speaking who is not an 22 attorney? No one? Okay. 23 MR. KILE: 24 Good morning, Chairmen, members of the 25 Board. The Pennsylvania Harness Horsemen's

Association or PHHA has requested approval of amendments to the retirement savings plan. Under Section 1406 of the Act, approximately four percent of funding received from the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Fund is required to be used to fund health insurance and pension benefits for members of the Horsemen's organizations and their families in accordance with the rules and eligibility requirements of each organization.

So Subsection F of Section 1406 of the Act requires that all health and pension benefit contracts be approved by the Board. And the PHHA's initial plan was approved on November 8th, 2007. The PHHA represents horse owners, trainers and others that race at Harrah's Philadelphia and the Downs at Mohegan Sun Pocono. Representatives from the PHHA are present today and would like to address the amendments to their retirement savings plan with the Board. Peter?

MR. MARINARI:

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Board. Can I have the first slide, please? Thank you very much. Okay. The first slide is a brief overview of the PHHA, when we were founded. I won't repeat what Kevin said. I'll just mention that the PHHA is governed by an 11 member Board of

Directors, elected to staggered four year terms every two years by the membership. And it just goes on then to detail the makeup of the Board.

The second slide is regarding our pension plan, the reason for the pension plan and the date that the pension plan came into existence. Slide number three details those who are eligible to participate in the PHHA pension plan. The individual must be a member of our association, and the individual must be either a driver or a trainer who competes at one of the two racetracks we represent.

The next slide is the eligibility of the benefits. Basically it details what constitutes that eligibility. Eligibility is based on the number of starts. We race 150 race days per year at Harrah's Philadelphia and this year 136 days at Pocono Downs. It's a cumulative basis. These earn on a cumulative basis. So it encompasses both racetracks. So this just details definition of a race day and how we establish our point system.

The following slide is the --- details how a trainer would earn points to be able to qualify for the pension. And the slide after that does the same for drivers. A vesting process is included and it's necessary to be able to withdraw pension

benefits. This slide details how one vests. It also goes into detail that at the end of 2015 there was 634 members of the Pennsylvania Harness Horsemen's Association, of which 361 participated in the retirement plan, 66 drivers and 295 trainers. As of the end of last year, of those participating in the pension plan, 35 drivers and 114 trainers are currently vested.

The next slide is an actual overview of the amendments that we are asking the Board to approve. The first amendment is to the qualified start provision of the pension plan. And I'll read this one since this is for your consideration.

The Board of Trustees of the Association wishes to amend the pension plan to provide for a nondiscriminatory procedure for review and approval of any mid-year change of the designated trainer or driver of a horse as entered in the official racing program or Judge's booklet for a race. The goal of this amendment is to protect the pension plan and its participants from abusive or deceptive practices by trainers or drivers seeking to earn qualified starts during a racing season.

By way of example, this amendment is intended to prevent individuals from falsely

identifying themselves as a trainer or driver in an official racing program and thereby falsely earning a qualified start.

2.4

Proceeding, the amendment provides that all trainers and drivers must obtain approval from the committee of any mid-year change of the trainer or driver or horse entered in an official racing program or Judge's booklet for a race. To obtain approval, the current trainer or driver and the proposed new trainer or driver must submit a written application to the committee requesting approval of the change. The amendment also provides that the committee has sole discretionary authority to approve or disapprove any such requests.

Finally, the amendment provides that any failure by a driver or trainer to comply with the rules and procedures established by the committee for obtaining such approval shall result in action by the committee, including denial of an applications for a mid-year --- yes, for a mid --- excuse me, proposed mid-year change, loss of earned qualified starts, and/or forfeiture of some or all of a participant's account, as determined within the sole discretion of the committee. That's amendment number one.

Amendment number two, the Board of

Trustees of the PHHA also wishes ---. Oh, sorry. The Board of Trustees of the PHHA also wishes to amend the pension plan to provide for a limited distribution of a participant's vested benefit where the participant has attained age 55 as of June 1, 2016. Currently the pension plan provides for distribution of a participant's account, one, upon retirement, on or after age 62; two, upon death; three, if a participant suffers a total disability, and four, if a fully vested participant has not performed active service for ten years.

The committee has received numerous requests by vested participants who are younger than age 62 to receive their account balance earlier than 62. The committee would like to accommodate these requests in a limited manner. As a result, the proposed amendment provides that vested participants who have attained age 55 as of June 1, 2016 may request distribution of their account.

Eleven (11) percent of drivers, a total of 7; and 22 percent of trainers, a total of 65, could take advantage of this limited opportunity to receive an early distribution of their vested account balance. Please note this early distribution option is purely voluntary. No participant will be required to take an

early distribution.

Then the PowerPoint goes on to detail the funding, the fact that --- the jockey obligations, number one. The health benefits are number two and the pension account is number three. It also details how we transfer funds, the third-party administrator for the funds, et cetera.

And the pertinent part here ---. I'm sorry, this slide. The pertinent part here is the final paragraph which says, in 2015 PHHA received \$3,615,149.67 for health and pension benefits to its eligible members. From these funds, pension disbursements of \$462,500 will be distributed to eligible drivers and \$1,712,500 to eligible trainers, for a total pension payment for 2015 of \$2,175,000. Health costs in 2015 were \$688,275.82. Sixty (60) percent of available health and pension funds will be paid into eligible members' pension accounts and 19 percent was paid for members' health insurance.

And finally, while Act 71 mandates 85
percent of funds received from the Race Horse
Development Fund for the purpose of members' health
and pension benefits be paid for their health and
pension plans, the Pennsylvania Harness Horsemen's
Association expends a hundred percent of those funds

for health and pension plans. We don't withdraw any administrative costs.

CHAIRMAN:

2.1

Are there any further comments here before I open this up for questions? Are there any questions or comments from the Board?

MR. WOODS:

Two. I noticed that two of the tracks are listed, but Meadows is not. So, they're in a different pension plan, obviously?

MR. KILE:

The Meadows is represented by the MSOA, the Meadows Standardbred Owners Association. So, they have a totally independent pension plan from ours.

MR. WOODS:

Can I ask the Department of Agriculture a question? Under the new formation of the Horse and Harness Racing Commission under one Commission, this presentation, didn't present it to them in any way, shape or form. Do you have any requirement to review it?

MR. STRATHMEYER:

No. To my knowledge, no. Executive

Deputy Mike Smith was part of the Executive Session,

so he did --- and he's privy to this presentation.

And that's to the best of my knowledge. Currently I'm Acting Director for Harness Racing. I'm assuming that position. So, it has not been brought to my attention until yesterday, when it was brought to my attention. But to my knowledge, a new Act does not require that we are involved.

CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Speak into the mic.

MR. STRATHMEYER:

I'm sorry, to my knowledge it doesn't require ---. The Act does not require that we --I'm sorry, the Agriculture Commission actually be involved in this conversation, to my knowledge.

MR. KILE:

I would concur with that.

CHAIRMAN:

Go ahead.

MR. MCCALL:

Okay. Just one question. The early distribution that you're providing, is there any penalty to the person who opts for the early distribution of his vested contributions?

MR. KILE:

Do you mean, would he receive a lesser extent than what he had earned?

MR. MCCALL:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

withdrawal.

Well, the State system, there's two retirement ages, 60 or 62. If I'm 55, the retirement age is 62, seven years difference, you're penalized two percent a year, 2.5 percent, depending on what the multiplier is, against your pension for that early withdrawal. Is there any type of pension reduction or penalty for the early withdrawal?

MR. KILE:

There is not a penalty for an early

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

If I may answer that. The distribution is a lump-sum distribution of the account balance, whatever the balance is on the day of the distribution.

MR. MCCALL:

So, it would not be the monthly benefit?

MR. KILE:

It's more like a 401(k).

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

That's correct.

MR. MCCALL:

Okay. I got you.

CHAIRMAN:

18 A good question. 1 2 MR. MOSCATO: 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned 4 that to participate in this plan you have to be a 5 member of the Association. And then you set out so 6 many races. Is there a dues structure to be a member of the Association? 8 MR. KILE: 9 I'm sorry? 10 MR. MOSCATO: Is there a dues structure? 11 12 MR. KILE: 13 There is a \$40 per year membership fee. 14 MR. MOSCATO: 15 Very reasonable. And you should also be 16 commended for not taking any administrative costs. 17 MR. KILE: 18 Thank you. 19 MR. MOSCATO: 20 You're welcome. 2.1 CHAIRMAN: 22 Commissioner Ryan, do you have any 23 questions? 24 MR. RYAN: 25 No.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions. If I understand the second amendment, the retirement age is not being lowered to 55; is that right? I thought you said that a distribution would be allowed on a limited basis, I think those were your words, at age 55; is that correct?

MR. KILE:

10 Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. FAJT:

So the retirement age stays at 62?

MR. KILE:

Correct.

MR. FAJT:

And what are those limited basis that you are allowing that distribution?

MR. KILE:

If the person --- correct me if I'm wrong. If the person is --- attains age 55 by

June 1st of this year. So, anybody who is vested ---.

There would be two requirements. They would have to already be vested and they would have to be 55 by

June 1st.

MR. FAJT:

Okay. And I know we don't, you know, necessarily have to be big brother to the world. obviously you had members come to you and say, you know, as you mentioned it, that I would like this vested benefit at age 55 instead of waiting to 62. Do you worry at all that that money's going to be squandered and not available? You know, and obviously, people are living longer and retirement age and Social Security distribution ages, you know, are going north, not south. And yet your plan is lowering that availability of a distribution from 62 to 55. Т mean, do you worry at all that that might not be a good thing, and that this money will be squandered and not available for retirement, which was the original intent of the plan?

MR. KILE:

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To be honest, I don't have that concern.

MR. FAJT:

Okay. And my last question is, because of the allowable distribution at 55 now, is there any impact on the actuarial soundness of the plan going forward, so that this drain of money is coming out earlier than originally anticipated? Is there any issue with the actuarial side of it? I'm assuming this is a defined benefit plan?

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

It's sort of a hybrid between a defined benefit plan and a defined contribution plan.

MR. FAJT:

Okay.

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

It is not a defined benefit plan in the concept of the type of plan you're referring to, where a monthly benefit comes out and that monthly benefit is calculated or defined ---

MR. FAJT:

Uh-huh (yes).

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

be based on years of service or final average pay.

The benefit is determined by the amount of money that is in the account. And the amount of money that is in the account is determined by --- in two ways, by annually, the money gets contributed to the account, based on the amount of qualified starts, which translates into some amount of points.

The most points that a participant can earn in a year is a whole point. So, they might have a quarter-point, a half-point, three-quarters of a point or a whole point. And amounts based on the

available revenue in a given year, that available revenue is then divvied up among the participants, according to the amount of points they have earned for that year. And that gets put into their book entry account. And that is one way how their benefit grows.

The other way that their benefit grows is by investment earnings. The money is pulled, for purposes of investment, and the earnings are then divvied up each year by the third-party administrator, ---

MR. FAJT:

Staffordshire.

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

administrator then provides a spreadsheet to the Association and they basically prepare their numbers to make sure they agree. And then the earnings are then divvied up among the participants' existing accounts. And that is how the account balance grows. So, in terms of actuarial soundness, actuarial soundness is not really a variable here because of the way the account grows.

MR. FAJT:

Got you. So, it's not generally a defined benefit plan.

ATTORNEY BAKKER:

Yes.

MR. FAJT:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

I've got a question. You say about the withdrawals, a certain class of people after the age of 55. Does that mean that a person that decides to do that is no longer an active --- active in the industry? This is basically an early retirement for the people who are pulling money out or portions of their money out at age 55?

MR. KILE:

What would happen would be they're still welcome to participate in racing. This doesn't affect their participation in racing. It would eliminate them from continuing within the plan, however.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you, very much. Any other questions from the Board? May I have a motion?

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the amendment to the Pennsylvania Harness Horsemen's Association retirement savings plan as presented.

24 1 MR. FAJT: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 4 5 AYES RESPOND 6 CHAIRMAN: All opposed? Motion is adopted. Thank you. Does Human Resources have anything at this point 8 9 or are we skipping over Players' presentation? 10 Nothing? 11 MS. YANTIS: 12 No. 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 Claire, a presentation, nothing? 15 MS. YANTIS: 16 No. 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Office of Chief Counsel (OCC), Doug 19 Sherman? 20 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 21 Good morning, Chairman and members of 22 the Board. Today we have two petitions on the agenda. 23 Each is to be decided on the documents of record as 24 they are both uncontested. For each of the matters 25 the Board has, in advance of this meeting, been

provided with petitions, OEC's response and any evidentiary materials which have been filed as a part of the record.

2.3

The first petition before the Board today pertains to Samantha Fly's request to be removed from the Involuntary Exclusion List. I do note that Ms. Fly is present in the audience. And if there are any questions, I presume that she would be more than happy to come forward to answer them.

On August 18th, 2012 the OEC filed a complaint to place Samantha Fly on the Board's Exclusion List, alleging that she was 19 years old and gained access to the Sands gaming floor, and as a result was issued summary citations for that access.

On June 5th, 2013 the Board placed Ms. Fly on the Exclusion List until at least her 22nd birthday, at which time she would be permitted to apply for the removal from the list. April 2016 the Board received Ms. Fly's request, seeking removal from the Exclusion List. The OEC does not object to that removal, and as such the matter is ready for the Board's disposition.

CHAIRMAN:

Are there any questions or comments from the Board on this matter? May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to grant Samantha Fly's petition as described by the OCC.

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

The second petition before the Board today relates to Kyle Reed's petition for removal from the Involuntary Exclusion List. By way of background, on November 19th, 2014 Mr. Reed, who was under the age of 21 at the time, gained entrance to the Sands Casino. He had been escorted by Sands' security to a restaurant located within the facility. However, after his meal he walked past security and onto the gaming floor, where he wagered at a slot machine before he was noticed and removed.

Mr. Reed was thereafter charged with underage gaming and subsequently pled guilty to that offense. As a result of the incident, the Office of

27

Enforcement Counsel (OEC) filed a petition requesting 1 2 his placement on the Exclusion List. Mr. Reed did not 3 respond and the Board issued an Order on November 19th, 2014 placing him on the Exclusion List 5 for at least one year from the date of the Order. 6 It's now been over a year since his placement on the list and Mr. Reed is requesting to be removed from the Exclusion List. OEC has not objected to the request, and as such, it's ready for the 9 10 Board's consideration. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Any questions or comments from the 13 Board? May I have a motion? 14 MR. MOSCATO: 15 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 16 issue an order to grant Kyle Reed's petition as 17 described by the OEC. 18 MR. RYAN: 19 Second. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 All in favor? 22 AYES RESPOND 2.3 CHAIRMAN: 2.4 All opposed? Next? 25 ATTORNEY SHERMAN:

 $\label{eq:Next-presenting-Withdrawals} \ \text{and Reports}$ and Recommendations is going to Deputy Chief Counsel $\ \text{Steve Cook.}$

CHAIRMAN:

Just for the record, I never got to that. The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Good morning. The Board has received several unopposed petitions to withdraw applications or surrender the credentials of the following individuals, Alan T. Eland, Scott D. Schweinfurth, Deron J. Hunsberger, Robert M. Pickus and Michael Carlotti. The OEC has no objection to any of these petitions. As a result if the Board were to grant same, they would be doing so without prejudice. And the matters are now ripe for the Board's consideration.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

20 May I have a motion?

MR. RYAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issued orders to grant the Withdrawals and Surrenders as described by the OEC.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Next before the Board for consideration are six Reports and Recommendation received from the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA). With each case the Report and Recommendation, as well as the complete evidentiary record, have been provided to the Board in advance of today's meeting.

And additionally in each case the person that's the subject to the Report and Recommendation has been notified that the matter will be taken up today and that they can come forward to briefly address the Board. If any of these persons are present and wish to come forward, they should do so when their matter is called. Melissa Brown is the first Report and Recommendation. On December ---.

CHAIRMAN:

Steve, before you proceed, just for the record, just note that Commissioner Jewell is participating. That's the voice you're hearing, long

distance in this deliberation, so you do have a full seven member Board participating today. Proceed.

ATTORNEY COOK:

On December 10th, 2015 Ms. Brown submitted a Non-Gaming Employee application, seeking work as a beverage server at the SugarHouse Casino. In January of 2016 the OEC issued a Notice of Recommendation of Denial based upon Ms. Brown's criminal history. Specifically in 2012 Ms. Brown was convicted of forgery and theft by deception after having forged a prescription for oxycodone.

A hearing in this matter was held on April 5th, 2016. Both the OEC and Ms. Brown attended the hearing and provided evidence. Ms. Brown did not dispute a criminal record at that time, admitting that her conduct was wrong, that she served two years of probation, which she has successfully completed. And that she has been employed now for over four years in the food and beverage service industry, as well as has become the mother of now a three-year-old child.

She also admitted --- submitted into evidence several letters attesting to her good character. Those letters were written by her current employer as well as a former Chester City Councilman, an attorney and a couple of other individuals.

Relative to her specific criminal conduct, Ms. Brown testified that she did not secure the drugs in question for her own use, but rather for a person with whom she was in an abusive relationship at the time. And after hearing all of the evidence, the Report and Recommendation issued by the Hearing Officer recommends that Ms. Brown's Non-Gaming Registration application be approved given the totality of evidence as presented. And that is the recommendation before the Board today.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA, regarding Melissa Brown's application for Non-Gaming Employee Registration as described by the OCC.

MR. FAJT:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

23 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? Motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

William Gerrity's Report and
Recommendation is the next matter before the Board.
Mr. Gerrity holds a Gaming Employee Permit and has worked as a security officer at Mohegan Sun Casino.
However, he no long works for that facility or any other Pennsylvania casino, but he does continue to hold his Gaming Permit.

On October 30th, 2015 the OEC filed a complaint to revoke Mr. Gerrity's Gaming Permit. The complaint alleges that on September 3rd, 2015 this individual was charged with theft by unlawful taking, receiving stolen property and possession of drug paraphernalia.

specifically, while police were responding to a report of a domestic disturbance at Mr. Gerrity's residence, they were informed by an individual involved in the dispute that Mr. Gerrity had in his possession stolen items from a storage room in the apartment building in which he lived, as well as stolen packages intended to be delivered to other building tenants, drugs and drug paraphernalia. Mr. Gerrity consented to a search of his apartment, which confirmed the allegations that were made by the other individual.

33

Ultimately, on October 23rd, 2015 Mr. 1 2 Gerrity pled quilty to theft and possession of drug 3 paraphernalia. A hearing in this matter was held on 4 March 1st, 2016. Despite receiving proper notice, Mr. 5 Gerrity did not attend that hearing. As a result, the only evidence put into the record was that of Enforcement Counsel, which corroborated the facts I just stated. And after hearing all of that evidence, the Hearing Officer issued a Report and 9 10 Recommendation, recommending that Mr. Gerrity's Gaming 11 Permit be revoked. And that is the recommendation 12 before the Board. 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 Questions or comments from the Board? 15 May I have a motion? 16 MR. FAJT: 17 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 18 adopt the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA 19 regarding the revocation of William Gerrity's Gaming 20 Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OCC. 21 MR. MCCALL: 22 Second. 23 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 24 25 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

Lamont Jackson's Report and

Recommendation is next before the Board today. On

November 6th, 2015 Mr. Jackson submitted a Non-Gaming

Employee application seeking work as an Environmental

Services Heavy Porter at the SugarHouse Casino. In

January of 2016 the OEC issued a Notice of

Recommendation of Denial of this application, based

upon Mr. Jackson's criminal history, which included

numerous theft-related offenses.

Mr. Jackson's most recent conviction occurred in 2005. Specifically at that time he pled guilty to receiving stolen property and was incarcerated for approximately nine-and-a-half years. Based on that conviction and his prior criminal history, ultimately he was released from prison onto parole, which he remains in 2015.

A hearing in this matter was held on April 7th, 2016. Both Enforcement Counsel and Mr. Jackson appeared at the hearing and offered evidence. Mr. Jackson testified, acknowledging his criminal history, but noting that he has participated in various work-training programs while in prison, and

provided documentation confirming his participation and completion of all those programs.

After he was released from prison and placed on parole, Mr. Jackson joined the Center for Employment Opportunity in Philadelphia, where he participated in life-skills education. In fact, he now mentors others at the Center by helping young offenders being released from prison and sometimes juvenile facilities. Mr. Jackson is also, at this point in time, heavily involved with other community activities and his church and is presently maintaining a sober lifestyle.

Finally, it's worth noting that Mr.

Jackson is, at present, employed by SugarHouse in a noncredentialed position back of house, in the kitchen. And, in fact, on March 31st SugarHouse itself wrote a letter of recommendation citing Mr.

Jackson's strong performance in that facility and the fact that he's been an outstanding employee. And as a result, SugarHouse is backing this license as well.

So, with all that evidence being heard, the Report and Recommendation issued by the Hearing Officer recommended that Mr. Jackson's Non-Gaming Employee application be approved; and that he has shown strong evidence of rehabilitation since his

release from prison.

1

2

5

6

9

10

11

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN:

3 Any questions or comments from the

4 Board? May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA regarding Lamont Jackson's application for Non-Gaming Employee registration as described by the OCC.

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

12 CHAIRMAN:

All in favor? 13

14 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? Motion is adopted.

17 ATTORNEY COOK:

> Next Report and Recommendation before the Board pertains to Marlon Merjos. On December 17th, 2015 the OEC filed a petition to place Mr. Merjos on the Exclusion List after it was found that on August 2nd, 2015, while only 20 years old, he gained access to and gamed at Mohegan Sun at Pocono

23

2.4 Downs Casino.

25 When asked for identification, Mr. Merjos at least once provided false identification while on the gaming floor. And while on the gaming floor he also played 17 hands of Blackjack. As a result of these actions, Mr. Merjos was charged with and pleaded guilty to unlawful wagering.

He did request a hearing, participated in the hearing, testified, essentially, that he thought the legal age for gaming was 18.

Unfortunately he did not have a good explanation for why he presented a false ID indicating that he was over 21. As a result of that evidence, the Hearing Officer found him not to be credible and recommends that, in fact, he be placed on the list for a period of at least one year, at which time he could petition for removal from the list.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board adopt the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA regarding Marlon Jake Merjos's placement on the Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OCC, and that Mr. Merjos be placed on the Exclusion List for at least one year, at which time he may petition

this Board to be removed from the list.

MR. RYAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

The next matter before the Board is the Report and Recommendation pertaining to James Platts. On October 22nd, 2015 the OEC filed a complaint requesting that Mr. Platts be placed on the Board's Exclusion List for leaving his four-year-old unattended in his vehicle in the parking garage at Harrah's Casino while he gamed.

A hearing in this matter was held on January 7th, 2016. The OEC and Mr. Platts appeared at the hearing offering evidence. Mr. Platts testified that prior going to the casino he dropped off his girlfriend and her children at home. It's noteworthy that the couple had seven children. And unbeknownst to Mr. Platts, a four-year-old --- one of his four-year-old children had fallen asleep in the back of his passenger van.

Mr. Platts' girlfriend also testified at the hearing and provided documentary evidence to corroborate her testimony, that soon after Mr. Platts left for the casino, she recognized that one of the children were missing. She attempted to call Mr. Platts on his cell phone. The cell phone rang at their apartment because it was left behind. She, thereafter, subsequently tried to or did call Harrah's five times, so that they could track him down on the floor. That didn't happen.

2.4

Ultimately, she thereafter called the Chester Police, who responded. Sure enough, the child was found sleeping in the back of the car.

After hearing this evidence, the Report and Recommendation issued by the Hearing Officer found that while Mr. Platts did not knowingly leave his four-year-old in the car, he nevertheless --- the Hearing Officer nevertheless recommended that he be placed on the list for at least one year. And that is the recommendation before the Board.

CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. RYAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

reject the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA regarding James Platts' placement on the Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OCC, and that Mr. Platts not be placed on the Exclusion List.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? Motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY COOK:

The final Report and Recommendation before the Board pertains to Andrew Micali. In February of 2009 Mr. Micali pleaded guilty to charges resulting from his part in an illegal sports-betting ring operating out of the Borgata Casino in Atlantic City.

In 2010 New Jersey placed Mr. Micali on that jurisdiction's Exclusion List for five years. He was also placed on the Delaware State Lottery's Exclusion List. As a result of this gambling-related criminal conviction, the fact that Mr. Micali was known to frequent Pennsylvania casinos, the OEC filed a complaint to place him on the Board's Involuntary

Exclusion List.

Before the Board took that matter up, however, the OEC and Mr. Micali reached a Consent Agreement, which the Board subsequently approved, placing Mr. Micali on the Exclusion List for three years, at which time he could petition for removal from the list.

He subsequently did petition for removal from the list after that three years ran. At the hearing, OEC continued to object to his removal from the list. A hearing on his request was held on March 15th, 2016. Mr. Micali provided evidence that he has had no further run-ins with law enforcement since his placement onto the list. And he also testified that he has separated himself from the other participants in the sports-betting ring.

The Report and Recommendation subsequently issued by the Hearing Officer recommends that Mr. Micali be removed from the Involuntary Exclusion List. And that is the recommendation before the Board. It is worth noting that this individual has also sought and been removed from the New Jersey list, having served his five-year ban in that jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN:

42 Questions or comments from the Board? 1 2 May I have a motion? 3 MR. WOODS: 4 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 5 adopt the Report and Recommendation issued by the OHA regarding Andrew Micali's petition to be removed from the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OCC. MR. FAJT: 10 Second. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 13 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 All opposed? Motion's adopted. 16 ATTORNEY SHERMAN: 17 And that concludes all matters of the OCC. 18 19 CHAIRMAN: 20 Thank you, Doug. Next, we have Ms. Sue Hensel, Director of Bureau of Licensing. 21 22 MS. HENSEL: 23 Thank you, Chairman Barasch and members 24 of the Board. Before the Board today will be two 25 Junket Enterprise License Applicants, as well as 934

Principal, Key Gaming and Non-Gaming Employee 2 applicants. In addition, there will be a 3 consideration of 21 Gaming Service Provider Applicants.

The first matter for your consideration is the approval of a Gaming Junket Enterprise License for Chi Ho Leung. The Junket Enterprise is a sole proprietorship based in Connecticut and conducts business in Pennsylvania and Connecticut. The Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement (BIE) has completed its investigation of this company and the Bureau of Licensing has provided you with a Background Investigation and Suitability Report. I have provided you with a draft Order and ask that the Board consider the approval of a license for Chi Ho Leung.

CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

22 May I have a motion?

1

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

23

24

25

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board approve the Gaming Junket Enterprise License of Chi Ho

44 Leung, as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 1 2 MR. MCCALL: 3 Second. 4 CHAIRMAN: 5 All in favor? 6 AYES RESPOND CHAIRMAN: All opposed? 8 Motion's adopted. 9 MS. HENSEL: 10 Next for your consideration is the 11 approval of a Gaming Junket Enterprise License for Lion Gaming and Travel Group, LLC. The Junket 12 13 Enterprise is a limited liability company based in New 14 Jersey and conducts business in Pennsylvania, the 15 Bahamas, Louisiana, Nevada and New Jersey. 16 The BIE has completed its investigation 17 of this company and the Bureau of Licensing has 18 provided you with a Background Investigation and 19 Suitability Report. I have provided you with a draft 20 Order and ask that the Board consider the approval of 21 a license for Lion Gaming and Travel Group, LLC. 22 CHAIRMAN: 2.3 Comments from Enforcement Counsel? 2.4 ATTORNEY PITRE: 25 Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

1 CHAIRMAN: 2 Comments from the Board? Questions? 3 May I have a motion? 4 MR. MCCALL: 5 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 6 approve the Gaming Junket Enterprise License of Lion Gaming and Travel Group, LLC, as described by the Bureau of Licensing. 9 MR. MOSCATO: 10 Second. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 All in favor? AYES RESPOND 13 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 All opposed? Motion's adopted. 16 MS. HENSEL: Also for your consideration is the 17 18 approval of Principal and Key Employee Licenses. 19 Prior to this meeting, the Bureau of Licensing 20 provided you with a proposed Order for two Principal 21 and two Key Employee Licenses. I ask that the Board 22 consider the Order, approving these licenses. 23 CHAIRMAN: 24 Questions or comments from Enforcement 25 Counsel?

46
ATTORNEY PITRE:
Enforcement Counsel has no objections.
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
Questions or comments from the Board?
May I have a motion?
MR. MOSCATO:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board
approve the issuance of Principal and Key Employee
Licenses as described by the Bureau of Licensing.
MR. RYAN:
Second.
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
All in favor?
AYES RESPOND
<pre>CHAIRMAN:</pre>
All opposed? Motion's adopted.
MS. HENSEL:
There are also Temporary, Principal and
Key Employee Licenses. Prior to this meeting, the
Bureau of Licensing provided you with an Order
regarding the issuance of temporary licenses for three
Principal and 11 Key employees. I ask that the Board
consider the Order approving the licenses.
CHAIRMAN:
Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objection.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

5 May I have a motion?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RYAN:

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

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

15 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

MS. HENSEL:

Next there are Gaming Permits and Non-Gaming Registrations. Prior to this meeting, the Bureau of Licensing provided you with a list of 664 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted temporary or full occupation permits, and 220 individuals to whom the Bureau has granted registrations, under the authority delegated to the Bureau of Licensing. I ask

48 that the Board to consider a motion approving the 1 2 Order. 3 CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments from Enforcement 4 5 Counsel? 6 ATTORNEY PITRE: Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 8 CHAIRMAN: 9 Questions or comments from the Board? 10 May I have a motion? 11 MR. WOODS: 12 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 13 approve the issuance of Gaming Employee Permits and 14 Non-Gaming Employee Registrations as described by the 15 Bureau of Licensing. 16 MR. FAJT: Second. 17 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 All in favor? 20 AYES RESPOND 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All opposed? The motion's adopted. 23 MS. HENSEL: 24 Also there are recommendations of denial 25 for two Gaming and three Non-Gaming Employees.

each case the applicant failed to request a hearing 1 within the specified time frame. The Bureau of 2 3 Licensing has provided you with Orders addressing the 4 applicants. The OEC has recommended for denial. I 5 ask that the Board consider a motion approving the 6 denials. CHAIRMAN: Enforcement Counsel? 8 9 ATTORNEY PITRE: 10 Enforcement Counsel continues to request 11 denial in each instance. 12 CHAIRMAN: 13 Questions or comments from the Board? 14 May I have a motion? 15 MR. FAJT: 16 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board deny 17 the Gaming and Non-Gaming Employee applications as 18 described by the Bureau of Licensing. 19 MR. MCCALL: 20 Second. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All in favor? 2.3 AYES RESPOND 2.4 CHAIRMAN: 25 All opposed? Motion's adopted.

MS. HENSEL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

23

Next for your consideration are
Withdrawal Requests for Gaming and Non-Gaming
Employees. In each case a permanent registration is
no longer required. For today's meeting I provided
the Board with a list of 16 Gaming and 11 Non-Gaming
Employee applicant Withdrawals for approval. I ask
that the Board consider the Order approving this list
of Withdrawals.

CHAIRMAN:

Enforcement Counsel?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Enforcement Counsel has no objections.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board

members? May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

18 Mr. Chairman, I move the Board approve

19 the Withdrawals as described by the Bureau of

20 Licensing.

MR. MOSCATO:

22 Second.

CHAIRMAN:

24 All in favor?

25 AYES RESPOND

51 1 CHAIRMAN: 2 All opposed? Motion's adopted. 3 MS. HENSEL: 4 In addition, we have an Order to certify 5 the following Gaming Service Providers, Development Management Associates, LLC, Label Rite, Inc. and Vollers Excavating & Construction, Inc. I ask that the Board consider the order, approving this Gaming 9 Service Provider Applicants for Certification. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 Enforcement Counsel? 12 ATTORNEY PITRE: 13 Enforcement Counsel has no objection. 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Questions or comments from the Board? May I have a motion? 16 17 MR. MOSCATO: 18 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 19 issue an order to approve the applications for Gaming 20 Service Provider Certification as described by the 21 Bureau of Licensing. 22 MR. RYAN: 2.3 Second. 2.4 CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

25

1 AYES RESPOND 2 CHAIRMAN: 3 All opposed? The motion's adopted. 4 MS. HENSEL: 5 Finally, for your consideration are 6 Gaming Service Provider Registrations. The Bureau of Licensing provided you with an Order and an attached list of 18 registered Gaming Service Provider Applicants. I ask that the Board consider the Order, 9 10 registering these Gaming Service Providers. 11 CHAIRMAN: 12 Enforcement Counsel? 13 ATTORNEY PITRE: 14 Enforcement Counsel has no objections. 15 CHAIRMAN: 16 Questions or comments from the Board? 17 May I have a motion? 18 MR. RYAN: 19 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 20 issue an order to approve the applications for Gaming Service Provider Registration as described by the 21 22 Bureau of Licensing. 2.3 MR. WOODS: 2.4 Second. 25 CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

2 AYES RESPOND

1

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

20

2.3

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

MS. HENSEL:

That concludes the Bureau of Licensing's

7 matters.

CHAIRMAN:

Thanks, Susan. Next up, OEC.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

The OEC will present 21 matters for the Board's consideration today, consisting of two Consent Agreements, six revocations, one suspension and 12

14 Involuntary Exclusions. The first two Consent

15 Agreements that will be presented have been negotiated

16 between the OEC and Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment,

17 Inc., doing business as Parx Casino. The matters will

18 be presented by Assistant Enforcement Counsel, Dustin

19 Miller.

ATTORNEY MILLER:

Good morning, Chairman Barasch, members
of the Board.

CHAIRMAN:

Before we begin, I'd like to ask anyone who's going to be addressing the Board this morning

please stand, state and spell your name for the court 1 reporter and be sworn, please. Other than the 2 3 attorney, obviously. 4 MR. DOYLE: Martin Doyle, M-A-R-T-I-N, D-O-Y-L-E. 5 6 CHAIRMAN: Next? 8 MR. FRETZ: 9 Gerald Fretz, F-R-E-T-Z, Director of 10 Security at Parx Casino. 11 MR. FARANCA: 12 Anthony Faranca, F-A-R-A-N-C-A, General 13 Manager of Parx Casino. Morning, sir. 14 15 WITNESSES SWORN EN MASSE 16

CHAIRMAN:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you. Proceed.

ATTORNEY MILLER:

Thank you. This first Consent Agreement arises from an incident of underage gaming at Parx Casino on December 8th, 2015. Both the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development and Gaming Act and the regulations promulgated under the Act prohibit a Slot Machine Licensee from allowing persons under the age

of 21 to engage in gaming in Pennsylvania casinos. On December 8th, 2015, an individual under the age of 21 entered Parx Casino at 9:28 p.m. The individual was 19 years of age at the time of this incident. The individual was asked for identification by a security officer when she entered the casino.

After reviewing the individual's identification, the security officer allowed the underage individual on the gaming floor. The individual remained on the gaming floor of Parx Casino for approximately 1 hour and 26 minutes before it was ascertained that she was under the age of 21. The individual had played 20 hands of blackjack while on the gaming floor and consumed one alcoholic beverage. The underage individual was detected when her husband attempted to use her identification to obtain a cash advance, which showed her to be 19 years old. The underage individual was not criminally charged by Pennsylvania State Police for this incident.

On May 17th, 2016, the parties entered into a Consent Agreement to settle this outstanding compliance matter. If approved, this Consent Agreement will be the third penalty assessed against Parx for violating the Act and Board regulations pertaining to underage gaming since its last renewal

and its eighth overall penalty for underage gaming violations.

2.1

2.4

The terms of the agreement include a provision that Parx Casino shall reinforce existing policies and provide training, guidance and reinforcement to employees to minimize the opportunity for a similar incident to occur in the future. And also, Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc., shall pay a total fine of \$15,000. Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc. shall also pay a fee of \$2,500 for costs incurred by the OEC, BIE and other related staff which is consistent with the Board's billing policy.

Both the fine and costs shall be due within five days of the Board's approval of this Consent Agreement. Counsel for Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc. is in attendance today to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN:

Any comments from Greenwood Gaming at this point?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

My name is Bryan Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R. I'm the Assistant General Counsel with Parx Casino.

Quickly I'd like to do a set of introductions. To my

Good morning, Chairman, Commissioners.

left and your right would be Martin Doyle, our Vice
President of Food and Beverage. Next to him is Gerald
Fretz, our Director of Security, and on the end is
Anthony Faranca, our General Manager.

Parx does not dispute any of the facts stated by OEC. However, before I'd like to hand it over to Director Fretz to give you some information about what we've done to remedy some issues with underage, I want to point out one specific fact that we both agree that --- OEC and Parx in the Consent Agreement. When the underage individual was in the Pennsylvania State Police offices, they removed an object from their back pocket. It was laminated, reflected light. They then put it underneath their sweater and finagled it a little bit longer at that point.

Parx believes very strongly that was a fake identification that she used to enter the building. OEC's position is there's not sufficient evidence of that. And from there, that's part of the reason we're going to hand it over to Mr. Fretz to describe some things we put in place. Jerry?

MR. FRETZ:

Good morning, Chairman, gentlemen.

Since that time, we've placed some physical barriers

to funnel the individuals to the central point of the 1 2 entryway. In addition to that, when we have minimal 3 manpower, we continue to funnel to the point where we have it down to about a ten-foot area. We've also 4 5 requested additional ID scanners to be placed at each 6 entrance. Currently utilize one for the front two entrances and one for the west entrance. We've ordered two more. In addition to that, we've increased our manpower footprinting in the lobby area 10 to reflect some of the more busier times in the 11 casino.

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

And that increase of hours, man hours, is approximately 80 to 90 hours per week.

CHAIRMAN:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

2.3

24

25

Any other comments?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

No, Chairman. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments from the Board? Commissioner Fajt?

MR. FAJT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a quick question. Mr. Schroeder, approximately how many guests do you have in your casino on an annual basis?

		59
1	ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:	
2	Anthony or Jerry?	
3	MR. FARANCO:	
4	We can see 5,000 to 10,000 on a giv	7en
5	day. Over the course of the year, millions of pe	eople
6	will come through our facility.	
7	MR. FAJT:	
8	Okay. Thank you.	
9	CHAIRMAN:	
10	Other comments from Board members?	Мау
11	I have a motion?	
12	MR. FAJT:	
13	Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board	i
14	issue an Order to approve the Consent Agreement	
15	between the OEC and Greenwood Gaming & Entertains	nent,
16	Inc. as described by the OEC.	
17	MR. MCCALL:	
18	Second.	
19	CHAIRMAN:	
20	All in favor?	
21	AYES RESPOND	
22	CHAIRMAN:	
23	All opposed? The motion's adopted.	,
24	ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:	
25	Thank you.	

ATTORNEY MILLER:

Thank you. Once again, Dustin Miller on behalf of the OEC. This next Consent Agreement arises from an incident whereby a patron of Parx Casino was served alcohol to the point of intoxication while actively gaming, in violation of Board regulations and Greenwood Gaming's signed Statement of Conditions regarding its approved Compulsive and Problem Gambling Plan.

9:20 p.m., the Parx Casino Surveillance Department notified the Bureau of Casino Compliance that a patron had been asked to leave the property after being identified as being intoxicated. The Bureau of Casino Compliance's review of the incident showed that the patron was served 15 alcoholic beverages between 2:33 p.m. and 8:28 p.m. by three different beverage servers, while she gamed at the same four card poker table.

Throughout the time that the patron was consuming alcohol, the patron was also actively gaming. Parx's alcohol service policy guidelines states that as a rule of thumb, patrons are not to be served more than two alcoholic drinks per hour. This rule of thumb was violated by Parx Casino beverage

servers on multiple occasions during the patron's visit to the casino. The OEC conducted a compliance conference with Parx Casino on June 24, 2015 regarding seven other instances where Parx Casino patrons were served alcoholic beverages by casino employees and subsequently escorted out of the licensed facility for signs of visible intoxication.

On May 12th, 2016, the parties entered into a Consent Agreement to settle this outstanding compliance matter. If approved, this would be the second Consent Agreement entered into with Parx Casino regarding an intoxicated patron. The terms of this agreement shall include a provision that Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment shall immediately reinforce existing polices and provide training, guidance and reinforcement of its employees to minimize the opportunity for a similar incident to occur in the future.

Further, Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc., shall pay a total fine of \$15,000 and in accordance with the Board's billing policy, Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc. will also pay a flat fee of \$2,500 in investigative fees. The civil penalty and fees shall be paid within five days of the Consent Agreement being approved by the Board.

Once again, Counsel for Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment is in attendance today to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN:

Any comments or ---?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

Chairman and Commissioners, we take alcohol service at Parx Casino very seriously. All of our servers and bartenders are TIPS trained. They're not allowed to work until they receive their certification and they must have the recertification done before they're able to enter the floor again to service --- to serve alcohol. In addition, in this situation, the two servers of the three that violated our alcohol awareness policy received progressive discipline.

And finally, in addition both Tom

Bonner, our General Counsel, and myself, met with OEC

on our alcohol policy and how we apply it in extremely
strict uniform application which results in a lot of
people being found. In this case, the policy was
followed filed correctly in the sense that a table
games dealer identified a problem, reported it to
their supervisor. Their supervisor notified security.
Security immediately came over to assess the person,

determined that they were intoxicated and removed them 1 2 from the game immediately, escorted them off the 3 floor, got them a safe ride home. Any additional questions, I'll be glad 4 5 to answer, as will anyone at this table. 6 CHAIRMAN: Any questions from my fellow Board members? 9 MR. RYAN: 10 No. 11 MR. FAJT: 12 One. 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 Go ahead. 15 MR. FAJT: 16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dustin, is ---17 I think in your testimony, you stated that 18 surveillance notified our gaming office that there was 19 an intoxicated patron that was escorted off of the 20 gaming floor. Is that standard procedure for all

ATTORNEY MILLER:

intoxicated patrons in all casinos?

21

22

23

24

25

I don't know if it --- if that's the procedure in all casinos, but it's been the procedure at Parx Casino.

MR. FAJT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Okay. So, once surveillance is notified somebody is intoxicated, they immediately call our office.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

All the casinos have some level of someone who is responsible for contacting the Casino Compliance Representatives in the casino when an intoxicated patron is identified on the floor.

MR. FAJT:

Okay. And then you come into the scene and do your investigation and then determine whether ---?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Actually, the compliance people at the casino ---

MR. FAJT:

Write up their report?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

--- backtrack ---

MR. FAJT:

Okay.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

24 --- and determine whether or not the 25 individual was playing and how much alcohol was served to that individual and so on. That report then comes to us and then from there, we take it.

MR. FAJT:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And this is --- I'm going to editorialize here. I am personally very concerned with the recent passage of the law that allows casinos now to serve alcohol for a fee, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. And I will just --- I'm not picking on you, but you're here, just send a, you know, a shot across the bow to all the casinos, and I know they monitor these hearings, that this is going to become a much bigger issue. People are going to leave bars at two o'clock, leave nightclubs, they're going to want to continue to drink and the place of preference is going to be your house. And this is going to be, I suspect, a bigger problem down the road. So, I know you have procedures in place, that's great, but just kind of a message, request, whatever you want to call it, to really be on the lookout.

Obviously, these fines are --- you know, come out of your bottom line, and I think they're going to increase because people are going to come into your facility after two o'clock.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

I can say --- not that I defend the

industry, but I can say that every casino has employees, through their Compulsive and Problem Gambling Plan, to detect or to attempt to detect individuals that come into the casino already intoxicated and they've been pretty successful at that.

MR. FAJT:

Good.

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

ATTORNEY PITRE:

So from that standpoint, I just think it's a matter of being vigilant --- more vigilant after two o'clock.

MR. FAJT:

Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Any questions or comments ---?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

Commissioner Fajt, just to piggyback onto that. We do keep track of our numbers and approximately, I would think, about 30 --- we've stopped about 30 percent of the people from entering --- from appear --- appearing visibly intoxicated and get them out of our building before you enter it.

MR. RYAN:

I'm sorry, 30 percent?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

People that we've identified as intoxicated. So it's probably --- so you're looking at maybe 10 to 20 --- 10 to 20 people we stop a month approximately and turn them around the door.

CHAIRMAN:

Are there other questions from the Board members because I have one?

MR. RYAN:

No.

CHAIRMAN:

I'm not even sure who to address this to, so I'll try your general manager, but whoever's the right person. Maybe I didn't follow this. This individual was playing at one poker table during this time period. Is that what I heard?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN:

What responsibility do the --- does the dealer or dealers that would have been working during that time period have, not so much about whether the person appears to be intoxicated, but being aware that the person has received 15 drinks? I'm trying to draw a distinction between the signs of visible

intoxication --- and I understand you rotate dealers. I understand there's a lot of other things that come in here. But it would seem to me 15 drinks being served to a patron at the table, whether they're showing signs of intoxication or not, unless you guys are watering the drinks an awful lot, that person is drunk.

And I want to understand what responsibility or what training prior to somebody keeling over dead drunk, a dealer at the table or some other security people would be aware of just sheer the number of drinks that are being served. I'm not sure who's the best person to answer that.

MR. FARANCA:

2.4

You're absolutely right about the rotation of the dealers, it does create some challenges. But it's absolutely everybody's responsibility in the facility to be on the lookout for people that are intoxicated. The rotation of the dealers and them going on breaks, there could have been different dealers throughout the time that the person was there, which does make it more difficult to quantify the total number of drinks that that individual has received.

So, you point out a good point. It's a

good point. And we have to be extra diligent in the training of all of our employees and reinforce these --- the things that they look for in the TIPS training.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, let me just follow this for another minute, because --- really I'm not trying to single you guys out. I agree with Commissioner Fajt. With 24 hours of alcohol now becoming available, these incidents are likely to become more common and it's going to put all of us here and in the industry in a position of having to be more vigilant.

MR. FARANCA:

Well, in regards to the 24 ---.

CHAIRMAN:

Let me explain the question so you can, the best that you can, try to answer it. If there's a dealer working at a table and he's been dealing for half hour or an hour and he knows that a woman or a man has had three drinks, when he goes off on rotation and a new person shows up, does he say, by the way, patron number three over there has already had three drinks or four drinks. Is that something that would happen during a rotation?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

Before Anthony addresses that, I do --I want to point out one --- I don't want to say
conflicting, but a tension that exists. And part of
the tension is our dealers and supervisors are trained
to protect the game and the assets of the game to make
sure the rules are followed, that no one is cheating.

CHAIRMAN:

Right.

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

They also should be concerned about alcohol service. We emphasize they are watching the gaming, watching the hands being dealt, watching the people with their chips because quite frankly, there is a lot of cheating that goes on. We emphasize that when they're dealing a game, they are to protect the assets, protect the table and protect the rules. And the supervisor also does that. It does not mean that it's not also the responsibility to follow the drink, but there is a tension that exists between the responsibilities while they're on the table right there dealing it, as well as a supervisor who's overseeing three or four tables at a time.

But to your question, I'll defer to Anthony to answer your specific question. I just wanted to point that out, because --- as you're

talking about it, it came to mind.

CHAIRMAN:

Just so you're clear, I'm not trying to single out the dealer. Is there somebody else who would be observing if it's not the dealer?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

That is --- go ahead.

MR. FARANCA:

We would want our dealers to tell their supervisor if they notice someone's had multiple drinks, absolutely. So, if they're going off the game for a break, I would hope that they would tell their supervisor, listen, for the incoming dealer just know that that this person had so many drinks. And we want to be as diligent as we can possibly be.

CHAIRMAN:

But is there a policy in place that requires that sort of activity to occur when there's a shift change or somebody goes on break?

MR. FARANCA:

The policy would be governed by our TIPS training, which is predominantly looking for signs of intoxication. If they see someone that is looking intoxicated in any way or they've noticed someone that's had multiple drinks over a certain period of

time, they should notify their supervisor.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. FARANCA:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Any questions? Thank you.

MS. LANGAN:

Wasn't it the dealer that reported this to their supervisor?

ATTORNEY SCHROEDER:

Yes. So, I was going to suggest that
Martin Doyle is our Vice President of Food and
Beverage. He can speak to the service part of it, the
cocktail servers as well. Not just --- and he can
speak to the dealers. So, I think if Martin can talk
about the training that the servers get as well as
their responsibilities, that will be helpful, I think,
for the Board.

MR. DOYLE:

Sure. I mean, the servers --- every beverage server is preshifted before service. And we always talk about responsible alcohol service. We always talk about exactly what to look for and what the policies and procedures should be afterwards if

there is somebody, you know, deemed to be slightly intoxicated, whether we slow them off, back them off or cut them off. So, the policy is that they would go to one of the beverage shift managers, who in turn would go to the table game supervisor. So, then we would keep an eye on that person --- you know, that particular person.

CHAIRMAN:

Do you have more on that?

MS. LANGAN:

No, no, no. I was just pointing out that in this case --- I took a while, but the table games guy kind of came in.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, that prompts another question.

The same question I had about the dealers, I assume similarly, your servers are rotating in and out. This took place over several hours. If whoever's the server goes off shift, does she tell her supervisor, by the way on table 16, I've served that guy five drinks?

MR. DOYLE:

They've been absolutely trying to do that. Whether it happens 100 percent of the time or not is --- because most of the time, people don't stay

74 put at a certain --- at a single table, that they 1 2 bounce around also. So, in this situation, the person 3 did stay at the table, they should have been doing a 4 little better. 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? MR. RYAN: 8 No. 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 I appreciate it. May I have a motion? 11 MR. MCCALL: 12 Mr. Chairman, I move the Board issue an 13 Order to approve the Consent Agreement between the OEC 14 and Greenwood Gaming & Entertainment, Inc. as 15 described by the OEC. 16 MR. MOSCATO: 17 Second. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 All in favor? 20 AYES RESPOND 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 All opposed? The motion's adopted. 23 ATTORNEY SCHROEDER: 24 Thank you. 25 ATTORNEY PITRE:

The next seven matters on the agenda consist of enforcement actions in which the OEC has filed complaints seeking the revocation of five Gaming Permits and one Non-Gaming Registration, as well as the suspension of one Non-Gaming Registrations issued to individuals by the Board.

Each complaint has been filed with the Board's OHA and properly served upon the individual named in the complaint. The individual named in each complaint failed to respond within 30 days as required by Board regulation. As a result, the OEC filed a Request for default judgment and properly served the same upon each individual. Thereby, all facts in each complaint are deemed admitted.

All filed documents have been provided to the Board and the matters are presently ripe for Board consideration. In each instance, we'll read a brief summation and request the appropriate Board action.

ATTORNEY MILLER:

All right. Once again, Dustin Miller on behalf of the OEC. The next matter today is the request for revocation involving Mackendy Calixte.

Mr. Calixte was employed as a security officer at Parx Casino and permitted as a Gaming Employee. The OEC

filed enforcement complaint to revoke Mr. Calixte's 2 Gaming Employee Permit due to his felony conviction 3 for burglary and criminal trespass on November 13th, 2015. At this time, the OEC would ask the Board to consider the revocation of Mackendy Calixte's Gaming 6 Employee Permit.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

1

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

2.1

22

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the revocation of Mackendy Calixte's Gaming Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. RYAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

19 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY MILLER:

23 The next matter is a request for 24 revocation involving Johany Rivera-Aponte.

25 Rivera-Aponte was employed as a Table Games Dealer at

Parx Casino and also permitted as a Gaming Employee. 1 2 The OEC filed an enforcement complaint to revoke Ms. 3 Rivera-Aponte's Gaming Employee Permit after she came to work on September 17, 2015 in an intoxicated state 5 and made numerous errors while dealing cards at a four 6 card poker table, resulting in Parx Casino losing \$170 over the course of 38 minutes before Ms. Rivera-Aponte was relieved of her duties.

Ms. Rivera-Aponte was terminated from Parx Casino on or about October 21st, 2015 for failing to show up for work and is not currently employed at any Pennsylvania casino facility. At this time, the OEC would ask the Board to consider the revocation of Johany Rivera-Aponte's Gaming Employee Permit.

CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. RYAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the revocation of Johany Rivera-Aponte's Gaming Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY STUART:

Thank you. Glenn Stuart for the OEC, S-T-U-A-R-T. Next for the Board's consideration is the revocation of Hoa Van Nguyen's Gaming Employee Permit. While working as a dealer at Harrah's Philadelphia, Mr. Nguyen, paid out several losing wagers to a patron who had not won the hand.

Mr. Nguyen paid out these losing wagers to the same patron over a three-day period. In total, Mr. Nguyen paid out over \$3,000 in losing wagers, which he should have retained as the dealer. As such, the OEC requests the Board revoke the Gaming Employee Permit of Hoa Van Nguyen.

CHAIRMAN:

19 Questions or comments from the Board?

20 May I have a motion?

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an Order to approve the revocation of Hoa Van Nguyen's Gaming Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OEC.

1 MR. FAJT: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 4 5 AYES RESPOND 6 CHAIRMAN: All opposed? The motion is adopted. 8 ATTORNEY CROHE: 9 Morning Chairman, members of the Board. 10 John Crohe, C-R-O-H-E, for the OEC. The next matter 11 is a request to consider the suspension of Charles Inquartano's Gaming Permit. In January of 2016, Mr. 12 13 Inquartano was charged with three drug related 14 offenses after swerving into oncoming traffic while 15 operating his vehicle, failing a sobriety test and being found with narcotics and drug paraphernalia in 16 17 his vehicle. Mr. Inquartano is currently awaiting a 18 formal arraignment. OEC now requests that the Board 19 suspend the Gaming Permit held by Mr. Inquartano. 20 CHAIRMAN: 21 Questions or comments from the Board? 22 May I have a motion?

MR. FAJT:

23

24

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 25 issue an Order to approve the suspension of Charles Inquartano's Gaming Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

7 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY FERRELL:

Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. Benjamin Ferrell, F-E-R-R-E-L-L. The next matter here for consideration is revocation of Nelson Wynder's Non-Gaming Employee Registration. On June 13th, 2015, Mr. Wynder was arrested and charged with possession of a controlled substance after Mr. Wynder was found in possession of five bags of marijuana while working on a shift in SugarHouse Casino. At this time, OEC would request that the Board revoke Nelson Wynder's Non-Gaming Employee Registration.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

23 May I have a motion?

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

81 issue an Order to approve the revocation of Nelson 1 2 Wynder's Non-Gaming Employee Registration as described 3 by the OEC. 4 MR. RYAN: 5 Second. 6 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? AYES RESPOND 9 CHAIRMAN: 10 All opposed? The motion's adopted. 11 ATTORNEY ADAMS: 12 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, morning. Kim Adams for the OEC. The next matter for 13 14 the Board's consideration is the revocation of Jeremy 15 Anesetti's Gaming Employee Permit. Mr. Anesetti was 16 charged with various criminal offenses, including 17 possession with intent to deliver and theft charges. 18 All of his criminal charges are still pending. 19 OEC is requesting that Mr. Anesetti's Gaming Employee 20 Permit be revoked at this time. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Questions or comments from the Board? 23 May I have a motion? 2.4 MR. RYAN: 25 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board

issue an Order to approve the revocation of Jeremy Anesetti's Gaming Employee Occupation Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion's adopted.

ATTORNEY ADAMS:

The next item for the Board's consideration is the revocation of James Benczkowski's Gaming Employee Permit. While employed as a slot supervisor at Mohegan Sun Pocono, Mr. Benczkowski stole approximately \$26,000 from the casino. He was criminally charged and his charges are still pending. At this time, the OEC is requesting the Board revoke Mr. Benczkowski's Gaming Employee Permit.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

MR. WOODS:

Just one question, Mr. Chairman. I'm interested in the facts of this case in that the counting machine, there didn't seem to be a, how do I

put it, a true-up between the auditing of the machine and the, you know, internal Auditing Department at the casino. Is any discussion going on with the casino on this matter?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

We do have a pending investigation into this matter and several other matters that have occurred over time at --- particularly at Mohegan. So, if you take everything into context, you figure this individual by our calculations was stealing about \$146 over 179 days. Okay. So, this individual --- there were 494 days in total that this was going on. He worked for approximately 355 of those 494 and he stole on 179 of the total --- of those days. If you average it out across the slot machines, it comes to about \$.06 cents a day per slot machine.

So that's looking for a needle in a haystack, assuming that you know a needle is there. So that the revenue --- the audit of that would have to look for a variance and take into account the different variables that go on every day. So I'm not going to say it's impossible to catch, but you have to --- it has to --- you have to notice a consistent patter over time. Because the individual could sign off on the slip without anybody verifying and because

it was such a low amount that he was signing off, until somebody would have noticed something, like they did in this case, and then hindsight be 20/20 going back and tracking, it's a little difficult on a day-to-day basis to look for something that you know may or may not exist. So yeah, there are some discussions, there is an investigation. There's also --- you know, we're going to look at what we can do to ensure that we work with the casinos to detect these matters quicker.

But in the grand scheme of things, when you consider that Mohegan Sun is bringing in somewhere in the neighborhood an average GTR during this period, \$590,000 --- over \$590,000 per month --- per day, and this individual is taking \$146 per day. It's one of those things when a variance --- you look at the variance and say okay, that's within the normal scheme of things. You know, that variance --- the ebb and flow is not out of sorts. So, it's a lot harder than it appears. We know it goes on and so the important thing is when we catch individuals, that we prosecute them and that we do everything in our power to ensure that the casino --- we're working with the casinos to prevent something like this from happening.

MR. WOODS:

From your recitation of the facts and the calculations you just gave me, I have every confidence you're involved in this up to your elbows. So, ---.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah, we're knee deep in it right now.

MR. WOODS:

It would just seem to me however, that internal auditing at the casino with the slips of paper that are signed off and handed in, specifically go back to an event at a machine specific or at some sort of directed point and ---.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Right. So, you have to take the balance from the main cage ---

MR. WOODS:

Correct.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

--- and then look at the slips from each slot machine. Okay? And then balance out that slot machine. Now, for whatever reason, you got --- you have other variables that come into play too. Is a slot machine set a certain percentage way above the theoretical payout where you expect certain things to occur and that's within that normal variance of that

particular slot machine?

But I mean, it would take somebody consistently, going through this every day and making sure everything balances out. When it doesn't balance out, go and pull the play from that machine and see what happened and see who signed what, when and where. And like I said, he spread it out over time, so he didn't do it every day he showed up for work. So, ---.

MR. WOODS:

But \$26,000 is a lot of money.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

It's a lot of money. It's a lot of money for one individual. In my opinion, he should have gotten caught earlier. I would have thought, within 90 days, something like that, you looking back and then determining whether or not something is out of sorts. But you know, you put people in certain positions to do certain jobs and you hope they do those jobs.

In the end, where somebody's motivated to do the wrong thing, where there's a will, there's a way, but eventually, they do get caught because they get comfortable and they do it over and over again. This is one of the situations where I think it

went on a little too long before getting caught.

MR. WOODS:

Would the OEC be notifying other casinos of what occurred here and recommending that they look into their policies to see if they're able ---

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, it's ---.

MR. WOODS:

--- to determine a pattern or some sort of internal audit process to ensure that this doesn't happen at the other casinos?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah, I don't even think it would be up

--- it would be us because the Casino Compliance

Representatives at each casino, they talk to each

other. The surveillance, the security at each casino,

those directors, they speak to each other. So, they

know when something is going on and they'll say, look,

this is what happened at our casino and they --- that

word gets around pretty quickly.

But like I said, it's --- sometimes it's like looking for a needle in a haystack and you're looking for an employee that may or may not be doing something on any given day. Until you see that pattern and until you go back and look at your books,

sometimes, it takes a little longer to catch. But yes, to answer your question.

MR. WOODS:

Thank you.

MR. MCCALL:

I'd like to follow up. I'd like to follow up a little bit, Cyrus. You said 179 events; correct?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Right.

MR. MCCALL:

The way we first read through the materials, it was the money reader that failed in one of the machines. The lady put in a \$20 and it didn't register, so he filled out the form to give her the \$20?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Right.

MR. MCCALL:

Now, are all 179 of those incidents, occurrences where the money reader failed or was this just a guy forging a form to get the money? Because we had a concern that --- why are all these machines --- why are all the money readers on these machines failing? Because that's money that goes to the

central computer that GTECH would see. That now, all of a sudden, if we have 179 incidents where these machines aren't reading those dollars, that's tax revenue that's not coming to the Commonwealth and there's 179 --- well, I don't know, if it's one machine or 179 different machines that aren't reading these dollar bills, or is this guy actually forging paperwork, making up that the machine's not reading, you know, the dollar bill or the \$20 bill that's going into the machine. You understand what I'm saying?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah, I understand what you're saying.

We were looking at whether or not he was targeting only machines that had bill validator problems or is he just writing up slips whenever he felt like. If I had to speculate, I would say he was targeting machines that had a problem. So, unless a machine that maybe he knew would --- would not --- was registering a high amount of play and, you know, --- or a high amount of jackpots or lack thereof. And if the bill validator doesn't read a person's bill, okay, so then you have a slot person come over there to verify it. Okay. The meter readings are still --- are not affected by that bill not being read correctly. So, Commonwealth would get our money

because we get our money off the top. Who loses money in this instance is that casino, who then --- he writes up this slip and then he walks over to the cage and says, hey, I need \$100. He gets \$100 from the casino, he goes back, gives the person \$20 and he pockets the other \$80.

We get our money off the top from the readings within the casino --- within the slot machine. That's not to say we're not --- we don't care because we want our casinos --- we don't want our casinos to fail. So, by him taking this money from the casino, it's putting the casino in a financial, you know, parlay, --- a financial --- causing a financial problem for the casino. So, I'm speculating.

So, our investigation, part of that is to see did the Commonwealth lose any money. The other part of that is to ensure that okay, if this --- if there's a way that an internal control fix or something, some kind of fix that could occur to where they should have been auditing more frequently or auditing from the standpoint of their machines, because their machine is failing too often, that should send a red flag.

MR. WOODS:

Well, true, but the machine ---.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

But I mean, we've got 2,300 --- over 2,300 machines across the floor, and one fails today and another one across the floor fails two days later and he's writing up a slip, it's all a matter of looking for a pattern and seeing something consistent. Like I said, this was over a 494-day period that this was done.

MR. MCCALL:

I mean, I know there's enough accounting to worry about it. You know, it seems simple enough in my mind, and it may be much more difficult to reconcile that machine. If there's a lot of slips at these casinos, there should be a red flag even on the casino's end that if you have all these slips coming through where you're paying out money because the machine's not reading, it would be fairly simple to reconcile that to the machine because you're going to have X amount of dollars in that machine where, you know, the variance of that \$20 or \$100 or whatever it is, is going to show up with the amount of money that's actually in the machine as opposed to what was read by that machine.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

You're absolutely correct. And I think that the average win per day per machine was \$253 during that period, okay, of time. So, if he takes \$146 --- and that's to say whether or not he was doing it for only one machine. He might have been doing it \$100 here for this machine and then tomorrow or two days later, do \$20 for another machine.

The important thing to remember is that if --- I mean, we can put something in place that would say okay, for every time you do a slip, somebody's got to verify. But that would bring the casino operations at such a halt and put us at such a competitive disadvantage that we'd do more harm than good in that situation.

MR. MCCALL:

2.0

It's not worth 20 bucks?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah. So, ---.

MR. MCCALL:

But if it's \$26,000, it's worth \$26,000.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

\$26,000 over 494 days. I mean, you take into consideration of what --- I think --- I forget, it was --- I mean, what Mohegan takes in. But if you look at it from a --- like on a monthly --- a per day

basis and you make \$590,000 versus \$146. So I mean, this is not anything new to the industry. This goes on. We know it goes on.

MR. MCCALL:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Other questions from the Board members?
MR. RYAN:

person, these are very sophisticated machines. Does it surprise you that if --- what this individual was doing was just taking advantage of problems with machines, does it surprise you that there would be that many bad readings by bill counters in a slot machine?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Well, see, Commissioner Ryan, I don't want to --- it's easy to sit in hindsight and say, oh, you should have caught this. But when you're in the thick of it and people are running all over the place and you have machines that are --- you know, that may have a problem here or there, you know, in the grand scheme of things, no, it doesn't surprise me. But that's one of the things we want to look at to see, okay, is there some --- was there some inordinate

amount of bill validator breakdowns going on. And if so, why?

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But if across the industry, if its average for this day happening, I mean --- I mean, it looks bad on paper because this one individual got away with \$26,000. But if you take a casino's daily operations with everything that goes on in this casino, I'm not going to say that it's virtually impossible to catch anybody because nothing is impossible. But it's a matter of determining the pattern of your employees and a pattern of the individual. This individual, we later found out or the State Police found out, he did it because he was hooked on Vicodin, and he was purchasing --- using the money to purchase Vicodin. So it's about knowing your employees. And there were enough people in the casino that knew about this and should have said hey, he's hooked on something. But it's a matter of knowing your employees and knowing their patterns, knowing their behaviors, and then following through and saying to people in accounting, the people in surveillance, the people in security, hey, keep an eye on this guy and let me know if you see anything suspicious. So, ---

MR. RYAN:

Thank you.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

--- one of the things we're going to look at is in the grand scheme of things, did it make sense for those breakdowns to occur.

MR. RYAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

I have a couple of questions. Cyrus, coming from a white collar background myself, I've prosecuted cases involving bank embezzlements where people were stealing four or five cents out of 100,000 accounts. And of course, no one's ever going to notice; right? So I understand that if you spread it out and do it small, you'll get away for a long time. But you know, I'm relatively new here. Have we had other actionable cases in time that you've been here involving similar crimes, whether it's \$26,000 or \$5,000?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Yeah, we've had --- I mean, but it's --there are always different schemes to everything.

Usually it's with the comp. I mean, I know the Board
has done a number of cases with free play involved and
comps. They find ways to manipulate that.

CHAIRMAN:

But have you seen one like this before? Have we ever done one of these before?

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Not to my knowledge that I can recall.

I would say that this is our first big one of this status. We've had people steal \$100 here, \$100 there.

CHAIRMAN:

Oh, sure.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

But for this amount of time --- so that's what concerns me about this, that he was able to do it for so long.

CHAIRMAN:

Here's a question and now I'm not sure it's for you, because I think you've said that you don't think it's the OEC's appropriate responsibility in any formal way to educate other parts --- maybe I'm putting words in your mouth, other parts of the agency. I guess my question is for you, Kevin. When we find an event like this, what systems internally do we have in this agency to make sure, whether it's \$26,000 or --- when we find a pattern, how do we know that Jerry Stoll's people, whatever, are aware of what happened in this one casino, that they can start to

look for patterns elsewhere? Do we have any kind of internal systems that --- it's one thing to say, you know, CCRs talk to each other. That's nice. But if they don't happen to talk and --- how do we know that what happens in one casino puts other casinos on notice?

MR. O'TOOLE:

Chairman, the coordination is between Jerry Stoll's unit and Cyrus' unit and the Assistant Enforcement Counsel here at the table. When that report of the arrest came through, then that arrest --- if you read the report, it discloses as much of a scheme as they know, and then at that point, it is the BCC's responsibility to look at what facilitated that criminal activity. Was there a breakdown in controls? Where were the red flags that should have been identified by casino personnel?

And I know that that process has occurred and that's what's before OEC now in the investigative stage. Which, if there is a failure of the casino to detect this event earlier, then there's an accountability on the casino as well and there could be an enforcement action from the subsequent ---.

CHAIRMAN:

But in terms of our own internal systems to make sure this kind of information gets into the hands across 12 casinos, you know, with our people being aware of this, I'm troubled by the idea of ---. And I don't want to try to put words in anybody's mouth here, but it's kind of like a word of mouth sort of thing. And you have to depend upon people just by talking to each other as opposed to having any kind of formal notification process in place to make sure that when a particular scam shows up in one casino ---.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

And I don't know, it's not as simple as a word of mouth. I mean, the report is there.

CHAIRMAN:

Yeah.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

Jerry Stoll informs his people, look we had this occur here, this is the report number. We can all pull the report. State Police, I mean, they have their reports which we --- they give us access to when they're done with their criminal investigation. And they provide those reports to other State Police personnel within the casinos. So it's not like, you know, this situation or these schemes are flying beneath the radar without somebody in Presque Isle not

knowing what occurred at Mohegan Sun. No, that's not the impression at all.

CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

Okay. But I guess what I'd like,
then ---. And I don't want you to put you more on the
spot at the moment. I wouldn't mind if you would look
into this and be able to tell the Board in Executive
Session some of this. I'm not so sure we would want
to certainly air it in a public setting, wouldn't want
to tip off the criminals, as to exactly what our
internal systems are, to make sure that evidence like
this is spread among our enforcement people and the
people on the ground in the casino, as opposed to
asking you to tell me what we're doing right now.

MR. O'TOOLE:

Certainly.

CHAIRMAN:

Okay. Thank you. I'm not sure where we are. I guess we have ---. I guess I just need a motion then.

MR. WOODS:

Mr. Chairman, ---

CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

MR. WOODS:

--- I move that the Board issue an order to approve the revocation of James Benczkowski's Gaming Employee Occupational Permit as described by the OEC.

MR. FAJT:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

The remaining 12 matters on the agenda consist of enforcement actions in which the OEC has filed petitions seeking the involuntary exclusion of individuals whose presence in a licensed facility are inimical to the interests of the Commonwealth or licensed gaming therein.

In each instance the Petition for Exclusion has been filed with the Board's OHA and properly serviced upon the individual named in the petition. The individual named in each petition failed to respond within 30 days, as required by Board regulation. As a result, the OEC filed a Request for Default Judgment in each instance and properly served

the same upon each named individual.

Thereby, all the facts in each petition are deemed admitted. All filed documents have been provided to the Board, and the matters are presently ripe for the Board's consideration. Once again, we'll read a brief summation of the facts and request the appropriate Board action.

ATTORNEY ADAMS:

The next matter for the Board's consideration is the placement of James Benczkowski on the Board's Involuntary Excluded Persons List. While employed as a Slot Supervisor, Mr. Benczkowski stole approximately \$26,000 from Mohegan Sun Pocono. He was criminally charged and his charges are still pending. At this time the OEC is requesting that Mr. Benczkowski be placed on the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of James Benczkowski to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

5 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY ADAMS:

The next matter for the Board's consideration is the placement of David Cyphers on the Board's Involuntary Excluded Persons List. While as a guest at Mohegan Sun Pocono, Mr. Cyphers gained access to the back of the house area, attempted to help other guests at a Players' Club booth. Mr. Cyphers was criminally charged and the charges have been resolved. At this time the OEC requests Mr. Cyphers be placed on the Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

20 May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of David Cyphers to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

1 MR. MOSCATO: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 4 AYES RESPOND 5 6 CHAIRMAN: All opposed? The motion is adopted. ATTORNEY ADAMS: 8 9 Next matter for the Board's 10 consideration is the placement of Thomas Johnson on the Board's Involuntary Excluded Persons List. While 11 12 as a guest at Mohegan Sun Pocono, Mr. Johnson stole a 13 jackpot in the amount of approximately \$2,000 that 14 belonged to another patron. Mr. Johnson was 15 criminally charged and those charges are still 16 pending. At this time the OEC is requesting Mr. 17 Johnson be placed on the Excluded Persons List. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Questions or comments from the Board? 20 May I have a motion? 21 MR. MOSCATO: 22 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 23 issue an order to approve the addition of Thomas 24 Johnson to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as

25

described by the OEC.

1 MR. RYAN: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 4 AYES RESPOND 5 6 CHAIRMAN: All opposed? The motion is adopted. ATTORNEY ADAMS: 8 9 The next item for the Board's consideration is the placement of Darius Petrovici on 10 the Board's Involuntary Excluded Persons List. While 11 12 as a guest at Mohegan Sun Pocono, Mr. Petrovici 13 engaged in combative behavior with various security 14 officers and actually struck two of the officers. Mr. 15 Petrovici was criminally charged and his charges are 16 still pending. At this time the OEC is requesting Mr. 17 Petrovici be placed on the Excluded Persons List. 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 Questions or comments from the Board? 20 May I have a motion? 21 MR. RYAN: 22 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 23 issue an order to approve the addition of Darius 24 Petrovici to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as

25

described by the OEC.

105 1 MR. WOODS: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 4 AYES RESPOND 5 6 CHAIRMAN: All opposed? The motion is adopted. ATTORNEY ADAMS: 8 9 The next matter for the Board's consideration is the placement of Charles Scalamonti 10 on the Board's Involuntary Excluded Persons List. 11 12 While as a guest at Mohegan Sun Pocono, Mr. Scalamonti 13 stole another patron's wallet and various items from 14 within his wallet. Mr. Scalamonti pled quilty to 15 theft charges. At this time the OEC is requesting Mr. Scalamonti be placed on the Excluded Persons List. 16 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Questions or comments from the Board? 19 May I have a motion? 20 MR. WOODS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 21 22 issue an order to approve the admission of Charles 23 Scalamonti to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as 24 described by the OEC.

MR. FAJT:

25

106 Second. 1 2 CHAIRMAN: All in favor? 3 AYES RESPOND 4 5 CHAIRMAN: 6 All opposed? The motion is adopted. ATTORNEY MILLER: 8 The next matter today is requests for placement on the Board's Excluded Persons List, 10 involving MD Mollah. The OEC filed a petition to 11 place Mr. Mollah on the Exclusion List for leaving a six-year-child and a 12-year-old child in his vehicle 12 13 while he went inside Parx Casino and played slot 14 machines on September 27th, 2015. Based upon the 15 foregoing, the OEC asks that the Board place MD Mollah on the Board's Excluded Persons List. 16 17 CHAIRMAN: 18 Any questions or comments from the 19 Board? May I have a motion? 2.0 MR. MOSCATO: 2.1 Mr. Chairman, is MD a first name? 22 ATTORNEY MILLER: 2.3 Yes. 2.4 MR. MOSCATO: 25 Interesting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

May I have a motion?

MR. FAJT:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of MD Mollah to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC. I further move that Mr. Mollah's name be removed from the Exclusion List after one year.

MR. MCCALL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

13 AYES RESPOND

14 CHAIRMAN:

15 All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY STUART:

Next for the Board's consideration is the placement of Tommy Frye, Jr. on the Involuntary Exclusion List. Mr. Frye was caught stealing \$100 in chips from another patron and capping a \$10 bet while patronizing Harrah's Philadelphia Casino. As such, the OEC requests the Board place Tommy Frye, Jr. on the Involuntary Exclusion List.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the admission of Tommy Frye, Jr. to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

11 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY STUART:

Next for the Board's consideration is the placement of Hoa Van Nguyen on the Involuntary Exclusion List. Mr. Nguyen paid out several losing wagers to a patron who had not won the hand, while dealing poker at Harrah's Philadelphia Casino. Mr. Nguyen paid out these losing wagers to the same patron over a three-day period. In total Mr. Nguyen paid over \$3,000, which should have been retained by the dealer. As such, the OEC requests the Board place Hoa Van Nguyen on the Involuntary Exclusion List.

CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MOSCATO:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of Hoa Van Nguyen to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. RYAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

12 AYES RESPOND

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY STUART:

And next for the Board's consideration is the placement of Tuyet Nguyen on the Involuntary Exclusion List. Ms. Nguyen collected losing wagers which should not have been paid out to her while she wagered at Harrah's Philadelphia Casino. Ms. Nguyen's actions occurred over a three-day period and she collected over \$3,000 to which she was not entitled. As such, the OEC request that the Board place Tuyet Nguyen on the Involuntary Exclusion List.

CHAIRMAN:

110 Questions or comments from the Board? 1 2 May I have a motion? 3 MR. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board 4 5 issue an order to approve the addition of Tuyet Nguyen to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC. 8 MR. WOODS: 9 Second. 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 All in favor? 12 AYES RESPOND 13 CHAIRMAN: 14 All opposed? The motion is adopted. 15 ATTORNEY FERRELL: 16 The next matter for your consideration 17 is the placement of Miguel Fields on the Board's 18 Involuntary Exclusion List. On February 22nd, 2016 Mr. Fields capped 11 wagers and pinched three wagers 19 20 while playing Ultimate Texas Hold'em at SugarHouse 21 Casino. At this time, OEC would request that the 22 Board place Miguel Fields on the Board's Involuntary 2.3 Exclusion List.

CHAIRMAN:

2.4

25

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of Miguel Fields to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. FAJT:

MR. WOODS:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

11 AYES RESPOND

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY CROHE:

The next matter before the Board is a request to place Jason Thompson on the Board's Excluded Persons List. Mr. Thompson illegally posted several bets while gaming at Hollywood Casino and was charged with knowingly, by trick or fraud, winning or reducing a loss. The status of the charge listed is not final and the OEC now requests that the Board add Jason Thompson to the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

25 May I have a motion?

MR. MCCALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board issue an order to approve the addition of Jason Thompson on the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board Involuntary Exclusion List as described by the OEC.

MR. MOSCATO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

10 AYES RESPOND

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY CROHE:

The next matter before the Board is a request to place Alicia Witmer on the Board's Excluded Persons List. Ms. Witmer used another individual's Players' Club account number to make 76 transactions totaling \$2,998.75 without the individual's knowledge or consent while employed by Hollywood Casino as a server at the Skybox Sports Bar. Ms. Witmer did not hold or did not require to be licensed by the Board. The OEC now requests to add Alicia Witmer to the Board's Excluded Persons List.

CHAIRMAN:

Questions or comments from the Board?

May I have a motion?

2

1

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOSCATO:

You sure can. Mr. Chairman, I move that
the Board issue an order to approve the addition of
Alicia Witmer to the PGCB Involuntary Exclusion List
as described by the OEC.

MR. RYAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN:

All in favor?

11 AYES RESPOND

12 CHAIRMAN:

All opposed? The motion is adopted.

ATTORNEY PITRE:

That concludes our business.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, very much. That concludes the business of the OEC. Thank you. Next we have a public comment period scheduled. As I understand it, we don't have anybody who's preregistered today to come forward and speak. Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to make a comment --- make public comments to the Board?

Okay. That concludes today's meeting.

Our next scheduled public session will be held on

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, meeting held before Chairman Barasch was reported by me on 6/22/16 and that I, Corey Elizabeth Summers, read this transcript, and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Corey Elizabeth Summers