

JUL 30 2008

2

HOLLYWOOD
Casino

PENN NATIONAL RACE COURSE

John deGrasse
Vice President, Legal & Business Affairs

(717)469-3310
John.degrasse@pngaming.com

July 28, 2008

VIA U.S. MAIL

Paul Resch
Secretary
Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board
P.O. Box 69060
Harrisburg, PA 17106-9060

RE: Public Comment on Regulation #125-88

Dear Mr. Resch,

On behalf of Mountainview Thoroughbred Racing Association ("HCPN"), please accept for your consideration the following comments on the proposed rulemaking #125-88. Specifically, HCPN has comments on the proposed changes to §465a.11 and the provisions of 465a.33.

§465a.11(a)(5): It is HCPN's understanding that the Board desires to expand the ability of a slot machine licensee to allow the six departments identified in §465a.11(b) to report to the chief executive officer or to an assistant chief executive officer. However, the proposed change contains conflicting language on this point. A new sentence reads:

"However, the assistant chief executive officer may not be the supervisor of one of the department's [sic] required by subsection (b)."

The subsequent sentence reads:

"Each supervisor of a department required by subsection (b) shall report directly to the chief executive officer or assistant chief executive officer of the slot machine licensee regarding administrative matters and daily operations."

HCPN respectfully requests clarification regarding this apparent conflict.

§465a.33(a)(1)(ii): This provision requires that the access door to the secured CCCS area be alarmed so as to send an audible signal to Surveillance when the door is opened. HCPN has two comments regarding this proposal. First, HCPN was allowed to open without this arrangement and adding the additional wiring would be burdensome at

this time. Second, there are alternatives to requiring an audible signal. Rather than require a specific means of notifying Surveillance, HCPN recommends that the Board require the licensee to have procedures by which Surveillance is notified that the CCCS area is being accessed. An example of an alternative means of notification would be requiring a Surveillance representative to be a second authorizing person (in addition to Security) for the removal of the CCCS area key from the sensitive key system. By this means, the key could not be removed from the secure sensitive key system without the physical presence of a Surveillance representative.

§465a.33(a)(4): HCPN employees do not have access to the secured CCCS area. Under these circumstances, is it the intent of this provision that the individuals on this list would be GTECH employees? If so, may HCPN rely on the list provided by GTECH or does the list need to be approved by the Department?

§465a.33(a)(5): Please clarify that this provision applies to those circumstances where someone other than those on the list maintained pursuant to §465a.33(a)(4) is required to access the secured CCCS area due to an emergency situation. Moreover, is the notice after the fact or prior to entering the area? Considering that the event would be an emergency and there are three notifications to be made, HCPN believes the notification should be as soon as practicable.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please contact me at 717.469.3310 if you have any questions regarding this submission.

Sincerely,



John deGrasse

