HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

* * * * * * * * * *

House Bill 2308

* * * * * * * * * *

House Judiciary Committee

Ceremonial Courtroom
Federal United States District Court
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Monday, July 1, 1996 - 1:15 p.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Thomas Gannon, Majority Chairman

Honorable Lita Cohen

Honorable Timothy Hennessey

Honorable Al Masland

Honorable George Kenney

Honorable Thomas Caltagirone, Minority Chairman

Honorable Michael Horsey

Honorable Kathy Manderino

Honorable Harold James

ORIGINAL

KEY REPORTERS 1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404 (717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6367

| 1 | CONTENTS | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 2 | WITNESSES | PAGE |
| 3 | City of Philadelphia Honorable Edward G. Rendell, Mayor Ted Beitchman, Deputy Chief of Staff | 5 5 4 |
| 5 | Honorable Anthony Hardy Williams 191st District | 87 |
| 6 7 | Joseph Mahoney, Governor Greater Phila. Chamber of Commerce | 102 |
| 8 | Robert Green, President Philadelphia Park Racetrack | 111 |
| 9 10 | Gerry Gutenstein, General Manager Sheraton Society Hill Hotel | 158 |
| 11 | Michael McGovern, Exec. Vice President Pennsylvania Restaurant Association | 168 |
| 12 | Barbara Dietrich, President | 187 |
| 13 14 | Philadelphia League of Women Voters Testimony submitted by: | |
| 15 | Coalition of Philadelphia Neighborhood Associations | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

| 1 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'd like to convene | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | the Judiciary Committee public hearings on House | | |
| 3 | Bill 2308. Our first witness is the Honorable | | |
| 4 | Edward G. Rendell, Mayor of the City of | | |
| 5 | Philadelphia. Welcome, Mayor Rendell. | | |
| 6 | Before I start, though, I'd like to | | |
| 7 | have the members of the committee who are here | | |
| 8 | to introduce themselves. | | |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Mike Horsey, | | |
| 10 | Philadelphia County. | | |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Tom | | |
| 12 | Caltagirone, Democratic Chair, Berks County. | | |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Lita Cohen, | | |
| 14 | Montgomery County. | | |
| 15 | MR. PRESKI: Brian Preski, Chief | | |
| 16 | Counsel to the Committee. | | |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: George Kenney, | | |
| 18 | Philadelphia. | | |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Al Masland, | | |
| 20 | Cumberland. | | |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I'm not a | | |
| 22 | member of the committee. I'm Babette Josephs, | | |
| 23 | Philadelphia. | | |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative | | |
| 25 | Thomas wanted to be here today. He's ill so he | | |

could not be with us. Thank you for your patience, Mr. Mayor. You may begin any time you like.

1 7

1.2

MAYOR RENDELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. We appreciate your coming to Philadelphia to hold these hearings. We also appreciate the extension of an invitation to testify.

As you all know, I have been a strong proponent of riverboat gambling since my election in 1991 when I came up to the Harrisburg to talk to both the Democrat and Republican caucuses in the House of Representatives. We have gone down a number of different roads in that time period. Much has stayed the same, but much have changed.

As you are aware, our sister State of Delaware to the south now has legalized gambling. They have legalized gambling at the tracks and that includes motor sports tracks, as well as racetracks. It is basically a limited form of casino gambling. By reports, including one that was reprinted in the Inquire three Sundays ago, the yield for gaming in Delaware has been extraordinary, way beyond the hopes of

the state officials who implemented the program.

To tell you just the level of public acceptance, I was down at Dover Air Force Base for the ceremony when Ron Brown and the others, their bodies were sent back from Bosnia. We had a memorial service in the airplane hangar. That was not only for Secretary Brown's, but also one of the businessmen from this area.

On the way back from the hearing we got a little lost and we were looking for Route

1. We pulled into a McDonald's and I went up to the counter and asked the fellow behind the counter, how do we get on Route 1? He said, no problem. We were near Dover Racetrack, Dover Downs. He said, no problem; just turn left at the light and then go one block, you'll see the casino. It's right past the casino.

The reason I mention that is, we now have 2 sister states, Delaware and New Jersey, that are actively pursuing gambling; that are taking gambling dollars from the citizens of Pennsylvania. Those gambling dollars are going to Jersey; they are going to Delaware. We are getting no social benefit out of those dollars. Whatever ails comes from gambling, people from

Southeastern Pennsylvania can in fact gamble by just going a few short miles to Delaware or a few short miles to New Jersey.

2.3

You may not have seen but there is a proposal in New Jersey to bring riverboat gambling to the Camden waterfront. That's was printed in the Camden Courier Post, and I have sent that or it's in the process of being sent to legislative leaders and members of my delegation. Ohio and New York, although they do not have legalized gambling yet, both with conservative Republican governors are taking some decided steps toward the goal of legalizing gambling.

You and most of the folks here are from the Delaware Valley. But if you were to go -- And I think you all know this. If you were to go to the Walt Whitman Bridge or the Ben Franklin Bridge at 5 o'clock on a Friday night, you will literally hear the sounds of dollars being sucked out of the Pennsylvania economy and being sucked out of the tax rolls of Pennsylvania going to Atlantic City. It is something that I believe that we can no longer afford. We cannot be an isolated island that

does not have any form of legalized gambling when our sister states do and take jobs and tax revenue and entertainment dollars from us which should be rightfully ours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What would the impact be of riverboat gambling along the scope of the bill that we are here discussing today, Representative Kenney's While we have had a gambling commission, I appointed my first year as Mayor a commission The gentleman to my left is Ted on gaming. Beitchman who is the Deputy Chief of Staff and he has been the liaison to the commission. The commission was headed by former United States Attorney for the Eastern District, Michael Baylson who was appointed by President Bush to be United States Attorney for this district. The commission has strongly recommended the implementation of legalized gambling for the State of Pennsylvania and for the Philadelphia area.

We have had studies commissioned by a number of different consultants. Ernst Young has done a study on this particular legislation that is before this committee. Let me just read you briefly what Ernst Young says the economic

impact would be, first for the City of Philadelphia.

Ernst Young estimates from the 15

percent gaming tax the City of Philadelphia

would net on an annualized basis \$87 million a

year. We would also get 8 to 10,000 new jobs if

the number of franchises was increased to 5 as I

will recommend here today for Philadelphia and

Allegheny County. We would get \$10 million as a

result of the wage tax paid by employees to this

industry. That would be \$97 million.

Assuming the requirement for fee simple ownership is removed, and I will testify for reasons that I think we should remove that, the City of Philadelphia would get a market rate of 5 percent of the gross for its incinerator site and net \$12 million annually. That would be \$109 million in annual revenue for the City of Philadelphia. We are not going to even begin to calculate the ripple effect that it would have from other vendors doing business with those 5 franchises. The ripple effect in terms of jobs and tax dollars would be enormous. We don't even get into that.

Ernst Young estimates that under this

2.2

current legislation with 19 dock-side facilities it would create a \$2.5 billion industry immediately and that would mean a gaming tax revenue of \$375 million statewide, to be split along a formulation that has been laid out in the bill. We have done a Wharton School Econometric Study that estimates that in 4 years the Pennsylvania market will create a \$4 billion industry, which, given a 15 percent tax on the win which this bill hauls would create a pool of 600 million from the gaming tax.

In either of that, the state's share of that 375 million or 600 million can go a long way to rectify some of the problems that you just dealt with in this year's budget. I know that this year's budget was not a happy task for almost anybody. School districts all around the State of Pennsylvania felt decidedly short-changed, hospitals, health care agencies, museums, institutions, ordinary citizens in need of health care. All those individuals complained that there wasn't enough in this budget for them. Many of you felt on given issues that they were correct. The reason there

was not enough in the budget for them is that there wasn't adequate revenue. No one wants to raise basic taxes.

Cambling revenues are a way for this city and this Commonwealth to deal with some of its pressing problems. This bill carries a formulation for how the money should be spent both in counties of the first class, Philadelphia, and in the state. Obviously, you'll take a look at that formulation and I'm sure there will be some give and take.

I would urge today that the statewide money be allocated with the exception of the portion that's there to guarantee any net losses in the lottery and the remainder would be given to education. I think if we dedicate these dollars to education, it will be a very, very important step, not only garnering public support, but more importantly in dealing with what is a problem in Philadelphia, in Beaver County, in Berks County, in Clarion County.

It's a problem everywhere in the state. There isn't a school district out there that doesn't believe that it seriously and genuinely needs additional dollars. I think we

should dedicate the majority of the revenue pool for education.

I would even go as far as to say the other 50 percent for counties of the first class; for counties of the first class, one-half of it is held aside for wage tax reduction, and I am in favor of that. I think the other half of that could be dedicated to education for counties of the first class as well, and I would so propose.

So, the economic impact for us is substantial; a hundred and 9 million dollars of direct annual revenue a year for Philadelphia, and for Pennsylvania somewhere between 200 and \$300 million of annual revenue a year. The mind boggles at the opportunities for using those dollars. It is one of the most significant opportunities that we will have as a city and I believe as a state to use those dollars for a purpose that will meet the needs of our citizens.

But, I am not unaware of the problems that the opponents of this legislation and other legislation say that gambling will cause. I'd like to just very, very briefly address some of

those comments. The comment that we hear most often is that gambling will create other crimes in Pennsylvania. If you legalize gambling, crimes like prostitution, drug dealing, money laundering, organized crime will take over in this state.

We have to look no further than

Atlantic City, New Jersey, or Las Vegas, Nevada,
to see that as far as the street crime offenses
that is incorrect. Those cities have both, over
the course of time since they have had gambling,
seen a reduction in street crime in their areas;
a reduction in street crimes; not an increase.

As far as organized crime getting a foothold because of gambling, again, I would address -- Take a look at the situation in New Jersey where the Casino Control Commission, an effective, well-funded, independent body has stripped the licenses from 3 franchisees on what many would consider remote and tangential links to organized crime. Three licensees lost their entire license to operate 100 percent; were kicked out of Atlantic City. I believe the type of Casino Control Commission that we could institute, whatever you called it, could do the

same type of effective job.

2.2

Michael Baylson, the United States

Attorney for this district under President Bush also believes that that is a goal eminently achievable. Robert Colville, the District Attorney, the long-time District Attorney of Allegheny County also believes that that is a readily achievable goal; a properly operating Casino Control Commission to ensure that those influences not come to pass in Pennsylvania.

The second argument we hear against legalized gambling of any form is that gaming is immoral; that it will, in fact, cause people who work hard for a living to spend their money on gambling and not bring it home to their families, not take care of there children, not take care of their obligations, their legal obligations. That is a hard argument to deal with in the sense that I believe that instances of that will occur. I believe they are smaller than the opponents of gambling would lead you to believe, but they will occur.

But I will suggest to you very respectfully that whether you legalize dock-side riverboat gambling or not, the people who have

that problem, Pennsylvanians who have that problem, will continue to have that problem. Ιf we never have legalized gambling in Pennsylvania but we have Pennsylvanians who are bound and determined because of addiction or of something else to spend their salaries on gambling, they have ready vehicles to do it in Pennsylvania. They can do it at our racetracks. They can do it at our off-track betting parlors. They can do it playing our legal lottery. They can do it by going to Atlantic City or New Castle County, Delaware. They can do it in many many different ways, and they do do it in many, many different ways.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whatever immorality there is with gambling, whatever side effects there are with working people blowing their money those are going to continue whether this state has legalized gambling or not. In this area that argument has absolutely no weight and no merit because people can readily obtain gambling opportunities outside of the state and readily obtain them inside of the state as well.

You cannot cure what I believe has been a human weakness since man and woman

Euphrates. If I read my history, there was gambling even back then. Nothing we do here is going to stop people who are bent on gambling from doing so. That is very very very important because there are benefits from gambling that are obvious from the figures that I read, from the reports from Delaware, from New Jersey where the casinos continue to generate more and more gross revenues, and therefore, produce more and more revenues for the state. Those benefits are there. Pennsylvanians right now only are suffering the downsides of gambling. They are getting none of the upsides.

Next you will hear from people who fear that our restaurant industry will be hurt in Philadelphia by the institution of dock-side gaming. I think that can be regulated by either you, the state, or by us. It is our intention not to allow any significant food service on any of those gambling franchises--none.

So, in fact, the restaurant industry here would not be hurt. It would be helped because, if, in fact, people are coming down and gamble and eat, they will have to eat at

riverfront restaurants or eat at restaurants in downtown Philadelphia. That is a very controllable problem that you can control or that we can control by our local zoning power, and we intend to control it. I have told the Riverfront Developers Association that. I have said that on a number of occasions publicly. We will not let anything happen that will hurt our existing businesses, our clubs, our restaurants, our hotels, or the like.

1.5

Next there is raised by residents who live somewhat near gambling the problems of traffic, parking, et cetera. Those also are legitimate problems that none of us takes lightly. Number 1, Representative Kenney in this bill was very clear and very astute to not disallow — He disallowed all other taxes or fees, but he did not allow fees on the franchises that are related to enforcement activities.

So, we can charge the franchises for additional police. We can charge the franchises for additional sanitation services. And we can mandate, again, through our land use power or through something that you put in the bill, we

can mandate the appropriate number of parking spaces on their own property to make sure that there is no spillover parking problem for any of the neighborhoods that are close to where gambling would be allowed in the City of Philadelphia.

Those are problems, again. They are not spurious problems. They are substantial problems. But they are problems that either you or we can address. We intend to address them.

I have already said that publicly. If it is left to us and with our land use power that you reserve to the local governments—it probably will be left to us—we will mandate a proper amount of parking spaces on the property before any franchise would open. We will take use of the allowable provision that allows us to charge fees for extra police, extra sanitation, extra traffic control. I believe we will address those problems very readily.

So, I am a strong supporter of legalized gambling under proper and appropriate circumstances here in Pennsylvania. I want to make 8 specific suggestions for this legislation which I think will strengthen the legislation

and will make it more productive and more efficient. I'd like to go over these for you one by one. We will submit this portion of my testimony in writing later on.

2.3

Number 1. As I stated a little bit earlier, it is our belief that the number of licenses designated for Allegheny and Philadelphia counties should be raised from 3 each to 5 each. This will increase the potential revenue for the Commonwealth, the casino operators and the political subdivisions of Allegheny, the City of Pittsburgh, and the City of Philadelphia. We believe that the 2 largest counties in the state, Allegheny and Philadelphia, can absorb 5 gaming franchises well, without any of the intended problems and without dipping into the marketability of those franchises.

We also believe that where gaming should take place should be restricted in this legislation, so that voters who don't want gaming in their area will have a clear understanding that it will not be coming to their area. The Atlantic City, New Jersey experience is very instructive. The first time

legalized gambling was put on a statewide referendum in New Jersey it went down by 60 to 40.

But, another attempt was made a year and a half later. In that referendum gaming was restricted to Atlantic City. With that restriction, with that restriction, gambling passed by almost as much as it was defeated the first time.

We would urge you to specifically restrict in this legislation the areas which can have legalized gambling. That way citizens of other parts of the state can understand that this legislation is not opening the door for gambling in their areas, and the areas where you specify that gambling is potentially allowed those citizens can make their own decision. So that is the first and I think a very important change that we would urge upon you.

Secondly, we would urge that this legislation carry a requirement for a statewide referendum. We do that because Governor Ridge has insisted on that. He has made it absolutely clear. I think publicly he has made it clear to me that without that provision he would veto

this legislation. We believe that under those circumstances a statewide referendum is advisable.

1.5

As you know, it would be a nonbinding referendum. I think each individual county and political subdivision should be tallied as well as the statewide figures. We believe that practicality dictates that we do add a provision for a statewide, nonbinding statewide referendum.

that we should change the areas that would receive gambling revenues both in the state portion of those revenues to public education, again, with the exception of the one-sixth that is reserved for senior citizens to offset any potential loss in the lottery fund. I think that's an important carve-out because we don't want the lottery fund and we don't want our senior citizens to suffer. I think the remaining state revenue should be dedicated to public education throughout the state. I know this committee could come up with a formula that could make that fair and appropriate.

I would also say that we would have no

problem in cities in the first class. We have already by the mandate of this bill indicated that 50 percent of our gambling revenues go for wage tax reduction. We would have no problem with the other 50 percent being applied by us to public education. Even though local political subdivisions have no legal responsibility for public education, we would be willing to buttress the property tax and buttress what the state gives us by giving our remaining 50 percent share to public education.

Fourth, we would request that there be a provision in House Bill 2308 that would allow any city or county that hosts gaming to charge the casino operators a one-time upfront development fee, the level of which would be driven by what the market will bear. So Philadelphia might have a different market fee, a franchise fee, than Delaware County, different from Allegheny County, different from Erie. But that would be a hands-on, market-driven transaction between the franchisee that the commission selects and the political subdivision.

The reason I say that is, we do not

want to repeat the story of Atlantic City. though the annual revenues that would come to the city and county of Philadelphia are great in these bills, we would be missing a huge opportunity if we did not charge upfront franchise fees. Because remember, the cost for a casino or a gambling operator to purchase a boat without eating facilities, without the requirement for hotel rooms, the cost is minuscule compared to what it is in Atlantic The debt service is infinitely less to Citv. the operator than it would be in Atlantic City. There should be an upfront, one-time franchise fee that goes to the local political subdivision.

We believe from studying new gambling enterprises in other areas of the country -- for example, if the city and county of Philadelphia could charge \$50 million for a franchise fee, and easily find takers, avid and willing takers, that \$250 million I've already publicly stated, if this legislation would allow us to get it, that \$250 million would go towards community development; \$200 million of which would be spent in our neighborhoods, creating housing

opportunities for people needing it, creating commercial opportunities, and economic development in the neighborhoods of Philadelphia, and \$50 million would be spent in downtown Philadelphia helping us with such vitally needed projects as new hotels.

That's already included in the projected economic stimulus plan that I publicly disseminated 2 years ago. It's still our hope that those franchises be awarded. If that had been done in Atlantic City, if the initial 9 casinos had pumped in \$450 million, a half of a billion dollars into Atlantic City, just close your eyes for a second and think of the level of development that could have occurred in the neighborhoods of Atlantic City.

No one today would be saying, look at what happened in Atlantic City. The people of Atlantic City didn't get anything in return for gambling. That is correct, because the City of Atlantic City and its neighborhoods did not get those upfront franchise fees.

I feel so strongly about the need for upfront franchise fees that without it I would not publicly support gambling in a public

referendum. There is no reason not to do it.

The operators won't like it because that money could stay in their own pockets, but they will pay that money easily.

We have had discussions with over 20 different casino gambling operators who have been in to see us during my first 4 years as Mayor. I have told every one of them that I would seek that type of upfront franchise fees. I'm not talking just about Philadelphia. I'm talking about Erie. I'm talking about Delaware County. I'm talking about Bucks County. I'm talking about Allegheny County. Not one of them has said to us that that would be a problem that would stop them from coming here.

When you compare the debt service on a riverboat, dock-side riverboat in Allegheny or Philadelphia or Erie compared to building those huge casino hotels, the debt service is so much dramatically lower that those upfront franchise fees would be paid just like that, and it would be an incredible economic development boom to the City of Philadelphia, to the residents of our neighborhoods, and to the people of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia.

Council President John Street, who could not be with me today to testify but wanted to, has asked me to indicate to you that this bill with the franchise provision would carry his strong support. Having the ability to spend \$200 million in our neighborhoods on top of our CDDG and homes money would give us the opportunity to totally in 18 months revitalize the face and the look and the feel of each and every neighborhood in the City of Philadelphia. The franchise fee amendment would be of vital importance to me and to the people of

there be a change in the fee simple language that would permit gaming by casino operators that do not own land. The reason we ask that requirement is, one of the prime locations in the City of Philadelphia for dock-side gaming would be the city's former incinerator site on Delaware Avenue. That site is just used for storing vehicles which could be easily moved to a different site. That site is a prime location where we could easily accommodate 2 franchisees. It's a very large site, 12 and a half acres in

size. We could accommodate 2 franchisees and we could get the rent from that site as part of our annual revenue from gambling.

So, it's very very important to us, and I would assume there might be other areas that would want to do the same thing. In fact, I know there are other areas that want to do the same thing. So, I would ask the requirement that there would be a fee simple ownership of land of any casino operator be accepted when that operator rents from a political subdivision or public entity. That would have application not only for Philadelphia, but also for Erie.

I've been urged to make this suggestion to you by Mayor Joyce Savicchio, the great Mayor of the fine City of Erie, Pennsylvania. She would request that a change be made to House Bill 2308 that would permit gaming on Presque Isle in Erie because that is the location that Mayor Savicchio feels could best accommodate gambling with the least impact on her neighborhoods and communities. She will be sending the committee a letter along those lines, but I will also submit that to you in writing.

Those are our 6 basic changes. Some of them carry 1 or 2 parts to each one of them.

As I said, I will submit them to you in writing.

Let me say in closing that this is the first, in my judgment, serious effort since Governor Casey indicated in late 1991 that he would veto gambling legislation.

2.2

I appreciate Representative Kenney stepping forward and submitting this bill. I appreciate Chairman Gannon holding these hearings, the willingness to hear opposing sides. I know this is an emotional issue and people feel very strongly on the other side of this issue. We do not scuff off their assertions. We do not believe that their arguments are spurious or not founded.

But for the reasons I stated, we believe when you analyze the benefits against the liabilities in proceeding with legalized gambling; when you look at what's happened in Delaware, extraordinary results, and Delaware is fairly close to Atlantic City; when you look at the ever-increasing revenue yield in New Jersey; when you look at the experiences in other cities and locations that have undertaken riverboat

gambling.

I sent a letter to every member of our delegation and to the legislative leadership about the town of -- There's a town in Illinois that has riverboat gambling and the incredible, dramatic effects -- Joliet, excuse me. The New York Times wrote a huge article about the impact it has in Joliet. It has taken Joliet from a devastated area to a vibrant area, new economic activity, with thousands of residents gaining jobs for the first time. Joliet had no capital budget and now it has a booming capital budget to deal with its problems.

The benefits are great. The liabilities are there but they can be controlled by proper regulation. We should not turn away from an economic opportunity to generate revenue for political subdivisions and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania when we need revenue.

You have all had to sit in your chairs and seen the effects of federal budget cuts. I would submit to you very unhappily that we have seen just the first wave of those effects and how it will impact on the State of Pennsylvania

and the City of Philadelphia and all our other political subdivisions. We will need new revenue. We will need new revenue desperately. This is a way to generate that new revenue. It's a way to do it and give local communities an opportunity to redevelop themselves beyond their wildest dreams, hopes and expectations.

It is no panacea. Riverboat gambling will not solely save the economic situation here in the City of Philadelphia, but it is a very important part of redeveloping our city.

In short, if you were to ask me where I could find a development that would produce eight to 10,000 jobs, \$109 million a year in annual revenue and \$250 million in upfront one-time franchise fees for my city, I will tell you it doesn't exist. We could bring a General Motors plant to the City of Philadelphia.

Boeing Airline Company could create a place to do new air buses for Europe and the world in the City of Philadelphia; they won't come close to matching those figures.

There is no economic development enterprise that you could think of that comes close to matching those figures. If you

resurrected the Navy yard at the height of its economic vitality, we might regain some of their annual tax revenues and the 8 to 10,000 jobs, but we wouldn't get the upfront franchise fees.

This is something that the City of

Philadelphia needs and would be a vital part of

their economic regeneration, and I will also

submit a wonderful thing for the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania to allow us to take public

education to the next step in every district in

this state.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify. We will submit those specific changes in writing.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mayor
Rendell. We've been joined by Representative
Kathy Manderino and also Representative Paul
Clymer, who is not a member of the committee.
But if he cares, he can come up and join us if he wishes.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Mr. Chairman,
I'm going to respectfully decline. This is your
hour here, so to speak, and I'll sit right here.
Thanks very much though. I appreciate your
kindness.

1 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 2 Representative Clymer. Mr. Mayor, would you be 3 willing to answer questions from the committee? 4 MAYOR RENDELL: Sure. 5 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative 6 Horsey. 7 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you, Mr. 8 Thank you for coming before the Mayor. committee to provide your comments. 9 10 questions are relatively brief. We don't have 11 affirmative action. We have just passed anti-discriminatory legislation for the state. 12 13 Would you be in favor or how would you quarantee 14 minority participation is the first question? The second question is, would you 15 present a specific formula on how the 250 16 million one-time license fee will be used within 17 18 the neighborhoods? Would you develop and 19 present a particular formula? 20 And the third question is, on a residential lot on those who work in the casino 21 22 as being mandated to live in the city, would you be in favor of that? 23

24

25

MAYOR RENDELL: Number 3, I would be

in favor of a residential requirement just as

New Jersey does. That's Number 1. Number 2, as to minority input into ownership and jobs, I would be in favor of that being in your legislation, but if it were not in your legislation, I believe we could use our land use power in a way to at least set goals so that we could have proper diverse employment in at least the 5 Philadelphia franchises. If it's not addressed in your bill, it would be our hope to address it in our bill as well. I think we could deal with that. The middle question was?

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: The allocation

of a one-time --

MAYOR RENDELL: We will submit to you our economic stimulus plan where I talked about this as part of the record that we submit to you. But I would also say, it would be my -- If, in fact, this came to past, let's assume we had it and the franchises had all paid \$50 million and we had a pile of \$250 million, our plan of operation, and I've talked to the City Council President Street, not to every council member, but we would ask individual neighborhoods to present their own development plans to us, giving us an idea what their

1 priorities were; housing, commercial 2 development, retail, industrial development. 3 So, we would not dictate to the neighborhoods. We would find a formula or apportion that 4 \$200 million around the city and then ask the 5 6 individual neighborhoods to submit plans. If you don't believe that's workable, 7 8 that's what we did with our 3 empowerment-zoned 9 neighborhoods. It worked enormously 10 successfully. If you studied our empowerment-11 zoned process, that's exactly what we did. Through the benchmarks that they submitted to me 12 13 in the empowerment-zoned process, it worked enormously effectively. So, that's what we 14 would do. I will submit what we have already 15 filed publicly with City Council in our economic 16 stimulus plan. 17 18 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you, Mr. 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mayor. 20 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative 21 Cohen. 22 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: No questions. 23 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative 24 Kenney. 25 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Mayor, thank you for your leadership on this issue. I guess in developing this legislation I truly believe there's no other industry like you have said that offers the potential for job growth and revenue growth, not only in the City of Philadelphia but throughout Pennsylvania. In analyzing those benefits versus the liabilities, I guess the community groups have been the most outspoken towards me in asking, just what is the benefit to us of moving forward on this issue?

2.2

You mentioned public education. I, in drafting the legislation, I guess hear most about taxes up in Northeast Philadelphia. I guess as I look at more data on this issue, public education becomes one of those issues that people see as a direct benefit.

Do you see that or is that something that you have seen?

MAYOR RENDELL: I agree. I think the legislature is wise to codify where the benefit would go. Because, if you don't codify it, you might go back to the old days of revenue sharing when cities and other political subdivisions got blank checks from Washington with no

restrictions on how it was to be used. A lot of that money was wasted. It went to blotted benefits. It went to a lot of things; not to the people in the neighborhoods.

1.8

I do believe you as a legislative body, whatever your decision is, you should codify where it goes. In our case 50 percent wage tax reduction I think is vital.

As you know, Representative Kenney, there is nothing that more adversely affects the City of Philadelphia's economic viability than having the nation's highest wage tax. It is something that we have pledged to reduce and we are on our second year of a 9-year incremental wage tax reduction plan. But, I am not certain that federal and state budget cuts may not force us to give that up sometime in the future.

We just entered a new contract with our nonuniform workers last night around midnight. That contract is affordable. We know we can pay it. We will not be leaving a deficit and we can pay it keeping our tax reduction plan. However, if we get hit with further federal or state budget cuts we will need some new source of revenue to stay on course and even

speed up that course for wage tax cuts. I think your dedicating 50 percent to wage tax cuts is very appropriate.

2.1

requirement that a political subdivision give money to the school districts, and in fact, the City of Philadelphia is the only political subdivision in the Commonwealth that gives some of its own money to the school district. Every other district relies on state funding and property tax funding. We have given almost \$60 million in the last 14 months to education.

Even though that is the case I would still be willing to commit now to give the other 50 percent on an annualized basis to public education. We have the most serious needs. We have so many different constituencies to balance in our educational system, and so many different needs. We have the highest number of learning disabled kids. We have the highest number of kids who go to school hungry, or sick or beaten. We have extra requirements and I would have no hesitation in seeing the legislature designate the other 50 percent to public education.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: On the issue

of upfront development fees, should we write in state law, or in state statute what assurances a community should receive from those fees or should we leave that to local government?

MAYOR RENDELL: I would have no problem with the legislature prescribing that the upfront franchise fees be used for community development so that they cannot be used for paying off salaries, or for stadiums or something like that. You could write very clearly into the law that those upfront franchise fees be used for community development or it would give you a formula that at least 75 percent, or 50 percent be used for community development. I think that would be very reassuring.

You said that you hear from community groups in opposition to legalize gambling. As all Philadelphians know, I am out every night and every weekend speaking to people in the City of Philadelphia in every neighborhood. When I mention the upfront franchise fees going for community development, and when I mention the possibility that the annualized revenue could go half for wage tax reduction and half for maybe

something like public education, those community groups by and large are not against it anymore; not against it anymore at all. I think there would be no problem prescribing that at least some percentage of the upfront franchise fees be reinvested into community development.

I think the question about Atlantic
City is a legitimate question. Every time we
talk about gambling people say, it didn't do
Atlantic City one darn bit of good and they were
right at the beginning. I think it's starting
to do Atlantic City a little bit of good. But
it didn't at the beginning because they didn't
get those upfront franchise fees and didn't
reinvest them back into their neighborhoods. I
would have no problem with you legislating them
in.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: When we say reinvesting into communities, I guess when you submit to the Chairman your language, just how would we say that? How detailed --

MAYOR RENDELL: For example --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I literally heard from groups in Center City Philadelphia.

Community groups have been asking me the size of

the sewage pipes leading to the -- I'm thinking --

MAYOR RENDELL: The sewage pipes from the --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: From the facilities on the river --

MAYOR RENDELL: Remember because of your bill you exempted that from the general appropriation against other fees and taxes. We could charge a specific fee, and we do intend to charge a specific fee for that problem. That wouldn't have to come out of the upfront franchise fees at all, because your bill very appropriately carves out the ability to charge for fees for enforcement, sanitation, things like that. We would cover that in that provision of your bill.

For example, I might suggest that the upfront franchise fees percentage be spent according to the guidelines of the Federal Community Development Block Grant Program. But, you would have to modify that because the CDDG program has some income requirements and we'd want every area in the city to benefit. We will work on appropriate language and submit it to

the committee.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Mr. Mayor, do you or Mr. Beitchman have any language that communities have ever submitted stating what they would like to see — to support it what language they would like in the legislation to be supportive? Because, one thing I have said to communities, what do you want? At the same time I haven't seen anything come back in writing detailing what they want done. Maybe they have done that.

MAYOR RENDELL: I think it's basically what falls under the broad definition of community development.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Have they responded in writing on those issues?

MAYOR RENDELL: No, but we can generate that response. There's no question. We've had discussions, ongoing discussions with an extraordinary amount of community groups. In fact, I have urged a lot of our community groups who aren't automatically eligible for CDDG funds to submit to us neighborhood redevelopment plans like Frankford has done, you know the Frankford plan. I have suggested that to some other areas

| 1 | of the city. We would use basically those plans |
|----|---|
| 2 | as the earmark for how we would spend the |
| 3 | allocated franchise fee money. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Good. Thank |
| 5 | you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| 7 | Representative Kenney. Representative Masland. |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Very briefly, |
| 9 | Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for |
| 10 | appearing before us. I do appreciate your |
| 11 | recognition of some of the downside of the |
| 12 | problems because I come from a part of |
| 13 | Pennsylvania, Cumberland County, which many |

MAYOR RENDELL: And a great university.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND. That's right.

But my constituents, interestingly enough, about

70 percent of them in a recent poll said that

they were opposed to riverboat gambling. Even

though they're opposed to it, about half of them

would still like to see it on a statewide

referendum. They're willing to at least see it

come up for a vote, but they're concerned about

would consider rural, although we do have a big

town Carlisle there with all kinds of problems.

the downside.

2.2

2.3

One aspect of that which I know they've tried to address in New Jersey, and forgive me, Representative Kenney, I haven't poured over your bill over the past few weeks since we've been doing other things in the General Assembly, but I don't recall seeing anything specifically in the bill regarding setting up some type of council for compulsive gambling. That is something that they do have in New Jersey. I think that's something if this does pass should be considered.

I do note that in New Jersey last summer they were experiencing some problems with the funding of this council because it was funded exclusively from fines on the various casinos. When those fines dropped, so did funding from about 600,000 to I think they were about at 450,000; 150,000 short. The editorial in the Atlantic City Press basically said, if we're going to rely on this for our income, and it accounted for about 7 percent of New Jersey's state income that year; if we are going to rely on it to that extent for our income, we ought to also address the underside or the downside of

this. What are your thoughts?

1.9

MAYOR RENDELL: I agree with you.

Just as I think Representative Kenney did a good job allowing the local subdivision to charge fees for enforcement, for sanitation, et cetera, I would have no problem if the legislature mandated that a percentage, and it wouldn't have to be very much of a percentage given the figures that we talked about, a percentage of the county share or the political subdivision share must be paid on an annualized basis to like organizations, because I think it is a problem.

Although I will say that and I'm sure those organizations do some good and have had some effect, but just like Alcoholics Anonymous hasn't cured all alcoholism, I don't think you're ever going to cure—I think you should be honest—you're never going to cure all gambling addiction. If you can make a dent in it, it's certainly worthwhile and it's certainly worth an expenditure of some of those funds. I would write it in. Write it in not in fines, but write it in off the revenue side. Because the revenue side is always going to be strong,

certainly strong enough to sustain the level that's necessary to keep those organizations functioning.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I would agree with you there and not try to define it. As you said earlier, and the figure is pretty astronomical if you think about it. If these casinos would be willing to pay \$50 million upfront in a development fee, some of those revenues ought to go toward compulsive gambling.

MAYOR RENDELL: If we're going to get \$109 million a year, half of one percent of that would be like \$55 million a year for, excuse me, \$550,000 a year for those type of agencies, dedicated revenues streamed right from our share or from the state share. I would have no problem with legislating that in on the revenue side rather than depending on the fine side.

means that I still have to say that the fact that they can pay \$50 million and get it back like that is what really worries me and really bothers me. That means there's an awful lot of losers out there.

MAYOR RENDELL: There's no question,

but again, I will say to you that people have a tendency when they focus on the individual, they have a tendency to focus on the downside as far as individuals go. I know you don't have the time to do this. If this committee would like on any Tuesday or Thursday morning in the winter, in the cold toughest days in Philadelphia, I'd like to pile you in a little I can take you to locations where the van. buses load for Atlantic City in South Philadelphia, in Northeast Philadelphia, down at the river, in West Philadelphia and you can go with me and we'll get on the buses because they take a few minutes to wait to make sure everybody is there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Let's talk to those people. They aren't rich people. They aren't the Leonard Toses (phonetic). Those are people who don't have a lot of money, and yet, they're going down with \$50 in their pocket. In most cases they're going to lose that. They are going to get a bus ride and lunch and lose that 50 or \$60, but they will tell you that that adds excitement to their lives. It's fun. It is a sense of adventure. It's a sense of anything can happen. Most of

these folks who take the buses happen to be our senior citizens. They will tell you that it brightens their lives considerably. That is a fact.

I think there are far more, hundred times more people who enjoy gambling as a recreation, enjoy gambling as a recreation than there are those gambling addicts who lose money that they can't afford to lose.

Seriously, if you went with me you'd see a lot of very excited people who don't have a lot of excitement in their lives; who don't have a lot of color in their lives; who don't have a lot of vibrancy in their lives. Right now we are requiring them to get on a bus and shuffle all the way down to Atlantic City, spend an hour or hour and 10 minutes both ways, a total of 2, 2 and a quarter hours to do something and to have that fun.

You know what, over the course of their gambling lives they lose money. If they didn't, you wouldn't see the profits that they made. But that one time when they come back with \$400 in their pocket it's so exciting to them. They are very happy about it. They know

1 that they're going to lose money generally, but they're just there for the excitement and the 2 3 It's a very decent part of their lives. 4 It's not all bad. Gambling is not all bad. Seriously, I would invite this 5 committee -- It is my hope that we will get 6 this on the ballot for the November election so 7 8 we can't wait for the cold weather. But I'd 9 invite you to come in early September and we'll 10 just travel --11 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: You don't 12 have to do that. I saw a bus today at the 13 Valley Forge Plaza from Pittsburgh and they were 14 backing up. I stopped and asked, are going to 15 Atlantic City? I saw one Steelers hat on. 16 Coming from Pittsburgh? Yeah. 17 MAYOR RENDELL: Don't you think they knew the odds were against them? 18 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I should have 19 20 asked some follow-up questions. I really should 21 have. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. 2.2 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 23 Representative Masland. Representative 24 Caltagirone.

25 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank

you, Mr. Chairman. Mayor Rendell, we held a hearing in Harrisburg on this issue a few months back. We had different people from around the state testifying. After the hearing I had talked to some of the people from casinos and I had asked them pointedly, approximately how much money from Pennsylvania is going into Atlantic City each year? They didn't give me a dollar amount but they said roughly over 25 percent of the total take in Atlantic City is coming from Pennsylvania each year.

We're kind of -- and I know that you have been doing an excellent job here in Philadelphia, by the way, managing the budget, striving for economic development. Short of this kind of potential input that you could have as new fusion of money into Philadelphia, and I know you've been grappling with trying to get other types of investments into your city, is there anything else that would have the dramatic impact that this one issue might?

MAYOR RENDELL: In terms of economic development, only tax reform that could allow the City of Philadelphia to totally eliminate its wage tax and reduce its business taxes by

one half, but that tax reform would mean a substantial increase in the state income tax.

But, if you did that, if you wiped out our wage tax entirely and reduced our business taxes by half, it would have the same economic impact. But, you know the price you pay for that type of tax reform would be a significant increase in the state income tax. Not quite a doubling but fairly close to it.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I like the point that you had made because a lot of people that are anti-gambling, that's their opinion, our state lottery, the offtrack betting, the horse racing that takes place in the state, the lottery, and God knows --

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: The illegal kinds.

MAYOR RENDELL: Card games at home.

MAYOR RENDELL: Card games at home as long as no one is cutting the deck are not illegal, and big money is lost at card games at home. I know, because when I was a young Assistant D.A. I prosecuted a lot of homicide cases that flowed out of arguments from those type of games. We're not going to stop them.

We're not going to stop them. We couldn't stop drinking liquor with prohibition and nothing we can do, and that's very important. Nothing you can do is going to stop gambling.

2.2

If someone is bent on feeding that addiction, there is nothing you can do to stop it, anymore than you can stop people from drinking liquor. We tried that and it didn't work and it does not work with gambling. One way or the other people who are bent on taking that paycheck and are going to spend it are going to spend it. They're going to find a vehicle for spending it. Nothing you can do. Nothing I can do.

If I believe that by not passing this legislation we wouldn't have one person in the State of Pennsylvania who took money that they couldn't afford to lose and lost it on gambling, I would be against this legislation. I don't believe that for a nanosecond; not for a nanosecond. Nothing we can do will achieve that result.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Mayor Rendell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Caltagirone. Representative

Manderino. We have also been joined by

Representative Harold James who is a member of
the committee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have my notes with me from when we had our first hearing. I'm going to paraphrase what I heard the casino interest saying. These are my words. I walked away from the first hearing with a distinction in my mind between what the casino interest considered reasonable versus unreasonable regulation. What was classified in the unreasonable regulation end of it were the very regulations that I think people try to attach to proposals such as this to try to make them acceptable; things that have to do with --

In essence, what they were saying is, don't put restrictions on us that tell us that you know how to run our business better than we can and that might put us in a bind where our business isn't profitable. One of the things that I took away from that was things like, don't tell us not to combine food with the gambling because we need those 2 things to work

off of each other to keep people there longer, to keep the gambling profitable, et cetera.

Would you respond to that and how you think, knowing your interest in protecting our other entertainment and restaurant facilities in Philadelphia, that you think we can accomplish that? That's one of the areas that I walked away with a clear distinction that they wouldn't be happy about or, they would be happy initially and it would not be too much longer that we would see them back in saying, you have to remove this restriction.

MAYOR RENDELL: Let me say, just touching on what Representative Masland and Representative Caltagirone said. Hey, these guys are coming if we legalize it no matter what restrictions you put on. No matter what restriction, they are coming. Fifty million dollar upfront franchise fees, they whined about that at some hearings. As Representative Masland said, how fast do they make that back? They are coming.

Food, you got a split on food. A lot of them want every available square foot on that boat to be gambling; not food. They want the

most amount of square footage for gambling.

They'd don't like necessarily having food,

particularly when there are enough restaurants

in the riverfront to keep people right there.

They can leave the casino, go next door, eat,

come on back.

But understand, you decide what restrictions are right and don't worry. They're coming; they're coming. You outlaw food and double my franchise fees from 50 to a hundred for Philadelphia and I could put 20 franchisees in Philadelphia. I guarantee you. If I couldn't, we'll give all of the money to the state—all. We won't take any it if I couldn't put — They are coming.

There have been months when I haven't been able to get work done because I've had to meet with different casino interests to explain to them that I have nothing to do with picking the franchisees, so they shouldn't be meeting with me. They are coming. Do not worry about the whining.

The money to be made -- Representative Caltagirone said 25 percent of their take.

That's probably a little low. Ted, do you know

1 what the profit was last year? 2 MR. BEITCHMAN: In Atlantic City? 3 MAYOR RENDELL: Yeah. 4 MR. BEITCHMAN: The win was 3.7 5 billion. 6 MAYOR RENDELL: The win was 3.7 7 billion, for how many of them? 8 MR. BEITCHMAN: 12. MAYOR RENDELL: For 12. Let's divide 9 10 3.7 billion by 12, that comes to --11 MR. BEITCHMAN: About 300 million. 12 MAYOR RENDELL: A mere \$300 million 13 each. For 300 million I think they're coming 14 regardless of what the upfront franchise fee is and regardless of whether we allow them to have 15 food or not. You put in what you believe is 16 right to protect the maximum amount of people 17 18 that need protecting. They are coming. We 19 don't even have to build it. They will build it 20 themselves. 21 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Following 2.2 up on that, do you perceive in addition to whatever we would put in statute with regard to 23 legalizing gaming in Pennsylvania that we would 24

also have our local ordinance that could or

25

would provide any additional controls with regard to what happens with the franchises in our particular county?

MAYOR RENDELL: Yeah, I think you could give us the right to conduct market transactions for upfront franchise fees, but then dictate how we use those franchise fees.

Absolutely. That would be clearly within your purview.

Again, as I said after giving a response to his question, I would have no problem with that as long as we took the criteria that was fair to all neighborhoods and a criteria that everyone could live with. I think we can work that out fairly easily and we'll submit some suggested language. I'm sure you will have no trouble doing that on your own.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: What I'm thinking of is, you made the suggestion about no significant food on the boats. That probably works for Philadelphia.

MAYOR RENDELL: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: That probably doesn't work for a smaller area. That is one of those areas that you would see being

left to local regulation?

1.9

2.4

MAYOR RENDELL: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: On the area of local -- Actually, let me go back to the statewide level too. With regard to franchisees in the County of Philadelphia and you're suggesting that we consider bumping that up to 5 and not 3 franchises, are you envisioning those franchisees being limited to operating on the Delaware River, and would you be amenable to language in both the state and the local statutes or regulation that -- statutes that would exclude it from the Schuylkill River within the boundaries of the City of Philadelphia?

MAYOR RENDELL: I would not oppose that, although I will tell you that, generally, I think I would leave -- Again, for Philadelphia I would not oppose that. But generally I would leave that to local land use. But in Philadelphia, for example, I know there are people who feel very strongly about the Schuylkill being used for recreation.

I would have no problem in that for the city of first class. But I would try to

leave that to the local government's lands use planning statewide because local government tends to know best what they can and cannot do even more than the local representatives because we deal with land use issues all the time.

Specifically for counties of the first class a prohibition on the Schuylkill would not bother me at all. I have not talked to City Council at large. I've briefly discussed it with Council President Street. If I had my druthers, I would restrict it to certain areas on the Delaware; not all of the Delaware Riverfront in Philadelphia, but certain areas.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You had an annual revenue projection for the City of Philadelphia of 109 million. Did that include what you were anticipating with regard to rent from 2 franchisees on the city?

MAYOR RENDELL: Yes. We anticipated -- We put in 12 million into that figure. Without that 12 million we would be at 97 million.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You did respond to Representative Horsey with regard to a residential requirement for jobs. Was that

for all jobs, and that was a Pennsylvania residency requirement or a Philadelphia residency requirement?

MAYOR RENDELL: I would say the local political subdivision, but that may not be workable in other areas because the host subdivision might be too small? But for our county I would strongly urge that it be residential.

I would feel differently if there were not proposed franchises for Delaware and Bucks. If we were getting all of the franchises for the Delaware Valley area, then I could see opening it up to a regional requirement. Since they're having their own franchises or may have their own franchises, I would strongly suggest for cities in the first class that it be residency.

one thing that has dramatically helped New
Jersey. Again, can you imagine if they had done
it in Atlantic City? Can you imagine what it
would have done for Atlantic City. Nobody would
be sitting around talking about, well, they
didn't do anything for Atlantic City. Can you
imagine what it would have been like for

Atlantic City? It actually might have been unworkable in the end as they started to add, but can you imagine what it would have done? would have absolutely transformed Atlantic City. What it would have done for its real estate property tax base, it would have been dramatic. Eight to 10,000 employees won't do the same thing for Philadelphia, but it will help. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you,

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Mayor.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Manderino. Representative
Josephs.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for indulging in me, allowing me to ask him questions. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for appearing before us.

I've been listening to this conversation about the banning of food in these establishments with a mixture of, I don't know, I guess incredulity and amazement. Are you suggesting that we allow these establishments to serve alcohol but not allow them to serve food?

MAYOR RENDELL: I would not suggest that they have general alcohol services bars, et

cetera. I might do the same thing that Atlantic City does and allow individual gamblers to order drinks from the floor. But, if your point is that people are going to get more drunk because they don't eat, I will tell you that the average person who goes in and gambles in Atlantic City, except for our busloads of senior citizens, doesn't eat. If they do eat, they eat in extremely high-priced restaurants at the end of their gambling.

Again, you can't legislate to protect everybody against every foible they have. I mean, should people wear their glasses when they gamble? Yeah, they should because it's important to see the cards, for example, if you're playing blackjack. Are we going to legislate that people should not be vain and should wear their glasses at all times when they gamble? I'm being serious. It makes a big difference in seeing the cards. I know if I wear my glasses when I play blackjack I can see the cards a lot better than I can. It's a good thing to see the cards. It's a good thing to see the cards.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Sir --

MAYOR RENDELL: What I'm saying is,
you cannot legislate against every human foible.
I would estimate that no more than 10 percent of
the gamblers in any of those casinos have eaten
something in the casino.

2.3

But remember, we are putting these casinos in an area that has some of the world's best restaurants, restaurants at different price scales. All sorts of restaurants are available right down on the riverfront. If they want to eat, they'll eat and then they'll go gamble, or they'll take a break and they'll go eat.

I don't think the fact that there's a restaurant actually on the boat as opposed to getting off the boat and walking a hundred yards or taking -- Penns Landing has a shuttle that goes up and down the Delaware River, has a shuttle. I don't think that having a restaurant in the physical establishment is going to mean anything.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: A follow-up question to that, you've been saying that you believe these establishments, this industry will come no matter what kind of restrictions we place on them. Suppose we told them they

couldn't serve alcohol?

MAYOR RENDELL: I believe they'd still come. They would be less likely to come, but I think they'd still come.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: That might have some effect on them?

MAYOR RENDELL: Some. You might lose a few, but we'd get our 5 franchises. We'd get our 5 franchises. If you are implying that casinos are dependent upon drunken gamblers --

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I am.

MAYOR RENDELL: -- their revenues,
you're wrong. You've obviously never spent time
in a casino. Most of the people who are there
are not drunk. I have been a blackjack player
since I was in the Army. I go over 5 or 6 times
a summer. I sit at the table. When you sit at
the table you converse with your fellow victims
and you commiserate. It's like you all yell at
somebody who takes the wrong card because
there's some notion somewhere that that screws
up the game. I never understood it but everyone
believes that. So you all yell at them. I have
seen thousands and thousands of gamblers and I
have seen maybe 1 or 2 inebriated in all that

time; 1 or 2 inebriated.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I don't want to prolong this argument or this discussion. I would be happy to get for you and submit to the committee chair and to you studies which show that casinos depend very much on the free flow of alcohol, not only for participation, but for their win; and that they will not operate without alcohol and I'm saying they need --

MAYOR RENDELL: Babette, you simply do not know anything about gambling. I do not drink. I am for my lifetime decidedly down in gambling and I do not drink. I am decidedly down. But nobody is asserting that we -- I don't think anybody is contemplating that we don't allow them to serve alcohol.

What I'm saying is, and it goes back to someone's suggestion, I think it was Representative Manderino, that it depends on the locale whether they should serve food. If you are in a locale in Bucks County where there are no restaurants readily available, obviously they should serve food there; clearly. But we are trying to protect our own restaurants here who have a very significant investment on the

Delaware Riverfront. I think by eliminating food or by maybe saying no more than sandwiches or something. Again, I don't think where you get your food is important as long as there is food readily available.

If you're suggesting that we ban alcohol, I'd say no. I think some people enjoy that as part of the experience. Again, you can't legislate against people's foibles. Every time you've tried to do that -- I don't mean you specifically, but every time any legislative body has tried to do that it simply hasn't worked.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I have another question if I might. There's been a lot of talk, always is a lot of talk about people who go from Philadelphia to Atlantic City and now to Delaware. I understand the logical feeling or what seems to be logical that people have that we could capture all or at least a very large part of that business.

I wonder whether anybody has actually ever done a study aside from the anecdotal evidence which people have been able to gain as you have said at bus stops. I have never seen

one and I am very curious. I wonder whether there has been a study? Will people really stay here or is part of what they like the fact that they are getting out of town and going somewhere? I don't know the answer. If you have a study, I would like to see it.

MAYOR RENDELL: I can give you more than anecdotal. That same argument was raised against legalized gambling in Atlantic City.

They said that it will never work because people just don't go to Las Vegas to gamble. They go for the experience. They go for the strip.

They go for all of the entertainment. They are simply not going to do it in Atlantic City. No one is going to do it. They want to go away and gamble.

Atlantic City, no matter how many fabulous casinos Las Vegas puts up, no matter how many pyramids, no matter how many volcanoes, no matter how many waterfalls Las Vegas puts up Atlantic City boxes their ears off. Do you know why Atlantic City boxes their ears off?

Location, location, location.

We will keep 85 to 90 percent of our gambling dollars here 10 out of the 12 months of

the year. In July and August we'll have a problem, but we are doing so well as a convention and tourist town now that those conventioneers and tourists in part, not all, but in part will fill the boats in July and August as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have got 10,000 Moose in town. don't know if any of you belong to the Moose. I have addressed the Moose on 2 occasions. Let me tell you that the Moose are free-spirited folk. Last night at the Wyndam-Franklin Plaza in the middle of our labor negotiations, our team was in a very big suite. The Moose were under the misconception that our suite was the hospitality suite for the Canadian Moose. Our team was interrupted constantly by Moose knocking on the door asking, is this Canada? Our response was no, this is Philadelphia. They said, well, can we come in anyway? I would have a hunch that you would have a lot of those Moose down on the riverboats when Philadelphians are going to the shore.

Seriously, the argument was made against having gambling in Atlantic City. That very same argument that it's experienced --

1 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Seriously, 2 I'd like to see if a study has been done. I would like to see it. 3 MAYOR RENDELL: The answer is, just 4 look at what Atlantic City is doing to Las 5 It's for location. 6 Vegas. REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Mr. Mayor, 7 you gave me your answer and I appreciate knowing 8 that there's no study. And I'm sorry because I 9 think we should know what we're doing before 10 11 we --12 MAYOR RENDELL: Babette, do we do a study to --13 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Well, we 14 15 should. MAYOR RENDELL: Should we do a study 16 to discern that tomorrow is Tuesday? There are 17 18 some things that we know. We know that New 19 Jersey has done so well because of location. It's got New York. It's got Philadelphia. It's 20 21 got location. REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I have just 22 another comment; not really a question. There's 23 24 also been some talk about neighborhood

associations and the role that they should play.

25

I have a great deal of sympathy for you, Mr.

Mayor, because I know from your side which is also my side in many ways you feel -- I have been out and talked to many of these neighborhood organizations and a million people.

I've spent hours and hours and hours and still they come back and they complain that they're not part of the process.

From the other side when you talk to people who belong to neighborhood organizations they'll say, well, yeah, we sort have been included but not enough and we still haven't made our input and nobody is listening to us and so on. I know that problem as well as anybody does, as everybody here knows that problem who's been in elected office.

Just the same, I would be very grateful and I think groups that all of us represent, particularly those of us who are in and around Philadelphia County, if we could get some feeling of the time and the groups and the contacts that you have made in the past and some plan or some idea that you and your administration have and how you're going to include neighborhood organizations that are

interested, not only in spending the money, but in having some input into how this legislation ought to be crafted; how anything that the city passes ought to be crafted; what the makeup of certain groups who might control this industry and so on; how they might have some input into making some of those decisions. I say parenthetically that I speak for the groups that I represent, they do not have a position.

2.4

What they are asking for is the opportunity to be at the table as citizens who live in this county. I think that you have tried to do that and I would like to see more of it both retrospectively and prospectively on paper so I can go back to my groups and say, don't complain, or, you do have a right to say that you haven't been included, or whatever the case may be.

MAYOR RENDELL: We'll do that.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I really would appreciate that.

MAYOR RENDELL: But let me say that over the last several years, myself, Mr. Beitchman and Mr. Veon (phonetic) we have appeared before community groups in even the

most remotely directly affected areas, Queens Village, Pennsport, Washwest, Society Hill.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I don't doubt it. I think if it were documented then you would be more --

MAYOR RENDELL: Let me also tell you, to be honest, that I haven't satisfied all their concerns. Every new thing that comes about strikes fear in the hearts of community groups. I understand that. I'm not denigrating that. Changes always are very scary. There's no question about that.

I've listened as much as we can. I think Representative Kenney listened because he put in the bill what I think is very important, the ability to charge fees for enforcement, sanitation and the like. That's a very important issue.

I have told the groups. I have pledged publicly to each one of those groups that we would work with them to determine what the adequate amount of parking would be for each establishment so that they could be guaranteed that the parking would be right there and wouldn't spill over into their neighborhood.

That's a problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But, I think one of the things that you can look at, and I know this is a concern of yours, is right now on Delaware Avenue, as you know, there's a lot of tension between the clubs and the restaurants and some of the surrounding neighborhoods. In response to that, we set up this police task force. We urged the restaurants and clubs to kick in money to hire a task force of Philadelphia police above and beyond the baseline police that we have down there on a nightly basis during the summer.

There's an additional task force paid for by the operators of the clubs and restaurants that does things like traffic control, and parking, and tries to make sure that people don't go up in the neighborhood areas and use their lawns or trees for public bathrooms, and things like that. I think we have a fairly good track record of trying to work with those groups to address problems.

But, I can't--I've got to be honest with you--I can't absolutely wipe away all of their fears and all of their speculative ideas.

25 We've tried the best we can and we will document that as much as we can.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you. I appreciate that. I would like to say, even though sometimes the Mayor and I do engage in some of these kinds of questions, he and I are very good friends.

MAYOR RENDELL: No question about it.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Josephs. Representative Cohen.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for taking so much time, Mr. Mayor. I have to say I'm very impressed. We don't often get public officials who are such experts in the topic that we're dealing in. I'm impressed with your expertise as a participate in this industry. You've answered my question.

What I want to do is ask you just not to cast your answer in stone; which is, I heard you speak many many times on the subject of regionalism. You and I have some similar and certainly some different concepts of how far regionalism goes. We've worked together, for example, on the City Avenue Corridor, a project

1 which is striving.

MAYOR RENDELL: It's a great project.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: A wonderful example of how regionalism does work. Having said that and, of course, as you know I represent a county of Second Class A, and there are provisions in this legislation for it. But you've talked and said it twice today in response to Representative Horsey and Representative Manderino concerning jobs and restricting the jobs at these casinos to Philadelphians.

My district borders Philadelphia. We participate with you. I think 80, 85 percent of my constituents actually work in the city. We have a wonderful marriage. Even though we might have 4 licenses, or actually I guess 2 possibly in my county, I would be very concerned that you would restrict employment to Philadelphia when I--since we are talking about gambling--would bet you dollars to doughnuts, you would get a lot of my constituents coming into Philadelphia --

MAYOR RENDELL: Even if you had your own casinos, your own dock-side?

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Yes. I think it's an area thing. As my people now go down to Delaware Avenue to frolic, I think they would gamble within G-a-m-b-o-ville on your riverfront even if they had something in Montgomery County. So I'd just like to say, don't cast it in stone.

MAYOR RENDELL: Let me say this.

Residency would not be so much of a concern of mine if I could find a way to guarantee minority employment, because I think residency really helps to achieve that goal for us. That is an important goal for me.

My guess is that you're not going to be able to require that in the legislation.

Absent that, residency is our best hope to guarantee minority employment. But, if there would be --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Just don't cast it in stone.

MAYOR RENDELL: No, no, it isn't cast in stone. That would not be a deal breaker for us. I mean, for example, we certainly would want to say state. We don't want any -- just like Jersey doesn't allow any of its gambling employees to be Pennsylvania residents. We

certainly would want to eliminate that because of our proximity to Jersey, we would lose a ton of our employees to Jersey, I think. We want to at least regulate that.

It's a difficult question as to the others. If there was a way of guaranteeing minority participation in the jobs, I don't think I would be so adamant about residency.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Cohen. Representative Horsey, do you have a follow-up question?

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Just this one quick question, Mr. Mayor. There are some things about this process we do know. I'm not sure we are connecting the dots here. We do know that Delaware in its first month of slot machine gambling made \$50 million. We do know that we shouldn't make the same mistakes that Jersey made, the community development fee of \$50 million. I happen to know as I sit here of 3 minority-owned corporations, 51 percent, who would put up the \$50 million.

MAYOR RENDELL: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: So, getting

the \$50 million won't be an issue. The people want that.

There is one question I need to have answered because it did come up in the State House as an issue. Once again, we also know that we have revenue from liquor that is drank by the tax in Philadelphia. We know that those taxes go to simply schools. Why would anybody want to restrict liquor in a riverboat gambling process? I don't know.

Anyway, the question I have for you, Mr. Mayor, is relevant to liquor-by-the-drink tax, and it's related but it's not related.

What is the Mayor's position on liquor-by-the-drink tax because we considered about a month ago repealing that on the House floor.

of it. It was a very difficult political issue for us. We only passed it by a one vote margin in City Council. It has succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. We had hope to get maybe \$10 million a year. It looks like we'll running at about 20, 21 million. As we grow as a convention and tourist town, that 20, 21 million, even without gambling will continue to

grow. There's no substitute for it. There is no substitute for it unless -- There does not seem to be a substitute on the horizon for it.

restrict it to the hospitality area we would do so? Chicago has a liquor-by-the-drink tax restricted to what they call their hospitality district. That way it doesn't impact on neighborhood bars. If we could have done that, we would have. But under our uniformity clause we can't; we cannot.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Just one brief comment. We also know that 50 to a hundred buses leave Philadelphia, many of them are senior citizens. Once again, added testimony that I provided at one hearing before was that, hundreds on those buses are little old ladies or gentlemen who want to go down there, pull a few slot machine arms and come back without ever having touched a drop of liquor. So, the correlation between liquor and gambling, I don't know.

My wife and I, we go down at least a dozen times over the summer and we never gamble. We go down there and eat. We get a quick meal,

quick evening or a little bit of entertainment and we come back. We never see a slot machine.

2.4

MAYOR RENDELL: I think Representative

Josephs may have been talking about more of the

high-end gamblers where they is some, again

anecdotal evidence of drinking and then

gambling. Let me tell you, I don't expect that

the enterprises here, the riverboats wouldn't

comp people for meals at our restaurants. One

way or the other we can't, again, let me repeat

it, I don't think we can protect people from

their own foibles.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Horsey. Mr. Mayor, I wanted to
personally thank you for taking your afternoon
to be with us today. It's been very
informative.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I checked with Representative Horsey and he said that he did ask you a question, a concern. I just want to be assured the same, African-Americans and minorities -- I know you talked about employment. I'm glad to hear you say that

you are dealing with residency as an assured way to get that.

As you know this House of
Representatives talk about eliminating
affirmative action when we really don't even
have it. We need leaders like you in
empowerment to assure that we have equal
opportunity, equal access. I just wanted to be
sure, would that be at all levels in terms of
contracting, hiring; at all levels?

MAYOR RENDELL: To the best of our ability to do that, and we have some leverage because of our land use powers, the answer to that would be yes. I don't want to be disingenuous. I'm not sure legally that our land use powers extend to all of the things that you just said. I'm not sure that that may not have to come from the state legislation.

But let me assure you, Representative

James, that whatever condition the legislation

comes to us, and assuming it becomes part of a

law, through our land use power we would try to

achieve all of those goals because I believe in

them. Again, I would like to see that and maybe

just for counties of the first class, but I

would like to see some guarantee of employment and that may be a way around the residency question.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Even in talking with the casinos, the people that's coming in, we need to talk to them in the front end in terms of making sure that they can assure --

MAYOR RENDELL: We have made that point with literally 22, 23 different gambling enterprises that their chances of getting a license, at least for a Philadelphia operation, would be much stronger with minority participation. I think that would be true regardless of what the scheme is.

I also make it clear to them that I have nothing to do with picking them. I think regardless of what the scheme for awarding the franchises, they would be stronger in terms of their likelihood of getting a franchise with substantial minority equity participation. As Representative Horsey said, because of the dollars to be made, this is an area where minorities can raise that equity.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Also ensuring that it gets back into the communities other

than just inner city.

MAYOR RENDELL: I'll try to address a number of things Representative Joseph added. I will file our economic stimulus plan. I'll file with you the Ernst Young studies, as well as our specific suggestions for amendments.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: The other thing is just that I think Representative Manderino told me that she talked about as we have a statewide or you would be in favor of a referendum. Would you also prefer that the counties be controlling their own --

MAYOR RENDELL: Yes, I think we should have a statewide referendum. But remember, it's nonbinding; it's nonbinding on you and it's nonbinding on the Governor. It's nonbinding, but my argument would be that at the end of that referendum --

Let's assume hypothetically gambling went down 55, 45 statewide, but it passed in Philadelphia, Allegheny, Delaware County, Bucks and Erie. I would think that the voters of those political subdivisions should be allowed to have it.

That's why I said it is important in

the legislation to delineate those areas that are not going to be potential recipients for legalized gambling because I think it will be much clearer to those residents if they're worried about it that they have nothing to fear. Because, if I lived in Clarion County and I knew that the gambling would be in Erie, Allegheny, Philadelphia, and the Philadelphia region and maybe Dauphin and Dauphin County; and yet, I would get money for my school district for that and it wouldn't be anywhere near me, I think I'd vote to support it.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you.

Thank you, Mayor, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative James. Representative Hennessey.

Mr. Chairman. Let me just extend to the committee my apologies for my late arrival. For those of you who don't know it, this is the 25th anniversary of the United States Postal Service. I spent my earlier hours today up in Elverson in celebration of that event. I certainly was otherwise occupied, but I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I'm sorry I missed your

1 testimony, Mr. Rendell, but I'll look it over. 2 Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 4 Representative Hennessey. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I thought I'd wait until the TV cameras had left. 6 MAYOR RENDELL: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. 7 8 Chairman. 9 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr. 10 Mayor. 11 MAYOR RENDELL: I forgot about you. 12 CHAIRMAN GANNON: I want to personally 13 thank you for taking your afternoon to be with 14 Just a follow-up question to make sure I understand what you're saying. 15 I wanted to follow just a bit on 16 Representative Horsey about this over the bar 17 18 drink tax which I knew you were a strong supporter. Do you think that City Council, and 19 I know you can't speak for Council, but do you 20 believe the City Council would consider 21 22 repealing that type of a tax should there be make-up revenues or riverboat gaming permitted 23 in Philadelphia? 24

MAYOR RENDELL: Only if there were

25

dedication to public education. If there was dedication to public education of a substantial portion, I think that the City Council might be, and I can't speak for them, but might be amenable.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: If there was an offset they would consider repealing that?

MAYOR RENDELL: Offset here would be, we would certainly recoup substantially. Let's assume the formula that I suggested happens, we would get over \$50 million a year as opposed to 20 or \$21 million a year. So, I think that would be possible.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative

Manderino seemed to get a little bit into the issue of the micromanagement body by the governmental units. There was a great deal of complaint by the casino folks when we had our first hearing. From what I'm picking up from what you're saying here, correct me if I'm wrong, that a lot of those issues you feel should be decided at the local level.

For example, Philadelphia should decide whether or not restaurants or eating establishments should be operated by casino

operators and, perhaps, Philadelphia should decide whether or not drinks should be served. Do you feel that that, perhaps, would be the better approach than trying to --

MAYOR RENDELL: Yes. Representative
Kenney has allowed that to be possible by
reserving in the bill, by not preempting our
land use power. You could have preempted our
land use power; you didn't. Representative
Kenney didn't and that was a very wise and
appropriate decision, but we retained the land
power.

We could hypothetically say no drinking. That could be part of the requirements to get the zoning for a franchise. Yes, whenever possible because -- I forget who it was that pointed out the differences. Because of the differences I would agree that that should be left to local land use planning.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank, Mr. Mayor, for your testimony today, for taking the time once again.

MAYOR RENDELL: I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman. Again, thanks for all of you for not only allowing me to testify, but for your

1 attention.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Our next witness is the Honorable Anthony Hardy Williams. He's a member of the General Assembly. Welcome, Representative Williams. Thank you for your patience.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: I think we all know the Mayor wants this. I think that, frankly, your indulgence, I mean as a committee concerning an issue which has been bantered about for a number of years since we have both been here, and your individual attention in terms of the insightful questions that you are putting forward provides some level of comfort for those of us who want this endeavor to go forward. Because clearly, you're interested and you're also knowledgeable about the industry. And it is, let me be clear, a new industry. I have some comments which are drafted, but I would rather speak extemporaneously because a lot of it the Mayor has covered.

I want to be clear that I am supportive and in support of the current legislation, even though there may be some amendments down the road. I also want to be

clear that my views -- I have spoken upon this as Co-Chairman of the Philadelphia delegation, the Democrats, as an individual legislator from Philadelphia County, and frankly as an African-American who, as a citizen and a constituent of a city which has a significant population of African-Americans. Those are my views that I will represent today.

2.5

I believe that it should be laid out simply; that the state should have licensing and enforcement responsibilities, and that the local areas should have consideration for commerce development as well as neighborhood planning.

Those two separate areas are very distinct and should not confuse either in terms of what the responsibilities are.

It is clear from the history in the casino and I want to also make this clear that today I'm in support of not a land-based activity. This should be, we are talking about riverboat gaming and it should not be discussed in any other form. We are talking about riverboat gaming.

But, the state is clearly only the body which would have the ability to enforce as

well as to license objectively any counties in terms of the franchisee that they would put forward and also would have the legal mechanism by which to do that. But also, I think the Mayor has laid out effectively why the local entity, be it a municipality or be it a township would need some flexibility in terms of laying out how planning should occur and who should be involved in that.

2.2

The reasons that I'm for this are obvious, and they should be obvious to any one of us who are here today. Revenues in the State of Pennsylvania and across the country are not increasing. They are in fact flat. To find new revenues for municipalities in particular are difficult without raising taxes. And as you, Mr. Chairman, are not for raising taxes, I'm not for raising taxes. Therefore, we clearly know this a way to raise revenues without inflicting pain upon our constituents.

The area that I want to also focus upon chiefly and primarily has to do with that constituency in Philadelphia County which is significant, the African-American community. While I have spoken about this publicly for

approximately 2 and a half years now, but I am in favor of it. I have met with 2, and I mean specifically 2 entities which are interested in placing franchisees within this county. I think as the Mayor has laid out earlier, his day is not complete without one of those entities speaking to him. There's something wrong with that picture.

I agree that I would not be in favor of having a great deal of mandates with regard to affirmative action policies and programs within the body of the legislation. Frankly, I don't think it would pass. We had that first activity in our made-for (phonetic) Convention Center. It did not work. What works is an agreement upfront. That agreement upfront with private industry will only occur with interaction with that community.

November occurs, myself, members of the black caucus, members of this committee and members from the community, the NAACP, the black clergy, other significant leaders in this county have to meet with people of industry. They have to meet in an organized way. I don't mean in a beat-up

way in a good section, but I mean in a proactive planning way that says 3 basic things:

Certainly and obviously, employment should be a chief concern. I believe the Mayor, and unfortunately Representative Cohen has left the room now--I'll speak to her later--the issue of residency is significant to those of us who want to make sure that there's a reason why we will bestow a vote upon this, an affirmative vote. I have to be able to see constituents of mine working in those locations.

In addition to that, I also have to provide a vision for young people in my district that vendor relationships as well as franchisees possibilities exist. That means that on that river I would hope and I would expect that the state, along with the local government, would provide a mechanism that certainly one of those franchisees could be owned wholly by a minority entity; as well as every one of those franchisees that sits on that waterfront has significant relationships with vendors who are minorities. I don't mean just mean African—Americans. I mean any minority of any sort, but that it would serve as a model for this county

as well as the state, as well as the country.

Those 3 areas have to be laid out.

Those 3 areas have to be defined before I

believe, and I believe this with every fiber in

my body, that the vote will be close; that the

minority community will play a typical role in

terms of how this is cast. I will also tell you

that, frankly, the black clergy is not flatulent

to riverboat gaming.

The gentlemen that heads the black clergy in Philadelphia County, Reverend Patterson, comes from Atlantic City. His impression that gambling, in particular gaming in those casinos destroyed Atlantic City. As well, even though I point out to him there are a lot of buses that come from churches that go to Atlantic City, they are not inclined to believe that perception.

We have a long way to go in terms of rolling this out. We have a long way to go with regard to persuasion. I believe it's achievable but a frank, honest, candid conversation is one that is long overdue.

Just as the Mayor convened a blue ribbon panel, I would hope that the Mayor would

help myself and those who have expressed an interest along the lines of a task force; a task force comprised of significant players within the minority community can be comprised, so that we can sit down and have a frank and honest understanding. I don't mean persuasion because there will be people who are on that task force who will never be persuaded, but at least they will be educated; they will be informed. So when they can go back and they can talk to their constituents, they can give them information which is accurate as opposed to opinionated.

If they're talking about rolling this out by November, then I guess we better get stepping to get this thing in place. Without it I don't see a significant number of minority legislators, and in particular Philadelphia legislators, being able to cast an affirmative vote for this particular legislation because it will be simply stepping on faith into something that clearly should a blueprint prescribed for it.

The last and final thing is that, I want to be clear that without some of the suggestions we are led to amending the

1 legislation with a variety of assorted mandates. As you know, Mr. Chairman, I am not a fan of 2 3 mandates. I don't think they work. I am also not a fan of caste. That means that 10, 15, 20 4 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, whatever it be 5 with regard to minorities because, in fact, you 6 will find a minority can do a hundred percent of 7 8 the work, so I'm not a fan of all of that. 9 want, dearly, that we do this early on, quickly 10 and above board. 11 With that I'll close my comments and 12 allow for any questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 14 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 15 Representative Williams. Representative Horsey. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: I don't know

if you were here or not, Representative Williams. If not, my apologies.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: That's fine.

REPRESENTATIE HORSEY: I don't know if you were here earlier when the Mayor commented on the one-time license fee. Those funds would go to community development. What are your feelings on that one-time licensing fee? What are your feelings on the city creating before

the legislation is passed an economic development package or community development package and would show people in the community exactly how this \$250 million he proposes from these fees, how they will be spent and where they will go?

2.2

One of the problems in Atlantic City is, when they initiated gambling they did not have this one-time fee which went directly into the development of the communities. As a result, the casinos got out front before community development was able to get out front.

Community development has been lacking. I think the \$50 million fee, and I'm going to take the same thing I told the Mayor, I know of 3 corporations, 51 percent minority owned that are interested in paying and can pay that \$50 million fee, and will pay it if given an opportunity to compete for these licenses. The fee is not an issue. The question is, I need to know your feeling on those points.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: I think that the \$50 million is a conservative number. I think the Mayor knows that's a conservative number. I think the idea is a great idea. It's

not unique.

For those who have followed the gaming industry, land, you know, is the primary driving force; location as he said. The native Americans are probably the leading minority in terms of this industry who explained to us how to use our land. The Mayor just derived an idea from them. If they are going to come here, then they pay a price. He's just defined what the price is, the starting price.

I believe while that is a great starting place, the Mayor, along with all of us, have to provide some infrastructure for those neighborhoods by which they can articulate their concerns; in other words, how they spend that \$50 million. You and I work in neighborhoods and know how that can happen that one community group will say X, other group will say Y, and before you know it everything is confused and nothing gets done.

If we are smart enough early on to lay out a mechanism when that \$50 million comes, does it go to recreation in west and southwest Philadelphia? Does it go to a school in southwestern? Does it go to 52nd Street, 60th

Street or the like? Does it go to the park? We have to provide a mechanism by which they can express their concern early on. While I agree that \$50 million is a great starting point, we have some work in which to do to get it done.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Mr. Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Williams, I believe your comment earlier was that the clergyman's assessment with Atlantic City has been led down the declining path by the casino industry, or something to that effect. I'm not old enough to remember this in detail, but it seems to me that Atlantic City was probably on decline before the gaming industry came to Atlantic City.

As I recall, that industry was almost seen as a salvation for Atlantic City in the hope that it would somehow contribute enough to turn it around. Perhaps one of the disappointments is that the industry hasn't at least in the past seemed to be very interested in making that contribution until only recently when I understand either the state or the local

authorities imposed a tax and allowed for credits against that tax if monies were set aside for urban development.

The problem we had, as we expressed it in some of the other hearings was that, the casino industry seems to think that its contribution to the city should stop at its property lines or their respective property lines. What I'm interested in is what type of feeling you have about how we could force contributions? I understand the franchise fee idea, but how would you do it on an ongoing basis, force a contribution by the industry to the cities that riverboat gambling would take place in?

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Let me clarify one thing I said. I said the person who happens to head the black clergy, and that is Reverend Patterson, came from Atlantic City. His perception, which I believe a bit pristine, that the casinos were the downfall of Atlantic City. Of course, he remembers Atlantic City a lot differently than I do, because my assessment was what yours was, that it was in decline and that casinos were seen as a salvation. I think

that many people were disappointed that it was not the golden bullet to solve all their problems.

I also want to say this. As I said to him, Atlantic City and what we are talking about here and what we're proposing in Pennsylvania are 2 decidedly different activities. They are not the same. The concerns that are raised with regard to a land-based casino capturing restaurants, day care, entertainment, movies, lodging, as well as gaming in one facility is not possible on a riverboat facility. What you have in addition to the franchise fee is, you have an inner mixture of economies.

If a riverboat comes to a place, and we have examples of this in fact already in existence, even though it is a very new industry where you don't have an economy which is mature and can sustain itself independent of a riverboat gaming company, the riverboat gaming company does not do well; and, in fact, cannot stay because the boat needs good restaurants, needs museums, needs other entertainment for the gamer to participate in because it is not a captured kind of institution in and of itself.

Philadelphia and the Commonwealth sit in a very convenient location because that gamer will come off that boat at some point in time, walk up and down Delaware Avenue; may go across the bridge and go to the aquarium; may go to the arts; may go out into the county. There will be a variety of things that they are able to do. If given that they are conventioneers, certainly there are going to be a variety of things that they're going to want to do in addition to gaming.

Riverboat gaming is not designed for quote unquote the (inaudible word). I'm not saying they don't happen, but it's not designed for the high ticket and high price person to come and spend their day on the boat. They're not going to do that. It is designed for people of moderate means to do an activity that they want to do that they're interested in doing, but it's not designed to lose their whole paycheck. It is designed for them to go in and come out.

So, an integrated economy is what will happen. Because of that integrated economy, hopefully, relationships such as most corporations in Philadelphia County and the

| | 1 |
|----|--|
| 1 | surrounding area enjoy; that is, good corporate |
| 2 | sponsorship. You will find a lot of those |
| 3 | people in our community meetings and a lot of |
| 4 | those people involved in our community projects. |
| 5 | I hope that same thing will occur. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you. |
| 7 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| 9 | Representative Hennessey. Representative James. |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. |
| 11 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you, |
| 12 | Representative Williams, for bringing testimony. |
| 13 | We appreciate it and know that you are going to |
| 14 | stay on the case as the Co-Chairman of the |
| 15 | Philadelphia delegation. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Thank you. |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| 19 | Representative James. Representative Manderino. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: No |
| 21 | questions. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative |
| 23 | Kenney. |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: No. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: I have no questions. |

1 Thank you, Representative Williams, for coming today and sharing your views with us. We 2 3 appreciate it very much. REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Thank you 4 5 very much. 6 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Why don't we just 7 take about a 5-minute break to give our court 8 reporter a rest. 9 (Short recess occurred) CHAIRMAN GANNON: We are ready to 10 convene our meeting. Our next witness is Joe 11 12 Mahoney with the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of 13 Commerce. I welcome Mr. Mahoney and thank you 14 for joining us today. 15 MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, 16 Representative Gannon. My name is Joe Mahoney and I am Senior Vice President at the Greater 17 Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce. 18 Thank you for giving us the 19 opportunity to testify before you today on the 20 21 very important subject of gaming Pennsylvania. We are pleased to assist in the 22 23 efforts of your committee and offer, in addition

to my testimony today, a copy of the statement

made by our President Charlie Pizzi at a similar

24

25

public hearing last year before Representative Clymer's committee.

We have followed the debate on the issue of gaming very closely, and while our organization has not adopted a formal position, we believe that several items are vital to the formulation of any proposed legislation.

A comprehensive plan is critical to the success of gaming in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania. Key to our success is the realization that gaming cannot and should not be a dominant force within our economy, but rather an adjunct to the many and varied recreational opportunities available to visitors to our city and the other fine destinations in Pennsylvania.

Locally, gaming is viewed as a natural component of the development along the Delaware Riverfront. But before the first card is dealt, many plans, programs, and assurances must be in place.

First is community impact. Provisions of the legislation must assure the community that gaming will be an added attraction, not a dominant one. We must preserve local restaurants, hotels, and other entertainment

sources.

2.1

2.4

With the already bustling development along the riverfront, the major initiatives down the Avenue of the Arts and the evident success of our state-of-the-art Convention Center, Philadelphia is truly a first-class designation city. We must be careful to approach gaming in a way that protects the growth and impact of these exciting enterprises. Riverboats can and should act as a catalyst to increase business in surrounding establishments, not detract from it.

Further, developers familiar with urban planning issues should be consulted on the design of boats as well as the related facilities to assure that each community is being enhanced by the design. We do not want gaudy displays which will downgrade the look of our historic districts.

Infrastructure planning. Traffic,
parking, highway improvements and public transit
issues are a few of the challenges which must
also be addressed. Local groups should
undertake a comprehensive planning effort along
with the city to assure that the needs of the
casinos are met with the least disruption to the

surrounding neighborhoods.

License and fees. To help assure that gaming is an enhancement rather than a dominant enterprise, the number of licenses available must be limited. Legislation must also guarantee that gaming revenues and fees are used in a responsible way. Both entrance and exit licensing fees must be levied to assure an operator's long-term commitment to our region.

These are just a few items which we believe must be addressed by any proposed legislation legalizing gaming in Pennsylvania. As all levels of government are forced to seek new sources of revenue to maintain necessary services and to continue to operate, we must also identify new industries whose revenues can help produce benefits throughout our economy. Gaming, if positioned carefully, can be one of those points.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr.

Mahoney. Representative Horsey.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative

Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yes, thank

you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mahoney, the exit fees that you're talking about, can you give me an idea what you have in mind?

MR. MAHONEY: In some communities that have gaming down in the south as new areas opened up to gaming, you know boats left communities to go to population centers which were seen as more profitable for the industry, we would propose that you need to protect against that in any legislation, of gaming interest picking up and leaving to go to what they perceived to be more profitable communities.

One way of doing that would be not only the upfront fee as the Mayor spoke to, but also an exit fee if a gaming company were to leave within a prescribed period of time; whatever would be deemed appropriate.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I guess what I'm wondering is whatever would be deemed appropriate. Are you talking about \$50,000? Are talking about half a million dollars?

MR. MAHONEY: We're talking about fees probably comparable to the licensing fees that the Mayor was talking on the front end.

| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, |
|----|--|
| 2 | Mr. Chairman. That's all. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| 4 | Representative Hennessey. Representative |
| 5 | Manderino. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, |
| 7 | Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mahoney, the Mayor had one |
| 8 | suggestion for us, increasing the number of |
| 9 | licenses in Philadelphia from 3 to 5 in the |
| 10 | legislation. I don't know if you have a |
| 11 | position on that yet, but I would be interested |
| 12 | if you do what it is, or if you don't, are you |
| 13 | developing one? |
| 14 | MR. MAHONEY: During the discussions |
| 15 | that we have had, Representative Manderino, in |
| 16 | the past about this we have talked about no more |
| 17 | than 5 licenses in Philadelphia. I think that 5 |
| 18 | is the number that we would see as being |
| 19 | realistic as a cap. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I note in |
| 21 | your testimony that you talked about it in the |
| 22 | context of development of the Delaware |
| 23 | waterfront. Can I assume from that comment that |
| 24 | the Chamber would support riverboat gaming in |

Philadelphia exclusive to the Delaware River and

not any of our other waterways?

2.2

MR. MAHONEY: Our discussions at this point have been limited to the Delaware River. We have not given any consideration to the Schuylkill, for instance, within Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Manderino. Representative

Kenney.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mahoney, in your comments you said before the first card is dealt, many plans, programs and assurances must be in place; community impact, infrastructure planning, licenses and fees. How do we put into place assurances when it comes to community impact and infrastructure planning? Are we saying we should write plans and impact into the legislation, or do you have plans that —

MR. MAHONEY: No. I think that some of the plans and proposals, Representative Kenney, that the Mayor talked about within your legislation, having the flexibility but having the city guarantee with its land use policies that adequate parking facilities and some of the

other issues that he addressed in his comments are things that we consider vital as well.

We don't want to see gaming detract from either the established businesses in the area or to adversely impact the residential areas surrounding Delaware Avenue. We think the community input is vital and that those communities be assured that their positions will be taken under advisement and the least disruption happening to those communities is considered.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: But I guess what the community groups are saying is that, they want to see the plan prior to the legislation being adopted or supported in the General Assembly. Do you agree to that?

MR. MAHONEY: No. I think that's very hard to do. I think you just have to create the most assurances that there will be input by community groups. I think you can't have -- A plan before the legislation is probably putting the cart before the horse.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Kenney. Representative Horsey.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: One quick
question. So, do you think that the Mayor's
plan for the one-time fee with the community,
how do you feel about that? Is that a good
idea?

MR. MAHONEY: We think that's terrific. The business community as you know, Representative Horsey, has been in other areas such as the Philadelphia plan where the legislature was good enough to grant community redevelopment tax credits. The business community in Philadelphia has 12 corporations that have stepped up to the plate and made significant contributions to the neighborhoods. We think the Mayor's plan for this is terrific.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Horsey. Mr. Mahoney, are you
perhaps suggesting that these issues of
community impact and infrastructure planning
would be considered by any commission that we
set up that would actually issue licenses before
they would issue a license?

MR. MAHONEY: Yes. Our concern is

that we want to avoid some of the mistakes that happened in Atlantic City. We feel in having seen the impact there and some of the shortcomings in hindsight that we are best to craft our legislation in a way that we can avoid any of the downsides that hit that community. If it's deemed to be that the commission gets the community impact prior to the licensing, that would be fine. CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much,

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. Mahoney, for joining us today and for taking time in your afternoon and being so patient.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you,
Representative Gannon. I appreciate it. Thank
you.

Out of order again. Mr. Green who is with us has to catch an airplane. He's on a pretty tight schedule so we are going to ask if he will be our next witness. Bob Green, President of Philadelphia Park Racetrack. Welcome and thank you, Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, and members of the House Judiciary Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity of testifying before

you.

My name is Bob Green. I was born in London but I have been here on a permanent basis since 1989, and I have made Philadelphia my home in United States. I own a house in South Philly on the corner of Front and Christian, which is where I currently live.

Apart from my corporate involvement which I will come onto later, I am a Philadelphia resident. I pay city property taxes, the city wage tax and (for me probably a larger expense than it should be) the city liquor surtax charge. That's probably why the Mayor is getting double what he anticipated.

At the end of 1990 -- I should say, as a little insert that I've also learned how to run up and down the steps of the Art Museum and say yoe. I consider myself a fully-pledged Philadelphian.

At the end of 1990 my company, which is based in the United States and is called Greenwood Racing, purchased Philadelphia Park Racetrack. The park is the major racetrack in the Commonwealth and sits on 420 acres just over of the northeast city line in Bensalem, Bucks

County. We also own 3 offtrack wagering and dining facilities, Turf Clubs we call them, in the Philadelphia area. We also operate the most extensive telephone waging system in the country.

We are currently building our fourth

Turf Club in the Valley Forge area. We hope to

start work on our fifth site out on Baltimore

Pike at Route 202 this summer. Our sixth site

should be open sometime next year. By that time

we would have invested approximately

\$110 million in Pennsylvania and we would have

1,800 employees, a thousand more people than we

did when we came here in 1990.

In addition, last year our commission validated 3,500 people to work our racetrack for owners and trainers who have horses stabled there.

We consider ourselves very much a part of the Philadelphia entertainment and recreation industry. This is a major element in the service industry which is so vitally important for this area and the Commonwealth as a whole. Philadelphia used to be the manufacturing capital of America. Those days are long gone.

As a result, there is a tremendous need to maintain this state's competitiveness in the service arena.

You are here to review the issue of gaming and its effect on tourism, hospitality and business within Pennsylvania. Our position on this matter in straightforward. We are not opposed in principle to the expansion of gaming in Pennsylvania. However, that expansion must be considered within the framework of the legalized gambling that already takes place within the state; namely, the Pennsylvania Lottery and the business that we are in, horse racing and pari-mutuel wagering.

At your March hearing you heard from the Executive Director of the Lottery, so I will not use up my time discussing that, except to say that it has been extremely successful and despite competition and the expansion of lotteries in adjoining states, it is still in good shape.

As for horse racing, 3 principal factors have helped it to become one of the state's most important industries, and one of the most progressive horse racing jurisdictions

in the country. First has been the support with the legislature who, recognizing the importance 3 of racing and the preservation of open space, allowed the industry the opportunity to take its product to the people by permitting offtrack betting, telephone wagering and full card 6 simulcasting. 7

1

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Second has been the industry's willingness to invest in the future and its flexibility in adopting to changing economic conditions and consumer preference. Third has been the absence of direct immediate competition from casino gaming.

What this has meant, according to a recent independent study by the Economic Research Association, is that horse racing in Pennsylvania is responsible on an annual basis for supporting more than 40,000 jobs, generating \$576 million in personal income and producing a total economic impact of \$752 million. industry supports capital facilities worth \$1.2 billion; plus, another \$1 billion in equine related commercial activities.

In an age of sprawling shopping malls and suburban housing development, it is

particularly important to note that the industry is also a significant contributor to the maintenance of open space and agricultural land, with over 520,000 acres devoted to the breeding, raising and training of horses.

In my view, it would make absolutely no sense whatsoever to do anything that would impact in a negative way these two existing legalized gambling activities. They both operate under the strictest regulatory environment. They pose no enforcement or control issues. They do not cause the state a single problem and they produce significant tax revenues and jobs.

Indeed, the importance of the racing industry to the state has been recognized in the bill that George Kenney has introduced, and there is provision for racetracks to obtain a riverboat license within their primary market area. In our view this makes sense, because what we have seen in other states where an established racing industry has not been taken into account within an expanded gaming environment, has been the decimation of that industry.

However, we do recognize that this bill represents a major public policy issue for the Commonwealth, and it is essential that it's approached with a clear understanding of what is being proposed and what, if it came into effect, would be the result. Your committee and other forums where this matter will be debated need as much relevant information as it is possible to obtain. With an issue of this magnitude, there should be no illusions and there should no surprises.

In the meantime, our business and the very substantial investment that we've made here in the Philadelphia region is under quite serious threat. Last year the State of Delaware, faced with the potential closure of its racing industry, approved the installation of up to 1,000 slot machines at each of its 3 racetracks.

On the 28th of December, 1995, slot
machines made their first appearance at Delaware
Park Racetrack. Delaware Park is a 25-minute
drive south down I-95, just 30 minutes away from
this building. These slots have been
phenomenally successful. They have not only

dramatically changed the shape of racing in Delaware, but they have also created over a thousand new jobs and added millions in tax revenues to the state's coffers.

Because of the bad weather that we endured in January and February of this year when our track was only open for a total of 19 days of live racing, it was difficult for us to measure, on a like-for-like basis, what effect this added attraction at Delaware was having on our own business. Since March, however, what we have seen is a steady and continuing negative impact on both our racetrack and our Turf Clubs. We estimate that we are currently losing around 10 percent of our business down to Delaware and, in my view, that number will continue to grow.

Pennsylvania's perspective is that slots have enabled Delaware Park to revive their purse structure. The purse is the amount of prize money that you pay to horsemen. This has meant that last year they were paying \$70,000 a day in purses against approximately \$100,000 a day that we were paying in Philadelphia. This year their purses have already more than doubled to over

\$150,000, a day which gives them a distinct competitive advantage.

2.2

As a result, owners and trainers are now moving their horses out of Pennsylvania and into Delaware. Just last month, for example, we lost two of our major outfits down to Delaware Park. This is not just ominous for the racing industry. It's also bad news for the state's agricultural industry.

Not that I'm critical of Delaware's slot machine business. It's a very good operation, well regulated and properly conducted. Nor am I critical of horsemen that move there. In their position, I would do exactly the same thing. What I'm doing is to simply draw attention to the current degree of competition that our business faces here in Philadelphia.

Within the Pennsylvania context, this competition is not just confined to Delaware.

At the western end of the state, West Virginia has slots at their racetracks and this undoubtedly attracts wagering dollars from Pittsburgh and the surrounding region. Nearer home, in addition to the planned, massive

expansion of facilities in Atlantic City, New
Jersey has just introduced enabling legislation
for slot machines at racetracks and similar
measures are currently under active
consideration in Maryland and New York.

This propensity for states to put slots at their racetracks is understandable. In the first instance, it is a limited and restrained response to the clamor for expanded gaming, and wherever they have been introduced, they have been an unqualified success. And this has been a success without causing any problems to the community or the state concerned.

In our view, this would be the same case in Pennsylvania. The racing industry is already highly regulated with every employee licensed and every contract subject to State Commission approval. The control functions are already in place, without having to set up a new and expensive bureaucracy.

Each racetrack is already zoned for racing and for wagering. Each one has at its disposal hundreds of acres of available land. Each racetrack has many thousands of available parking spaces and there are no problems with

access and traffic flow. They present no difficulties to the communities in which they are located, and they're all highly regarded within their own neighborhoods. The primary purpose after all of a racetrack is a place where people go to have a bet.

I'm not here to whine about our industry, nor to ask for special protection for it. We are businessmen and risk is one of the functions of business. What I do think needs serious consideration is for Pennsylvania to measure what is going on around it and then to determine its response.

From a simple economic standpoint, it would be totally unrealistic in my view to expect this Commonwealth to sit idly by and continue to allow more and more of its money to be drained away across state lines. We know that people in this state play slot machines. It's just that they play them, not in Philadelphia nor in Pittsburgh, but they play them in Atlantic City, at Delaware Park Racetrack and racetracks in West Virginia. It won't be long before you can add New York and Maryland to that list.

As I said, the racing industry does not need special protection. It just needs the tools to compete. As a highly regulated industry, it is only the legislature that can give us those tools.

By way of an example, between 1992 and 1993, Philadelphia Park lost 25 percent of its trade to the New Jersey racetracks and we were facing the elimination of our business. It was a simple matter. The New Jersey racetracks had full card simulcasting; Pennsylvania tracks did not.

In the summer of '93, the legislature recognized that problem and allowed us to do the same thing--no better, no worse. Within 6 months we had not only recaptured the business we had lost, but we significantly increased our market share at New Jersey's expense. Why? Because once we were given the tools to compete. We invested heavily in developing the technology that underscores our business in such things as satellite communication, digital up-linking and information text display systems.

What I am saying is this, give us the tools to compete and we will deliver. We will

deliver the money, our imagination and our resourcefulness in order that we keep the wagering dollar within Pennsylvania and for the benefit of Pennsylvanians.

2.2

Does it makes sense for Pennsylvania dollars to drive 30 minutes away and fund social programs for Delaware residents? This is a time when major components of our future, matters like higher education, which have been referred to remain critically underfunded. These items can always be remedied by an infusion and reallocation of cash, but with all citizens facing higher state and local taxes, maybe the way to do it is through tax revenues from the expansion of gaming.

Maybe the way to go is via the Kenney riverboat bill which is very thoughtful, well constructed, or might be through wholesale, theme related, Las Vegas style casino complexes. Maybe, in the short term and as a lead into future expansion, the sensible thing at this stage would be for slots at racetracks.

These are clearly matters for consideration for the legislature and your committee. In any event, I hope this address

will be of some assistance to you in assessing the current competitive picture and help you in your deliberations. I would be pleased to answer any question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr. Green. Representative Horsey.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: I have a question for you. Before I ask the question, Mr. Chairman, and Representative Kenney, just real quick, does our legislation address any of the possibilities because I think I hear from his testimony that slot machines or some other type of additional gambling might aid that particular industry? Does this legislation address that in any way?

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Kenney, why don't you answer that.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Not at the present locations, no. I guess in trying to look for a preference, giving this industry a preference, the horse racing industry, because this legislation would have an impact on it, we said to those for racetracks that you will qualify for a license under the same conditions as anyone else would within 35 miles of the

1 racetrack. That does not mean -- Mr. Green has 2 his facilities in Bensalem, Bucks County. 3 could not open up a casino-type gaming at his 4 facility now. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Slot machines 6 would be considered casino type? REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: He couldn't 7 open up anything at his facility. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Under this legislation? 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Correct. 12 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Let me ask 13 you, Mr. Green. First of all, would something 14 like slot machine gambling help your industry 15 any? 16 MR. GREEN: Just to go back to Mr. 17 Kenney's point that the draft bill proposes at this stage that the granting authority may issue 18 an additional license in addition to the 19 20 licenses that are already planned for Class A 21 counties. It gives a discretion to the issuing 22 authority, the power to grant an additional 23 license to a racetrack that's within that area

if riverboat gaming is allowed. We would have

the opportunity to obtain the fourth license.

24

25

If there were 3 existing licenses in Philadelphia, we would have the opportunity being within that primary market area to open a fourth, or to apply for a fourth riverboat license within that vicinity.

Putting that to one side and then coming back to your question, clearly, this is fairly immediate for us because we are seeing the impact of what's happening 30 minutes away in Delaware. Outside of this particular bill, certainly, slot machines at racetracks which have been introduced in Delaware and West Virginia are being very popular and certainly would assist our industry, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Separate and apart from riverboat gambling because that's the legislation that we are taking notice of today. I understand your availability in applying for a riverboat license. Is this the correct way to go as opposed to just having another category of gambling available vis-a-vis the tracks themselves?

MR. GREEN: I think the legislation has quite rightly in this bill taken account or tried to take account of the racing industry. I

think that's important because there's no point in creating a new industry at the expense of a very substantial existing industry, which is what we have in Pennsylvania. I think the legislation tries to address that point. I would not know, quite frankly, whether that would make us whole; in other words, the amount of money that would be lost in cannibalization, whether we would make up that revenue promoting the riverboat license, I don't know. Only time will tell that.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: That's part of the direction of my question. If we could somehow hypothetically, because I don't have the ability to do this, but if we could somehow consider another category of gambling and that is gambling at racetracks in one way, for example, slot machines as opposed to just riverboat, I'm asking for your opinion in that area?

Because, like you said, from the riverboat it may not make you or your industry whole, but I think to allow -- because the bottom line of this legislation is, we are only talking about controlled gambling. That already

exists in Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania, by the

way of racetracks. Are we still talking about

controlled gambling when I address the question

of allowing racetracks to operate slot machines?

I need to have a definitive opinion from you on

that particular topic. What is your opinion?

MR. GREEN: It would be extremely helpful. It would enable us to compete with surrounding states, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you.

One quick statement, Mr. Chairman, and that is,

I happen to know and I have seen the statistics,

they've been in the newspaper, \$50 million in 30

days from Delaware. Pennsylvania is losing

revenue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Representative Horsey. Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Mr. Green, you had given us some
statistics indicating that last year Delaware
Park was paying \$70,000 a day in purses and this
year it's up to 150. Was that just for Delaware
Park Track or is that an average across the
State of Delaware?

MR. GREEN: Just the Delaware Park
Track.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: What has happened across the State of Delaware? Can you tell us that in comparison with other racetracks across the other state lines?

MR. GREEN: Delaware Park is the only thoroughbred track in the State of Delaware. There are two small harness tracks, Dover and Harrington. They've been later in introducing machines than Delaware Park. The actual numbers from Dover and Harrington are not up and running yet. Dover just got up and running. It's too early to say what the effect of the purse structure will be on those harness racetracks.

The only thoroughbred racetrack, that's what we are concerned with as far as our track is concerned, is Delaware Park. I wouldn't be surprised if their purse structure is up to 190, \$200,000 a day by the end of the year.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: To give us a comparison, what is Philadelphia Park's purse structure today? It was a hundred thousand dollars a day last year on average.

| 1 | MR. GREEN: It's a hundred thousand |
|----|--|
| 2 | dollars a day. |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That stayed |
| 4 | relatively the same? |
| 5 | MR. GREEN: Yeah. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Same as |
| 7 | last year, but while you've seen an increase in |
| 8 | fact of a hundred percent down south of us? |
| 9 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Are we |
| 11 | talking apples and apples in terms of the number |
| 12 | of days you have been opened, the number of |
| 13 | races on your card in a particular day, |
| 14 | comparing you and Delaware Park now? |
| 15 | MR. GREEN: We do race more days. We |
| 16 | race approximately 210 days. They race about |
| 17 | 150 days. Our program is approximately the |
| 18 | same. We run either 9 or 10 races a day. |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The |
| 20 | addition of slots in Delaware is what you |
| 21 | describe as 10 percent loss of your business |
| 22 | too, right? |
| 23 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'm not a |
| 25 | person who frequents tracks or the casinos down |

in Atlantic City, but it would seem to me that people go from here to Atlantic City not just for slot machines, but for the shows, for the gaming tables or restaurants. There are a lot of other attractions in a casino resort that you wouldn't have if we were to allow slot machines in Philadelphia Park. Why do you hitch your start to the slot machines and think that they will be that much of a boost to your business?

MR. GREEN: If you look at the
Atlantic City breakdown, 70 to 80 percent,
depending on the casinos, that their revenue
comes from slot machines. The actual percentage
that's contributed by table games has been on
the decline virtually since they opened. The
vast majority of their revenue comes from slot
machines and that is the basic attraction.

Really, it's proximity. The fact that people in south and west Philadelphia can get there in 25 minutes, much easier actually than they can get to Atlantic City and play the slots. It's just another feature of that entertainment. If a man goes out to play the horses on a Friday afternoon, he would take his wife with him and she'll probably play the slot

machines at Delaware Park. It's just an added
feature of that entertainment, and the fact that
it's so close to Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Hennessey. Representative
Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Green, I guess I'll ask the questions of you, but some of mine go to my understanding of the legislation and what it allows or doesn't allow in light of your testimony. I admit there are some things I'm a little confused about. It's Section 702 of the bill that provides for the additional authority to issue gaming licenses vis-a-vis what the horse race industry does now.

Just so I'm on the right page, we have -- and it doesn't refer to them by name but it talks about one additional gaming license for each primary market area as defined by the Race Horse Industry Reform Act. As best I know, we have 4: Philadelphia Park, Penn National, Pocono Downs, and the Meadows.

1 MR. GREEN: That's correct.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: The bill calls for 15 licenses. The Mayor is suggesting 17 licenses, but the bill really calls for 15 licenses plus a possible additional 4 under this Section 702.

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. As it's written now in the bill, 702, that section would not allow you to bring slots into your current racing facility, but would allow you to be a franchisee on a river.

MR. GREEN: Yes, within our primary market area.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Right. I was getting that with my next question. We already know vis-a-vis your park, Philadelphia Park, that there will be at least one opportunity. There will be an opportunity for a franchise within 35 miles because you are within 35 miles, not only of the sites on Philadelphia and Delaware River, but probably Bucks County and up along the Delaware.

I assume also with regard to the Meadows and how and that's written that

vis-a-vis the rivers in Pittsburgh that they are within 35 miles of that.

2.2

2.3

Do you know, even though you don't represent them, whether Penn National and Pocono Downs are also -- I'm assuming this 35 miles.

It's not written in this bill, but I'm assuming that's your primary marketing area as written in the Horse Race Act?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Are they also within 35 miles of a defined county by this bill?

MR. GREEN: Certainly Penn National just outside Harrisburg, yes. I'm not sure about Pocono Downs.

either. When we had our last hearing there was a representative from Ladbrook (phonetic), I believe, Meadows facilities——Am I on the right page here?——and I walked away and it was probably because I didn't have a understanding until your testimony exactly what was provided in this section. I walked away from that hearing with an overall impression that what he was advocating was, if you give riverboat

gambling the horse race industry, or at least we'd like to see slot machines at our current racetrack facilities, different than what's provided in here. Am I hearing you say the same thing or am I hearing you say, we're satisfied with how it's written in this bill now?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GREEN: No. As I said, we are not opposed to the expansion of gaming, and we believe it's correct that we should be part of this particular bill. What I was doing in my testimony I think was relying on what is currently happening out there. I don't know what the passage or the progress of this particular bill will be, and assuming that it goes through with the various stages, gets on the ballot, goes through referendum, legislation takes place, 8 months is spent in writing the regulations; 6 months is the licensing and the determining process. Six months is in construction. You may be talking about 1999. We've got a problem in 1996. I was just raising that.

How we deal with that I'm not proposing an answer. I'm just saying that that's the situation that's currently out there.

Certainly, we are satisfied with the fact that we've been made, there's a provision made for the industry within Mr. Kenney's bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I don't want to put words in your mouth. What I'm hearing is, regardless of this particular bill, we as an industry may need to be coming back to you in Harrisburg vis-a-vis whether or not the current status of the Horse Race Industry Reform Act is enough given expansion in other areas?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And you aren't weighing in, at least at this time, whether you have a preference for slot machines on site or inclusion in this bill or both, or are you and I just missed what it is?

Yes.

MR. GREEN:

MR. GREEN: Not at this time. I think it's important to note that, actually, in my opening remarks I said that by next year we would have invested \$110 million in our business. Forget the other tracks; just in our business.

In a sense, it's two businesses. We have a business, a racetrack business, in Bensalem and then we have our Turf Club business

which is another. One might be, let's say, an \$80 million investment. We have also got a \$30 million investment in Philadelphia itself with our Turf Clubs.

Yes, I'm pleased and I think it's right that the provision is made in Bill 2308 for the racing industry. What I'm saying is that, there is an immediate problem out there that we may have to address separately from this particular piece of legislation.

able to offer an opinion right now, and maybe you're not, either vis-a-vis just your own corporate view, not necessarily on behalf of all of the racetracks, as to if it would be either/or proposition which one would help you the most? If the either/or proposition was a comparable to what Delaware has now, limited to slot machines and at your -- I don't even know if they are only at their live tracks and not at their parlors.

MR. GREEN: They don't have --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Only at your live tracks or being included in something like this, is there either an industry position

or your Philadelphia Park position as to which would help us the most?

MR. GREEN: From the Philadelphia Park perspective in the short-term, certainly it would help us to have the ability to compete with Delaware Park already having slot machines at the racetrack. It probably depends to some extent, as far as an industry situation is concerned, the location of the particular track.

In the case of Meadows on the western end of the state, I think that they would be more keen to be a riverboat licensee because they see their market as Pittsburgh. We are much closer to the sensor. It'd be like Philadelphia. We are 17 miles away, just across the border. The racetrack could serve a larger residential population demographic than what it could at the Meadows. I think it would depend on the racetracks. That would be difficult to give an indicant this way.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Manderino. Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. I

1.5

1 didn't have the opportunity to hear the testimony, but I'm just concerned that -- I did 2 3 have an opportunity to be at Philadelphia Park 4 and observe the atmosphere and it was very interesting. I just want to make sure as we 5 6 develop this legislation that we don't hurt your 7 industry as well. Since the day is ongoing, I 8 would just suggest, and I'm sure that you at the table at the beginning as we develop this kind 9 of legislation make sure that your interests are 10 11 met. Thank you, sir. 12 MR. GREEN: 13 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 14 Representative James. Representative Masland. 15 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you, 16 Mr. Chairman. I'm from Central Pennsylvania. 17 don't get to come in contact with residents of 18 19 South Philly too often. As I was listening to to you during the hearing, I closed my eyes and 20 I could have sworn I was listening to someone 21 from South Liverpool. 22 23 MR. GREEN: South London.

25 Seriously, though, one of my concerns with this

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: It's close.

24

issue is the concept of a limited amount of discretionary dollars. Now, I don't know whether there is an overall limit, zero some gain here we're talking about in general with discretionary dollars outside the mortgage, the car payment, et cetera, or whether there's also maybe an isolated amount of discretionary dollars for the gaming industries. It sounds like there may be is somewhat specialized.

You were talking about the simulcast in New Jersey having initially taken away from you and then you having gotten that back from New Jersey. It seemed like there was ebb in the flow there. What are your thoughts on that? Are there a limited number of discretionary dollars in your opinion for gaming in general, or is it restricted and more specialized based on the type of gaming?

MR. GREEN: Out in the New Jersey situation that was a question of competitiveness. We couldn't compete. If you wanted to have a bet on the third and fourth race at Churchill Downs, you could have it in New Jersey, but you couldn't have it in Pennsylvania which was quite ridiculous. That

issue was squared away.

What I was saying is, by giving us the tools to compete, we didn't only compete and get back to where we were, when we were on the level playing field we could actually increase our market share because we think we do things better.

In terms of the question of the discretionary dollar, I have been involved in racing, betting, gaming since 1960. I used to run 2,000 offtrack betting offices in the U.K.

I was also the Chairman of the 6 major casinos in London and in Europe, in U.K., in Bombay and Cairo. I also used to run the casino operations on board the Cunard, on the QE 2. I've got significant experience in the racing, betting, casino gaming industry. Yes, and this may address a point that was raised earlier.

In all the years that I have been involved in it, the number of problem gamblers or people who have had difficulty gambling I could count on the fingers of one hand. People know what they are doing. They know what the odds are. They're very sensible with their money. They are generally people who hold down

good jobs and they allocate part of their budget to gaming. It's part of their entertainment dollars. It's the same as going to the movies or having a drink in a pub.

I think there is a limit to that discretionary amount. What that is, I'm not sure, but certainly there's absolute evidence coming back to some earlier points raised with the Mayor, that 1.2 billion of the 3.5 billion that is won in Atlantic City comes from Pennsylvania. There's absolutely no doubt about that.

We know already that you got 1.2
billion going to Atlantic City. You've probably
got several hundred million now going down to
Delaware. On the western end of the state, I
don't know how much is going into West Virginia,
but that's not a question of the discretion of
the dollar. Those dollars are actually here and
going somewhere else. I think that there is
enough of that to support a significant
expansion of the gaming industry in
Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I realize we have a big population center here in the

northeast. My concern is that some of the economic benefits for gaming enterprises, be it riverboat or slots or whatever may, tend to be overstated because there is a limit. I don't know where that limit is. As the Mayor said, maybe the upfront fee should be 50 million.

Maybe it could be a hundred million. Maybe it could be 150 million and they'd pay it. But sooner or later there's going to be a limit that the casino is not going to pay. Sooner or later they is going to be a limit as to what can really be earned and then come back to the state in the way of tax revenues.

MR. GREEN: I support the Mayor's advocacy and the economic development of Philadelphia. I'm a strong supporter of that. I think people get carried away by saying what you can get on one hand and what you can get on the other.

I'm not speaking here as a proponent for the casino industry. It seems crazy for me to say that yes, we want to get so many million dollars of upfront licensing fees, but we are only going to let you become half pregnant. You can't have a restaurant or you can't have

1 entertainment.

2.5

I think you have to bear in mind, if you are going to go into this business you've got to go into it. You can't go into it just putting your elbow into the water and saying, we like this or we don't like this. You've got to compete. You've got to compete with Atlantic City. There's no use you saying, if you're not in a position where you can't compete, you shouldn't go into it.

I think yes, there may be a concern about hotels and restaurants. I think the infrastructure in Philadelphia will support that and, in fact, they will do well with casino gaming. I certainly don't think that you can be ninny mouth about it and say, we want to charge you so many millions of dollars to come in here. We want to charge you so many millions of dollars to leave here, but in the meantime you can't run the business the way you should be running it. That seems to be crazy.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you, Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Masland. Representative Kenney.

1 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: No. 2 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Mr. Green, does the 3 Delaware tracks have offtrack betting in full card simulcasting? 4 5 MR. GREEN: They have full card simulcasting which enables the Delaware Park 6 Race Track to operate if you like as an offtrack 7 8 facility when they're not racing live, but they 9 don't have any satellite facilities in the way 10 that we do. 11 CHAIRMAN GANNON: I heard a rumor--I 12 don't know whether it's true or not--that 13 Delaware Park was on the verge of closing about 14 a year, maybe a year and a half ago. 15 MR. GREEN: It wasn't a rumor. It was 16 a fact. CHAIRMAN GANNON: I know the 17 Brandywine Track was closed. That was knocked 18 19 down and they bulldozed that over. I don't live 20 too far from Brandywine. Now I hear, this may 21 or may not be true, that they are building additional stables at the Delaware or are 2.2 2.3 planning to build additional stables?

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

The slot machine

CHAIRMAN GANNON:

24

25

| 1 | operation at Delaware Track, is that run by the |
|----|---|
| 2 | owners of the track? |
| 3 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: They don't have any |
| 5 | manager, an outside manager? |
| 6 | MR. GREEN: They don't have any |
| 7 | contract with any casino or any other company. |
| 8 | The facilities at Dover Downs is actually |
| 9 | managed by Caesar's Palace. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's what I meant. |
| 11 | It's not managed by It's not managed by |
| 12 | the |
| 13 | MR. GREEN: No, that's the one at |
| 14 | Dover Downs. The one at Delaware Park is |
| 15 | managed by the owners, yeah, at the racetrack. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: The one at Dover |
| 17 | Downs is the one that is managed by Caesar's? |
| 18 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Just to clarify, you |
| 20 | said 1.2 billion win, is that actually the |
| 21 | amount that stays in Atlantic City and doesn't |
| 22 | come back with the folks when they come back to |
| 23 | Philadelphia? |
| 24 | MR. GREEN: That's right. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: But that's not the |

1 amount that's actually handled? 2 MR. GREEN: No. 3 CHAIRMAN GANNON: There's probably a 4 substantial, more money that --5 MR. GREEN: In terms of -- Handle is a different concept in pari-mutuel wagering. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GANNON: I think I'm mixing 8 two kinds. You know what I mean. 9 MR. GREEN: You can measure handle in 10 terms of pari-mutuel gaming. That's the amount 11 that the people stake on bets. People stake a 12 hundred dollars on bets, the hundred dollars is handled, and your win is a percentage of that. 13 14 You can't measure handle that way in a 15 casino industry. You measure it by what's 16 called drop, which is cash tokens that are exchanged for cash, because the actual speed of 17 the game doesn't allow you to compute each 18 individual bet or handle. The real measurement 19 20 is drop and the second measurement is the gross 21 win, which is the amount of money that players lose, obviously, before the casino has its own 22

CHAIRMAN GANNON: What I'm trying to understand is, it sounds to me that when you use

expenses and taxes to pay.

23

24

25

| 1 | the amount of the drop If \$1.2 billion is the |
|----|--|
| 2 | amount of win, then the amount of drop, if you |
| 3 | will, is substantially more than that. |
| 4 | MR. GREEN: Absolutely. The total win |
| 5 | is 3.6 billion. The 1.2 billion is what really |
| 6 | comes from the Pennsylvania part of that market. |
| 7 | Atlantic City as a market isn't a market. It's |
| 8 | really made up of the two major feeder markets; |
| 9 | the feeder market of New York and the feeder |
| 10 | market of Philadelphia. The third element to it |
| 11 | is if you add New Jersey in toto, but Atlantic |
| 12 | City itself, it's just there. There's no real |
| 13 | local element to their handle. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much. |
| 15 | Representative Horsey. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: I have one |
| 17 | brief question. I'm considering gambling next |
| 18 | month. Is that okay with you? |
| 19 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: So you have a |
| 21 | knowledge of slot machines, I gather? |
| 22 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: This is the |
| 24 | question that no one has asked since we've been |
| 25 | here; that is, slot machines represent an |

industry in and of themselves, in that, in 99 percent of the cases they are board fixed and put together within the confines of those individual states; is that correct?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: So that would be an additional industry for jobs for the State of Pennsylvania. Because immediately when you talk about buying them from Virginia, West Virginia, or Maryland, you've got to go by federal rules. What a lot of states do is operate them totally within the confines of their states. Somebody in the State of Pennsylvania has to build them, has to repair them, and stop me if I'm wrong, Mr. Green; has to build them, has to repair to have to train people to be at those facilities to operate -- I mean fix them, is that correct?

MR. GREEN: Most states, there's 24 states now with some form of legalized casino gaming whether it's on Indian reservations or elsewhere. There are a number of major suppliers who dominate the marketplace who actually do manufacture their machines outside

1 of the state where they are going in. They have 2 to acquire heavy support function and support 3 personnel within that state to maintain them, to 4 service them, and to look after them, yes. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: That's another 6 angle for jobs within the state. 7 MR. GREEN: Oh, yes. REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: I just don't 8 9 want us to sit here and to overlook, especially if we are talking about, perhaps, putting slot 10 machines in Turf Clubs. Thank you. 11 12 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Representative Horsey. Representative 13 14 Hennessey. 15 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Mr. Green, 16 if I can ask you to look in the future in your crystal ball for a second, as I look at what is 17 happening in the gaming industry especially in 18 Nevada, it seems like the casinos have plateaued 19 as casinos and now they're turning into family 20 21 type resorts. If we were to allow for an expansion 22 23 of gambling in Pennsylvania, either the

riverboat gambling kind or slot machines at your

tracks, in 15, 20 years are we going to be

24

25

looking at situations where you're going to have roller coasters on your 420 acres in Philadelphia National Park and a water wonderland or water playground or something like that where you are going to be asking people to come in and stay for the weekend as opposed to coming in with your wife, your husband, and have the women at the slot machines and the men placing bets on the track?

MR. GREEN: I think that's the natural progression.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Is it?

MR. GREEN: Yeah. If you look at

Vegas -- I was there for the opening of the

Stratosphere which is the new second-story

structure where you going up in a ride. They

actually, I think in the first weekend, made

more money from the actual ride than from their

table games.

It's an interesting concept that's going on. Every new place that opens in Vegas on the strip has to have some attraction. If you look at Treasure Island, as you look at the Balaggeo (phonetic) that's opening next week, if you looked at Monte Carlo that just opened, what

they're creating is something that you can't really create anywhere else in America. You can't create a city with 125,000 hotel rooms. It mean, on the corner of the strip in Tropicana, just on the one corner alone you've got now 20,000 hotel rooms on one corner. You can't do that anywhere else in America. There's always going to be that destination element as far as Vegas is concerned.

What's happening is, you're seeing
Atlantic City try to go that same way; try to
create a much more attraction, theme related.

If this thing comes off at the H (phonetic)
track they're talking about, you're going to see
major theme related, if you like, experiences.

You're going to see the -- they regard it almost
as -- they want to do something that they do in
Florida but with gaming.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Focusing on what you'd like to see us do, is it your wish that we would simply authorize the tracks to have slot machines or are you looking farther down the line and saying we really do want to become part of this overall entertainment industry, the family entertainment industry and

expand in those kind of directions?

MR. GREEN: I think there's a natural progression that it must become that. At the moment, what slot machines are doing is, they're fulfilling an untack demand. There's a demand for people to play on the slot machines. That won't last forever. That won't carry on. Table games have declined; slot machines have increased.

If you look at Las Vegas and

Henderson, Clark County, there's 750,000 people

living there now. Those people play machines

but it's interesting that the more used they've

become to, if you like, a slot machine

environment, the actual machines change. The

breakup of machines in Vegas is much different

than say the breakup of machines that you would

see in Delaware Park because, as people get used

to machines, they want more options.

Video poker is a much bigger game amongst the Las Vegas residents than it is amongst the people who go to play. People who go to play got a desire for slot machines and play slot machines. People who have got used to them won't play a choice and think they got some

control over how much money they lose and in what time. What you buy in a slot machine is time. You don't buy anything else. You buy how long your money will last in that machine.

Whether it's 18 minutes or 20 minutes a regular player knows that.

2.5

Moving on from that concept, it's inevitable that you will get a bigger entertainment element within what goes on with gaming. Gaming as it's own and by itself naturally will progress toward a broader entertainment spectrum. It's inevitable.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: In Nevada and Atlantic City where you have a broad range of gambling choices, slot machines, gaming, whatever else there might be, blackjack, that kind of thing, are the odds generally worse in the slot machines or is that regulated by the state or by the commission in such a way or do odds vary? Are slot machines also the worse odds in the house?

MR. GREEN: No. Never play roulette type with double zero. It's an outrageous situation. There's no way to win. You should only play --

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'll jot that down.

MR. GREEN: It depends upon the speed of the game. If you look at slot machines, people will say, well, they give 90 percent back to the player which doesn't say I'm the bad kind of deal. You might lose 10 percent of your money. What it means is, you lose 10 percent every time you press a button or pull a handle. You might pull that handle or press that button 3 or 4 times a minute depending on the speed that you play. The percentages that they talk about don't really matter.

If you go in there to play a slot machine with a hundred dollars, you're going to lose a hundred dollars. Basically, you're going to lose a hundred percent of your money. It just depends on how long it's going to take you to lose it. If you lose it in 2 minutes, you're going to be cheesed off. If you play for about an hour and at one stage you can walk away, you could have walked away with \$110 at some stage during that cycle of play, that's fine. You feel kind of relaxed about it.

You can work out the exact odds on the

That would then depend if you got a single zero or double zero. You can work out the odds at blackjack more easily, but that would depend on some of the things that the house might give you; whether they give you bonuses or whether they allow insurance bets. Part of it just depends upon the time.

REPRESENTATIE HENNESSEY: In terms of your odds of winning, though, I think what you're telling me if I go in and play a slot machine, eventually it's going to take all my money?

MR. GREEN: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Other
things being equal. But who sets the odds? Who
sets how long its going to take? Is it the
state that does that, the gambling commission or
is that left to the owners of the casinos?

MR. GREEN: The odds, to tell you honest, the odds are immutable. The odds are the odds. If you've got 3 wheels and each one has got 10 on it, so there's 30 combinations, each one of those, if they are all the same, would be 29 to 1. What changes --

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Math wasn't
my strongest suit in school. I think I
understand the answer. They don't get set.

They're just there and eventually they're going to take the money.

MR. GREEN: No. The odds are the odds. What gives the house its percentage is the pay table, is how much he actually pays for when your 3 cherries come up. What it gives with the moment is to pay 90 percent on average; about 90 percent gets paid back in terms of every time you pull a slot machine. In some instances you might get 50 percent of your money; sometimes you might get a thousand percent of your money back. That just depends on what comes up on the pay table. But the odds are the odds.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you very much. I understand you have a plane to catch and I won't hold you up with any other questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Hennessey. Thank you very much,

Mr. Green. I appreciate your willingness to be

here this afternoon and give us that very

important information, how this type of business 1 would impact on horse racing industry in 2 3 Pennsylvania. 4 MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you members. 5 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Just a little 6 7 housekeeping before we call our next witness. 8 For the information of the members, in Pittsburgh we did have hearings focusing just on 9 the horse racing industry. If you want a 10 transcript of those hearings, we'll be glad to 11 provide you with a copy. It will probably 12 answer a lot of questions that you have on your 13 14 mind. We have written testimony submitted by 15 16 the Coalition of Philadelphia Neighborhood 17 Associations. I'm going to ask if we can make that part of the record. 18 19 Our next witness is Gerry Gutenstein, 20 General Manager, Sheraton Society Hill Hotel and President of the Greater Philadelphia Hotel 21 Association and Vice President, Pennsylvania 22 23 Travel Council.

MR. GUTENSTEIN:

members of the House Judiciary Committee.

24

25

Good afternoon,

name is Gerry Gutenstein. I am the general manager of the Sheraton Society Hill Hotel in Philadelphia. I am here today not only as a hotelier, but also as the President of the Greater Philadelphia Hotel Association and Vice President of Pennsylvania Travel Council.

With me is Barry Wicks, President of the Pennsylvania Travel Council. On behalf of these two associations and the Pennsylvania hospitality and tourism industry, I thank you for giving us this opportunity to testify here today.

The Greater Philadelphia Hotel
Association represents and serves the hotel and
hospitality community in the Greater
Philadelphia region on issues which includes
sales and marketing, education, government
relations, community outreach, labor and
employment, public relations and industrial
development.

The Pennsylvania Travel Council is the statewide trade association whose mission is to promote and protect the interests of Pennsylvania's hospitality and tourism industry. As such, the council provides governmental

affairs representation, as well as marketing and
deducational programs to its membership of over
deducational programs to its deducational programs to it

Although the Hotel Association and the Travel Council have not yet taken a formal position on this critical issue, the state's hospitality and tourism industry does believe any discussions on riverboat gaming ought to begin with a strong dose of realism. Here are some critical factors to consider:

Reality versus hype. Gaming exists already in Pennsylvania in many forms, and it exists in many other states in some legally sanctioned form. The key is not whether to allow more gaming, but to ensure that gaming of all kinds operate with a climate of public protection and fairness.

Riverboat gaming should not be allowed at the expense of existing public and private investments, including hotels, restaurants,

retail establishments or other legalized gaming facilities. Revenue and jobs should be balanced against infrastructure and governmental costs of public safety and regulation.

To avoid unnecessary financial loss to the community, the legislation must provide that riverboat gaming entities incur the costs of the infrastructure improvements and the consumption of community services such as the addition of police.

Also necessary is the creation of an interdependent relationship between riverboat gaming operators and the various hotels, restaurants, retail operations and attractions; to ensure that riverboat gaming does not undermine the existing businesses which are currently thriving. In order for this interdependent relationship to prosper, it may be necessary to include provisions that benefit existing local business.

The Commonwealth should recognize that riverboat gaming is not a panacea for fiscal difficulties faced by any level of government whether it's local municipalities, schools, or other special programs. It is not likely that

riverboat gaming can generate the revenues that most ardent supporters project. In future years, the national market may become saturated. Pennsylvania needs to look with great caution at the long-term and potential inflated claims of revenue generation.

Pennsylvania's hospitality and tourism industry believes the Commonwealth must take a common sense and fair approach to new gaming opportunities. We have two primary concerns and expectations of legalized riverboat gaming: 1, that gaming entities form marketing partnerships with the hospitality and tourism industry; and, 2, the economic opportunity is expanded, not merely shifted from one enterprise to another.

Some riverboat gaming proponents make the assumption that riverboat gaming will be the catalyst for conventions and tourism in Pennsylvania. Therefore, it is a priority for the industry to ensure that the assumption becomes a reality. Provisions must be made in the proposed riverboat gaming legislation to encourage joint marketing activities between gaming interests and businesses that depend on tourism. Currently, we believe this is not the

case.

2.5

In order to ensure marketing dollars are properly committed, the final legislation must include specific language relative to collection of fees upon entrance to the casino for interstate marketing.

Our industry supports the right of Pennsylvanians to vote on the legalization of riverboat gaming. Governor Ridge, along with supporters and opponents of riverboat gaming, have called for the statewide referendum. We believe that any referendum should be placed on the ballot sooner than later. Local option should also be respected and included in the final version of any legislation to legalize riverboat gaming in Pennsylvania.

In conclusion, the hospitality and tourism industry is most appreciative of the support we have received from the legislature. Your continued support has helped us become a strong and important component of the Commonwealth's economy.

As the state's second largest industry, we want to support what our legislators and the citizens of the Commonwealth

feel is good for the state, but we ask that representatives from our industry have the opportunity to provide input into the further development of proposed legislation to legalize riverboat gaming in Pennsylvania. We will work closely with this committee, members of the General Assembly, and the Ridge Administration to ensure that the industry's concerns and expectations outlined in these remarks are included in any approved riverboat gaming legislation.

Thank you for taking this opportunity to let us share our views. I will be pleased to respond to any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr. Gutenstein. Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the inclusiveness of
your remarks going to the whole travel industry.
But I want to ask you to be a little bit
parochial to respond to my question that where
your society, Hill Sheraton Hotel, has. Three
riverboat license franchises on the Delaware
River that don't have hotels and don't have
restaurants, does that help or hurt you?

1 MR. GUTENSTEIN: That would be an
2 amenity for the community and for our business.
3 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: If there
4 were 5 of them instead of 3, would that still

help you or would that hurt you?

MR. GUTENSTEIN: That would not make a difference.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: If they had restaurants on their facilities or eating establishments on their facilities, would your answer be any different?

MR. GUTENSTEIN: I think that while I wouldn't like it as much, I don't think it will have that great of impact. If you've been on riverboats, and I've been on a few, the quality of their food versus any of our restaurants in the city, they're not the same. It's more of a snack and low-end amenity. The space given to their food and beverage is minimal. They are interested in the machines.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Then, finally, I don't know how the numbers work out in Philadelphia right now with hotel space and our capacity to meet our current needs or how far under capacity we are, would your answer

| 1 | change if any of those establishments said we |
|-----|--|
| 2 | need a hotel facility too? |
| 3 | MR. GUTENSTEIN: I would only support |
| 4 | a hotel facility that was in center city that |
| 5 | would augment the hotel rooms needed for the |
| 6 | Convention Center. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. |
| 8 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| l 0 | Representative Manderino. Representative James. |
| l 1 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. |
| l 2 | Chairman. No questions. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative |
| 1.4 | Horsey. |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: No questions. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative |
| 17 | Hennessey. |
| l 8 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: NO |
| l 9 | questions. |
| 2 0 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you for |
| 21 | joining us today, Mr. Gutenstein, and sharing |
| 22 | your testimony with us and taking time from your |
| 23 | afternoon and being so patient. |
| 2 4 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Mr. |
| 25 | Chairman. |

1 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative 2 Manderino. 3 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I know we 4 were being brief because of our time, but I did 5 what to, since no one else did, just ask you, 6 you made a very important point that I thought 7 was important with regard to joint ventures in marketing. With that you made a specific 8 suggestion with regard to something like 9 entrance fees or something that was a mechanism 10 to fund this. Could you just for 30 seconds 11 12 expand on what you were talking about? 13 MR. GUTENSTEIN: Yes. In some 14 municipalities that have riverboat gaming now there's an entry fee charge, an admission, 15 whether it's 2, 5, 10 dollars. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: To the person coming in? 18 19 MR. GUTENSTEIN: To the customer 20 coming on board. Part of that fee should go 21 back as marketing for the area. 22 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 23 Representative Manderino. Thank you again, Mr. Gutenstein. 24

MR. GUTENSTEIN:

Thank you.

25

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Our next witness is Michael McGovern, Executive Vice President, Pennsylvania Restaurant Association. Welcome, Mr. McGovern, and thank you for joining us this afternoon.

MR. McGOVERN: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Chairman and members of the

House Judiciary Committee, thank you for the

opportunity to appear before you today and

present testimony on gambling in Pennsylvania

and its affect on tourism, hospitality and

business industries.

My name is Mike McGovern and I am representing the Pennsylvania Restaurant

Association. I am speaking on behalf of and represent over 2,500 members of our association operating businesses at over 4,600 locations throughout this Commonwealth, and represent individuals operating both large and small, independent, individual, and multiple chain and franchise food establishments.

Our eating place sales are expected to reach \$8.7 billion this year. We employ 280,552 individuals and represent the largest retail employer and the second largest private sector

employer in the Commonwealth.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, our food service industry contributes significantly to the economic viability of our Commonwealth. It is also a highly competitive industry who relies heavily on the disposable income of our citizens and our visitors.

The mission of our association is to promote, protect, and improve the food service industry in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The introduction of proposed gambling legislation necessitates that our association maintain its mission and focus on the economic, socioeconomic, job and discretionary income facets that would be affected if additional forms of gambling became legalized in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Our association is opposed to any legislation that would permit casinos or riverboat gambling to compete with our restaurants for disposable income and/or affect the fiscal integrity and competitiveness of our food service industry.

Proponents argue that casinos will bring in more tourists. Studies, however, show

that many gamblers aren't out-of-town tourists,
but residents of the surrounding community. And
when casinos come to town, these local residents
often end up spending their discretionary
dollars inside the casino rather than in local
businesses.

A study by the Gaming and Economic

Development Institute, for example, determined

that a limited-scale local casino draws 67

percent of revenues from the local population

and another 18 percent from regional visitors.

A large-scale casino gets 52 percent of its

revenues from the local population, with an

additional 20 percent from regional travelers,

the study found.

Proponents also claim casinos will create jobs. A large casino could hire hundreds of new dealers, bartenders, wait staff and maintenance workers, as well as bring in a one-time increase in demand for construction workers, plumbers, and electricians to build the casino.

In many cases, however, the casinos take employees from other service sector jobs and increase the competition between employers.

Casinos, with high profit margins, can offer employees higher salaries and attract the most talented people in the area. Earl Grinols, a University of Illinois professor who studied 10 counties that legalized casino gambling in the 1990's, concluded that job gains in those counties were negligible. And after accounting for job gains without gambling, one job was lost for each gambling job created. Restaurateurs across the country who also face tight labor markets are finding that in many cases casinos only increase competition and drive up wages in an already limited market.

Many state and local governments support casinos as a way of generating tax revenues, noting that land-based and riverboat casino will bring in wagering taxes, sales taxes, meal and drink taxes, and admission or docking fees.

Yet, one researcher, Robert Goodman,
Director of the United States Gambling Study,
warns that there are hidden costs associated
with casinos. In his study, "Legalized Gambling
As A Strategy For Economic Development", Goodman
finds that an influx of tourists increases the

need for basic support services such as transportation, health and police, and, coincidentally, the need for corresponding increased public resources.

Goodman further finds that gambling usually diverts money from people's discretionary income. Richard Syron, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, believes that money for gambling is extracted from other consumer spending.

Restaurant Business, wrote in his piece, "Can't Compete With Free." For 15 years casino hotels have been dumping millions of dollars worth of food and beverage on Atlantic City, \$234 million worth in 1991 alone, in order to keep the gamblers as close to the tables as possible.

The effect on Atlantic City's restaurants: 40 percent fewer units competing for 10 percent fewer dollars in a 10-year period. In Minnesota restaurant business within the 30-mile radius of casinos with food service fell by 20 to 50 percent.

Jan Oleck's article, "Are they Gambling With Your Future" in Restaurant

Business reports that in Atlantic City the number of restaurants declined from 243 in 1977 to 146 in 1987, the 10-year period following the first year casinos were legalized.

2.5

Casinos and riverboats can use complimentary or reduced or subsidized meals and alcoholic beverages to promote their gambling and as a legitimate business expense against their profits.

Independent and multi-unit restaurants have great difficulty competing on a playing field that is not level. It is difficult to compete with free or reduced food and alcoholic beverages.

It is more difficult today than ever before to be a public official. You are asked to do more with less. You basically have 3 choices: reduce expenditures, increase taxes, or find new revenue sources. The attractiveness of the latter is obvious.

There is increasing documentation that revenue projections from gambling have been overstated and that the cost to governments in infrastructure, public safety, transportation and social services have exceeded original

estimates.

Casinos and riverboat gambling proponents have created and will continue to create the hope of increased tourism. However, we have shown that it primarily delivers local gamblers spending all their time and money in the casinos and on the boats providing little or no real benefit to the traditional tourist industry. Their promise of substantial economic gain is the result of the transfer of disposable income at the expense of existing businesses through loss-leader competition and subsidized food service and beverage service.

We have reviewed many studies on the impact of gambling in other areas of the country and consulted with our fellow state restaurant associations. Overwhelmingly, these studies point out the negative impact on our food service industry, and on other existing businesses, in areas that have approved gambling.

There have been indications of a growing national diversion of consumer expenditures on restaurants, movie houses, sports arenas, museums and other leisure

activities to gambling enterprises. Atlantic

City is a grim reminder of what can happen to an

area socially and economically when disposable

income ends up in the hands of a privileged few.

2.2

we believe the economic impact on our existing business community to be so complex and pervasive that we recommend that this committee commission an independent study to evaluate the impact of gambling on tourism, hospitality and business industries and to determine if the citizens of Pennsylvania want to expand gambling.

This study should be conducted by the joint State Government Commission, the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee, or by a leading Pennsylvania college or university to provide this committee with the knowledge and factual information it needs to make an informed decision on whether or not to recommend to the House of Representative the approval of the expansion of gambling in Pennsylvania.

In closing, we applaud the Chairman and the members of this committee for convening this public hearing to discuss the impact gambling would have on tourism, hospitality and

the business industries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We look forward to participating in the continued debate on this highly sensitive issue and would hope that the members of this committee would call upon our association to continue to provide input to insure the continued viability of our food service industry.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns with you. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you or any members of this committee would have.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. McGovern. Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

I share your view somewhat in terms of
discretionary dollars. I actually think there
are two kinds of gamblers: recreational
gamblers and compulsive gamblers. I think you
are right with regard to recreational gamblers
that there's only so much disposable income.
But, I'm not sure I want to encourage the other
gamblers.

But be that as it may, I don't, again, want to put words in your mouth, but am I

hearing you say that you don't see any way that
this works for a win-win situation with the food
industry or, were you just giving us a bunch of
cautions? If it was just a bunch of cautions,
what do you see that would make it a win-win
situation?

MR. McGOVERN: Representative, I don't think I was giving cautions. I think I was giving facts based on existing studies in other areas where gambling has been approved, both riverboat and casinos.

understood that, you were saying those were facts, which then made me think then why didn't you specifically say in your conclusion that there's no way this will work for the restaurant industry. If I believe those were the facts, that's the conclusion I would have come to.

MR. McGOVERN: Well, then, I
apologize. But the clear fact is that, in the
restaurant community there has been a
devastating effect on the existing restaurants.
Atlantic City is a good example. We can go to
Illinois. We can go to Iowa. We can go to
Mississippi. To a limited degree in

Mississippi, if I may, because that's more of a destination area at the present time because their surrounding states do not have gambling, so everybody is traveling to Mississippi. It's a little bit of a different impact. However, the restaurant community still has experienced declines of up to 35 to 40 percent.

3 -

The facts remain that the idea of the whole industry, which Mr. Green alluded to and there have been people who have been on record for the casino in Bridgeport, and so forth, there deal is to get you in the casino, get you on the riverboat and have you gamble. It is not --

Rendell is that everybody will go over for a leisurely cruise on the riverboat, win big stakes and then dine at Ruth Chris's at 6 o'clock in the evening. That just doesn't happen. The existing restaurants do not see an increase in the tourism. They are not encouraged to do that. They are encouraged to stay on the riverboat, to stay in the casinos. The tourism that comes in do not -- are not participating in the local restaurant community.

1 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. MR. McGOVERN: You're welcome. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: 3 Thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 5 Representative Manderino. Representative James. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. 8 Chairman. Thank you for your testimony. notice you named those cities that have 9 10 gambling. What about New Orleans who has a great restaurant industry? How has that 11 12 impacted there with the riverboat gambling? MR. McGOVERN: Initially, when 13 riverboat was first approved in the State of 14 15 Louisiana, New Orleans, the Restaurant Association was in support of it with limited 16 food service on board, which they do have. 17 addition to that, the Restaurant Association was 18 encouraging the world's largest casino down 19 there again with limitations on the food 20 21 service. Right in the middle of Canal Street 22 there stands a relic of the world's largest 23 casino which is not being realized, and 24

nonetheless, Ralph Brennan who just completed

25

his term as president of the National Restaurant
Association was a former president of the
Louisiana Restaurant Association has been
leading public debate on opposing riverboat
gambling and opposing land-based casinos because
of its devastating impact on New Orleans, worldrenown reputation as a fine dining restaurant
community.

The tourists simply do not support the restaurant community. They are going there for one reason. It is to gamble. It is not to participate in the traditional tourism industries. I think it's very clear that everybody recognizes that you cannot approve riverboat gambling or any expansion of gambling without displacing other industries that already exist in your communities and have been there long serving the needs of this Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I was just down in New Orleans and checked on the riverboat gambling. The riverboats I went on I didn't see the kind of restaurants or the kind of food service on the riverboat I went on. I still saw a lot of activity in the restaurants.

I also noticed that the other casino,

2.3

Harrah's, is bankrupted and closed. I think that was supposed to be the largest restaurant.

If, in fact, they had it here and there was no substantial restaurants or food service on the casinos, would you then be supportive?

MR. McGOVERN: I don't believe that we could because of the impact on the disposable income, sir. The other thing you have to take into effect, if you study Atlantic City with land-based casinos, they are now expanding their restaurant service and expanding their food service and beverage service within the casinos because they do not want their customers going outside the casinos into Atlantic City to enjoy the, quote, hospitality industry. The point is, once they leave the seat, the chances of returning are not in their best interest.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I think

Atlantic City is an example we need to learn

from in terms of what not to do, in terms of not

having that here. Okay, thank you.

MR. McGOVERN: Representative, I agree with you that the study that I'm referring to which we can make available to the committee are

| 1 | not strictly limited to Atlantic City. This is |
|----|--|
| 2 | in every locale that there has been riverboat |
| 3 | gambling or land-based casinos. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. I |
| 5 | hope that we would can get those studies, sir. |
| 6 | Thank you. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, |
| 8 | Representative James. Representative Horsey. |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: No questions. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative |
| 11 | Hennessey. |
| 12 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, |
| 13 | Mr. Chairman. Mr. McGovern, thank you for your |
| 14 | testimony. As a personal note, Mike and I went |
| 15 | to school together, grade school and high |
| 16 | school. He's I guess 2 years behind me, right? |
| 17 | MR. McGOVERN: Yes, |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: It's nice |
| 19 | to see him here testifying. |
| 20 | MR. McGOVERN: Thank you. |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I look back |
| 22 | and think that I used to have hair that color |
| 23 | too. |
| 24 | Mike, the testimony that you have |
| 25 | given and the citations, the comparison with |

Atlantic City, I don't know in that 10-year period whether or not -- It would be interesting to find out the number of restaurants that existed versus the number of casinos because, as I look at the prospect of 2 or 3, or maybe 5 riverboats offering restaurant or some food service, I don't know that would necessarily be devastating to a restaurant industry as solidly based as Philadelphia's already is.

2.0

2.1

The other studies that you talk about, the ones that deal with riverboats along the Mississippi, especially the newer ones, probably will give us a much better handle on exactly the kind of impact that riverboat — this kind of proposal would have on the city here and in Pittsburgh, and wherever else you might have them.

MR. McGOVERN: I'd be happy to make those available to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Mr.

Gutenstein didn't share your concern. He

testified just a few minutes ago. He was saying

that the quality of food service on riverboats

isn't going to be able to compare at all with

Philadelphia cuisine. Do you think he's just

being a little naive?

Where do you really feel this -- Isn't there a middle ground that we could find that a certain number, a limited number of riverboats might be an acceptable alternative or place for people to go as opposed to simply drawing a line and saying that we should oppose the idea altogether?

MR. McGOVERN: I would not presume for one moment that Mr. Gutenstein is naive. But I think the question that was proposed to him is that, if he as the hotelier of the Sheraton Society Hill, if there were 3 or 4 or 5 riverboats down there how that would affect his business. And I believe he was speaking as a hotelier that from a room standpoint that could possibly, in fact, probably will increase his rental of rooms.

From a restaurant standpoint, I think we have to consider it from 2 points. First of all, the food service on any riverboat could not be compared to any of the outstanding restaurants we have in Philadelphia.

However, it's the disposable income aspect. Right now you have tourists and patrons

1 that come down to the pier area to share in the 2 restaurant community, to share in the 3 entertainment that's down there. If there were riverboats down there, they would come down for 4 different reasons. I would submit that the 5 displacement of the income that would go to the 6 7 existing restaurants would then go to the docks 8 and to the riverboat gambling, and it would cause a dramatic impact on the restaurant 9 10 community in that area that already is vibrant and is coming back and increasing every year. 11 think that's really what would happen. 12 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Not because 13 of the quality of the food; just because they 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

might not have the money to spend for food when they get off the riverboat.

MR. McGOVERN: Exactly, or even going to the riverboat. It creates a different kind of person coming into the area.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Representative Hennessey. Mr. McGovern, does Atlantic City have a restaurant association? MR. McGOVERN: I don't know if the

Atlantic City per se has a restaurant association. I know the State of New Jersey has a restaurant association.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's all I have.

Thank you very much. Representative James, I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.

Mr. Chairman. I was just thinking maybe of some way -- I was talking to Representative

Manderino. I notice like when you go to a lot of casinos they give you these various coupons to use. Maybe in some of your discussions you could talk about the effect it's coming here that the casinos could work out something or riverboats could work out something with the restaurants, to give them coupons to go to the various restaurants out into the communities.

Maybe it's some discussion you might want to check into.

2.0

MR. McGOVERN: Representative, we appreciate that. In fact, we have a list of recommendations, but as we were advised by the Chief Counsel, this hearing today was on the impact of disposable income in those areas so we did not come forth with those recommendations.

1 We do have very extensive recommendations on 2 riverboat marketing, joint marketing efforts, food service, limiting food service that we'd be 3 happy to share with this committee if given the 4 opportunity. 5 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I think that 6 would be good if it's okay with the Chair. 7 8 MR. McGOVERN: We were trying to adhere to your ground rules, sir. 9 10 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Yes, we would like 11 you to share those recommendations with us. MR. McGOVERN: We would appreciate it. 12 13 CHAIRMAN GANNON: If you could get 14 them to myself or Mr. Preski will be glad to share them with the rest of the committee. 15 I want to thank you for taking time 16 this afternoon to be with us and your patience. 17 Thank you for sharing your testimony with us. 18 19 MR. McGOVERN: Thank you very much. 20 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr. McGovern. Our next witness and our final 21 22 witness for today is Barbara Dietrich, who is 23 President of the Philadelphia League of Women Voters. Welcome, Ms. Dietrich, and thank you 24

25

for your patience.

MS. DIETRICH: Good afternoon. I am
Barbara Dietrich, President of the League of
Women Voters of Philadelphia. However, the
testimony which I'm presenting today is on
behalf of the League of Women Voters of
Pennsylvania of which the Philadelphia League is
a part.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Judiciary Committee, thank you for holding public hearings on this very important proposal, HB 2308, to establish a commission and license riverboat gambling casinos in this state.

The league is very much in favor of bringing more business and jobs to Pennsylvania, but we do not think that expanding legalized gambling will ultimately have a positive effect on the local or state economy. While our great historic landmarks, renowned orchestra and distinguished art museums make our city a very attractive tourist destination, recent research on the economic effects of riverboat gambling indicate that the benefits to casino communities are very disappointing despite millions of dollars in profits taken from those communities by casino operators.

A recently completed study by the
Better Government Association of Chicago says
that Illinois experiences a net loss of
\$6 million a year from gambling, not including
the cost of infrastructure, regulation and
social costs of gambling addiction, according to
Association Director Terry Brunner. By
contrast, the 4-month long Monet exhibit at the
Chicago Art Institute during 1995 yielded a net
economic gain of \$393 million according to the
institutes's Public Relations Director, Eileen
Harakai, and the Better Government Association.

The report entitled, "Casinos in Florida: An analysis of the Economic and Social Impacts", which was released by the Florida Governor's office in 1994 concluded that for each new dollar in tax revenue generated by casino gambling, the cost to taxpayers could be from 8 to \$12.00. Several economists have noted that casinos generate significant new revenues only if they can export their problems; that is, when the gamblers go home to other communities. The Florida study notes that this system works for Las Vegas and Atlantic City, which draws patrons from New York, Philadelphia and

Washington.

Expansion of gambling leads to market saturation and an increased reliance on local population as customers. Can Philadelphia reasonably expect to attract gamblers from outside the Philadelphia area to its proposed riverboat casinos? Will the current corporate conventioneers and visitors to our historic and cultural attractions find the new casino atmosphere inviting?

The League of Women Voters of

Pennsylvania hopes that members of the General

Assembly will find alternative means to simulate

economic growth in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much,
Ms. Dietrich. Representative Horsey.

REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Ms. Dietrich, is it true that all
airline tickets to Las Vegas have to be
round-trip tickets so they can send everybody

home?

1.9

MS. DIETRICH: I'm not certain, but it would seem likely.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you very much. I think it's an interesting observation. Las Vegas doesn't really give us I think a very clear study as to what would happen in existing cities because Las Vegas does, in deed, import its gamblers and send them home whether they win or lose. But generally, I think it's after they've lost at least something; not to say they haven't enjoyed themselves while they did it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Hennessey. Representative
Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Your references to Chicago, I'm going to assume since the Better Government Association of Chicago did both the analysis of the gambling and the Monet exhibit at the art institute, that they used the same factors to determine their net gain or net loss. Do you have anything more than what you told us; either, do you know who the Better Government

| 1 | Association of Chicago is or did they actually |
|----|--|
| 2 | put a printed report together that shows how |
| 3 | they came to these conclusions? |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: If I can interrupt |
| 5 | for a second, we have a copy of that report. We |
| 6 | have sent it to the committee members. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I apologize |
| 8 | for it. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: It's probably in |
| 10 | your mail in Harrisburg. |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. |
| 12 | That was it. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, |
| 14 | Ms. Dietrich, for joining us and thank you very |
| 15 | much for your patience and thank you providing |
| 16 | testimony. |
| 17 | MS. DIETRICH: We hope to have another |
| 18 | opportunity if it so presents itself. |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Mr. Chairman, |
| 20 | I wanted to be on record, would you make sure |
| 21 | Do you know when the record will be transcribed? |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: No, I don't. It |
| 23 | takes about 3 or 4 weeks. |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Would you make |
| 25 | sure I get a copy in my office? |

| 1 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Certainly. | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE HORSEY: Thank you. | |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you. That | |
| 4 | closes the public hearing on House Bill 2308 | |
| 5 | before the House Judiciary Committee | |
| 6 | (At or about 5 p.m., the deposition | |
| 7 | concluded) | |
| 8 | * * * | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | 1 | |

CERTIFICATE

I, Karen J. Meister, Reporter, Notary
Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and
for the County of York, Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing
is a true and accurate transcript of my
stenotype notes taken by me and subsequently
reduced to computer printout under my
supervision, and that this copy is a correct
record of the same.

This certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under my direct control and/or supervision.

Dated this 19th day of July, 1996.

2 2

My commission expires 10/19/96

Karen J. Meister

Karen J. Meister - Reporter Notary Public