COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2008, 9:00 A.M.

VOLUME I OF IV

PRESENTATION BY GAMING CONTROL BOARD

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DWIGHT EVANS, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MARIO J. CIVERA, JR., CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN E. BARRAR

HONORABLE STEVEN W. CAPPELLI

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE CRAIG A. DALLY

HONORABLE GORDON R. DENLINGER

HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS

HONORABLE DAN B. FRANKEL

HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY

HONORABLE WILLIAM F. KELLER

HONORABLE THADDEUS KIRKLAND

HONORABLE BRYAN R. LENTZ

HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE MICHAEL P. McGEEHAN

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI

HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY

HONORABLE DAVE REED

HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY

HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.

```
1
   BEFORE: (cont'd.)
      HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
2
      HONORABLE JOHN SIPTROTH
      HONORABLE KATIE TRUE
3
      HONORABLE DON WALKO
      HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY, JR.
 4
5
  ALSO PRESENT:
      MIRIAM FOX
6
      EDWARD NOLAN
7
                                  JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
8
                                  NOTARY PUBLIC
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1		I N D E X
2	Т	TESTIFIERS
3		
4	NAMES	PAGE
5	MARY DIGIACOMO COLINS	8
6	EILEEN MCNULTY	13
7	KIM HANKINS	48
8	RANDY BENDIS	5 2
9		
LO		
11		
L2		
L3		
L4		
L5		
L6		
L7		
L8		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN EVANS: I would like to convene the Appropriations Committee and kick off with a little statement and then kind of talk a little bit about the housekeeping rules of the committee.

2.0

Earlier this month, Governor Rendell presented the General Assembly with his spending proposals for 2008 and 2009. This is a \$28.3 billion spending plan that protects the progress Pennsylvania has made over the last five years and prepares us for the future.

We are aware that the state of the national economy is not good. Across the country, Governors and State Legislatures face a budget season that is severely short on funding. Some will have billion-dollar deficits. Funding for education, health care, economic development, and the environment are in jeopardy in New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

But in Pennsylvania, we are moving forward. We are investing in the people, in programs, and in the policies that will keep our State strong.

With this budget, education spending will increase by 6 percent, a 6-percent increase or an additional \$291 million for all of our school districts. This is based on one of the

recommendations of the costing-out study done on education funding in Pennsylvania.

2.0

This budget renews a commitment to affordable health care for all Pennsylvanians. This budget continues with economic stimulus plans that affect communities across the State. We will redevelop old industrial sites; fix our roads, bridges, and dams; invest in research; and help budget our communities.

This budget continues to strive for energy independence. Pennsylvania remains a national leader in this effort.

This budget makes Pennsylvanians safer by spending \$20 million on the Police on Patrol program. This means 200 more officers on the streets of communities where they are most needed.

This budget proposes to put \$130 million into the pockets of 475,000 low-income working families. That is up to \$400 for each working family.

Today, we begin a three-week process relating to our hearings. It is our attempt to focus on the policies and the programs funded with State tax dollars. It helps us to focus on our spending priorities for 2008/2009.

Something will be new this year. At several hearings, we will invite citizens and community leaders to provide their perspectives relating to how this budget impacts them.

What I would like to do is now begin, and I would like to recognize the acting chair on the Republican side, Representative Craig Dally. Craig.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

2.0

I'm sitting in this morning for our Chairman,
Mario Civera, who is detained back in his district
for a few hours this morning.

But we also look forward to an engaging process here over the next three weeks and analyzing the Governor's budget, looking at his spending priorities, and also determining what programs are working, what programs aren't, and a way that we can achieve a zero-growth or a low-growth budget.

So that is certainly our goal, and hopefully through this process we will have the opportunity, our members on our side of the aisle, to ask the questions that we feel are necessary to really dig into the numbers of this budget and make sure that we are doing our fiduciary duty to the people of Pennsylvania by asking the right questions in order

to receive the responses we need to make informed decisions as this budget process goes forward.

2.0

So thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to provide those comments, and we look forward to an engaging process over the next three weeks. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you very much.

What I would like to say to all of the members on the committee, for those who have been on the committee, I have tried to be more than liberal relating to the questioning and the comments, but I am going to ask members that they are going to have to use self-discipline on themselves to ensure that all members fully get to participate in this process.

We have a lot of members and everybody wants to ask questions, so I'm going to try to leave it up to the members. If I don't feel that members are adhering to what I am expressing, then I will become even more aggressive about controlling how questions are being asked. So I am asking the members to kind of control themselves as we go through this process.

What I would like to do is, we don't ask for any testimony from the witnesses that are before us, but what I would like to do is get right into the

questioning of the people who are here before us.

2.0

So, Madam Chair, can you introduce yourself and anybody else you want to introduce, and then I can get into some questioning. You know, who the board members are around you for the purpose of the record.

MS. COLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm Mary DiGiacomo Colins. I'm the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

To my left is board member Ray Angeli; to my right is Eileen McNulty, our chief financial officer; to Eileen's right is Gary Sojka, also a board member; and to Gary's right is Jim Ginty, also a board member.

And I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today, to come here to respond as fully as possible to any of your questions which you may have. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to be here.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Madam Chair, I would like to start off with the first question.

As I look at, there is a sheet that you have kind of put together here -- I think this is from your shop -- where it talks about slots making a

making a difference, and it shows how you have collected a minimum, based on the State law, of \$50 million each for each casino and proposed casino, and then it talks about where it goes. Can you talk a little bit about the state of gaming in terms of the State collecting revenue? Where are we in terms of the benefits of it, and what has it meant?

2.0

MS. COLINS: Yes, I can. Thank you.

This chart that we developed and submitted to the Legislature contains a snapshot of the success that the Commonwealth has enjoyed as a result of Act 71 and the Racehorse Development and Gaming Act in terms of the generation of revenue.

When we conducted the licensing hearings and we evaluated the applications, we received projections from each of the applicants, and upon issuing the licenses, we followed those projections in terms of the revenue that would be generated.

And we are happy to say that at this point in time, the actualization of the revenue generated exceeds the projections by approximately 30 percent.

In addition to the \$50 million licensing fees, the gross terminal revenues that have been projected from the six slot machine facilities, and

```
1
       that does not take into consideration Penn National,
 2
      which just opened last week and which has been very
      successful just in its few short days of operation,
 3
      but these revenues are close to $700 million,
      approximately $700 million. Those are the gross
 5
 6
      terminal revenues from the slot machines themselves.
7
      The 1.2 figure includes the $50 million licensing
      fees which were paid as well.
8
               So the projections that we measured and the
9
10
      projections that the licensees put forward are
11
      below, in fact, what revenues have come into the
12
      Commonwealth Gaming Fund at this point in time.
13
               CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Sean
14
      Ramaley.
15
              REPRESENTATIVE RAMALEY: Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
16
17
               Good morning, Madam Chair.
18
              MS. COLINS: Good morning, sir.
19
              REPRESENTATIVE RAMALEY: Thank you all for
2.0
      being here.
21
               Obviously, based on your comments and based
      on what we all know, more facilities mean more jobs,
22
23
      more tax relief, more opportunities for those who
      want to partake in gaming, and more benefits
24
```

certainly for the horse-racing industry.

25

My question then, and I don't mean to put anybody on the spot here, but those of us in the Beaver-Lawrence-Allegheny portion of southwestern Pennsylvania are very curious about the time frame on the Category 1 license for the previously approved track in Lawrence County. Can you give any kind of guidance on that?

2.0

MS. COLLINS: I can give you certainly some general guidance as to what our expectations are at this point in time.

We are in the beginning of the license processing for that applicant. The application has been received. The Licensing Bureau has that application and is reviewing it and has requested supplemental information, additional information. That is a process that takes awhile.

The information, I am told from our Director of the Bureau of Licensing, that we are requesting is coming in. Their counsel, I bumped into the other day, has advised me that they are complying; they are submitting the requested information. And once Licensing has amassed everything that it requires, licensing will then turn that over to the Bureau of Investigations to begin the background investigations.

1 We will then conduct a public input hearing 2 in the locality, and that will probably occur sometime, we are hoping in the summer, and we are 3 4 anticipating suitability hearings in the fall and hopefully being able to award the license in 5 November or December. 6 So that's as detailed a timeline as I can 7 give you at this point, barring any fluctuations or 8 changes, sir. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE RAMALEY: Sure. Thank you 11 very much. 12 MS. COLINS: You are welcome. 13 REPRESENTATIVE RAMALEY: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Craig Dally. 16 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you, Mr. 17 Chairman. 18 Good morning. 19 MS. COLINS: Good morning, sir. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Madam Chairwoman, you 21 mentioned in your remarks about achieving revenue 22 greater than was expected when Act 1, Special 23 Session Act 1, was passed. In the Governor's 24 budget, there are estimates for property tax relief,

which at first blush seem to be overly optimistic.

25

As you are aware, section 503(a) of the act provides that the Secretary shall only certify an amount that is sustainable in subsequent years for property tax relief. And on page H-70 of the budget, the Governor anticipates the 34-percent tax on gross terminal revenues to generate \$441.32 million in fiscal year '07-08 and \$575 million in fiscal year '08-09, yet at the same time, as presented on page A-3.14 of his budget, it provides for property tax relief totaling \$853.8 million in 2008-09 and \$887 million in '09-10.

2.0

So what I'm having trouble understanding, in your projections you are showing that the 34-percent revenue or tax should generate \$575.28 million in revenue. So I am wondering how \$575 million can result in property tax relief of \$853 million, if you could explain those differences.

MS. COLINS: Well, you know--- Would you like to address that?

MS. McNULTY: That's fine.

MS. COLINS: I am going to ask our resident expert, our Chief Financial Officer, to address your question. I think she will give you a much more coherent answer and a clearer answer than I would.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Eileen, can you just

1 introduce yourself for the record, please?

2.0

MS. McNULTY: Yes. My name is Eileen

McNulty, and I'm the Chief Financial Officer for the

Gaming Control Board.

I think the answer to your question is that license fees have been collected as well, \$550 million in license fees, and those fees can be spread over the next couple of years. In fact, \$200 million of the license fees have already been transferred to the Lottery Fund to support the expanded property tax relief through the Lottery Fund.

So it is the combination of the 34-percent tax revenue and the license fees that is going to support the property tax relief figures that you mentioned.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: The license fees are one-time payments, correct?

MS. McNULTY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. So in the Governor's proposal of property tax relief, what portion of that \$853 million is license fees for that fiscal year?

MS. McNULTY: Well, on page H-70 where you were mentioning the figure of 441.3, if you look

right above that, there's \$315 million in license fees in '07-08. There were \$300 million in the previous year in '06-07, \$200 million of which has been sent to the Lottery Fund to pay for the expanded property tax and rent rebate program, but \$100 million of which is still available for property tax relief.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. So basically the Governor's budget is using \$300 million in licensing fees plus the 34-percent tax to generate the property tax relief that he is suggesting?

MS. McNULTY: To the extent that you are quoting the figures of 854 and 888, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Then I guess my next question is, how is that sustainable when a 34-percent tax is expected to only generate 575? How can we have sustainable property tax relief of \$900 million a year when the one-time license fees then will be exhausted?

MS. McNULTY: Well, we anticipate more facilities coming on line that will generate more revenue.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. And what is your projection in that regard for '10 and '11? Or I should say '09 and '10, excuse me; for the next

fiscal year.

2.0

MS. McNULTY: For '08-09 for the facilities?

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: No; no, for the next

fiscal year on license fees. Not '08-09 but '09 and

'10, since those are the dollars that are going to

be used.

MS. COLINS: Two and a half million would be the projection on that. There would be license fees from the Category 3's that would come on board, the additional Category 1, and then there would be the additional facilities that would be opening on line that would produce additional gross terminal revenue that would be subject to the 34-percent tax.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: What is your timeline in terms of these new facilities coming on line?

MS. COLINS: Well, the issuance of the license for the Category 1 would be in the fall, and the Category 3's we are hoping to license in September, approximately September. The Category 3's would come on line very quickly, because they will be existing resorts, and the Category 1, which is a racino, could be on line, I would anticipate, five, six months after the issuance of the license. That's just an anticipation. I can't be more specific than that.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: So you are projecting 2 \$2.5 million of license fees for this fiscal year, 3 correct? 4 MS. McNULTY: That is the projection in the budget for '08-09, 315 is for this year, and between 5 6 the two years, we should reach those numbers. 7 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. Then my question was, though, in '09-10, what are your 8 projections for license fees, because obviously you 9 10 are going to need additional money to come up with 11 that \$900 million for property tax relief. MS. McNULTY: Well, I think at that point it 12 13 will be coming from the 34-percent tax on the additional venues that will be open by then, which 14 15 will include the one in Bethlehem, which we anticipate will open at the end of the fiscal year, 16 17 and the two in Philadelphia and the seventh track.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. So I guess then to change my question, what do you expect the 34-percent State tax to be in '09-10?

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McNULTY: I don't have that number right with me, but we can figure it out and send it to you.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: All right. I wish you would do that, because that's pretty important

to analysis these numbers and know whether the Governor's assertion is correct or not.

Thank you very much.

2.0

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Dally.

Representative Jake Wheatley.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Good morning, everyone.

MS. COLINS: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I have a question, one, if you can help me to understand what is going on with the compulsive gambling. Do we have it set up? Do we have the relationship and the criteria in place to handle compulsive gambling that is going to, if it hasn't already started, that will start with the implementation of this new industry? Do you have a projection on what you think the problem will look like and if counties are set up to handle it?

MS. COLINS: Great, thank you.

Yes, we do have a very active program to deal with problem compulsive gambling. We are the only jurisdiction in the nation that has someone at a Director level who is charged with the responsibility of overseeing compliance with our problem and compulsive gambling regulations.

We are very active through this Executive Director, who has established an administration of and a process for a self-exclusion list. This self-exclusion-list concept is provided for in the statute and in our regulations. We already are responsible for a self-exclusion list which consists of approximately 200 individuals in the Commonwealth in the short time that we have been in existence.

2.0

In addition, our Director of Problem and Compulsive Gaming has created programs where there has been information that has been submitted to the Pennsylvania State prisons, to the State probation department, and parole offices. She has coordinated efforts with the Racing Commission and with the Lottery Commission. For the first time, our agency, along with those three departments, are talking and coordinating efforts to educate the public in the area of problem and compulsive gaming.

We have as one of our conditions imposed upon all licenses the requirements that every operator, before they can open their casino door, must comply with our regulations requiring a problem and compulsive gaming program, and our program has been discussed and evaluated within the gaming industry as being perhaps one of the most strict and

expansive problem and compulsive gaming programs in gaming jurisdictions in the country.

2.0

So we are very involved in it. Our Director, Nan Horner, is doing an outstanding job for us, and the requirement for each facility to comply is one that we take very seriously, and no doors can open without them meeting that requirement.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And I can appreciate that response. I guess I was not clear in my question, though.

One of the questions was, are the counties, it was my understanding, especially in Allegheny County, that we may not be set up to handle the increase that may come from compulsive gaming, and part of it is making sure we have the necessary certified individuals to handle this particular type of addiction, and I was wondering if we are keeping an eye or if you are keeping an eye or if someone is keeping an eye on if the Commonwealth itself is prepared to handle this particular type of addiction.

MS. COLINS: Right. The Department of
Health receives \$1.5 million from gaming revenues
towards providing for certification and development

of programs to treat problem and compulsive gaming.

That is within the jurisdiction of the Department of

Health. We certainly, through our Director of

compulsive gaming, reach out to them and make

ourselves available to support them as they go

But that is within the purview of the

Department of Health, the distribution of those

funds and the certification process for treatment of

compulsive gaming.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: So one last question on this area.

MS. COLINS: Okay.

forward to do this.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: So that I'm clear, you have a person who is a Director over compulsive gambling who creates programs and does the outreach from the Gaming Board, but then we send money to the Department of Health to do the exact same thing. Is that what you are saying?

MS. COLINS: No, sir. The Department of Health, I believe, is a different jurisdiction. They get the money to actually certify treatment and to provide that money to certified programs. They certify the medical treatment end of it and disseminate the funds to those programs.

We require that the operators comply with our regulations, which promote awareness of problem gaming. We make sure that there is a hotline available. We also disseminate information by way of education and make sure that the facilities do the same and comply with our regulatory guidelines in that regard.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you.

And if you can just explain to me the difference in the local tax share assessment and where that goes, and then the funding of the local law enforcement piece. Can you help me understand the difference in those two funding parts?

MS. COLINS: I can, but I think Eileen

McNulty can do a better job. I'm going to ask her

to fill in. Thank you.

MS. McNULTY: Thank you.

The local law enforcement grants are funded from a \$5 million appropriation out of the Gaming Fund each year, and the Governor has recommended continuing that in '08-09. The local share is funded from a 4-percent assessment on gross terminal revenue.

Generally speaking, 2 percent of that goes to the county and 2 percent goes to the local

1 municipality, but there is a quarantee of a minimum 2 of \$10 million to the local municipality. There is 3 also a cap on how much of it they can keep, which is 4 based on 50 percent of their budget. So if the local portion exceeds that cap of 50 percent on the 5 6 municipal budget, then the additional funds would 7 also flow through the county share mechanism. REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you, Representative 10 Wheatley. 11 Representative Reichley. 12 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Good morning. 13 MS. COLINS: Good morning. 14 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you, Mr. 15 Chairman. 16 Do you prefer to be referred to as 17 Chairwoman or Judge? I just want to make sure I 18 address you in the correct way. 19 MS. COLINS: At your pleasure, sir, whatever 2.0 you choose. You can call me Mary; whatever works. 21 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, I wouldn't 22 want to fool anybody as to how friendly we are going 23 to be then. But thank you for---24 MS. COLINS: You can call me Judge, sir. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: That will be fine. 25

I'll just remember you don't have the contempt powers to use either. Thank you.

MS. COLINS: Thank heavens.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you to you and your fellow board members for appearing here today. It is especially appreciated that you have come before the Legislature in this setting. It is unfortunate that we weren't able to gain the appearance of the board members before the Policy Committee when we had previous discussions about these kinds of topics, but it is good to finally have you before us.

I guess my concern is focused somewhat upon the enforcement capacity of a board as it currently stands, especially in light of recent media reports that the State Police intend to reduce their 24-7 coverage in the gambling facilities based upon budgetary constraints, and then really in following up to Representative Ramaley's question about the newest license application in terms of the background check process and the capacity of a board for that.

I guess just beginning with Representative
Ramaley's question, I believe it is Valley View
Downs, is that correct, the name of the most recent

1 application? 2 MS. COLINS: Yes; yes. 3 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And what is the 4 exact status of that application? MS. COLINS: It is being reviewed by 5 Licensing, and they are amassing information in 6 7 order to complete their portion of the process. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And when you say 8 that "they" are reviewing, who is "they"? 9 10 MS. COLINS: The Department of Licensing, 11 sir. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. Has the 12 13 Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement under the Gaming Control Board conducted any investigation of 14 15 the license applicant? 16 MS. COLINS: That does not happen until 17 Licensing completes its review for completeness. 18 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: 19 Now, with regard to the capacity of the 2.0 Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement to conduct 21 background investigations, as a judge and as the 22 current chairperson of the board, what is your 23 position on behalf of the board as far as the Bureau 24 of Investigations and Enforcement capacity and the

board's capacity to receive criminal investigative

25

information?

2.0

MS. COLINS: Well, sir, I'll rely on both of my hats at this point, as a Judge and also as the Chairman of the Gaming Board, to respond to that question.

I realize that there have been those who have criticized us regarding the Mount Airy decision at this point, but with respect to the process of the Gaming Board, and I would like to call to everyone's attention once again that the situation in Mount Airy now is such that we have continued the operation of that casino. We continue to bring in revenue. We have spared approximately 920 jobs. We continue, we have allowed the flow of payments to small businesses in that part of Pennsylvania to continue by our suspension of the applicant pending the disposition of the criminal charges.

But going forward with other applications now and with how we conduct our investigation, our process has been, in my estimation, a very complete regulatory process. I think that no one would dispute that as regulators, we had in place a system which was comparable to any other regulatory investigative process in the nation.

We have met, I personally met with

representatives from the Nevada Commission, from the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement, numerous times in terms, in the early stages of this board, in terms of how to set up our system. And as comments from not only Pennsylvania State Police Commissioner Miller and others indicate, the Gaming Board did everything that a regulator could do in its past investigations in order to ensure completeness and thoroughness.

2.0

Now, what we will do going forward is to conduct similar investigations to reach out to the State Police, as we have in the past, and to hopefully be able to create a continuing partnership where we will be advised on an ongoing basis as to whether or not there is a criminal investigation going on. And when we receive that information, just as we would have acted in the past, we will act in the future, and that is to defer any licensing decision pending the outcome of those criminal investigations.

Now, it's my understanding of the law, of CHRIA, which has been tossed around by everyone who has an opinion on this issue, but it is my opinion that that law does not preclude a law enforcement agency from indicating whether or not there is a

criminal investigation in effect.

2.0

There is argument as to whether or not it precludes the dissemination of the specifics, but it certainly does not stop law enforcement agencies from telling the regulators, we have an investigation ongoing or there is information you may want to consider later when we are finished.

As I mentioned earlier, I have had numerous discussions with the Division of Gaming Enforcement people in New Jersey. We have Cyrus Pitre here, who was with that division, who can speak to you, and it is the practice of other regulators to receive information that states there is a criminal investigation so that regulators know where to tread and where not to tread.

There is, you know, there is a very real tension that is built in to the regulatory process as a result of the Fifth Amendment, and that is what we have to respect as regulators. If we know that there is a criminal investigation, we have the ability to stop and not license, and we will do that in the future again just as we would have done in the past had we had that type of information.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, taking up your point about looking at what other States have

done and what happened in the past and looking forward, I guess the question arises upon the legal basis for both the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement and the board to receive the information you have described.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

What I find troubling is based upon your statement here today, even after the license was granted to Mount Airy, on October 10 of last year -and this is from a fax that Mr. Stambaugh provided to me last Thursday -- the Department of Justice, and this is a letter from James K. Welch, Supervisory Special Agent, to you, which said, "The FBI has not, can not and will not provide the BIE with any investigative information. generally prohibited from providing investigative information to non-law enforcement agencies and the BIE is not a law enforcement agency. Consistent with our policy, we have refused all BIE requests for information on prospective casino license applicants and employees." And what is troubling in light of your statement this morning is that you had that information on May 5 of '06 in a letter from, again, Agent Welch to Mr. Roger Greenbank, your Deputy Director for the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement. You had that information as of

February 16 of '06, and the information was communicated to Mary McDaniel, Executive Director of the House Judiciary Committee. And this, again, is a letter from an M. McIntyre Sundin, Unit Chief, Access Integrity Unit, in which it is said that "Amending 18 PaCS Section 9102, to designate the Board or the BIE as criminal justice agencies within the state of Pennsylvania will not change the FBI's determination that the Board lacks authority to access NCIC information."

2.0

So in light of three determinations that you have received, why would the Legislature have confidence that you can safeguard an occurrence such as with Mount Airy from happening with the Valley View Downs? I'm not saying that there is anything related right now to Valley View Downs---

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Madam Chairperson, this is what I want to caution you as well as the member who just asked that question. I have asked Representative Harold James, who is the Chairman of the Gaming Commission and the House Judiciary Committee, in my view, to get into more detail and discussion relating to overall on the gaming issue. Only because of my time situation, I have like three, four more members, I have other people to

1 bring up on this dais, so this has to be the last 2 question, and, you know, so I'm asking you to be short in your answers to the gentleman's question so 3 that we can move through with the rest of the agenda that I have. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I--- Representative Dally, I'll refer 7 8 to you. REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. If I could 10 just comment on that. 11 So what you are saying is that you are going 12 to give members of the Appropriations Committee the 13 opportunity to ask questions at the hearing to be called by Representative James on this issue? 14 15 CHAIRMAN EVANS: I can't speak on that. 16 have asked Representative James to conduct hearings. 17 Right now, I'm trying to keep an appropriations 18 process moving, Mr. Dally. 19 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. I just hope 2.0 that the members have the opportunity to ask these 21 questions, because I think the people of 22 Pennsylvania deserve to know the answers to them. 23 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, Mr. 24 Chairman, are you saying that I have one more

25

question?

CHAIRMAN EVANS: No, I'm saying that we will end with this question that you just asked and the answer she will give so I can move on.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, let me include a couple caveats then for the benefit of the chairperson so that she can answer everything directly.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Okay, and she has to keep her answer very short.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And she can certainly amend the answer in writing.

MS. COLINS: No fair.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: She can certainly amend the answer in writing.

Madam Chairwoman or Judge, I think the critical question that Pennsylvanians want to know is, when did the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement make its referral, based on perjury allegations against a Mount Airy applicant, to the Pennsylvania State Police? When did the BIE notify the board that it had made such a referral? And did you proceed to issue a license to the Mount Airy applicant in light of the information that BIE had at its disposal? Because certainly the grand jury's presentment indicates that that was in the fall of

'06.

2.0

Furthermore, did the board do a financial suitability analysis of Mr. Barden, the Pittsburgh applicant who, as it has been reported, had \$11 million of personal gambling debts? And did you factor that into the determination---

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Reichley--REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: ---of the issuance
of that license?

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Reichley, you and I have known each other a long time and you have watched me as Chairman of this committee. I have been more than fair. I think you are stretching it with the additional caveats that you are attempting to ask. So I am asking you to allow her to answer that question and for me to get the rest of the members in to ask their questions. That is what I am asking.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, I respect you a great deal; I think you know that, and different than a court of law that the judge ruled upon, you know, that there would not be the closing down of certainly the direct line of questioning on the first opportunity.

My last part will be, there was a meeting

scheduled December 11 of '06 between, I believe,
Mr. Donahue and the U.S. Attorney's Office, and that
was cancelled, and that was prior to your issuance
of the DeNaples license, and can you explain to the
Legislature, in writing if you need to, why that
meeting was cancelled?

MS. COLINS: Okay.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

MS. COLINS: Sir, you have asked me many, many questions all around what I consider to be an issue that is not as complicated as it's made to be.

The licensing process for Mount Airy occurred after our investigators presented to the board all of the information that we had, and in addition asked the State Police, who had written letters of agreement with us, whether or not they had any information or whether or not there were any issues we should know about before the licensing.

Now, that has been categorized as a rush to license. I beg to differ; it's not a rush to license. It was a request for information so that we could know whether in fact we were in a ready state to license. As a result of the information

received from the State Police, we believed we had everything necessary.

2.0

Now, you will notice if you read the letter from the State Police that they indicated specifically that we had as much information as we needed. What is very troubling to me is that there was specifically outlined a Federal court opinion by Judge Robreno of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania which empowered the State Police to request of the U.S. Attorney the opportunity to provide to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board relevant information should the judge determine that the best interests of the public would be served as a result of that.

There was no request made by the

Pennsylvania State Police to do that. There was a

mechanism in place. So one of two things occurred:

either they believed that it was not relevant, or in

fact they chose not to go through that avenue.

What we are doing is considering a proposal to offer that will enhance the ability of the State Police, of the Gaming Board, to work together in the future such that we can have in place by statute, if possible, the similar procedure where a law enforcement agency can request the Attorney General

1 to ask a judge of a competent jurisdiction to review 2 the information, to weigh it, to see if that specific information should go to a regulator. 3 That 4 is something that I think would strengthen the Commonwealth's ability to review all information 5 going forward. 6 7 But I truly believe that what is troubling here is not how the Gaming Board acted, it is not 8 how the State Police acted per se, but it is really 9 how this has been characterized as a misadventure in 10 11 licensing when in fact it was the Gaming Board's 12 efforts that were expended to get as much 13 information as possible, which were, for whatever reason, be it for good cause or not, were rebuked by 14 15 the State Police in this case. 16 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. 17 Thank you, Representative Reichley. 18 Representative Scott Petri. 19 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Mr. 2.0 Chairman. 21 Thank you, Madam Chairman, for appearing 22 today. 23 MS. COLINS: You are welcome. 24 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: I noticed in the

prepared remarks that there are some revisions in

25

the proposed licensing, that generally we have pushed back some of the dates or ratcheted down some of the projections on openings, including, it looks like, the Category 1 license that you talked about with Valley View now projected to open some time around January of 2010. Is that correct?

2.0

MS. COLINS: That's a projection at this time.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Given the fact that since this law has been enacted and as we have moved forward there have been so many unforeseen circumstances and we have continually ratcheted backward the schedule, should we not be looking to do the same with regard to the need for complement within the Gaming Control Board and in regard to projected revenues, including the crucial element of property tax relief?

MS. COLINS: Well, in terms of whether or not our projections now are perhaps not valid because of potential obstacles which might delay openings--- Is that what you are asking, sir?

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: I think we could all admit that standing here at this moment, nothing has proceeded at the speed that we projected or at the cost we projected. So my question is, why should we

believe as an appropriations body that the projections would continue as you are now projecting them, knowing that there are all these unforeseen circumstances that are going to come along, and if so, should we be considering ratcheting back the projections needed for additional staff in the Gaming Control Board and also in projected property tax relief for Pennsylvania taxpayers?

2.0

MS. COLINS: Well, with respect to staffing needs, we have taken the projections and ratcheted back in our staffing needs, actually. We have taken into consideration the delays in the openings of the casinos that will not be in this budget year, and we have cut back as a result of that. Those we have considered completely.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay.

MS. COLINS: With respect to projected revenues, we have also considered that as well. I believe that the fundamental underlying criteria for the budget have taken into account what we consider foreseeable delays.

Now, it's difficult to take into account the unforeseeable, but we have tried to put everything that is very realistic about what facilities will open and when and put that into this budget.

1 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Would you give the 2 Appropriations Committee some cautionary notes with regard to being too aggressive on release of 3 property tax relief, or do you think that the 4 projections are adequate? 5 6 MS. COLINS: I believe the projections are 7 adequate. REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: And that they are 8 sustainable? 9 MS. COLINS: I believe they are sustainable. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: So that if we 12 disburse the money that the Governor in the budget 13 contemplates, you feel that it will be sustainable year after year, including the following fiscal 14 15 year, not just this fiscal year? MS. COLINS: I do. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay. Well, you 18 know, there may be people on this side that rely on 19 that. 2.0 One final comment or question. How much is 21 the General Fund expected to augment for -- that's a 22 fancy way of saying "pay for" -- your operations 23 this year? 24 MS. McNULTY: There are no general funds 25 that support our budget. In fact, fines and

```
1
      penalties generated by our assessments against
 2
      licensees augment the General Fund.
              REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay. Well, let me
 3
 4
      ask it a different way: Will your operations be
      fully sustainable this year so that you will not
 5
 6
      need any money from any separate fund in order to
7
      pay for your anticipated expenses and complement?
              MS. McNULTY: Our budget anticipates a loan
8
      from the Property Tax Relief Reserve Fund. This is
9
      a reserve that is established in the event that
10
11
      projections do not materialize as anticipated.
12
      Reserve Fund is there regardless of the amount of
13
      property tax relief, so---
14
              REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: And how much are you
15
      seeking in this budget to borrow from the Reserve
16
      Fund?
17
              MS. McNULTY: $25.5 million.
18
              REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay. Thank you.
19
      have no further questions.
2.0
              CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                                Thank you.
21
              Representative Denlinger.
22
              REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Thank you, Mr.
23
      Chairman.
24
              Good morning.
25
              MS. COLINS: Good morning.
```

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: I want to follow up a little with Representative Petri's line of questioning there on the stability of revenues and your projections.

2.0

I do also appreciate Representative Reichley highlighting some deep concerns that I am hearing from constituents about the whole Mount Airy situation, and I do appreciate those questions as well.

But getting back to revenue streams, I am wondering, are you taking into account fluctuations in revenue based on new operations coming on line and those new ones competing with existing venues? I'll give you an example.

The Mohegan Sun at Pocono Downs facility was producing revenues averaging, an average monthly gross terminal revenue of \$16.7 million for the three months prior to the opening of Mount Airy, but after Mount Airy opened, those same gross terminal revenues decreased to \$12.96 million. So obviously there is not a never-ending supply of gamblers out there who will always go higher and higher in terms of what they are willing to spend.

Can you talk with us a little bit about those fluctuations of revenue, your system

internally of how you deal with that, because I think Representative Petri's comments about concerns that we have on the revenue stream are legitimate and deeply concerning. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. COLINS: All right. Well, we have taken into consideration the fluctuations in revenue. mean, within the gaming industry, those whom we have spoken to, and we have relied also on studies done by an outside consultant, Price Waterhouse Coopers, which has a hospitality and gaming department with a tremendous amount of expertise, and we have reached out to them when we conducted our projection studies in the licensing process, and there is no doubt that as all of the facilities, when all of the facilities come on board, there will be a leveling out of the revenue. And we based our projections on a study that considered the concept of a stabilized year, and that means revenues when all 14 operations are up and running, and our studies indicate that the revenue projections that we came up with are valid and in fact will be exceeded to a degree.

I also want to point out, too, that the success of Pennsylvania has really been well recognized. I mean, the New Jersey gaming industry has experienced a drop in their revenues which they

attribute directly to the Pennsylvania venues, and,
I mean, we don't have Philadelphia on line, we don't
have Sands Bethworks on line, which draw from
additional markets that feed into the New Jersey
gaming market. So I believe that when our other
facilities come on line, that we will enhance our
marketplace, and I believe our projections for a
stabilized year -- again, that is a year when all 14
are in operation -- will hold true.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: And one followup, if I may.

With the prospect that Maryland will also move into gaming, what is your expected impact from people not coming to Pennsylvania but staying in Maryland?

MS. COLINS: Well, I don't know that

Maryland is close to that yet. I know Kentucky, the

Governor of Kentucky, is talking about legislation

that is very similar to ours. But if in fact

Maryland were to come on line, we have considered

that, we did consider that in our initial studies,

and we do not think it impacts us to any degree.

Now, there would have been an impact on the license from Gettysburg had we awarded that license, but overall, we believe that Maryland, if they pass

1 that referendum in the fall, that we do not think it 2 will have a significant impact at this time. REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: 3 Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Ron Miller. REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: No; thank you, Mr. 5 6 Chairman. 7 Representative Barrar. REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Thank you, Mr. 8 Chairman. 9 10 I wanted to follow up on a couple of 11 questions that Representative Petri asked. We are 12 borrowing money to pay the cost of the Gaming 13 Commission at this point from the Property Tax Relief Fund. Why aren't the casinos paying, the 14 15 gaming licensees paying, the full cost at this 16 point? 17 MS. McNULTY: They are paying a portion of 18 the operating costs of the agencies, and at the 19 present time, that money is being disbursed to the

the operating costs of the agencies, and at the present time, that money is being disbursed to the State Police, the Department of Revenue, and the Attorney General's Office. The remainder is being funded by this loan, which the gaming licensees will begin to repay when all of them are up and running.

The reason for some to be paid currently and

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

some to be in the form of a loan that will be repaid

later is so that the entire cost of regulation is not borne by the first people to come on line but is shared by the licensees who will come on line at a later point.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: So currently, we are hearing from you that the current licensees are all doing much better because the other licensees aren't on board yet, but at the same point, there's a hesitancy in your commission to charge them the full cost of operating your commission because the rest of the board--- So on one hand they are doing better, but on the other hand are they complaining that if they have to pay the full cost, that it's unfair?

MS. McNULTY: The hesitancy is not on the part of our commission. We are not in charge of this. The withdrawal from these accounts to support the regulatory agencies is handled by the Department of Revenue. They are in charge of determining what the amount taken out of there is and who it goes to, and the Governor's budget recommended that we would be funded in the budget year from a loan from the Reserve Fund, and we are in support of that.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: What percentage is that that the licensees are being assessed at? At

this point, is there a percentage?

2.0

MS. McNULTY: Currently, they are calculating it based on 1 1/2 percent of gross terminal revenue.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Okay. Now, compared to other States that fund using this mechanism, is this pretty much in line with what other States are doing?

MS. McNULTY: I'm not aware of any other
State that uses this particular mechanism. Some
States have assessments against the fund where the
taxes from gaming go, and that is used to support
the regulatory agencies, but not as a direct charge
against the licensees.

Our budget is in line with similar States, such as New Jersey. They have a budget in the neighborhood of \$70 million for the combination of the Casino Control Commission and the Division of Gaming Enforcement, which is more than the combination of the three agencies that basically are involved in gaming regulation in Pennsylvania, whose budgets total about \$50 million.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is all I have.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

2.0

I would like to do something unusual this year and have, if we can kind of have the board move over a little bit and get some more chairs, I'm going to have the Executive Director of the Meadow's Standardbred Owners Association come to the table, Mr. Kim Hankins, and then Mr. Randy Bendis, the owner, come to the table, because what we are attempting to do is to invite citizens and community leaders to provide their perspective relating to a policy that was passed by this General Assembly in how exactly this policy has had input upon that particular industry.

We started out, when we started out gaming, we started out on the basis of helping the breeders and the racetracks on the basis of why we did what we did. So I'm asking some people who directly have been affected by this public policy exactly what it has meant in terms of employees, workforce, health care, anything that you can describe in terms of policy, because sometimes I think we miss why we do what we do in terms of a policy for average people, because we get kind of caught up in the minutia of the inside baseball. But I am interested in you all explaining to us, and particularly Meadow's

Standardbred, coming from my good friend, Tim's district out there, right? Fayette. Tim is happy about that. He is the Representative right over there. So can you tell us in a very specific way, as a result of this policy and what was passed here, talk to us about what it has meant.

MR. HANKINS: Okay. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and committee members.

2.0

My name is Kim Hankins. I'm the Executive Director of the Meadow's Standardbred Owners

Association. I thank you for the opportunity to come before you today to give our story.

The Meadow's Standardbred Owners Association is a trade association of 650 members comprised of owners, trainers, and drivers of harness horses in western Pennsylvania. We also represent the groom's interest who work for the trainers out there. There are several hundred grooms.

I have been in Pennsylvania for one year.

Previously I had worked in and for horsemen's associations for over 20 years in California and Illinois. From my previous experience in those States and a general knowledge of slots legislation nationwide, I can tell you that Act 71 is the most amazing piece of legislation ever created in regard

to the benefits of the horse racing industry.

2.0

First of all, the realization by the Pennsylvania State government that horse racing is deeply rooted in the agricultural business is quite evident throughout the bill.

Secondly, the divisions of slot revenue positively affect all aspects of racing, from the overnight purse accounts to the Pennsylvania Sire Stakes. The Pennsylvania Breeders Awards have all increased substantially, and we have created a retirement fund, a health and retirement fund, for drivers and trainers.

To give you an idea of how much money it has meant to us, the timelines of the last year in regard to purses, when I arrived in Pennsylvania in January, the purses were \$45,000 per night. In April, we had a pre-gaming loan from Millennium Gaming and from Magnum, our casino and track operators, to help us be competitive with the other tracks to be able to keep our horses at home, so that moved it up to \$65,000 a night. Then we opened the temporary casino June 11, and June through August 15, we went for \$85,000 per night.

August, September, and part of October, we took a break for demolition of the grandstand to

make way for our new permanent casino. During that break, the gaming purse account accumulated \$5.4 million. So since October 16 to the present, we are now racing for \$130,000 per night, almost triple what we were one year ago today.

2.0

Also, the pre-gaming loan and \$1.4 million overpayment have been satisfied and repaid. All of this is from a temporary facility. We expect to have another purse increase in May or June, and we look forward to a permanent casino opening in early 2009.

The act calls for 4 percent of the

Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund to be

dedicated to driver-trainer health and retirement

plans. We have recently implemented a new health

insurance plan that is subsidized by 50 percent.

Since driver-trainer earnings have increased, and

with the reduced premiums and better coverage that

we have provided, we have actually reduced the

enrollment of our members on Adult Care and the CHIP

Programs, thereby reducing State subsidies.

The 4-percent fund also generated enough capital to begin a new driver-trainer retirement plan to the tune of \$500,000 in 2007, and it is expected to almost double in 2008. These people

have worked hard all their lives and dedicated themselves to their horses and the horse industry. Most have never earned enough previously to put aside retirement dollars, so these are excellent things for our people. Being an administrator of those plans is one of my biggest joys.

2.0

Also, with the slots-induced purse increases, we will now be able to offer affordable health insurance to over 100 grooms, most of whom have no insurance and are on the CHIP or Adult Care Programs.

The infusion of the money has trickled down throughout the industry. When taking into consideration the drivers, trainers, grooms, farriers, veterinarians, equipment suppliers, feed suppliers, farm workers, and many others, the economic impact from horse racing in Pennsylvania is in the hundreds of millions and thousands of jobs. Also, horses are now being rested properly and receiving more therapeutic treatment because the owners and trainers can afford to do so.

Each month, I hear of more farms being purchased for breeding and training of horses. The Pennsylvania Sire Stakes and other county fair stakes have shown a dramatic increase and will

continue to improve as the track and casinos come on line.

On behalf of the board of directors and members of the MSOA, I thank you for the chance to speak with you this morning, and on behalf of the entire harness horse industry, I sincerely thank each and every legislator that created or supported Act 71.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

Mr. Bendis.

2.0

MR. BENDIS: Thank you, and good morning.

My name is Randy Bendis. I've been a standardbred horse trainer at the Meadows racetrack in Washington County for the past 30 years. Our business has been declining over the past 10 years. Without the gaming legislation, I fear we would have been out of business.

I'm going to touch on some of the same points that Kim did. A few will be a little different.

Since the slots started, our purses have doubled in many classes and have substantially increased in all classes.

Another subject is the horse ownership. We really lost a lot of people that were involved in

horse racing simply because they didn't feel they could make any money at the game, but we see a new influx of owners. I get phone calls weekly from people wanting to get into the business, and also the previous owners who had gotten out of the business are now coming back to harness racing.

2.0

Farms. The farms in the area are full, you know, that we use for our resting of our horses between races and for rehabilitation, and they are upgrading their facilities to take care of our horses.

Grooms and the backstretch employees. My employees, I was unable to give a raise to my employees for the past three years because my business was declining. This year, I gave all my employees a 25-percent raise, so I'm trying to catch up with what I wasn't able to do for them in the previous years.

In closing, I would just like to say that
Pennsylvania has three top-notch harness racing
facilities in the Meadows, Chester Downs, and Pocono
Downs, and it is widely held among all the trainers
in our industry that Pennsylvania is on the cusp of
becoming the leader in all of harness racing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Can I go back to Kim?

2.0

Kim, I would like to deal a little bit with the health-care issue, because that is a huge debate. It has cost implications relating to the State's budget. The Governor has talked about an initiative from his perspective. But what I heard you say is, as a result of Act 71. Can you go back over the numbers around health care, what that has meant in terms of taking it off the government's payroll and putting it onto privacy? Why don't you talk a little bit about, go back over those numbers again.

MR. HANKINS: Well, part of the Gaming Act and the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund are strictly set aside for health and retirement benefits for drivers, trainers, and their employees. This last year, it has generated about a half a million dollars, and what we have done is we have created a health insurance program that is highly subsidized and it has great coverage, so many people, I truly don't have a number, but several people that I know of that have gone off of the Adult Care Program, which is free, and the CHIP Program, which is, in my understanding, free also, but what they have been able to do since they are

making more money now and CHIP and Adult Care only cover so much, now they are able to afford a really good health insurance coverage. Even though it costs them 50 percent of the premium, they still can afford it now, and that is to all people in our business, you know, as it is with everybody. Health insurance is vital.

The retirement program in the past, it was very difficult for horsemen to gather enough money. Like Randy said, for the last 10 years we have been in a decline, and for them to show profits was tough enough and they wouldn't hardly ever be able to put money aside.

So what we have done is of the \$580,000 that was generated in 2005, we have designated \$500,000 of it for the retirement program of the drivers and trainers.

What it breaks down to is, we go by participation. If you participate to a certain extent, you get one point, if you participate twice as much as that, you get two points, all the way up to four points. And what it broke down to this year was, for half a year's income, the drivers with the top level and the drivers and trainers will have about \$5,000 to \$5,200 for their pension.

1 Hopefully next year with the new permanent 2 casino up and going, we will be able to double that. CHAIRMAN EVANS: Randy, you talked about you 3 haven't been able to give a raise in how many years? 4 MR. BENDIS: At least, oh, this was the first raise they received in about four years. 6 7 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Four years. And then you have been able to raise their salary, what, 25 8 9 percent? 10 MR. BENDIS: Yes. 11 CHAIRMAN EVANS: As a result of what, more 12 business? 13 MR. BENDIS: As a result of me being able to then raise my rates to charge the owners of the 14 15 horses, so then I could pass that along, you know, a 16 good percentage of that, to my help. 17 CHAIRMAN EVANS: What about in terms of the 18 health-care issues? The same thing as what Kim said 19 in terms of health care and things of that nature, 2.0 moving in that direction? 21 MR. BENDIS: I have not provided or we 22 didn't. I don't know of anybody, any self-employed 23 trainer, that has provided for their health care, but now with these new revenue streams, anything is 24 25 possible. I mean, we may be able to supplement

something, a 401k type thing, but really, it's been really impossible in getting from February 1 to February 29 in our business.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: So we do not have in Act 71 the Pennsylvania Gaming Board, the chairperson who is sitting next to you. You particularly and your industry could have maybe not been in existence, and I don't want to exaggerate and put words in your mouth, but you tell me what the health would have been like for you.

MR. BENDIS: Well, I know that, you know, for the past 10 years we have just got by on new revenues streams as far as--- It just seemed like we came up with revenue through different avenues just enough to tide us over until we got to this point but without, absolutely without, the slots. I know of many, many big-name racetracks out there in harness racing that face severe, serious problems.

CHAIRMAN EVANS. Yes.

MR. BENDIS: Some of the most successful.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Kim, you wanted to say

something?

2.0

MR. HANKINS: Yes.

In regard to, quote, "going out of business," there will always be people that race

horses. For the love of the horse, they will do anything to raise horses. But what it does is it increases the population of the horses, it increases the breeders, and we have a competition for racing with other States that have slots, like Delaware, like New York, like Ontario, and now Indiana. And so if we are not able to have big purses, those horses will go away and thereby the trainers will go away, thereby the jobs go away. So it is a big trickle-down effect that the purses drive the industry.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

2.0

Tim. Representative Mahoney.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: Thank you very much for attending today.

MR. HANKINS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: I go down past through the Meadows an awful lot, and in your opinion, what do you think the economic development around that area, with the gambling coming in, has it helped the Meadows as far as the crowds at your venture?

MR. HANKINS: Actually right now, because of the demolition of the grandstand, we have a temporary bedding facility, a simulcast facility,

that is called the Adios Room, and we don't have enough room, to be honest with you. It holds 250 people, but we are trying to get through this construction period. And the economic development around the area, obviously we have got the Tanger Outlet Malls there, we have got new hotels popping up here and there, and from my understanding, the property has skyrocketed through the roof in that area.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: And how far do you think that that spreads out, as far as, I mean, 10 miles around the area?

MR. HANKINS: Oh, I would say easily, and then if you take into consideration the new farms that are being purchased by trainers that never could previously do that, you know, even out to 30 miles.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: So raising the stakes and the purse has really brought that back again then, right?

MR. HANKINS: Yes. And like Randy said, you know, our owner investment, which are owners that are not trainers or drivers that invest in the business, that had dried up almost completely. The only people that would invest were people that

enjoyed getting their picture taken, because that was the only thing you could get back from harness racing at that point. Now we have got people of money that are looking at it, and when you go for \$130,000 a night, and just a for instance---

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: It makes it worthwhile.

2.0

MR. HANKINS: ---a horse that is of \$5,000 value races for \$5,000. I mean, it's unheard of anywhere in the country, you know, so it's a big increase and it's a big draw.

Right now we are trying to take care of our local horsemen first, and we have a preference system that takes care of those that have been there for years and years, and we are trying to take care of them through a certain time period so that the big stables don't scoop in and take all of the money and they haven't had a chance to improve themselves, whether through their stock, whether their income, however you want to put it. But we feel strongly that they should get the first two-year start before we allow the big stables in.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: On site at the Meadows, how many people are employed through the horse trade? Do you have that number?

MR. HANKINS: Employed. If you consider trainers, I would say over a thousand. We have 650 members, the majority are trainers and drivers, and I would say, you know, there are another 200 to 300 grooms. So somewhere around a thousand people.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: That's impressive.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: I want to sincerely thank both of you for coming here to testify, because I think, as I said earlier, sometimes as a body we kind of get lost in what I consider the minor. You bring it back home to us when you talk about a thousand people, you talk about health care, you talk about increasing people's salaries. I mean, it is all about helping people. It's not about us, but it is about helping people. But I want to sincerely thank you for taking your time.

And, Madam Chairperson/Madam Judge, I want to thank you for what you do. I know it's not easy, but we really are a lovable group. I know you can see that, but I want to thank you and the members of the commission for coming before us to testify. I greatly appreciate this.

This hearing is now adjourned for the next hearing, the Attorney General. We will take a

```
1
       five-minute break.
 2
                Thank you very much.
 3
 4
               (The hearing concluded at 10:40 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Jean M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public