COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GAMING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

STATE CAPITOL HARRISBURG, PA

IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G-50

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2016 9:00 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON H.R. 619
SPORTS BETTING

BEFORE:

HONORABLE JOHN PAYNE, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE ROSEMARY BROWN

HONORABLE RUSS DIAMOND

HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR

HONORABLE AARON KAUFER

HONORABLE KATE ANNE KLUNK

HONORABLE RYAN MACKENZIE

HONORABLE TEDD NESBIT

HONORABLE JASON ORTITAY

HONORABLE DAVID PARKER

HONORABLE PAUL SCHEMEL

HONORABLE RYAN WARNER

HONORABLE NICK KOTIK, DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE TINA DAVIS

HONORABLE DANIEL DEASY

HONORABLE MARTY FLYNN

HONORABLE WILLIAM KORTZ, II

HONORABLE MARK ROZZI

* * * * *

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT MATZIE
COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:
JOSIAH SHELLY
MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

I N D E X

TESTIFIERS
* * *
<u>NAME</u> <u>PAGE</u>
REPRESENTATIVE ROB MATZIE PRIME SPONSOR OF H.R. 6195
SARA RAYME SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AMERICAN GAMING ASSOCIATION
SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY
* * *
(See submitted written testimony and handouts online.)

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Good morning. I'd like
4	to call the House Gaming Oversight Committee public hearing
5	to order. We'll stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.
6	
7	(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)
8	
9	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Can I have a roll call,
10	please?
11	
12	(Roll was taken.)
13	
14	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you. Chairman
15	Kotik, comments?
16	DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN KOTIK: Good morning,
17	everyone. I just welcome everyone to this hearing. I'm
18	glad to see my colleague, Representative Matzie, bringing
19	his resolution to the Committee in addition to the
20	legislation I've been introducing to legalize sports
21	betting in Pennsylvania.
22	I think this is an issue that would be very
23	productive for maintaining the viability of the casinos
24	here in Pennsylvania and also maintaining the gaming
25	industry in Pennsylvania because, as we know, well, we've

seen the example of Atlantic City, and we keep reiterating
that over and over that if we don't keep the gaming
industry competitive, we could fall prey to the same ills
that Atlantic City has experienced.

So I look forward to the hearing today, the testimony that we're going to receive, and any questions that anyone might have from the Committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With that, Representative Matzie, it's all yours.

REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: Good morning, Chairman
Payne, Chairman Kotik, Members, and guests. My name is
State Representative Rob Matzie. I represent the 16th
Legislative District in Beaver and Allegheny Counties. I'm
the prime sponsor of House Resolution 619, a resolution
urging Congress to lift the Federal ban on sports betting.

I'd like to thank Chairman Payne and Chairman

Kotik for holding this hearing today, and I'd be remiss if

I didn't thank you for your service to the General

Assembly, both of you announcing you'll be departing next

year. You'll both be missed.

Sports betting, or sports book, in the United

States totals an estimated \$400 billion per year, with only

1 percent taking place in legal form, according to study.

Fantasy sports betting draws in an estimated 57 million participants. The reality is that not only has the perception of sports betting changed over the years, but the ways in which to participate in some form of sports betting has greatly increased. Simply put, people are wagering on sports every day, in many different ways. The vast majority, however, are not doing it legally.

But not only has public perception changed, so has the opinion of some of the major sports leagues that have traditionally opposed the legalization of sports betting. National Basketball Association Commissioner Adam Silver has come out in favor of federally legalizing sports betting. Major League Baseball Commissioner Rob Manfred has acknowledged how society's views on gambling have evolved and is open to "fresh consideration" of baseball's official position on the issue, this in addition to the flurry of partnerships in the area of fantasy sports betting between the major North American sports leagues and the two largest daily fantasy sports entities DraftKings and FanDuel.

In July of last year, DraftKings secured \$300 million in funding that included investment from Major

League Baseball, the National Hockey league and Major

League Soccer, as well as the Madison Square Garden

Company, which owns the New York Knicks, New York Rangers,

and Legends Hospitality, a joint venture by the New York Yankees and Dallas Cowboys.

FanDuel secured its own \$275 million round of financing that included investment from the NFL and the NBA. And as of July 2015, the company had exclusive partnerships with 16 NFL teams and 13 NBA teams, while DraftKings has deals with 27 Major League Baseball clubs.

Currently, the United States Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act of 1992 bans sports betting, allowing only Nevada, Oregon, Montana, and Delaware to legally wager on sports. To date, only Nevada and Delaware have chosen to participate. Over the past few years, the State of New Jersey has challenged this law twice and lost. That didn't deter a number of other States -- Indiana, Minnesota, New York, South Carolina, Texas, and Representative Kotik's legislation here in Pennsylvania -- from introducing bills to legalize wagering just this past year. But, if passed, it's likely those laws will meet the same fate as New Jersey's.

It seems clear that the only way forward is to have the Federal law revised or repealed. To that end, in January of 2015, New Jersey Congressmen Frank Pallone and Frank LoBiondo introduced two bipartisan bills that would allow other States to gain exemptions from the law.

Pallone's legislation would exempt New Jersey from the

current Federal ban on sports betting, while LoBiondo's would create a four-year window in which all States could enact laws providing for sports betting in their State.

There has yet to be any action on either of these bills.

2.2

I believe that States already authorizing, licensing, and regulating casino gaming are uniquely positioned to implement sports betting in all its forms if they so choose. In Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development and Gaming Act has created more than 16,000 living wage jobs and produced more than \$9 billion in revenues. It's been undeniably an overwhelming success. It has demonstrated our ability to proficiently and responsibly oversee gaming in our Commonwealth.

The time has come for the Federal Government to allow the States to make their own decisions on sports betting.

And I would be remiss if I didn't remark, as a staff member in the Senate, when we passed legislation to allow for casino gaming, and as a Member of this Committee when we passed the legislation to allow for table games, listening to testimony from throughout the State, we made the decision, and I think we should have that same opportunity when it comes to sports betting.

Again, I'd like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to appear today, and my testimony was short and

sweet. I think it's a pretty cut-and-dried piece of legislation from a resolution's perspective. I would welcome any questions. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you. And I want to point out that Representative Diamond, Deasy, and Klunk have joined the hearing.

Questions? Representative Parker.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, in a lot of work environments and other places, people have their March Madness pools and various pools for sports, so under the current Federal ban, those are illegal?

REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: Well, technically, with what we've done in Pennsylvania from what I understand -- and please interject with your staff, Chairman Payne, relative to the small games of chance and some other legislation that we've done in recent history -- some of the pools that now occur, whether they're legal or not, I think the folks that are supposed to look at that maybe turn the other way. I don't know. Staff --

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: I'll let Josiah --

MR. SHELLY: When the pools provision was put in the Small Games of Chance Act, there's language in there that says that the pools have to comply with PASPA, so PASPA is a barrier for our clubs having pools that are

1 related to sports.

2 REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Do you know what the 3 Federal law says about it?

MR. SHELLY: I don't know. [inaudible].

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Okay.

MR. SHELLY: [inaudible].

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Oh, okay. Then I'll wait. Yes.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Representative Kortz?

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Representative, for bringing this to the Committee.

The Federal law in 1992 that carved out these four States -- you mentioned Nevada, Oregon, Montana, and Delaware -- any idea why Oregon and Montana have decided not to get into the sports betting?

REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: It was interesting in researching that there were four States that were exempted and why they were exempted. They were grandfathered because they had some form of sports betting laws already on the books. As for why Oregon and Montana have not stepped up, I can't answer that question. Maybe our next testifier can, but I think it's something that I as a policymaker, if I were a legislator in that State and had active casino gaming, that's something I would look at,

quite frankly. But I'm not really sure why,
Representative.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Representative Diamond.

REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Matzie, thanks for your testimony.

Can you differentiate, the ban does not include any

activity as far as fantasy sports, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: Yes, in the Fantasy

Sports Trade Association from the information that we've been able to come up with in estimating what they are doing, we're starting to see some States, including what New York has done -- and I know you folks have had some hearings and had some discussion about what's going on with the fantasy sports -- I think that speaks to what I'm trying to do. If in fact we're able to do this sports betting, I think it would be an opportunity to do a good piggyback potentially with Representative Dunbar's legislation, include that into a whole ball of wax, whether it's an omnibus bill or not, to allow for something to be on the books from a policy perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: And can you speak at all to the nature of the lawsuits that New Jersey has filed?

Is that like a States' rights kind of lawsuit? On what

1 legal basis --REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: They had bills --2 3 REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: -- did they ask for a 4 ruling to differentiate? 5 REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: They had bills, and in 6 fact, from what I understand and the information I've been 7 able to ascertain, the NFL was actually one of the folks that fought against the bill and actually took it to court. 8 9 So it was actual legislation that actually went through the 10 court system and it was struck down using the law we're 11 trying to get repealed as the basis. 12 REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: Okay. Thank you. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Okay. Thank you. 14 REPRESENTATIVE MATZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Next, we have Sara 16 Rayme, who's the Senior Vice President of Public Affairs, 17 American gaming Association. Sara, thank you. MS. RAYME: Good morning. Thank you. Thank you 18 19 for having me here this morning. 20 Number one, I just want to thank you guys. 21 think that Pennsylvania has done a tremendous job at 22 ensuring that the gaming program here remains competitive with the new competition that's coming, and I think you 23

guys have done a tremendous job doing that, staying ahead

of the curve, ensuring that our operators in the State

24

25

continue to remain successful.

2.2

Again, I'm Sara Rayme, Senior Vice President of
Public Affairs at the American Gaming Association. The AGA
is the national trade organization that represents the
casino gaming industry, including commercial, tribal,
gaming suppliers and manufacturers as well.

Just to kind of give you an overview of the industry itself, we're a \$240 billion industry. We're actually larger than the airline industry at this point in time. We support 1.7 million jobs and also pay \$38 billion in taxes every year.

And I applaud Representative Matzie and his resolution. The AGA would stand in full support that if you guys were to enact it. He really kind of stole my thunder talking a lot about PASPA, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you guys had.

I can just quickly kind of run through the presentation that I put together. There are really two Federal statutes that govern sports betting, the first one being the PASPA, which is the resolution that you guys are talking about adopting; and then the second one being the Wire Act. And what the Wire Act does is it would not permit sports betting from occurring online, whereas PASPA, if it were to be overturned, would enable there to be a national legalized sports betting regime in brick-and-

mortar facilities, so an important distinction. So if PASPA were overturned and the Wire Act were not to be overturned, you could not bet on sports online.

2.2

When we look at the landscape, and I know that Representative Matzie had talked about this a little bit, some of the States that were grandfathered in back in 1992, this was really an initiative by the leagues, by the professional sports leagues and the amateur sports leagues — the NCAA — to prohibit betting on sports. But at that time there were four States that did have legal sports betting occurring: Nevada, which is the only State that still is able to offer the full suite of games being bet in the State; then Delaware, Montana, and Oregon.

And I think someone had asked about why Montana and Oregon no longer offer the sports betting. My understanding was that the NCAA had asked them not to because they were not going to play games in their State if they did that, and so they said fine, we won't do it.

What's important to understand is that Nevada is the only State that has the full breadth of a sports book. These other States have very, very, very small sort of machinations of sports betting that's allowed.

Later last year, the American Gaming Association did adopt a new position, which was on the issue of PASPA in sports betting, which was to look and define the problem

around the current existing market that there is currently a \$4-500 billion illegal sports betting market taking place right now. We believe upwards of 80 to 90 percent of the illegal online gambling is actually around sports betting.

And in 2016 we would act sort of as the champion for this issue, that we would speak to stakeholders, get their input, stakeholders meaning law enforcement, the professional sports leagues, talk to them. Obviously, there has been a shift in position as of late, the NBA being one of the biggest ones, Commissioner Silver coming out and saying that they would be in support of a Federal legalized sports betting regime.

And then lastly, just a primary educator, being able to be here today to talk about the issues, to answer any questions that you guys have is certainly a role that we want to play.

So with that, I will stop talking and I will answer any questions that you guys have.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you very much.

Let me recognize Representative Dunbar and Representative

Rozzi have joined the hearing.

Questions? Representative Kortz.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Rayme, for your testimony.

Question for you on the Federal level. The

Congressman Frank Pallone and Frank LoBiondo have the legislation out there. Do they have a lot of cosponsors on that legislation? Does it seem to be picking up steam?

Are we getting anywhere with it I guess is what I'm asking?

MS. RAYME: That's a good question. I think 2016 is going to be a tough year to get anything done on this issue specifically. And that's kind of the strategy that we're playing out. In order to really move something through, you really have to have the leagues at the table. This legislation when it was crafted back in 1992, it was really to "protect" them. We do think that there's a shift in their position on that issue. So I would say that this is probably going to be a three- to five-year proposition.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. RAYME: However, I will add, New Jersey, there is obviously this pending case before New Jersey right now -- excuse me, the Third Circuit that New Jersey has brought on sports betting. The Third Circuit has agreed to hear the case en banc, which means that they would have all the judges there to rule on it again.

What would happen is if the court were to rule in favor of New Jersey, you would essentially have unregulated sports betting occurring in the State, and I do think that that could be an impetus then for Congress to take action because, essentially, you would saying, okay, unregulated

sports betting is now legal, which would cause, I think, some concern.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you.

MS. RAYME: You're welcome.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Representative Dunbar.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just out of curiosity, you had mentioned how some of the established leagues are starting to get on board, the NBA, I assume the NHL as well. The leagues that aren't as well established and have a strong fan base, they seem to be supportive of this. And it always seems like the catch is the NFL and MLB. In your expertise, do you think they're getting anywhere near that they're willing to look at this? It always seems like the NFL was always the one that stops this? Is that the case?

MS. RAYME: Certainly, I couldn't speak on their behalf. I read, like everyone else does, what they say. It does seem that I think the issue of daily fantasy sports has certainly put a spotlight on the larger issue of gambling, and I think the leagues have had to kind of look at their positions and reassess where they may be. The indication I have had is that I don't think that the NFL has changed their position yet. I think that they very much hold true to a belief that a legalized sports betting regime would somehow hurt the integrity of the game. I

think that we would disagree with that, and we intend on proving why that is actually not the case.

When you look at the U.K. model -- they've had legalized sports betting for close to 20 years at this point -- the reason why they did that was to prevent match fixing with their football. And what they do is essentially collect all the big data, they look for irregular betting that's occurring, and then they report it to the regulatory body and say we think that there could be something suspicious going on.

When you have a huge illegal vast black sports betting market that no one knows what's going on, it's obviously harder to detect when someone could be taking money for the game. So we would advocate by having a fair, transparent, open process that people are actually able to see when bets are placed, look for irregularities. You're actually going to be able to track when the integrity of the game is compromised versus what's happening right now.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And you had mentioned in the U.K. where sports betting is legal, as well as internet gaming is legal all across Europe, which I don't know why we're so far behind but that's a question for a different hearing I guess, when they established legalized sports gaming, do you know -- you had mentioned earlier -- I can't remember the exact number -- of how much illegal sports

betting is going on. Do you know once they established it as legal there, did they eliminate the illegal activities? Was there a sudden increase in people participating? Or was it just shifting from illegal to legal?

MS. RAYME: That's a very good question. My understanding was that in all the European countries there are different regulatory models as it pertains to online gambling, and I think that there has been some challenges with the tax rates and sort of the regulatory model. For example, I think Italy has a very stringent sort of regulatory model in place that doesn't exactly attract the player to go play legally versus just continuing to play illegally online.

So I think your question about did the illegal activity cease to happen after you legalized online gambling is a good one. I couldn't speak sort of in depth about that, but my general understanding was, because there wasn't sort of a one-size-fits-all in Europe, that it would probably be hard to make that determination, but it's something that we can certainly look into and get back to you about.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And the only reason I ask is because the naysayers are going to say, oh, you're just looking for an expansion of gaming. I support Representative Matzie's legislation, and I don't see it as

an expansion of gaming to tell you the truth. I just see it as being a shift from an illegal activity to a legal activity. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Representative Klunk.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
and thank you for joining us today.

I have two questions. The first question goes to Delaware came in a little bit later to the sports betting game than Nevada, is that correct?

MS. RAYME: No.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: No?

MS. RAYME: From what I understand, in 1992 when PASPA was enacted, all the States that had had sports betting already occurring were just grandfathered into statute.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Okay. Grandfathered in.

I guess my question then is when you look at Nevada, they have a pretty wide range of sports betting activities for pro and college sports, can be placed in person, on interstate mobile account wagering systems, and includes single games. Now, Delaware, they require the parlay wagering on NFL games only, and then it's the minimum of the outcome of three games, which is very, very specific. So can you talk a little bit about Delaware's decision in going just to NFL, why they chose that, and does that

really go towards ensuring the integrity of the betting?

And is that more of the trend, to be more focused to prevent fixing?

MS. RAYME: So I think, again, when PASPA was enacted back in 1992, they sort of looked at the landscape to see where sports betting was already occurring. In the State of Delaware that was the niche sort of product that they had had at that time. So that was what they were able to continue to do then after PASPA was adopted. I couldn't speak on their behalf or I don't know sort of the history and why they didn't change at that point in -- or if they had time to change and offer more products, why they didn't do it, why they just picked this one little niche product. But they obviously continue to use it. From what I understand, it is relatively small in comparison to the larger sort of gaming suite of products in their revenue base, but it is something that they do still offer.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Okay. And then my followup to that is in these States where this is occurring, so

Delaware and Nevada really are the two biggies, is there
any data that they have been able to collect that there is
integrity within these betting systems and that there isn't
fixing of games? And have they been able to see any trends
from that standpoint like what is happening in the U.K.
right now with their sports betting?

MS. RAYME: Yes, that's a really good question.

I think Nevada, again, because they do have that full suite, they have the NCAA, they have NFL, they have NHL, they have MLB, they have the sports books, people go. They also have a mobile online app where people can place bets as well. I worked very closely in partnership with the FBI whenever they do see something irregular. They work very closely with their Gaming Control Board as well to make sure that they're aware when they see irregular bets being placed or, you know, maybe some sort of nefarious activity to make sure that the proper law enforcement agencies are aware of what's happening.

Clearly, that is just one State that that is happening so it's not the big sort of data I think that we would hope to achieve at some point in time, but I would say that anecdotally there are some really powerful stories about how Nevada sports book operators have worked in tandem with law enforcement to identify when irregular betting has occurred.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Representative Schemel.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEMEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for your testimony.

Just so that I'm clear, on the States that legalized or the proposals that are there, is this limited to professional? Or what States include collegiate in the

betting pools?

MS. RAYME: So right now, obviously no State can legalize sports betting just given the Federal statute, that it's now not allowed. But when this was adopted back in 1992, Nevada did have sports betting on collegiate games, and so therefore, when they were grandfathered in, they were able to keep that piece of it.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEMEL: Okay. And are there proposals, then, that would allow sports betting on collegiate games as well?

MS. RAYME: So at a Federal level I think that what they had talked about was the -- that Congressman Pallone had introduced legislation then that would overturn PASPA, I think that's the only one right now in Congress that would potentially look at repealing the bill or amending the bill to allow for sports betting on collegiate games. But there really hasn't been more discussion about that, and that's why our association has taken the standpoint that we really do need to work in partnership and in tandem with the leagues to kind of identify a solution together.

I know the NCAA has been very adamantly opposed to gambling. They've been very adamantly opposed to daily fantasy sports. So, again, I can't speak on their behalf, but I wouldn't imagine that their position would change.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEMEL: You mentioned legalized sports betting in Europe. I don't know how familiar you are with it. I'm not familiar at all. But I wonder if you've noticed that it changes the dynamics of -- I don't know if they have the equivalent to the draft or the way that they hire professional athletes. Does it favor large cities? Does it disfavor smaller communities? What impact has it had on the overall play of sports in those countries?

MS. RAYME: I could only speak on what my perception is, and that obviously football in the U.K. is a huge sport. People are very engaged. I think that when you ask them about our sports betting regime and market, they think it's sort of silly that we don't do it. It's sort of a part of their culture. You have sports book operations pretty much on every single corner. You have gaming companies that are able to advertise on the uniforms. It's just sort of part of their culture. There's a company Betfair. They do these sort of fun proposition bets.

So people, they enjoy it. They really see it as part of the game. I honestly don't think it's much different than probably opinions of U.S. consumers either, but I couldn't really speak to whether or not that's driven more business in smaller or bigger cities.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEMEL: And one last question in regard to the casino industry, do you believe that sports betting will draw additional clients to the casinos or does it just give people that already go to the casinos additional products on which to bet?

MS. RAYME: A great question, and one that our organization contemplated as we had this discussion with our members, and a lot of the people that we represent are Nevada-based operators, and you would think, well, you've got a monopoly; you would be opposed to something like this. They're not at all because the sports better tends to be higher average income, they tend to, when they go to the casino, yes, they'll go place a sports bet but they're going to go play roulette, they're going to go play the slots, they're going to go play poker. So they see it as an additive. They see it as another sort of opportunity to draw a consumer into the brick-and-mortar facility and then have them play other games or be a patron of other restaurants or whatever else within the facility.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEMEL: Thank you.

MS. RAYME: You're welcome.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: I want to recognize
Representative Warner and Representative Davis have joined
us.

Chairman Kotik?

DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN KOTIK: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Sara, for your

testimony today. It's been very enlightening.

2.2

I think what Representative Matzie and I are trying to accomplish is we're trying to position

Pennsylvania -- I can remember 10, 15, 20 years ago there were only two placed you could go to before. You could go to Las Vegas or you could go to Atlantic City. And Governor Rendell had the foresight and the initiative to push through casino gaming, and it's brought a lot of revenue into the Commonwealth.

And I think Pennsylvania has to be ahead of the curve. We have to be positioned. We don't know if this is going to happen. We don't know if it's going to end up before the United States Supreme Court. But Pennsylvania should be proactive in positioning itself so that if and when this does happen, we're not going to be behind the curve and all the other States that are looking at this issue are ahead of us.

We were ahead of the curve when we established the casino law and we established the casinos in Pennsylvania, and we've been proactive. And that's what I think John and I are trying to promote with the Committee is that we're proactive, we're ahead of the curve.

This may not happen. We don't know. We don't

1 know what a future Congress is going to do, we don't know 2 what a future Supreme Court is going to do, but let's be 3 ready in the event that it does happen so that we can be on 4 the forefront of enacting legislation in this Commonwealth 5 to get it done so we're not lagging when we should be 6 leading. 7 So thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: No, thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. 10 Sara, I'd like to do a couple follow-ups. 11 Representative Klunk brought up a good point about Nevada 12 and the regulations and whether there's some undercurrent 13 maybe going on in betting, how that's picked out and stuff. 14 I want to kind of flip the tables on that. At least they 15 have a system in place to know that. 16 MS. RAYME: Yes, exactly. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: We have no system. 18 MS. RAYME: Right. 19 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: And there are people 20 who believe, well, we don't need a system because it's not 21 going on. I don't believe that's true. Could you --22 MS. RAYME: Yes. No, I would agree with your characterization. Certainly, there have been estimates, as 23 24 I said, \$4-500 billion illegal sports betting that's

happening right now in the shadows, in the dark that people

25

don't know, they're not tracking. Obviously, that presents a problem from a consumer standpoint but also a problem from the integrity of the game piece. And I think bringing it out into the sunshine and being able to see and track when irregularity is happening.

I think at the heart of our industry is regulation. We embrace that. We understand why it needs to be there. It provides integrity not only to the casino but also to the consumer. So I couldn't agree with you more.

And I do just want to reiterate, again, I think that Pennsylvania, you guys have done a tremendous job at being forward-looking, and I think that, as I've said to other people, the competition among casinos is no longer just limited to the operators; it's now about the States. And whoever can present the most favorable sort of gaming environment is going to win because there's a lot more competition that's come online. You guys have seen that with Maryland, with West Virginia, with Ohio, and I think you are very smart to try and stay ahead of the curve and ensure that the operators are able to continue to grow and reinvest.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: And you walked right into my second question --

MS. RAYME: Oh.

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: -- which goes, as we talked about previously, Jersey has just announced that they're going to go on the ballot for question for the voters to allow two casinos in northern New Jersey. One of the things that Nick and I, when we first became chairmen, was to go out to all of our casinos and ask them what is it that we could do to help you. It's a novel approach, I guess, in government, but I spent 30 years in the private sector and we normally would go to our customers and ask our customers what is it we can do to help you? And we had lots of feedback at 26 hearings that we did in about 10 months. And I want to now spend this year following up on that feedback and initiating some of those things that they've asked for.

We know the pressure from the surrounding States is only going to get worse, and I believe in my heart if we don't do something to protect our Pennsylvania casinos, just like we ate Atlantic City's lunch, they're going to be after us to eat our lunch. I mean, we know Inner Harbor's going to open, we know Washington is going to have one, we already know Ohio has affected our casinos in the western part of the State. I can't imagine two large casinos in northern New Jersey would be good for Pennsylvania casinos. Could you follow up on that?

MS. RAYME: Yes. Again, I just think it goes to

-- number one, I think that gaming is a mainstream form of entertainment. We've done our own surveying. Nine out of ten people, voters believe that it's acceptable. People don't have a problem with it. They see the tremendous amount of economic benefits and the jobs that it creates. And so while this has happened, then you start to see States embrace it more, be more comfortable with having casinos, and I think that's just going to continue.

And New Jersey is a great example. They're going to make a lot of money. Why wouldn't you put two casinos up north? I mean, you're going to be closer to Manhattan. So on their part I think it's smart. And I think that, again, I applaud you for staying abreast of sort of what's happening around you and not just within the borders of Pennsylvania or Ohio or West Virginia and being smart and thinking about how you guys can remain competitive. So I think that's all good.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you. And I have one last question, but I've got to recognize Representative Mackenzie has joined us. We talked about the internet and online and online sports betting and online poker, and Representative Dunbar has more knowledge on this than I do, but we do have a bill to regulate internet gaming. And the reason for that is it's occurring right now unregulated, much like the sports betting is. What's your read across

- 1 the U.S. on the internet gaming? And it's growing, and I
- 2 know Jersey started it first here on the East Coast.
- 3 They've struggled in the beginning, but they seem to have
- 4 got their act together and are really doing very well.
- 5 MS. RAYME: Yes. So from the Association's
- 6 standpoint just sort of full disclosure, we do have members
- 7 that are on both sides of this issue, and so we have taken
- 8 a neutral position on the issue of internet gaming. Right
- 9 now, what you've seen is you have obviously Nevada,
- Delaware, and New Jersey with legalized online gambling.
- 11 As you noted, I think New Jersey obviously has done fairly
- well with that. They have offered more games. I think why
- 13 they have been successful is because of their liquidity.
- 14 They have more people that can play versus a Nevada or a
- 15 Delaware with just a smaller sort of population. In
- 16 addition, Nevada is only offering online poker at this
- 17 point, so they have a very sort of small scale of people
- that are playing and then games that are offered.
- I think that you are starting to see more
- 20 discussion clearly. Pennsylvania has been one of the
- 21 States. New York is another one. I think it's talked
- about in California as well. Some of these bigger States,
- I think they could generate some substantial revenue from
- 24 | it. So we'll see what happens.
- I think it is an ongoing debate about consumer

1	protections, and honestly, I don't think it's dissimilar
2	than probably what people talked about before brick-and-
3	mortar casinos were in 40 States. So I think it's a
4	healthy discussion for you guys to have, and I think that
5	hearing both sides of that debate and looking at the
6	consumer protection piece, again, is a wise move.
7	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Thank you. Thanks for
8	testifying today.
9	MS. RAYME: You're welcome. Thank you.
10	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: Any final questions?
11	Chairman Kotik?
12	DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN KOTIK: Nothing.
13	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN PAYNE: All right. This
14	hearing is adjourned. Thank you very much.
15	MS. RAYME: Thank you very much.
16	
17	(The hearing concluded at 9:37 a.m.)

1	I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
2	are a true and accurate transcription produced from audio
3	on the said proceedings and that this is a correct
4	transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Christy Snyder
8	Transcriptionist
9	Diaz Transcription Services