1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
2				
3		GAMING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE		
4		PARX RACING GRANDSTAND, COTILLION ROOM 3001 STREET ROAD		
5		BENSALEM, PA		
6		WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2017 1:57 P.M.		
7		PUBLIC HEARING		
8				
9	BEFORE:	HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE GENE DIGIROLAMO		
10		HONORABLE JEFF C. WHEELAND		
11		HONORABLE JAMES R. SANTORA HONORABLE THOMAS L. MEHAFFIE, III		
12		HONORABLE FRANK A. FARRY HONORABLE PATRICK J. HARKINS, MINORITY CHAIRMAN		
13		HONORABLE EDWARD NEILSON HONORABLE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI		
14		HONORABLE SID MICHAELS KAVULICH HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY		
15		HONORABLE DOM COSTA		
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
_ 3				

1					
2					
3	LEA D. FARRELL LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT				
4	THOMAS MILLER RESEARCH ANALYST				
5	JOSIAH SHELLY				
6	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HOUSE GAMING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CAUCUS				
7	CHRISTOPHER J. KING				
8	COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR				
9					
10	ALSO PRESENT:				
11	SENATOR ROBERT TOMLINSON				
12	BOB GREEN, Chairman, Greenwood Racing				
13	TONY RICCI, Chief Executive Officer, Greenwood Racing				
14 15	Horsemen's Association				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

1	INDEX				
2	ODENING DEMADES				
3	OPENING REMARKS By Chairman Petri	4 - 5			
4	PRESENTATION By Bob Green	5 - 7			
5	By Representative DiGirolamo	8 - 11			
6	ROLL CALL	11 - 14			
7	OPENING REMARKS By Chairman Harkins	14			
8	PRESENTATION				
9	By Brian Hessenthaler By Mayor DiGirolamo	15 - 18 18 - 22			
10	By Robert White By Representative Farry	22 - 25 26 - 30			
11	QUESTIONS	30 - 44			
12		30 - 41			
13	PRESENTATION By Tony Ricci	44 - 62			
14	QUESTIONS	62 - 79			
15	PRESENTATION By Sal DeBunda	79 - 91			
16	by bar bebuilda	70 01			
17	QUESTIONS	91 - 106			
18	CLOSING REMARKS By Chairman Petri	106			
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
-					

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going

to --- I'm going to call this public hearing of the

Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Gaming Oversight meeting

for April 12th, 2017, 2:00 p.m., located at Parx Casino,

Bensalem, to order.

The first order of business, our firefighter,

Representative Frank Farry, if you would lead us in the Pledge

of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

<u>CHAIRMAN PETRI:</u> I want to thank everyone for attending.

The members will recall that during the Governor's Budget Address he tasked our legislature with the responsibility of trying to come up with some money to fill budget holes, and particularly to come up with recurring revenue.

The Governor never addressed and told us what we should do. He left that to our, hopefully, sound thoughts and discretion about what we will do or not do in order to help fill those budget holes.

This hearing is a series of hearings. And for the members in the audience, the committee has already had a hearing in Harrisburg, there's been a hearing in Erie, and we've had site visits to Harrah's and also to Sands Casino.

We're now at Parx Casino in Bensalem. The committee will also soon be traveling to other parts, including Mount Airy and a couple of the casinos in the Pittsburgh area.

So with that, I want to recognize our host today, who is Bob Green, Chairman of Greenwood Racing, and our host, State Representative, our good friend and colleague, Gene DiGirolamo, for some opening comments. Mr. Chairman, you may proceed when ready.

MR. GREEN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the House Gaming Oversight Committee, we would like to welcome you with great pleasure to Parx Racing and Casino.

I'd also like to extend a warm welcome to Senator

Tomlinson and Representative Gene DiGirolamo. As you know,

they have been staunch supporters of the state's gaming

industry and were instrumental in the passage of historic Bill

2330, commonly known as the Slots Bill.

And just last night I was looking through a few old photographs and there was one that was taken just outside here in the entry at the grandstand. It was a bright, sunny Monday morning. The date was Monday, July the 5th, 2004. And in the early hours of that same morning the Slots Bill had passed the House and the Senate and the Governor's Office wanted the signing of that bill to take place here at the racetrack known as Philadelphia Park at that time.

And the photograph shows a table set out in the

open. There were people here watching the training of horses. It was obviously historic ---. So anyway, this table was set up, and the photograph shows the Governor signing the bill and on one side of him is Senator Tomlinson, on the other Representative DiGirolamo. On the other side of him is myself, Mr. Sal DeBunda and Mayor Joe. I'm pleased to tell you that all five of us are here today. I think we're still alive and kicking, as they say. And I was to understand the ex-Governor would be here, but he had apparently an important luncheon at the Capital Grille in Philadelphia.

On a serious note, at that time and on that moment who could have envisioned the phenomenal industry that is here today? But the truth is we did. We testified to that administration that if that bill was passed, we would produce --- the program, over \$1 billion in tax revenue. We would create 15,000 to 30,000 new jobs. We would spur capital investment with the initial finance of \$2 billion and that the economic ripple effect would be in excess of \$10 billion. All of that has happened. So those testimonies, those pledges, those promises, have been kept in spades.

Now, as the Chairman pointed out, the Commonwealth is looking for additional revenue through gaming. And we understand that. What I would say is be very careful. Do not jeopardize what you already have, which is enormous.

I believe that when push comes to shove, there is

some incremental revenue to be had from gaming. And I use the word incremental very advisedly.

What we intend to do is a portfolio of what we believe and others in the industry believe is a sensible and correct approach to go about providing upfront money and referring revenue for the future. I will leave that in the capable hands of our Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Tony Ricci.

At the last public hearing I spoke, and there was much talk about data, projections, analysis, et cetera. I have to say that before he was Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Ricci was my Chief Financial Officer for over ten years. Nobody in this business pares down numbers the way he does. So I can tell you and absolutely vouch for the veracity of any numbers or statistics he puts before you.

Moving over to the main part of the --- the first item on the agenda was local share assessment. And normally when people think about local share it's in some sort of vague conceptual arena. So we thought it would be very useful to bring a few of our local community partners into the meeting today. And to introduce them, I'll hand it over to our good friend and Representative, State Representative Gene DiGirolamo. Thank you. And I'll be here for the rest of the afternoon if you have any questions for me.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Thank you, Mr. Green. Gene, if you will proceed.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: Thank you. Welcome. 2 Welcome to Bensalem and welcome to the 18th Legislative 3 Chairman Petri, Chairman Harkins, all the District. 4 distinguished members of the committee, welcome to you all. Also, welcome to Representative Neilson as well. 5 6 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Gene, they're signaling they can't 7 Can you pull that mic closer? Or it might not even hear you. 8 be on. 9 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Better? 10 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Okay. 11 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: 12 And welcome to Parx Horse Racing and Casino. 13 And just to give you a little bit of background, 14 Bensalem Township is my home legislative district. I think I'm 15 the only one in the General Assembly to have one township as a --- as a district, 62,000 people. I was born and raised here, 16 17 as well as Senator Tomlinson and also Mayor DiGirolamo. And 18 we're very, very proud of that. We have a deep history. We're 19 actually going to celebrate our 325th Anniversary later on this 20 year. So we're very, very proud of Bensalem. But we're also 21 very, very proud of Parx Horse Racing and Casino. 22 A little bit about our history that I thought I'd 23 share with you very, very quickly. And again, we're very proud of our history. The first Treasurer of the United States, 24 25 James Hill, actually lived in Bensalem, and he's got a

magnificent house down on the river. Actually, at that house, when Lewis and Clark came back from their expedition in 1801 or 1802, they stayed at that house and transcribed their notes from their exhibition and gave it to --- I think it was President Madison or President Monroe.

Benjamin Franklin was also a visitor many, many times here in Bensalem. He had a very, very good friend who lived in Bensalem, Joseph Gavin. And our Historical Society believes that his experiment when he discovered electricity was actually here in Bensalem and not in the City of Philadelphia.

And also, and finally, during the Revolutionary War, something Scott Petri knows very well, at Washington Crossing, that night, when Washington crossed the Delaware, another general, General Cadwalader, tried to cross the Delaware River right here in Bensalem. And the idea was to attack Trenton from both sides. General Cadwalader never got over the river because of the ice and General Washington won the battle. We actually beat the British that time, Bob.

Anyway, just real quick about Parx, Parx Racing and Casino. What an amazing, amazing community partner they have been to Bensalem Township, to Bucks County and to the State of Pennsylvania. I was here, along with Senator Tomlinson, back in 2004. Governor Rendell actually came to Parx, as well as Mayor DiGirolamo, and signed the bill that created gaming here in Pennsylvania right out on the racetrack here. Me and

Senator Tomlinson stood right next to him. And they've lived up, I'm telling you, to every one of the promises that they made.

They've gone above and beyond, again, not only as it pertains to the local share, but they are taxed at 54 percent, the highest taxation in the nation. And over --- to remind everybody, over 30 percent of that tax, I think it's 34, actually goes across the State of Pennsylvania, where homeowners benefit and they get a tax rebate on their school property taxes each and every year. They have fulfilled every promise that they have made. And I'm saying it, and I say it all the time, Parx Casino, for Bensalem, for Bucks County and the State of Pennsylvania, has not only been a home run, but they have absolutely been a grand slam for what they've been able to do, economic development, really, really good-paying jobs, high-quality jobs with benefits. They have been an amazing community partner.

And I'm going to close with this, as Chairman Petri said at the beginning, we've got to balance our budget. Now, the Governor has proposed recurring revenue in the form of Marcellus shale, closing the Delaware loophole. Hey, I'm in favor of doing both of those things. I'll put that vote up every day of the week to do those two things. But some in Harrisburg do not appear to go along with this, so they're looking at other forms of gaming to balance the budget. Please

be careful of what you're doing. Do not, I'm begging you, hurt 1 2 an industry that has been up and running for over 12 years that 3 has created thousands upon thousands of good-paying jobs here 4 in Pennsylvania that have lived up to every one of the promises 5 that they made. Please do not hurt this industry to balance a 6 budget with other forms of gaming that is going to affect this 7 industry, not only the casino but the horse racing industry. 8 Because many of us in this state care very, very much about the 9 horse racing industry. 10 So with that, I'm going to turn it over --- back to 11 Chairman Petri. We ware just thrilled to death to have you 12 here in Bensalem and looking forward to hearing the rest of the 13 testimony from --- from some of the other people. Thank you. 14 Thank you, Gene and Bob, for your CHAIRMAN PETRI: 15 heartfelt comments. Let's do self-introduction and then my 16 colleague, who gets the award for traveling the furthest, he 17 came from Erie, wants to make some opening comments. He can 18 and then we'll get right into the local share. 19 So starting on my right, Lea, would you like to 20 introduce yourself? 21 MS. FARRELL: Lea Farrell, Office of Representative Scott Petri. 22 23 MR. MILLER: Tom Miller. I'm a Research Analyst. 24 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Ed Neilson, Philadelphia 25 County, 174th Legislative District.

1 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Tom Mehaffie, Dauphin 2 County, 106. 3 REPRESENTATIVE WHEELING: Jeff Wheeling, 83rd 4 District, Williamsport, PA, home of Little League Baseball. 5 MR. SHELLY: Josiah Shelly, Executive Director of 6 the Gaming Oversight Committee. 7 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Scott Petri, State Representative, 8 178th District. CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Pat Harkins, 1st District, Erie. 9 10 MR. KING: Christopher King, Executive Director 11 under Chairman Harkins. 12 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Representative Eddie Day 13 Pashinski, Luzerne County, Mohegan Sun, 121st District. 14 REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Sid Kavulich, Lackawanna 15 County, 14th District, home of new Philadelphia Eagles 16 quarterback, Matt McGloin. 17 Thank you very much. Tommy SENATOR TOMLINSON: 18 Tomlinson. And if I can just take one more minute in this 19 introduction. I was a very proud member of the House of 20 Representatives when I first met Bob Green, and this racetrack was on its way out. It was folding. It wasn't going to make 21 22 The owner was not going to make it. Mr. Green stepped in, 23 saved it and actually made it prosper for quite a while. But I was a House member at the time, and I remember 24 25 that I had voted for riverboat gaming in Philadelphia and then

met Mr. Green and several other members and realized that this was a great opportunity to save this track, keep these 1,000 jobs that we have here. And now I think we have over 2,100 jobs here in Parx Casino alone, 18,000 jobs statewide, billions of dollars in investments all over the state.

And as Gene pointed out, when you think about the largest portion of this 54-percent tax, 34 percent of that goes to every citizen that pays tax, property taxes in the State of Pennsylvania. And I think --- and I'm sorry, I thought we did a great job with the local share, which was really an impact fee for our mayors and our towns for extra police, extra fire trucks, things that would be needed for first responders. But when I saw what the Marcellus shale did --- industry did with 60 percent local share, I guess I didn't do such a good job with the four percent. But the largest part of this money does go across the entire State of Pennsylvania for property tax rebates. And of course, four percent stays locally, and we'll hear a lot more about that.

But I just wanted to thank you for inviting me and extending me the courtesy to sit here with you, but I did want the members of the House to know I was a very proud member of the House and it was in those days that we first realized we had to save --- it was Keystone Racetrack at the time. We wanted to save this racetrack, save these jobs. We didn't need another mall in Bensalem, didn't need another housing

1 development, and we maintained this track and turned it into 2 two very, very beautiful sites. 3 So Chairman and Chairman, thank you very much for 4 inviting me here today. 5 REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: John Galloway, 140th 6 District, Lower Bucks County. 7 REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: James Santora, 163rd 8 Legislative District, Delaware County. 9 CHAIRMAN PETRI: And I'll just reintroduce Frank 10 Farry, Middletown Township and local firefighter supporter. 11 Thank you, Frank, for being here. 12 Chairman, would you like to make some opening 13 comments? 14 Sure. I just would like to thank CHAIRMAN HARKINS: 15 everyone for hosting this, especially Bob Green, who I just had 16 the pleasure of meeting. 17 We have Presque Isle Downs up along the lake up in 18 Erie. It's a great facility, but this --- this really is, you 19 can tell, a great area and a lot of investment, both sweat 20 capital and labor intensive. But my hat's off to you. 21 really can see the effort that was put in here. 22 Again, thanks for having us. And I'll be very brief 23 because I have to make the drive back to Erie tonight, so thank 24 you very much. 25 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Okay.

We're going to start with our first panel. And the first topic is going to be local share assessment. We'll start with Brian Hessenthaler, who's the Chief Operating Officer of the County of Bucks. And Mayor Joe, you're on deck. Sure, you can join and that way we have both of your beautiful, smiling faces together.

MR. HESSENTHALER: Thank you. First of all, on behalf of the Commissioners of --- can everybody hear us? On behalf of the Commissioners of Bucks County, thank you all for having us here today as the county representative on this panel.

What I'd like to do is kind of lay out what the local share --- is that better? Again, thank you behalf of the Commissioners of Bucks County for having us here today to be part of this panel. We feel very privileged.

I'd like to start out by just kind of telling you what all the local share assessment means to the County of Bucks. We receive approximately, give or take, seven-and-a-half million dollars a year. And what happens with that seven-and-a-half million dollars a year is 50 percent of that goes to the Redevelopment Authority. And I'm sure Mr. White will talk about that in his speech. And the other 50 percent goes to the county. And we put that into our agenda from these various services.

If you look on the county recent local share

assessment sheet, some of these services that this money has been extremely beneficial in helping the county to provide are we have two public safety training centers in the county, one in the lower end, one in the Doylestown area that serves as --- and this is --- these training centers are extremely important to helping our first responders conduct training. And I believe the RDA does contribute on behalf of the one, but the county also contributes on behalf of the other.

Bucks County Health Improvement Partnership, it's

--- it provides insurance to those who cannot get insurance.

Again, the RDA contributes to that, as does the county.

One of the areas, unfortunately, we see all over, human services. The demand or the need for these services is growing all over. It's just --- it's outpacing anything we could ever have thought of as far as the rate. And this fund is in league with the county to try to fill up some of those holes. Some of the areas --- a lot of people may look at Bucks County and say, well, you really don't have a homeless issue. We do in Bucks County. We really do. There are affluent parts of the county and there are some parts of the county that aren't that affluent, and we do have homeless issues there.

We have mental health issues throughout the county that continue to grow and grow and grow. And the more we learn about these issues, the more they continue to grow. So they're issues that we have to deal with.

Our Children and Youth Program, as you all know, the increase that's been required of the people working in children and youth as far as due diligence, paperwork and whatnot, and justifiably so, that's just caused an increased cost to the county that these funds are going to help us to fill.

Drug and alcohol, with the opioid issue that's going on, I don't think I have to say a lot about that. Those needs continue to increase.

And aging, we continue to provide services for our aging population, which in Bucks County is increasing.

Bucks County's population is between 625,000 and 630,00 individuals, and again, that aging population continues to grow.

If this money --- if this local share were to go away, what it would mean for the County of Bucks would be no less than \$40 million a year and you're talking about a two-percent tax increase. It's a half a mill. That does not account for the portion that goes to the RDA.

I plead with you, please, as you've heard earlier, this is funding that is extremely important for the county.

When you look at our budget, it's a \$400 million budget. \$3.5 million, \$3.75 million, oh, that's not a whole lot. It is a lot. Every little bit helps. Every little bit we don't have to pass on to the taxpayers helps them.

One of the stories I like to share is, I'm sure you

all remember the budget stalemate in 2015, and there was a lot of impact, particularly in the social services area.

One of the things the County of Bucks was able to do, we did not curtail, we did not eliminate, we kept those services going. And because of the funding we had, we were able to get through that period. It was close. It was very, very close. We were within a couple million dollars ahead of taking drastic action until late December. And that was the local share over the course of the year that was a big, big part of us being able to weather that storm.

So again, I plead with you on behalf of the county, on behalf of the county residents, the commissioners, please, please do not look to cut this local share assessment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: We're going to hold questions until the panels are all complete. So Mayor Joe, when you're ready, you may proceed.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Thank you, Mr. Petri, Mr. Chairman and all the members of the Oversight Committee. Thank you for having us here today, a very, very important day of testimony for me. I can't think of more important testimony I could give in Bensalem than today other than maybe, as our good friend talked about, drug and alcohol being a major problem. And certainly we always put that first to make sure we can get that in order, and we're trying hard.

You know, I just want to --- Gene DiGirolamo, State Representative, gave a little bit of a history lesson. And I'm glad that he did. But he hasn't told you that I'm part of that history. I'm the oldest member around here, so --- I'm even older than Senator Tomlinson, by the way, but we are a great community, a great history. You're all invited here for our 325th birthday in October.

So having said that, let's talk about how important this revenue is to us. And by the way, I must interrupt myself to thank Parx Casino, Bob Green and all of his people here that have done an incredible job. They have lived up to everything they were going to do. They've done it. And I'm backing into this because when we were doing this with Senator Tomlinson and Gene and they were passing this bill and certainly with Ed Rendell and many meetings with --- we fought for that to make sure that we got this for the hometown, to get that stipend --- it's more than a stipend, to make sure we got that money, because we promised people that were against the casino and against Governor Rendell that we would get money to help the community to do a good job here and actually give money back to our constituents, which we have done every year since 206.

Now, having said that, the most important thing that we have here in Bensalem is our police force, our fire, EMS, without a doubt. As soon as the legislation passed, I immediately put on 19 more policemen. It was a promise to the

community that we --- to safeguard this community against any problems that may arise out of the casino being here, all of the things that they told you about, all of the things, prostitution, all the things that never really happened. But that was out there and we wanted to make sure our community was safe and well for our constituents. And we've done that. And that costs us money. That alone is 20 percent of our police budget, when we put on those 19 policemen. And to this day, they --- they're here all the time, whenever they're needed. Our fire is here, our EMS, and cooperating with this casino. They have done an incredible job.

Alone, I've told you that 20 percent comes out to \$5 million a year that we're putting into our police. We hired full-time firemen. We have --- we had to do that because we figured with the casino here, which is more people here, more things going on, daytime firemen, as Mr. Farry, as a representative will tell you, they're just not around during the day anymore. It's just because they're working. So we put on a full-time fire --- daytime, just daytime. And the volunteers do an incredible job of filling in for the rest of that. But that alone costs us well over a million dollars.

We get back and we've given back every year to our homeowner grant. We were getting it back. This year we'll get back \$3 million out of that money, goes directly back to our constituents.

The debt that we incurred --- we've put on like over 20 percent of our police force, caused us to increase our department structurally. We had to spend money on that. And that was not just for that, but for the paid firemen.

So in all of this, when we come up there, we have spent well over \$10 million. And I --- you have in front of you the numbers. It adds up to about \$12 million that we feel as though we put into it. So we're paying \$2 million more.

Our people deserve that. That's a service they deserve and we continue to do that.

If --- if, God forbid, that is ever taken away from us, we would have to lay off those policemen. We would have to lay off supporting staff. We'd have to do everything humanly possible to get that down, because we'd never be able to raise the tax rate on our constituents here. We wouldn't be able to do it to make up for that.

And by the way, as we went along through the years here, I didn't raise taxes for 22 years, until this past year. And this was a big part of it that helped us do that. And through those years I laid off --- in the last four years I've laid off 19 people out of other services, not the police. I vow I will never take a policeman off of that. I will never lay off them or supporting staff. They are the most important thing we have going on here.

And all of you know where you're located. And most

of you I'm sure have been to Bensalem before. You have the turnpike, I-95 --- there are two rails going through us, major state highways. We're in the middle of everything. The City of Philadelphia borders us on our south. North of us you see Trenton and New York. It all goes through here.

During the day we have approximately between 200,000 and 250,000 people in Bensalem. It's an incredible job that they've done here, and I hope, I hope that this committee can recommend not to ever cut any of this that we're receiving from the Parx Casino. And Parx Casino has been an incredible partner to us. I can't tell you --- they this year have come up and said that they're with the county, that they will come up with the money that we need for this year to get us through our budget. So Parx Casino has done an incredible job.

I thank you. If there's any questions, I'd be glad to ask --- answer them. At a later date, anything we can provide you for, if we have the information I'll be glad to share it with you. Thank you for having me. And thank you to the committee today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Thank you, Mayor.

Next we'll hear from Robert White, who's the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority for the County of Bucks. Thank you for being here, Rob.

MR. WHITE: I thank you for inviting me. I'm going to tell you I've got a little bit of a cold left over, but I

didn't want to miss this opportunity to let everybody know how important these local share funds are and what it would mean to have an end to them.

I'm the Director of the Redevelopment Authority of the County of Bucks, and we're tasked with actually taking in applications, assessing them and approving grant applications to the contiguous municipalities to help them to update intersections and look out for any of the impacts.

As you know, when this thing started off, people thought that there were going to be a lot of impacts, and they looked for things and really probably for reasons to not have gaming. But it turns out that, thanks to the foresight of people like Senator Tomlinson and Representative DiGirolamo, I can sit here and say without a doubt that the local share assessment funding for the contiguous municipalities has taken and lessened these impacts to those communities.

At the beginning there were legitimate concerns.

How will this new industry affect the surrounding community and how do we prevent these predicted impacts or soften them. Many talking heads, opponents to gaming, predicted serious impacts, expected higher crime rates, more traffic on our highways, more accidents to investigate, antiquated intersections, the need to update the fire and police equipment, improve facilities for our volunteer emergency service personnel, emergency responder radios and updated maintenance of public works equipment, just

to name a few.

Now, it's important to point out that all of the dire warnings never really came true. However, it is my belief that they never came true because the community surrounding the gaming facility could avail themselves of the local share assessment grant and prepare for and address any potential impact. They do that each year by prioritizing the expected impacts and submitting a grant application to my authority. The board and I and the staff review them, and my board actually awards those grants.

These grants are provided --- these grants provide the necessary funding for these communities to fully equip police radio and emergency response vehicles with updated equipment so they can better serve the community.

We updated the fire --- fire training school to provide the best training for our local firefighters, new emergency responder radios mandated by the Federal Government for better communication, upgrades to the intersections, which you know, forever have been --- in Bucks County it's hard to make a left, it's hard to make a right, so they were able to find funds to do that, to update these intersections and make them more of a pass-through. Updating, upgrading all the fire and police facilities.

Some of the impacts are not as bad as many had originally thought, but a lot of that, like we said, is because

money is available for these communities that are contiguous. And you know, you can go on and on and on and on, but we're representing a contiguous municipality that is where the blue collar people work and where they live in Bucks County and represents --- really, if you look at Bucks County, you take this away, it will flip over, because we're holding it down, you know, keeping it right side up.

And these grants are necessary if we're to continue to keep up, have better, better equipment, better trained personnel. You know, this is all --- you know, is all the work done? No, it's not done. Will it never be done? Probably not because we're going to have updates all the time. It's not going to be --- police radios, they were replaced a decade and a half ago and now they're replaced again. These are all costs that fall on these communities that are the highest taxed communities in Bucks County for the most part.

They're safer today because of this money and I would urge that this committee would do everything they can in their power to ensure that these funds continue to come to the County of Bucks, which gets half of that two percent. And the other half, or one percent of that, goes out to these six municipalities that are actually contiguous. I thank you for the time to testify today.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank you, Mr. White. Next we'll hear from our colleague Frank Farry, who's wearing his

other hat today as Fire Chief of Middletown Fire Company. Mr Farry, the mic is yours, as they say.

REPRESENTATIVE FARRY: Thank you. It's nice to be on this side of the table, actually.

<u>PANEL MEMBER:</u> We have some questions for you.

REPRESENTATIVE FARRY: I'm sure you do. Just go easy on me.

So as --- as I'm sure the committee knows, a longtime volunteer firefighter and Fire Chief of a neighboring community. But prior to being elected I actually worked for the municipal government here. I worked as the Assistant Township Manager and Acting Township Manager for Middletown Township, which is a community of 47,000 residents just to the north of Bensalem. So I actually have firsthand experience in applying for the local share grants.

We heard the Mayor testify about the host community funds. We heard Mr. Hessenthaler testify about the money that comes to the county. And a third component is the money that Bob White was just speaking to, which is to the contiguous communities.

Middletown is a contiguous community of Bensalem.

And over the many years I've made applications for many, many different projects. The process is Middletown would actually have all of their member agencies, EMS, fire and then their internal departments like law enforcement and public works,

actually provide al list to the Board of Supervisors, who would then whittle down that list. That list would then be submitted to the RDA, the Redevelopment Authority. We'd have a day of presentations, and then the RDA Board would actually decide what projects from what communities would be approved. So I think it's important for the committee and all our colleagues in Harrisburg to know this isn't some willy-nilly setup. This isn't like Williams used to be, which predated me in Harrisburg. There --- there is actually a formal process for deciding what projects get approved.

Over the last ten years --- and these are just rough numbers --- across these contiguous communities and regionally --- I think that's another important component --- some of this is done regionally. Just like, although we may have fire boundaries and fire districts and jurisdictions, when a building is on fire, there's mutual agreements and neighboring fire departments respond.

The tower truck you saw out here is actually from my department. It was a slightly over a million-dollar project. \$400,000 of the cost of that truck were actually funded by the RDA through a contiguous grant to our township, which purchased the truck. Would Middletown Township have been able to purchase that truck? Probably not. We would have maybe had to hold off for several years. That truck has a lifespan of 20 to 25 years. That's not a vehicle that's going to be replaced

every five to ten years. It has a tremendously long lifespan.

And although it's not first due on the casino, if there's a major incident in the casino, it will be here probably second alarm or not long after. Or when there's been other major incidents in Bensalem, that truck has actually relocated to cover the rest of Bensalem. So while Bensalem companies are tied up on a major incident, that truck has sat in Bensalem Station, ready to provide the service that the Bensalem trucks would normally provide. And we do that across the board throughout all their departments and it's probably similar in your home communities.

So over the course of these ten years, roughly \$5 million has been spent on police vehicles, equipment and various resources across these contiguous communities. Roughly \$4.4 million has been spent for fire departments. And again, this also includes station upgrades, equipment, apparatus.

We've spent over \$2 million --- the RDA has spent over \$2 million on EMS services. And we all know the struggle that our EMS providers are facing. And I think --- not to speak for the Mayor, but I believe you actually added it --- through your local share, you actually added an additional shift for your EMS to cover the busy times down here.

Over 600 --- excuse me, over \$6 million has been spent on joint public safety. We have a public safety training center here in Lower Bucks that covers all disciplines. Some

of that money has been funded through the RDA. And then Mr. White touched on the regional radios so that we all can communicate with each other. And that's included in those figures.

\$3 million --- almost \$3 million has been spent on quality of life programs. There's been almost \$9 million granted on transportation improvements, traffic signals, roadways and the like. And then there's roughly \$4 million that's been spent on municipal operations for each of the townships.

Now, those numbers may seem large as you're hearing them, \$5 million and \$4 million. Remember, those numbers are over ten years. And those numbers are spread either regionally or across six communities, six townships, that are outside of Bensalem. So if you start whittling down, those numbers aren't as large as they appear, but I can tell you they provide a very vital resource to our first responders and the operation of our government.

We talked about the process. And you know, can we quantify if there's been --- there's ten more accidents per month, you know, there's this many more EMS calls? You may be able to quantify some of it, but you're not going to be able to fully quantify it. I can't say that the accident that happens on Route 1 in Middletown --- we're not interviewing that driver, saying where were you going or where were you coming

from. Oh, I was going to Parx Casino or I was coming from Parx Casino. But that is an additional run for police, fire and EMS within Middletown Township. So that's why the contiguous community part is also a very important part.

And the final thing I'll close on, and this is something that --- that is missed quite often as we govern in Harrisburg, it's not always about the call volumes. It's not always about the big incident. It's very similar to our military. It's about a state of readiness because one day that major incident will happen. One day the resources will be needed. They may not have been needed today, they may not have been needed last week, but there will be a time where those resources are needed and ensuring that our first responders and our local governments have the resources they need to handle that major incident is an important part of delivering our services and governing. And that state of readiness is part of what these grants have funded.

So I thank you for the opportunity to be here, and I think you're going to open up for questions to the committee, the panel.

<u>CHAIRMAN PETRI:</u> Questions from members? I see you grabbed the mic?

23 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: I grabbed the mic, Mr.
24 Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony. No need,
25 Frank. I don't need ---. Yeah, the Mayor, I was wondering if,

while we're on the record, if you wanted to correct your nephew about the kite incident that he thinks happened in Bensalem?

Because we know that happened in northeast Philadelphia, right down the road, where I live.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Ben Franklin, he died this past week. Didn't you know that?

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Yes, he did. Yes, he did.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: He did, I'm serious, the actor who played him. I can qualify that. And actually I chaired the Tricentennial before I was Mayor, our 300th birthday, and we actually had a cutout of Ben Franklin with a kite up top with every so far how much money we were raising. And the City of Philadelphia went crazy. They said you can't do that.

Well, to be perfectly honest with you, nobody can prove where he flew the kite. Gene was exactly right. Franklin would go out many, many times up there. As I said, I'm the senior member around here, and I actually remember the key. I think we have that key that ---.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: You took the wind out of my kite. But for the record, and this has been something I ask all our panelists as we travel and we talk about local share, being a partner, you spoke about how good Parx is to you and the partnership and we saw the law change and what the Supreme Court ruled. Are they still providing you with local share or have they held back their payment?

1 MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: I think --- I thought I said 2 that. 3 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: I just want to make 4 sure ---5 MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Yes, absolutely. 6 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: --- that's pulled out 7 because some have it, and I want to make certain that the 8 community knows that they are a partner and they don't care what that law says, they're going to keep on supplying the 10 community ---. 11 MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Well, from your lips to God's 12 ears that they keep that, but they have certainly said that 13 they're now, you know, depending on the legislature. But they 14 have been incredible partners. We couldn't do it without them, 15 honestly. 16 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 That's all I have. 18 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Representative Santora? 19 REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: Thank you all for 20 testifying. Again, it's a shame that everybody couldn't play well in the sandbox. I know Parx has with the local share. 21 22 And I'm sure the ones who didn't thought everybody was going to 23 jump onboard with them. And it's nice to hear that a lot of our local casinos, including Parx and Harrah's back home in 24 25 Delaware County, have continued that effort.

So you've got my commitment that I'm going to do whatever I can. And I know our Chairman is very interested in getting this local share corrected as well. We --- we're going to work on your behalf to make sure that that happens.

We've got to make it, unfortunately, float to the Supreme
Court. And as soon as we do, we're going to make that effort
quickly and try to get it done as soon as possible.

Great to hear from you, Representative, on all the good things that the community is receiving form this local share. It is so important. And in fact, in my county it does go into the General Fund. And fortunately, for the last three years the county has not had to raise taxes.

The City of Chester, if not the poorest city in the Commonwealth, receives a major portion of their budget from and a portion that they actually receive. They get that money in from the casino, where a lot of their property tax people aren't --- don't pay. So they're sitting there with a big balance sheet and it's not helping. But Harrah's steps up. Parx continually steps up.

So it's --- it's good to hear. Again, we'll work on getting that local share corrected as fast as possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Representative?

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for your testimony. Some of our fellow legislators are talking about revising a law which would spread out some of these local share payments and these local share allotments more across the state rather than just the simple areas where the casinos are located in the contiguous counties.

I know how I feel about that, but would any of you care to comment on how this would affect you if these numbers are cannibalized by spreading it out over a wider area rather than just the areas that they are currently distributed, these local share monies?

REPRESENTATIVE FARRY: Sid, I'll be happy to comment. This is me wearing multiple hats. Because, obviously, I hear those same --- same arguments in Harrisburg. And you know, I believe the Senator alluded to the amount of money that these casinos are taxed and how that money is spread across the Commonwealth to benefit all of the residents. And you know, all we have to do is take a look at Marcellus shale and how much money is staying local there. You know, I mean, if it would need to be applied across the board, then it needs to be applied to everybody, which I don't think the Marcellus shale folks that may want some of their casino money would, you know, in their communities ---.

I can tell --- I can tell you the impact. As a first responder, as somebody that's on --- on these fire runs,

I know the difference of --- of the benefit we have from those local impacts. And remember, it's local impacts. I mean --- and that's --- I know where you are, but I'm just saying that's what our colleagues need to understand. It's the --- the local impacts. And as we struggle to --- to you know, keep our EMS afloat and as we struggle to keep the morale high in our police departments and we struggle to keep our volunteer fire service alive and well --- you heard the Mayor testify that they had to have a paid engine down here during the day to ensure that they can get out the door and handle the response volumes --- it would be that much harder in our communities to be able to continue doing what we're doing without that local share. And I think that makes a tremendous difference.

We've been blessed that there was a casino --- or there was a racetrack here that now has evolved into a casino location as well. So we've been blessed by that. But there are absolutely impacts going on here that we need to be covered, no different than, I'm sure, our colleagues from the Marcellus shale regions would be saying the same --- the same thing.

So I mean, that's my comment on it. I think we're like-minded on that issue. But I'd be happy if any of the rest of the panel would like to comment on that as well.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: I just --- thanks,

Representative. Absolutely the casino is taxed enough right

now. There's no question across the state. And people are
getting that benefit already from the casino, Parx Casino being
number one in the State of Pennsylvania. They're already
getting that. And to say tax them more or cut --- I don't know
--- we need that revenue. So I love the rest of my
Pennsylvanians, but I want to keep it here.

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Representative Pashinski? Oh, did you want to ---?

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: I'm sorry. Thank you. I'm just very --- I'll make it real short. I can't reiterate enough what these two gentlemen just said. It would be --- it would harm the county and the county's residents very much so if that percentage would be cut.

MR. WHITE: I have something to add to that. We don't just get grant applications for \$3.5 million that we have to give out. We give \$7 million and \$8 million worth of impacts that are in these communities, and some of them don't get taken care of.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mohegan Sun has also done their job just like Parx and they've continued to provide the onus of the money, which is very important for our local communities. I agree with you totally.

But what a lot of our colleagues are looking at is the distribution of the money that should be spread out

throughout the entire state. And I think it's really imperative for all of us to make sure that the people of our communities understand that for the last eight years that the casino industry has been in place every single property owner has received not a check in the mail but a reduction on their property tax. And most people still don't understand that. They don't look at their tax bill and as a result they say I thought --- I thought the casino industry was going to eliminate our property taxes. That also is false. So we want to make sure that we clear the record.

The casino industry has provided us a tremendous amount of opportunity for not only the host communities but throughout the State of Pennsylvania. It is working and has been working, and I want to make sure we emphasize that point. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELING: Thank you very much for your testimony and also hosting us down here in the flatlands. You know, we're --- up in Williamsport we're called ridge

Representative Wheeling?

20 runners. We call you folks flatlanders.

CHAIRMAN PETRI:

But being in the --- from the northern part of

Pennsylvania, the similarities between the Marcellus shale and

the impact fee and, of course, casino and the local share all

--- boy, a lot of similarities. And so that's why we get antsy

when there's talk of a severance tax, because as well as losing

the local share would affect your communities, losing the impact fee up in our neck of the woods would really impact our --- our communities. So it's almost like, you know, just change some words around and it's the same testimony whether you're talking about natural gas or the casinos. So I just wanted to point that out. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Senator Tomlinson?

SENATOR TOMLINSON: Yeah. When we originally did this it was to --- it was not universally welcomed when we proposed this casino in Bensalem. The Mayor and I and Gene took a lot of criticism that it will ruin our neighborhood, crime's going to increase, there's going to be all kinds of bad things happening in Bensalem, property values will decrease. Of course, none of those things happened, as the Mayor did testify.

But as part of what we thought was important to our community is to make sure that we mitigated any of these potential problems, and that's how we came up with the local share or, as you might call it, the --- you know, an impact fee. So it was for more police, it was for more fire. And when you look at the fire truck, it --- you see now how big of a facility this is with these two buildings. Our local fire companies probably couldn't handle this thing if this went into a full blaze. We need those other fire companies from those other communities to back us up. We need police departments

from the neighboring communities to back us up if something big happens at this facility.

So this was meant to be an impact fee. This was meant to mitigate any negative things that could happen in the community because many of the citizens thought I was crazy and the Mayor was crazy and Gene was crazy to bring this casino, but --- just a real short story. The reason that I fought so hard for this is all our residents are going to New Jersey to spend all their gaming money. We would have five buses a day leave at Dunkin' Donuts on Street Road to go gamble down in New Jersey. Bensalem residents and Lower Bucks County residents already decided they were going to gamble, and they were. And they were gambling millions and millions of Pennsylvania dollars.

Now, all I want to do is recover that. But we were actually more successful than just recovering the Pennsylvania dollars. We captured a lot of New Jersey dollars in the western part of New Jersey. We have captured a lot. Between Sands and here, SugarHouse and Harrah's, we captured a lot of that. And I know that New Jersey is not happy about that, but we've brought those dollars back.

And just another reason that I thought that this local share --- or this local impact fee would be important, I was a member of the School Board when this was just a racetrack. And the previous owners, we got no overshare. The

City of Philadelphia School District got one percent of the hand, but we got nothing.

The casino --- the racetrack was in my district, I'm on the School Board, and Philadelphia was getting the money.

Of course, I mean, isn't that always the way ---?

But anyway, I vowed --- I vowed as a School Board member, if we ever get something going in this area, this community is going to get some of that money for the impact here and, of course, the property taxes that are paid here by this space. Our school district gets \$8 million in property taxes, \$8 million. They went from a million dollars a year to \$8 million a year in property taxes for the school system, but of course, the township gets a little over \$10 million a year, you know, for their services.

So one of the reasons that I think local impact is important, local share is important, is --- and it was set up before and I wasn't around. We didn't get it. The School District of Philadelphia got it. So we want to make sure we get it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Okay.

PANEL MEMBER: We hear a lot about property tax and property tax relief, but I think Representative Pashinski said --- talked about that your property taxes didn't go up. And I think, Mayor, you talked about how property taxes didn't go up, because we don't see a line item on our property taxes saying,

hey, look, there's your share.

Can you try and explain how you're able to hold those taxes back because of this money? Because I think that the person --- people don't get it, but this held it back from you raising it. But if you didn't have this money, those taxes would have went up. And if you can, maybe project how much that would have went.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Well, being fiscally responsible, we had to make sure we didn't raise --- I'm a retired businessman, so I understand that. And we were able to do that by first making sure before the casino got here in 2006 that --- I came in office in 1994. So it was a long time ago. So we held the line on that.

When the casino came in, part of this money was used and has carried us through to last since 2006. And we finally came to a point after laying off as many people as I could without having --- not having departments, this money has carried through there. But we came to a point of no return, so last year we had to raise taxes because of everything going on. I mean, our police department is second to none. We were just internationally accredited. So it's all about the police. Actually, if you really want to know, they are a big part of our debt. So we were able to do that for many years by just cutting and let the money come in from the casino and giving back from our constituents. We were able to fulfill our

promises, as Senator knows and Gene knows, that we made to our constituents here to allow us to bring a casino.

We went through hell. We went through hell for a year-and-a-half before --- just going through the legislation that we were --- you know, we were selling the town down the drain, look what you're doing. You don't have any idea. That was very difficult for all of us because we're all from Bensalem. We know everybody. So that was very difficult.

And I would think by preventing --- as you heard my colleagues up here say, by preventing what could have been the worst things that could have happened, by doing it and spending the money we did we were able to sustain the quality of life that we have here in Bensalem. And we'll continue to do that. Without this money that we get, believe me, believe me, I've got nowhere to go. It's cut police. That's it. And I've vowed never to do that.

So I don't know how we make that up, I really don't, in God's name. We would be incredibly troubled, the share that we get. I don't know how else to express it to you other than come into the office and see what goes on here every day and you'll know that we need this money. And you heard the rest of the people here testifying how important it is. It's just --- I wish I could tell you in a better way. I can't articulate it enough to --- other than if you come with me and try to understand. I offer this to you, everything that's needed or

--- in the future, testify or numbers, whatever you need to do, we're willing to give that to you.

REPRESENTATIVE FARRY: And if I can follow up, on behalf of the contiguous communities, which I represent several of them as a State Representative, they will be faced with several choices. If they're buying a new police car, they'd have to factor that into their budget in one form or another, which obviously they do, but they would have a choice of raise taxes to buy that new police car, keep driving the dilapidated one, which probably should be put out of service. You know, they're really faced with several challenges, especially when it comes to new equipment.

The training we're getting at the public safety centers are a regional aspect which the county would have to fund. So it affects both the county and the contiguous municipalities as well because this infused money in there to replace older equipment, which is outdated, which may not have the latest safety standards.

I mean, that fire truck has rollover airbags in it.

Our ladder truck that it replaced certainly didn't. If that

fire truck got broadsided and the water weight sits high, it

rolls over, those firefighters are in much greater danger.

We're in a much safer position riding in that truck that you

saw here today. So the contiguous municipalities are in a very

similar situation to what the Mayor said and, you know, gave

him the opportunity to replace outdated equipment.

Some of those intersections would have never gotten improved. Some of those traffic signals would have never gotten modernized and replaced, which improves traffic flow. So without that --- those impact fees to those things, either we would have to raise taxes to pay for them or they wouldn't have happened, one of those two things, without the local share.

<u>CHAIRMAN PETRI:</u> Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

MAYOR DIGIROLAMO: Just one more thing. And if you read this it will tell you more, but the impact on your roads and the intersections that we had to improve, it was all part of this to make sure that we had it safe not just for our people but the people coming in and out for the casino. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: We're going to move next to our next panelists, Tony Ricci, Chief Executive Officer, Greenwood Racing.

And thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

For the audience's benefit, Dom Costa, a Representative, has joined us.

Tony, Bob, welcome.

MR. RICCI: Good afternoon. Thank you for this opportunity. We really appreciate the opportunity to share our

perspectives on what clearly is an unqualified success story here, Parx and actually the gaming industry within the State of Pennsylvania.

We've seen testimony so far about the many benefits that our existence and our expansion of gaming has provided both to the community in Bensalem but in the contiguous communities also. We're very proud of that.

And we're also very proud of our reputation. I think you've seen today how highly regarded we are in the community. Bob spoke earlier about our credibility. It's something that we take very seriously. When we come before you today, we come in a way to try to help you in your deliberations to make a good decision. We know that your goal is to do what's best for the Commonwealth. And we'd like to help you with that today.

You're getting bits of information from people outside the state that tell you that there's opportunity to increase what is already a tremendous success story. And we'd like to give you all the facts so that you can make a better informed decision and one that doesn't have negative unintended consequences which can happen when you make decisions without all the information. So thank you very much. Now I'd like to give my comments.

The first thing I'd like to mention is that we employ 2,500 people. About 1,200 of those are full time. And

more than 80 percent of the employees here are Pennsylvania residents.

As you heard previously, our team, which is led by our superb Director of Community Development and Diversity, Mr. Ron Davis, is tightly woven into the fabric of this wonderful community. And the casino gaming has produced substantial benefits to our surrounding business and it's also saved the racing industry. And Sal DeBunda, the president of our Horsemen's Association, will be commenting on that following my comments.

Our state, as you've heard, currently generated more tax revenue from casino gaming than any state in the country, and it's by a wide margin. And that's due in large part to the tax rate. We've heard about that earlier. On slots, when you include the costs to the Gaming Board, which are also allocated to us, it comes to over 59 percent.

And I mention that with respect to the Gaming Board because many other states don't charge the casinos for the costs of regulation. They're part of the state budget. So when you're doing an apples and apples comparison, it's important to consider that. Bob did mention earlier that I spend a lot of time with numbers, and I hope you can see that in my testimony.

We are concerned that initiatives that have been proposed within the legislature that have been supported by

outside interests that claim they're going to produce a similar benefit to what they experienced in a lower tax jurisdiction, what actually happened here in Pennsylvania, adversely impact our casino industry. This isn't possible given the large disparity that we have in the tax rates between our state and these other states. And in particular, I'll refer to Illinois and New Jersey.

Illinois's tax rate for casinos is bonded, but the weighted average is about 32 percent. Many casinos pay less than 30 percent.

In New Jersey the tax rate is nine percent. So when you have operators from those jurisdictions saying things work in those states, they don't mention to you that the casinos are paying a much, much lower tax rate than we're currently paying. We're not complaining. We're not asking for a reduction until we take it. But we know in this environment that's not realistic.

We're also troubled that some bills are circulating through Harrisburg in a piecemeal fashion. They ignore the potential adverse impact one bill could potentially have on another. An example of this is the local share assessment.

As we stated at our hearing on March 7th, we're very happy to honor our original commitment. We were very equipped to work on a voluntary basis with Mayor Joe to maintain the status quo and assured that they would have the revenues they

need to function.

However, if an internet gaming bill was passed, if
HB 1010 were to be passed, that could have serious negative
consequences for all revenue. And it really undermines the
whole concept of the local minimum or the impact fee and things
like that. We'd have no choice but to reassess our position.

It's also our view that internet gaming and slots at taverns can't coexist. There is really no need to place slot machines in bars if everyone's phone or computer is essentially turned into a slot machine already. There's really no need to go to a bar any longer for that amenity because you've got it in your own living room or wherever you are at that moment.

Therefore, we really urge you to consider all of these proposed initiatives globally in an omnibus fashion to ensure all the impacts are fully thought through and there are no negative unintended consequences.

As we testified on March 7th, we do believe internet gaming legislation will reduce the tax revenue earned by the state. And that's simply due to the large difference in the tax rates. What we've seen is 15 percent proposed for internet gaming versus the 59 percent that I referred to earlier, and really the high likelihood that there's going to be cannibalization of the brick-and-mortar casinos. I wake up every day and I read another story about a retailer who's closing his doors down and it's due to competition from

internet retailing. That's a serious matter throughout the state. We know we have Sears, Macy's, Borders, GameStop just announced, everyone is reassessing their brick-and-mortar positions and it's directly attributable to the competition in the retail industry.

So the claims that this won't have an adverse impact on our brick-and-mortar business really defy all the evidence to the contrary in the real world today. And I would ask you to seriously consider that with a healthy skepticism, particularly when we're talking about a huge disparity in the tax rate, with four times what's being proposed in the current legislation and that these issues that occurred in the retail sector are when the playing field's level. I mean, there is no tax disparity between the businesses, yet the brick-and-mortar is still losing out. So if the playing field is tilted toward them, we're even more likely to have cannibalization.

So I would say to you that, just from a purely numbers standpoint, it's a 25-percent cannibalization factor for the state to even break even. And I really question --- does anybody really think that not more than 25 percent won't come from brick-and-mortar casinos? I'm sure it will, and that's why I --- we go to great pains to point this fact out to you.

There's also no protections built into any of the existing legislation that would protect the brick-and-mortars

in terms of geographic --- protections, things like that, that just further compounds the problem where we'll end up taking what is a very well thought out system of marketing the gaming product to the consumer and turn it into a dysfunctional distribution system where people are just throwing money at anyone who may say the word casino on their computer, they'll get a pop-up that says sign up and gamble for free.

So I think, we're very concerned that not only will this lower the overall level of the brick-and-mortars, but it will just basically create less traffic on the whole and be disruptive to the local share, et cetera. Because then the question is, does the revenue leave Bensalem? Is the \$10 million minimum still applicable and realistic? So I would urge you to consider all those factors when you're thinking about gaming.

And separately, there's a similar issue with slots at taverns. The Slots at Taverns Bill, HB 1010, offers on all the faces, when you include Gaming Board costs, a 39.5 percent tax rate to the --- for the state. It then lowers our tax rate to what's effectively, when you include Gaming Board costs, about 53-and-a-half percent.

When you work the numbers, this is still, at best case, a wash for the state and more likely less revenue for the state. And I will walk you through that. It's in my testimony, but I'd like to walk you through that.

And all you have to do is look at the experience in I'm not making this up. We spent a lot of time assessing the impact of VGT, slots at taverns, in Illinois, how it impacted the casino industry and where the revenue came from. And what we saw was that, yes, there was \$1.1 million of new revenue --- that should read the word new revenue generated at these slot VGT outlets. However, the casino industry lost 20 percent of its revenue. Maybe the State of Illinois was not that concerned about it because net to net it really had the same tax rate. The VGT operators were paid 30 percent. industry was around 32. They apparently were less concerned with the issue of employment, capital investment, at the casino entities, and on a net basis they did generate additional tax revenue, it's undeniable, in Illinois. But that same approach would result in less tax revenue here in Pennsylvania because of the difference in the rates.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So when you look at it, if --- if our casino revenue --- and I truly believe our casino revenue here in Pennsylvania would be reduced by more than 19 percent. That's what the casinos in Illinois experienced.

I'd like to point out that those casinos are capped. They're nowhere near the quality of the casinos we have here in Pennsylvania. They're capped at 1,200 positions. There isn't a casino in our state that has that --- that few. And that's the maximum you can have in Illinois. Our --- almost 5,000

positions here at Parx. So you're talking smaller riverboat casinos, not well distributed throughout the population centers in Illinois. And even they lost 20 percent of their business.

I would contend that, you know, just based on the pure difference in slot machines --- we have a third more slot machines than they had when VGT gaming was introduced, that you'd expect more like a 30-percent reduction in revenue at the casinos.

Now, I'm presenting numbers that just Illinois experienced. You can make your own decisions on whether you think it's worse. We certainly believe it is. But even if you accept the Illinois numbers, it's no better. And I'll walk you through why.

There's about \$2.4 billion of slot revenue in the state last year. If you were to lose 19 percent of that, at 59 percent, that's \$269 million.

The lower tax rate that's in HB 210 would cost another \$110 million. Separately, the stadium casino project, which we --- we are part of that as a joint venture partner with Cordish Companies, would no longer be liable if HB 1010 would pass. It really would make no sense to put a --- to spend over \$600 million on a casino in south Philadelphia when every bar in the area has slot machines. It just --- it would lose its feasibility.

All told then, we've got \$490 million of lost

revenue before you even start with VGTs. If you applied the same methodology that Illinois experienced, yes, you could see that there's probably 1.2 --- one and a quarter billion dollars of revenue out there, at these taverns. No more than even the 1.1 that was realized in Illinois. So we're trying to be honest with this assessment.

2.4

With that, at 39-and-a-half percent you get \$496 million. For all that effort we generate an extra \$6 million. And that's if you believe the impact will only be of what was impacted in Illinois. We are certain it's going to be worse. And we're fearful that it will be worse. And in that regard, you're looking at a --- actually less revenue for the state. And that's before you get into the issues of job creation, job losses, investment losses, et cetera.

So our view towards our industry is better developed, has more slot machines, better serves the population centers of this state. You're actually going to see significant net loss in gaming revenue if HB 1010 were to pass.

One interesting point we'd like to note is that in assessing all the data in Illinois we noted that within 25 miles of the casino the market barely grew. We were able to go through all of the locations where slot machines exist in Illinois and separate whether they're within 25 miles or outside of 25 miles of the casino.

About 52 percent of the revenue from VGT at taverns

was done beyond 25 miles of a casino. Within 25 miles of a casino the overall market, when you factor in the cannibalization at the casino and the new business in the VGT areas, only grew five percent in 2012 to 2016.

You don't have to take my word for this. Part of my testimony that was submitted, the Illinois Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability, and I can refer you to page 45 in their 2016 report on wagering in Illinois, and I'll quote an excerpt from that, the inclusion of video gaming in the Chicago area has only slightly increased the amount of gaming dollars in the region. With an average annual growth in gaming of only one-and-a-half percent per year, thus far it appears that video gaming has simply reshuffled the deck chairs and redistributed casino revenues to the numerous gaming venues that now exist in the region.

It's clear that our state will not be able to increase its revenue for gaming taxes if you're going to trade 59 cents for 39 cents. The math doesn't work. Even in Illinois they acknowledged there's really no benefit when you're within 25 miles of a casino, but there was some benefit as you went down the state.

Over to the loss of this gaming tax revenue, we point out that the state could lose the benefit of the \$75 million stadium casino license fee that we expect to be paying very soon, along with the 5,000 construction jobs and the \$600

million of economic benefit that will --- from the construction of the facility in the development phase.

Furthermore, we're certain that the state would lose more than 4,000 jobs and the racing industry would be devastated in the proces. Because remember, a lot of this money goes directly towards horses for racing operations.

I would have to point out that the local share issue would be totally disrupted since most casinos who have agreed to maintain the status quo will now see a major reduction in their revenue sources and that they have to be reassessed and rediscussed.

And lastly, I'd like to point out that it will take several years to develop this VGT network. In Illinois, legislation was passed in 2009. However, the first locations didn't open until late 2012. And after that, the four-year rollout through 2016 generated \$121 million in year one, \$485 million in year two, \$805 million in year three, and just over a billion in the Illinois fiscal year, which runs through the end of June in year four.

This obviously is not going to correct a current budget deficit issue. And as I mentioned earlier, the comparable tax rates of 53-and-a-half percent to the casino, 39-and-a-half percent to the VGT operators.

It's reasonable for us to question why the state would even accept less money for the same product that's being

offered to consumers, particularly when the casino industry has contributed the following. We produce over \$1.4 billion of tax revenue to the state, more than any other state in the country by far. We've paid more than \$750 million of upfront license fees. We've invested more than \$6 billion in facilities and equipment. We directly employed more than 18,000 people.

We've worked with our local communities, as we've seen today, to spur economic development. We've saved our racing industry. And we conduct our business with great integrity and a commitment to responsible gaming and compliance.

I would like to point out that we're --- we're part of the Bank Secrecy Act. We spend a tremendous amount of our time working on money laundering issues and things like that, under the oversight of Department of Treasury.

And I don't know how that would work when you're talking about slots at taverns, but we've spent a lot of time on compliance, responsible gaming, regulation, and to me they're two completely different approaches, yet this group is paying a lower tax rate. We have all this infrastructure, all this effort, and somehow they would get a lower rate than us.

Any --- and HB 1010 requires the operators of the taverns to pay only nominal upfront fees. It won't create the jobs, an investment of any significance. And even worse, as you've seen in Illinois, a devastating impact on the casino industry will result and that loss of jobs, capital investment,

will put our racing industry in peril. So not only will all these benefits that we talked about earlier be significantly diminished, but the Commonwealth will end up getting less money.

So I struggle to understand the rationale for the state to structure an industry so that the casinos, who created all this job --- all these jobs, have a significant investment, have a much higher cost structure, would retain only 46-and-a-half percent of the revenue while route operators, tavern owners, with relatively no upfront costs and have a much lower cost structure, would be able to keep 60 percent. It doesn't make any business sense and I think the state is losing in this trade.

But we do think, as I mentioned earlier, there is some opportunity here. We know that the state is looking for money to help close the budget deficit. We're trying to find an approach that would accomplish that goal, but at the same time not hurt the casino industry, that would create jobs and still follow all the original guidelines that were established in the original legislation that has been so successful to date, which include things like compliance.

And as we looked at it, as I mentioned earlier, we saw that there was an amount of business generated in Illinois, well over \$500 million, at taverns that were more than 25 miles from the casino. So we took a look at the relative population

bases in Illinois and in Pennsylvania, noted that the populations were about the same. There are about 12.8 million people in both states and that there are about 3.7 million people in Illinois who live more than 25 miles from the casino. That's about 4.3 million, 4.4 million here in Pennsylvania. So there are some similarities and it led us to think that, you know, there might be something here that could create more revenue, more jobs, maybe even spread local share around throughout the state to communities that aren't presently benefiting or even being served by the casinos.

So we thought about it and, you know, what came to mind was something very similar to what the racing industry did with off-track betting locations, and it worked very successfully. And if we have something like satellite casinos that were beyond 25 miles of any casino and no closer than 10 miles to each other, so if you create some separation and market protections and distribution, that it could function in a way where it wouldn't adversely impact the casino industry and it could create additional revenue, additional jobs, additional capital investment, much like the off-track betting facilities did very successfully for the racing industry.

So we've been kicking around ideas and we've spoken with some other casinos and we do believe that there could be an approach where maybe 25 facilities, may two each --- two of the Category Is and IIs and one of the IIIs would pay a license

fee of somewhere around \$4 million to \$5 million at a 50-percent tax rate. If you had 25 of those locations in the state, that would generate somewhere between \$100 million to \$125 million of upfront license fees.

Separately, we do believe, while it wouldn't be as expansive as what the stops at taverns were, you could probably generate about \$450 million of additional gaming revenue on an incremental basis and at a 50-percent tax rate, you're looking at \$225 million of ongoing, recurring revenue that would produce 4,000 additional jobs, about \$700 million in capital investment for the 25 locations. And also we believe it would help create more local share for those communities, and we know that's a sensitive issue right now.

We also believe and we understand that the tavern owners are looking for something. We think it would be a good idea --- we would be supportive of them having Keno at the taverns. And in theory, that could generate, if you look at the national averages for Keno, with 4,000 outlets, it typically --- in our state, potentially it could average \$100,000 in revenue a week. That would translate --- in a year. I'm sorry. That would translate to about \$400 million of revenue that would generate, on a 20-percent tax rate, \$80 million for the state.

So that if you combine the \$80 million potentially from Keno with the \$200 million to \$250 million we think we can

generate at these satellite facilities, we've got over \$300 million in real revenue, not what you see to date in other proposals, but something that you can take to the bank because it's being delivered by an industry that you can rely upon. You see what we've done over the last ten years, how we conduct ourselves. We have the money. We can do it very quickly and very responsibly, which I don't think you could say about any of that. There's a lot of unknowns with respect to these critiques.

So that we also believe that we could generate some additional upfront fees through the repayment of our existing loan with the state. The casino industry has about a \$60 million loan outstanding to the Genera Fund for Gaming Board costs that were generated in the creation of this industry that were held off to a future date when the industry was completely rolled out in wealth. That's sitting at about \$60 million.

We're paying out a portion of that, about \$6 million a year right now. But I would propose that we would just pay that loan off if the state needs money.

And separately, I mentioned on March 7th that the Gaming Board costs are something that we would appreciate the legislature taking a look at. That would be something that we'd certainly be willing to pay money for, approximately \$30 million to help the state defray the costs of transitioning from the current approach to putting a one-and-a-half percent

cap, which is the one thing we do support in HB 1010, on Gaming Board costs.

That's --- that concludes my remarks. I'm certainly open to any questions.

Oh, one last point I think I forgot to make. I said earlier that internet gaming and VGTs could not coexist. I feel the same way about this. I have to tell you that before anyone would consider investing up to \$700 million to roll out 25 new locations with 500 slot machines --- and if I didn't mention that, I apologize. We're talking about locations with no more than 500 machines, no less than 100. My guess is with 25 --- and we've taken a look at the entire state, the population centers that fall outside of the 25-mile radius, and that the majority of these 25 would have about 500 machines. There's enough people out there --- four million people out there that would create 25 locations with approximately 500 machines.

So on that basis, you'd have to --- you'd proceed with caution, you know, before you make that type of investment if all you really had to do was market to those same people who are outside of all of our geographic regions on the computer.

Much less money, much cheaper. And if it's at a 15-percent tax rate, all the better.

So one of the driving assumptions in this is that internet would not be there because I'm not so sure everybody

would take you up on this opportunity like they said they would. And I'm only speaking for us, if someone else didn't want to do it, we would do it.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Thank you. I'm going to start with the first question. One of the things that a number of people have approached me about and the Governor is concerned about is the lottery fund and stabilizing that. Does your thought process include anything with regard --- and what would you do with regard to lottery? Some people talked about iLottery and the like. Have you given any consideration?

MR. RICCI: Yeah. We were assuming that the Keno that we're proposing for the tavern owners would be conducted through the lottery. So that out of that --- yeah, they would get their share out of that money.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Thank you.

Representative Pashinski?

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very much.

Thank you for testimony. Great stuff there. Because Mohegan

Sun was the first casino that was up and running and was in my

district, I got to be a big part of that whole operation. And

I wanted to make it very clear that I support the casino

industry 100 percent.

You've done everything that you've been required to.

You've provided the dollars for tax relief and the LSAs, and

you have helped the equine industry, and that's something we

also have to be very concerned with. That's another 30,000, 35,000 jobs.

that.

I also did see in my district some of the taverns and the clubs were affected negatively because of the fact that you can't compete, you know, with the quality and the kind of activity that you have, you know, in your facilities and the --- besides the gambling. I'm sorry.

So I began investigating, you know, meeting with our clubs and our taverns, trying to figure out what we could do to try to help them out. And of course, they were the ones that brought up the VGTs. So as we investigated that, we determined that there about 12,000 establishments between clubs and taverns, and it appears --- and this is where I'm going to need your expert advice --- it appears as though we have about 36,000 to 40,000 gray machines. So for --- that's our illegal machines. Does that number sound right to you?

MR. RICCI: That's the number that's thrown about.

I couldn't tell you that it's right. I've seen no evidence of

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay.

We do agree, though, that the gray machines do exist?

MR. RICCI: It's possible. I haven't seen any personally, honestly.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Well, they do exist. And

would you ---?

MR. GREEN: I think there's no empirical answer about the number that exist. I've lived here in Bucks, in Philadelphia, for 30 years and I've never gone to a bar and tavern where I have ever seen any.

Where they do exist, it's more in the western part of the state. And bear in mind that the ability to play slot machines and gamble is very well tested for in the main urban population census, where we have Parx, we have SugarHouse, we have Harrah's in Chester, Rivers in Pittsburgh, Sands in the Lehigh Valley.

So I believe that where there is the existence of gray machines are more in those areas that are not accounted for by the existing casinos. And that is where we adopted the approach that, okay, rather than have --- essentially there are 17,000 licensed facilities, bars and taverns, and having to have a situation where they are --- I don't know how you would regulate that, how there's compliance, how you could --- underage. They are enormous problems.

But that being said, --- four million people who are in areas 25 miles away from a casino. But we can actually develop a new industry, create results, create revenue, create upfront fees and do all that without stopping the investment in our existing industry and without cannibalizing what we have already created. Because, as we say, we put our money where

our mouths area. We pay hundreds of millions of upfront fees. We've invested here 700 billion bucks. I mean, we should not put that at risk. That --- it would be crazy.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I agree with you totally.

I agree --- I want to make sure that you know where I'm coming from. I do not want to do anything that jeopardizes the casino industry.

But as you are concerned about the infusion of something else which will then reduce your affectability, as legislators we're also trying to deal with another industry, the restaurant, tavern, club industry, that has been affected in some cases, many cases. What can we do? So it may not be VGTs. You --- you brought out another proposal. But I want to make it very, very, very clear, and I've stated this time and time again in public, we have to do everything we can to maintain the casino industry that we have right now because it's working.

MR. RICCI: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: And we do not want to saturate --- saturate the state to then take and reduce your output, which then reduces what the state and the people of the state receive.

But we're struggling, looking for ways that we can take something that is occurring, whether it's --- whether you agree or not, I think you agree that it's at least in parts of

the state, and legalize it to get some dollars out of that without affecting your business.

You've also offered some other opportunities here that I think we need to continue to discuss for the benefit of everybody concerned.

So I want to make that clear.

MR. RICCI: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I want to protect the casino industry. It is working. We want to keep it working. And it's also saved the equine industry, which is also a big part of our state.

MR. RICCI: I do agree with Bob, that more likely
--- we don't see a preponderance of those type of illegal
machines here, but they are more likely to be in the areas that
aren't being served by the industry. Our proposal helps deal
with that in a way. But it's possible that those machines will
not go away in any scenario because people are paying no tax
today, and they like that better than paying a tax down the
road.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I've heard that comment because my --- my --- my bill said three maximum, and they didn't like that. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: And Representative, and for the benefit of those listening or recording and the like, I have made a commitment that at some point in time we should have a

hearing on the VGT bill that is before our committee. And I think at that time if a regulator from Illinois would be willing to come to Pennsylvania and provide us with answers to the very big question you asked, and that is what do you do about illegal machines or gray machines and how does that unfold, I think we could benefit as a committee immensely by understanding what successes Illinois had, what failures they may have had and then answer our questions.

Anybody else have a question for this particular panel? Well, let's start with Representative Mehaffie. Since he has a question, he gets to go first.

REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bob and Tony, thank you so much for having us. You have such a great facility here. I can't wait to get over to the other side and see around.

So I'm in Dauphin County. We do have a racetrack and Hollywood Casino. The slots have saved our horsemen. And I see what you've done. I talked to some of your staff earlier about how beautiful are the new barns and what you've done here. Bob, thank you for saving it before the slot machines were here.

Two questions I have. Number one is, I know you didn't hit on numbers, Tony, but what kind of effect do you think the --- the other forms of gaming that are out there, the other bills, how would that affect the horsemen's funds in

1 numbers? 2 MR. RICCI: You know, that --- in slots and taverns, 3 if you use 25 to 30 --- use 30 percent to make it easy. You 4 know, for our horsemen here, that would cost them \$20 million a 5 year in purse money. You know, it would cause us to 6 dramatically reassess our racing program. 7 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Yeah, that --- I know 8 Sal's up next, so I don't want to steal his thunder in any way. 9 With your new proposal, ---10 MR. RICCI: Yes. 11 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: --- does that include any 12 money for the horsemen, the 50 percent that you're proposing? 13 MR. RICCI: We would certainly be supportive of 14 That's something that we would work with the legislators that. 15 on, to best allocate that money. But we would clearly support 16 that just as we did with the existing legislation. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Okay. 18 Because I think our other two bills, no money is in 19 there for horsemen. 20 Is that correct? 21 MR. RICCI: That's correct. 22 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: 23 All right. Thank you so much. MR. RICCI: 24 Sure. 25 CHAIRMAN PETRI: And you know, let me just say, from

my own perspective, without connecting to the rest of the 1 2 committee, to me it seems to make some sense in that you're 3 taking slots out of the original allocation which could come 4 into a building and then would be part of the distribution. So 5 in my mind, I'm --- if we considered this proposal, I'm 6 thinking of it in those terms, that as I understand it, your 7 proposal would not expand the number of allowed machines, it 8 would stay within the original allotment under Senator Tomlinson's bill. 9 10

MR. RICCI: That's correct. Each casino has a 5,000-machine allotment, and no one is --- you know, we have the most with 3,400.

MR. PETRI: Sid?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Mr. Ricci, you made a comment I believe the last time we were here about eight months ago or so and you said that when Pennsylvania set up this industry they did it the right way and just to leave us alone. And I've used that on several occasions.

MR. RICCI: To leave us alone?

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: It was a good point. And I was waiting for you to say it again today, but ---.

MR. RICCI: That's passed.

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Yes. But even when we talk about the effect of internet gaming and the impact it had in New Jersey, I go back to what you said, New Jersey set up

everything in one town.

MR. RICCI: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: And again, you alluded to the fact that people being more than 25 miles away from a casino, and it's --- we don't have it as much as they do in New Jersey, when it comes to the impact that internet gaming I think would have --- the adverse effect that it would have on our industry here.

 $\underline{\text{MR. RICCI:}}$ Thank you. Thank you for remembering what I said.

And I would like to point out that that has been our position. Not so much leave us alone, but do no harm. You know, we're certainly there to help. But to clarify, what we did was we really spent a lot of time data-mining the Illinois situation. And what we --- and what's clear is that there isn't opportunity more than 25 miles from a casino, that to create more revenue, to create more jobs, we could pay a higher tax rate than what's being proposed in HB 1010 by the tavern owners and operators. We do think that would be a better way for the state in every way. And having seen that, you know, we felt, you know, that it's something we should put forward.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Representative Neilson?

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony here today. And he answered my first question because I wanted to ask you about opportunities and suggestions

because the temperature up in Harrisburg seemed to think that

--- we're going over the sin tax. We want to tax every sin --people perceive to be a sin, whether it's drinking, smoking,
gambling. They want to go after all that. And I'm just trying
to --- because that seems like the common core. And I wanted
to see --- and your idea just struck me really good because we
talked about this. As Sid said, a year ago we talked --- we
had testimony about the OTBs and expanding in OTBs. That was
our last testimony. And we used a 50-mile rule. We attempted
to make that part of the bill because we thought it would
cannibalize. Would these off-sites, would they be OTB? Is
that what we're trying to put ---

MR. RICCI: It's a possibility.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: --- making it an OTB?

MR. RICCI: Since there's Category IIs and IIIs that don't have existing OTBs, they have to be part of this, too.

So our --- you know, we kind of stepped back from that approach and said let's --- let's call them satellite locations. You know, we can come up with a formal legal term for them down the road. And OTBs are called not primary locations as an example.

But every casino should have an opportunity to participate in this, not just the racing locations.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: As you looked at it, what would be a capital investment to put one of these facilities in? I mean, on my way in today ---.

MR. RICCI: It would be about \$25 million or \$30 million. \$25 million to \$30 million when you add on the licensure.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: So after that capital investment, \$700 million here?

MR. RICCI: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Since while we have everybody's attention, on the way in I saw probably a hundred construction workers as I walked in the front door.

MR. RICCI: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: And what is going on now?

MR. RICCI: We're in the process of building a multi-purpose showroom that will be able to seat 1,500 people for a seated event, a concert or comedy show. We'll also do boxing, MMA, benefits, things like that. And we're expecting to open that up in November.

We're also going to add two restaurant amenities, one a gastropub, another one that is a --- is Lombardi's Pizza in Little Italy. If you've never been there, it's the best pizza I've ever had in my life, and I'm looking forward to that.

Secondly, we're going to bring poker over.

Currently, poker is on our second floor here, and we're going to bring that over into the casino. So all that's expected to be done in November of this year. We're going to spend about

\$50 million on that.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Last question, Mr.

Chairman, if I may. What I haven't heard is commitment to charity. And it's something that I always like to bring up when I have an owner up here. Community, we've heard that and the local share. But charity? Then I'll end with that.

MR. RICCI: Thank you. Yes, it's all part of our core value. It's part of our culture that we work with the community. And we've contributed to international, national and local charities in excess of \$55 million since we started in 2006.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: So I'll --- I didn't see anybody else making movement. I do have one other question. I just --- I have to ask about the internet and iGaming because it's --- there's a proposal pending. What are your thoughts in that regard generally? I know you said that your proposal does not include any --- why don't you lay it --- lay that out?

MR. RICCI: Again, it goes back to the whole concept of a 15-percent tax rate versus 59. It's very hard to add things that are going to compete directly with the existing brick-and-mortar. That's why the proposal that we outlined can work because it doesn't compete directly. It's actually complimentary, where a casino like ours could have a satellite location and potentially have some cross marketing there.

The internet is going to be totally disruptive. And the first --- the first thing people will do is go after existing casino customers, try to sign them up to an account. And I think we've already seen some evidence of that when New Jersey implemented internet gaming. There were all kinds of TV ads here in the Philadelphia market. Now that SugarHouse has opened their site, they're even advertising in the market to their New Jersey customers to play online.

And clearly, you know, the national customer they're going to have gaming as a casino customer. There may be some that aren't, but it's highly unlikely. In the case that I referred to earlier, I think it's going to be clearly cannibalization of brick-and-mortar casinos if you're trading 59 cents for 15 cents. It's a clear loser in our mind.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Senator Tomlinson?

SENATOR TOMLINSON: Yes. I think I said this before. I think that putting a slot machine on everybody's cell phones is really, really bad public policy. The cell phone is already one of the most addictive devices we have. You can't go into a restaurant or a church or anywhere where people --- somebody's not on their cell phone, checking their messages or sending a message. It's just amazing to me.

And I think 60 Minutes the other night did a thing on how they engineered the addictiveness of this phone without putting gambling on it. So now we're going to put a slot

machine on a cell phone that will be in your hands, in your home --- in the comfort of your home. And you're going to give it a tax rate of 15 percent with no real investment.

MR. RICCI: Right.

SENATOR TOMLINSON: And I think a slot machine costs \$20,000 a buy. This casino or most casinos spend somewhere between \$350 million and \$700 million and they employ 2,000 people and now you're going to put a slot machine on a cell phone and have a 15-percent tax. I don't know how the State of Pennsylvania would allow that to happen because you just cut the State of Pennsylvania out of all its revenue. Fifty-four (54) percent after someone invested hundreds of millions of dollars and employed thousands of people, and now you're going to put somebody on a cell phone at a 15-percent tax, which allows the casino to spend an awful lot of money, given free play and promoting play on a cell phone.

So now we're going to have people not only driving down the highway texting on their cell phone, but they're going to be playing a slot machine on their cell phone driving down the highway, not only in their home.

I think it's the worst public policy I've ever heard second to the fact that we're going to give them a 15-percent tax. I don't know who even thought this up and thought about the State of Pennsylvania and the money that goes to the property tax refund, goes to the horses, goes to the local

share, goes to --- all that's gone.

And I --- I couldn't help but be shocked when I got this through one of the publications, a newspaper publication, New Jersey SugarHouse launches exclusive new Konami slot online gaming. It doesn't say Philadelphia or Pennsylvania SugarHouse. It says New Jersey SugarHouse.

Playsugarhouse.com is excited for the first --- to bring these two exciting Konami games to the New Jersey --- New Jersey online market. Now these games, which are extremely popular in land-based casinos around the world, can now be played right in the palm of your hand. And then it goes on to say and in the comfort of your home.

And I asked the SugarHouse representative last month
--- or last meeting that you had are they going to market the
New Jersey customer online that's traveling over the Walt
Whitman Bridge and traveling over the Benjamin Franklin Bridge
to play in Pennsylvania at 54-percent tax, are they going to
market the New Jersey customer at a 15-percent tax? They said
no.

And then I read in an industry publication that they're, in fact, promoting online gaming with a very popular game --- I don't play slot machines, so I don't know. So if I'm a Representative from the City of Philadelphia, I'm wondering what's happening to my local share, what's happening to my tax dollar that I get 54 percent in Pennsylvania, and now

this company is --- New Jersey SugarHouse? I never heard of New Jersey SugarHouse.

So I guess they are marketing the New Jersey customer. And then if I'm representative Neilson, I want to find out what's going on here because Philadelphia is going to get shorted, Pennsylvania is going to get shorted because that customer, instead of driving over the Walt Whitman Bridge, is now going to stay in Woodbury, New Jersey or stay in Hamilton, New Jersey or --- as I said earlier, one of the greatest successes we had is we dipped into the New Jersey market in a big way.

And now I guess they found a way to exploit the New Jersey market and not pay the Pennsylvania tax, which makes my point that I tried to make at the last meeting. If you give this to a Pennsylvania company --- Parx Casino will do this if you give them the ability to do it. Why wouldn't they? They make money. And if they can pay less --- what business doesn't want to pay less taxes?

So as I tried to say last time, the cannibalization of internet gaming is more --- not just in the casino customer, it's the --- it's the benefit that goes --- and we talked about it today, the benefit that goes with property tax reduction, the benefit that goes to the local share. That's not 15 percent.

So how can we disinvest Pennsylvania from gaming?

We just took --- we took --- the biggest --- the biggest winner in Pennsylvania gaming is the state. We made the state the biggest winner. We put the horsemen, we put the taxpayer, we put the local share in, we put capital improvements in. We loaded it up at a 54-percent tax rate, more tax revenue than any state in the nation, \$1.4 billion, and now we're going to let these casinos run and are taxing them 15 percent. And of course, that's the rate in New Jersey. The New Jersey tax rate at a casino is nine percent. The tax rate online in New Jersey is 15 percent, but the tax rate in Pennsylvania is 54 percent. So now you market your New Jersey customer on a Philadelphia casino. What happens to Philadelphia?

But anyway, I --- I think that it's a --- it's a troubled public policy because while I think that we can play internet poker, I think the shell game going on here is internet slot machines, because that's where the money is.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RICCI: I agree with everything you said. And I will add to that that, you're right, if it were passed, we don't think it would be a good thing for the state, but we would do it all out and we'd want to be number one in the internet world just like we are in the real world. So that's a legitimate point.

I'd also like to, if you'd allow me, to address a comment that was made after our last hearing. You reminded me

that there was a comment about our social gaming site, somehow by us conducting that it was in conflict with the comments that I've made earlier. And to me, the two are --- it's not a casino. It's a place where you can go play for free, play for fun, and play casino games, slot machines, try them out and hopefully come into our casino and play them if you like them. You can't win any money.

About 98 percent of the people playing that site that way, for free, don't give us any money. There are two percent of the people who would like to do that for a little longer, that they pay for the privilege of having more time. They don't win any prizes. We're not allowed to give them any prizes. That would be gambling. So that these are two completely different things. It's not in any way something that's impacting our revenue at all or the tax base for the state. So the statements we're making are not inconsistent.

And to follow up on what you said, Senator, yes, we would go all out on that. We'd have no choice. We're in the business.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Well, thank you for your testimony.

Our last presenter today will be Salvatore DeBunda,

Pennsylvania Thoroughbred Horsemen's Association, PTHA.

MR. DEBUNDA: I'm going to stand. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for having us here.

The reason I'm standing is --- I may be standing

here alone, but I do not speak for only myself. So I want to
--- since you're here at Parx, I just want to take the
opportunity to introduce some of our board members and our
staff who are here so that you get to know who they are.
I'd like to start, I guess, at the back of the room.

We have Phil Aristone. He's one of our directors. If they would stand, I would appreciate that. We have --- I guess Butch Reid --- is Butch still here? He left; correct?

Ron Glorioso, if you could stand for a minute. Nick Saponara, who's a member of our board. George Asensio is our --- Charles, I mean, Asensio is a member of our board. I'm leaving John Servis for last. I think you all know who he is. He's the trainer of Smarty Jones. And he is the only trainer in the history of racing that had entered one time in both the Kentucky Derby and the Kentucky Oaks and has won both times.

SENATOR TOMLINSON: Sal, before you go, can I interrupt you for one second?

Mr. Chairman, would you mind if I interrupted?

CHAIRMAN PETRI: I guess I don't mind.

SENATOR TOMLINSON: John, stand up again, please.

I'd like John --- when I first started doing this gaming bill and I knew there were a lot of horseman around, and then Smarty Jones comes along in the scene and there's a lot of publicity.

And all of a sudden I see this guy on TV and I said, oh, my gosh. I didn't know John Servis as a trainer or someone who

worked here. I knew him as the Little League coach. The Mayor and I and Gene go to every banquet that we have for our Little Leagues and our church groups and there's John --- that was John Servis. John Servis was always at the Little League banquets. And I just know him as just a wonderful, great community member, and then here he turns out to be probably one of the most successful trainers in the United States.

But my point, Sal, that I'd like to make, along with the other gentlemen that are there, is that when we hear that, you know, your horse racing gets this --- these folks are members of my community. They live here. Their kids go to school here. It might not just be in Bensalem, but it could be anywhere in Bucks County or anywhere in Pennsylvania. You're going to see a truck --- I'm going to show you all the people that work and live in this industry.

But the industry is --- has taken a little bit of rap I think for some people that --- but the people that work in this industry are good family people. They're community people. They pay taxes. They own homes here. They send their kids to school here. They're active in Little League. They're active in organizations. They're good community citizens.

And John, it was a shock to me to know you were such a --- here, I just thought you were a Little League coach from down the street, and here you're a great trainer.

MR. SERVIS: Thank you.

MR. DEBUNDA: I did leave out Dr. Steve Appel, who's an orthodontist, is here. And also last but certainly not least is our Executive Director, Mike Ballezzi, who has been our Executive Director I think for over 22 years, if I'm correct.

about this is the sport of kings and sheikhs and the legislature likes to throw that around. I'm going to talk about that more later, but Mike was a lawyer, practicing lawyer. He got this --- this bug, this --- it's called the horse gene, and he grew up in Upper Darby, was a lawyer, was a judge, had this horse gene. And he became exposed to horses and the people in the industry, and he fell in love, as everyone who has that gene does. And he gave up all of that to become the Executive Director of the PTHA so he could help people who have this similar gene that he does and like horse racing and are out here 24/7 working with these horses. And Mike, you deserve a round of applause.

Again, my name is Sal DeBunda. I'm president of the Pennsylvania Thoroughbred Horsemen's Association. I wear two hats as I sit here. One, I'm an owner of horses. I'm a breeder of horses. I'm president of this organization. And I'm also vice president of the Pennsylvania --- of the national THA, which consists of all states and many states involved in this industry.

The reason I mention that is that two of those members are Illinois and New Jersey. So it's interesting that you mention Illinois and the VGTs. I can tell you that our meetings, and we meet three times a year, both New Jersey and Illinois talk about they're not sure they're going to be around in the horse industry in the next few years. They're barely hanging on. They used to run over 150 days in New Jersey. They're down to 54, I think it is.

The City of Chicago is a great city in Illinois, yet their racing is almost nonexistent. They're going out of business. So I think you asked a very important question. How are the horsemen going to be taken care of in all these things? Well, they did them there without taking care of the horsemen and they're going to become dinosaurs. They're going to disappear from Illinois and New Jersey, in my opinion, unless something is done.

So I just point out that I'm involved in an organization that regularly meets and talks about these issues, and those two states are in the list of have-nots, if they not survive. So I think that's something you can keep in mind.

But I'm proud to say that we represent 4,300 members of our organization here at Parx. We have owners and trainers who --- you become a member by racing a horse here, and we have 4,300 of those members.

(814) 536-8908

While we understand the challenges that face the

Commonwealth in addressing the demand for new revenue, we want to express our concerns for the potentially damaging impact that the expansion of gaming will have on the horsemen.

I support the comments of Tony Ricci and Bob Green and their concerns about that because what happens to them affects us. So we're very much in partnership with them in what we get.

I also want to take a moment to acknowledge that they have met every commitment not only that they have under that but to us. Those barns that you see out there are well in excess of their requirement that they had to make under the slots bill. They went beyond that. They worked with us. This is all part of their cooperation with us. The proof of that would be that we set up about five years ago the Parx Racing Hall of Fame. And Bob Green was in the initial class of that. He was there. Tony Ricci is in recently --- last year was put in. So we have two members of the operators who are members of the Parx Hall of Fame because of their contribution that they have made to racing here at Parx.

So that --- when Act 71 was enacted --- I want to make this point very clear --- some of the legislatures think that this was a tax, that a tax is paid to them and they're giving us our tax money back. Bob described that photograph of which I was a party. It was a cooperative effort between the operators of the racetrack, the state and the horsemen. It was

a balance that was made. They recognized that casino gaming would have an impact on horse racing. They agreed to pay this sum of money up to 12 percent to pay that. So not one dollar of the money that comes to us in the Racehorse Development Fund is actually coming from taxpayers. It's coming from our good friends here and also from other casinos around the state to support horse racing. So this idea that it was a tax, that you can change that tax, is really against what the idea was to begin with.

And I thank the legislator who mentioned this earlier. Your predecessors were geniuses in setting up this legislation for two reasons. You put a balance of locations, unlike New Jersey. You have a balance, a spraying out of the locations so they didn't compete with each other. That was bordering on genius because that created an environment where they all could succeed rather than dealing with each other.

When the Borgata opened up in Atlantic City, everybody talked about that. But everyone said they're just going to take from the other casinos. And it turned out to be right. So that was part of the genius.

The second part of the genius was the fact that they had a balance between the funds that came for the state, the funds that went to the horse racing industry, the funds that went to the casino, the funds that went to other development.

That balance worked. And that formula has been working. And I

would say to you don't mess with that formula because you end up with Frankenstein, is what you end up with, okay, where you kill the industries that have been working as a part of that, because that's what you end up with if you start changing that around.

If you do change anything, you have to have the impact on the other parts of it from that change. The thing that's a concern to us is all these things that have been talked about with respect to the expansion of gaming, they don't include the horsemen in any of it, okay.

Now, I want to point out to you that under the new Act that's set up, the Racing Commission and --- and now the horse racing industry pays for its own testing. There was a study that was required in that, that was done by the state. And I'm quoting from there. It says, if the General Assembly finds that the addition of alternate gaming platforms is advisable, any --- any expansion of gaming should be tied to the financial benefit of the horse racing industry. Competitions on gaming platforms that are not connected to the casinos can only draw patrons away. That's your own state study that said that.

They go further on in the report to say, any expansion of gaming in Pennsylvania, in order not to be detrimental to the horse racing industry, must contribute financially to the State Racing Fund. Again, your own study

confirms that that's something you need to do and not just look at it one way and say, well, they're getting enough money.

Because what's happening to our industry here is if this happens we'll get less money to deal with and the state's taking away money, which I'm going to talk about.

Since 2009, the Racehorse Development Fund has been raided to solve the chronic structural deficit issues facing Pennsylvania. Over \$300 million has been diverted from the Racehorse Development Fund. It was not the intention of funds that were put into it by this establishment. I don't think there's anybody else in the state that's helped more by having their funds taken away, okay.

There have been significant funds earmarked for the Racehorse Development Fund siphoned off to help balance the General Fund, provide additional funding for fairs, the Farm Show, the Penn Vet School and the Animal Health and Diagnostic Lab. In total, over \$325 million has been taken from the Racehorse Development Fund for those issues. And it's continuing, okay.

Almost \$26 million was taken in the --- this fiscal year, to date. The Governor's budget proposal is over \$30 million to be taken from the Racehorse Development Fund.

We're concerned about the jobs that are created.
We're concerned about an industry that we want to survive.
We've put some charts up. And I want to look at this chart

here. You may have it in your package. It's a --- it's a chart showing all of the standardbred breeders and horsemen throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I want to make it clear it does not include vendors. These are just --- these are just the horsemen. I want you to look at that and say that's a list of all the factories for jobs that I have here in the Commonwealth because every horse is a job creator, 24/7 job creator.

PANEL MEMBER: Can you put a chart up?

MR. DEBUNDA: It's in your packet. We don't have a

11 chart. It's in your packet.

There's a chart that looks like this in your package. This is what one horse generates in terms of jobs. The second chart you have up there shows what purse money --- how the money is spent. That's also in your package. So that when purse money comes in, it doesn't just go into my bank account. I have to spend it for the trainer, for the vet, for the farrier, for the dentist, for the jockey, for all the other related jobs that come from having just one horse in there. So that the horse is a 24/7 job creator.

Unlike other factories that --- that create jobs, tomorrow that horse could be on a van and creating a job in a different state. That's the difference between us --- I always use the example, as my friend, Steve Crawford, has pointed out to me. Harley-Davidson is a single type of horse with

horsepower. They generate jobs. No one seems to worry about the fact that the owners of those people in Milwaukee are not residents of the State of Pennsylvania, but for some reason they worry about the fact that the horse owner is not a resident of Pennsylvania. Well, it doesn't make a difference whether the horse --- horse owner lives in Sweden, California, New Jersey or Pennsylvania. It's creating a job here in Pennsylvania. To me, that's what's really important.

So I want to point out to you that this is --- these are all locations that are going to create jobs, jobs for our Commonwealth. And anything you do to affect that in the expansion of gaming will affect those jobs. And that's something we believe is important.

The same study that I referred to indicated that we do get \$232 million throughout --- throughout the Commonwealth for the Racehorse Development Fund. That seems like a lot of money, and it is. But we're a big state with a lot of racing facilities. Delaware has two locations. So you have to look again at the number of racetracks we have here and look at the amount per race. That's really not much more than it is in other jurisdictions. It's just a bigger state with more racetracks.

But they also found of the \$232 million that was given to us, we returned in economic activity and benefited for the Commonwealth \$289 million. So that's about a 1.8 to 1 for

every dollar you give the racing industry we're giving back to the Commonwealth. All right. So if you take away \$50 million, you're actually going to take away \$80 million, in my opinion, of money that's being given back to the Commonwealth. So you have to look at that balance that's there. It's just not a matter of people sitting there and having this fund and not going to be affected by it. Because people --- what happened in --- in Illinois and what's happening in New Jersey is good horses, good trainers, good jockeys, they're leaving, because the results are better somewhere else and the legislature is more supportive. You have to look at that fact.

I just want to also mention one other thing. I'd mention that Mr. Ballezzi is not a sheikh or a king. All of us who are involved in this industry have this gene that we love horses and the people involved in it.

My good friend, Dr. Steve Appel, grew up in Sheepshead Bay. Lived in a condo, didn't have any horses, didn't grow up on a farm. He became a --- went to Temple and became an orthodontist here. The first money he made, where he had extra money, he bought a horse, not a house, a horse. Okay. His wife still talks about that 40 years later. But that shows you when you have that gene what happens.

Take my own case. I have a nice beautiful suit and tie, I drive a nice car, I have a nice legal practice. I grew up in a row house in south Philadelphia. Neither of my parents

went to high school. But I was lucky enough to have some brains and also be willing to work hard. I went to St. Joe's Prep. I went to Wharton School. I went to the University of Pennsylvania Law School. So I've been a very lucky individual.

Then somewhere along the line I got exposed to horses. I had never ridden a horse in my life, folks, so I don't know where this came from. I got exposed to it. I fell in love. I decided to be more than an owner. I got involved over 20 years ago in the Horsemen's Organization. So you do fall in love. This is what happens. So the people who are in this industry, they're not kings, they're not sheikhs. They're people who are in love with the horse and with the people who take care of those horses. And I would ask you to understand that love and not pull out the frame that that love generates in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thank you very much.

<u>CHAIRMAN PETRI:</u> Questions? Start with Representative Wheeling.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELING: Thank you very much for your --- your testimony there. One of the buzzwords --- and I'm relatively new. This is my second term. But one of the current buzzwords is corporate welfare as we talk about the Racehorse Development Fund. And before you get into that part of the corporate welfare, talking to Mr. Ricci back there and Representative Neilson about this track, this complex, there was no LERTA; correct? I'm looking at Mr. Ricci and he's

shaking his head. There is no LERTA. There is no corporate welfare ---

MR. DEBUNDA: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELING: --- that built this.

There was no KOZ. There was no funds, taxpayers' funds to build this.

So then we get into the Racehorse Development Fund. Can you explain to me or help me understand how that was an agreement that was some ten years ago, as I understand it, that there was a percentage of the slots and the industry had a choice that they could manage that percentage themselves or give it to the Commonwealth and then the Commonwealth would redistribute it back. Am I correct on that? What's the history of that?

MR. DEBUNDA: You're partially correct.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELING: Partially? All right. Help me understand that, please.

MR. DEBUNDA: Well, first of all, there was an agreement where the track operators that were going to become casinos basically agreed to give a percentage of it. And there were a couple reasons. One, it was going to have an impact on horse racing, number one.

Number two is they were going to be able to get a license, unlike the Category IIs, by just showing that they didn't have any problem, legal problems, and they had the

money. They didn't have to go through that what I'll call the dog and pony show to get it. So they were getting something back, their right to be able to have a casino at their racetrack.

2.4

And the third thing was that they wanted to make sure that everyone contributed equally to that.

So we only get what's generated here at Parx. We do not --- SugarHouse, for example, we do not get any of their money. But again, part of the genius of the legislation was that they made everybody pay for what we were entitled to. So when they open up a new casino somewhere that's not a racetrack, we get no more money. All that happens is that part of that contribution is spread over a larger number of casinos. So we --- our --- our number is based on what happens here at Parx. The national is based on what happens there.

Now, the reason it went to the state was it turned out that all the money that comes in goes to the state, all of it. The state then sends back to the casino their share, sends back to the casino our share, sends to the breeders their share. So it wasn't like it was decided that the state should get our money and pay it back. All the money went to the state. And then they take it, make sure the math is right, and then they send it to all the different places, and it comes back to the casino.

Our money is not sent directly to us. It comes back

to the casino and within a week they deposit it into an account for our share of that here. So it's not like it was only the Racehorse Development Fund that went to the state. All the money went to the state and then it comes back to all the various uses, including the state tax. I don't know if that answers your question or not.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: I think --- and I know what the Representative's referring to. Someone else in the industry, they could quit --- when the legislation was originally drafted, they could --- you could have as a group decided that it would be paid to you by the casinos as by --- as opposed to by the state. At the time the choice was to use the state. And I think that particular person's quip was maybe we should have thought about it the other way, because I think the point you've made is that is valid is that this is not taxpayer money. This is money that was set aside to save the horse racing industry.

I will tell you that I never would have voted personally for the original bill without that, because I know that there are --- and I'm glad the map showed it, there are a lot of horse owners in our area, that there's just a lot of them. And you are correct, you're all kinds of walks of life and half the time you don't even know who a horseman is or isn't. So I want to thank you for that.

MR. DEBUNDA: Could be a Little League coach.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: Exactly. Exactly.

Representative Neilson?

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: I want to follow up because this is --- this is something that we speak about, Sal. A lot of us newer members that came in in the last five, ten years --- the revenue, restricted to revenue. We don't like your typical politicians putting their hands in this pie, going in there, robbing this one to pay this one. Will that be something that the industry --- will it be receptive to having a restricted revenue fund that we couldn't get it and maybe like being oversaw by the Racing Commission itself and distributed that way instead of letting it come into our General Fund and then going back out?

MR. DEBUNDA: Going back in retrospect, we would rather that the money would come directly to us and not have gone through the state, to answer your question.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: That's exactly what we're trying to pull out of you, Sal. You all piqued our interest at a trip you did in Erie, and we all looked at each other like, wow. You know what, this is not welfare. It's something you're using right for the industry. And this --- this --- this is fantastic, because this is what --- I think this needs to get out there more. This shows us what just only one horse does and what it costs.

Because we heard last time, Mr. Chairman, from

different horse owners who testified and spoke to us in depth about what it really costs because we don't know that. But this is something we'll proudly share with our fellow members.

MR. DEBUNDA: And I just want to add a point. I think --- and Mr. Ricci spoke about this, it was good legislation. When it was first passed it was well publicized. And I'm going to be frank with you, people were starting to come to Pennsylvania to breed, to own and to train. We were getting phone calls --- our phones were ringing off the hook.

Unfortunately, financial things came up and they decided to start abating the Racehorse Development Fund, \$50 million the first year. By the way, it was Governor Rendell who did that. So the same person who passed the bill actually took the money away. I don't want to, you know, discredit anyone else. But --- and \$50 million the next year. And that's how we got to this \$325 million.

But that put a chilling effect on investment. Mr. Green spoke about investment for his facility. If you were going to --- it takes a lot of money to put a farm here and get stallions here and things like that. It put a chilling effect because they felt they couldn't --- and I don't mean this in a derogatory --- they couldn't trust the legislature to let --- leave it alone, okay. And that put a chilling effect ---.

That's now started to come back because now we're only down to \$30 million, okay, and the atmosphere was good.

But to do the work, to do these other things, you basically will put that chilling effect --- we'll be frozen. People will not come to Pennsylvania to race, to expand, to have their stallions here.

I'll put out a fact to you that --- those of you --- it's funny because --- I have to laugh at this. I was asked to be on a transition committee by Governor Wolf. And I said to the Governor, I appreciate that. Which committee would you like me to be on? He says agriculture. I says, I appreciate that, but do you realize I grew up in south Philadelphia, on a sidewalk? And he said, yes. But the horse industry is part of agriculture. So it was interesting he ---.

But I point out to you that Pennsylvania has the same exact soil that Kentucky has. We could have as prosperous and as big a horse industry here. In fact, we're the only state to put the horse on the flag, by the way. I don't know if you know that or not. We're the only state in the United States that has a horse on its flag. But it's more encouraged than Kentucky. There's more done to encourage that.

Part of the problem with the breeding program, and the head of the breeders is here, is that our top stallion stud fee is about \$10,000. Now, I know all of you would be great to take \$10,000 for a stud fee. But the stud fee is \$10,000. In Kentucky it's \$300,000 for the top stallion, okay, because we can't attract those kind of stallions. We could if we had the

right atmosphere and the right environment.

So I'd just point out we have a tremendous opportunity in Pennsylvania thanks to the good work of Bob Green and the COs who really make it a vibrant --- you know, we have two play barns on Pennsylvania Derby Day. Except for the Breeders' Cup, that's the only day in the United States where there's two great --- \$1 million races in the same day. It's all thanks to the operators of Parx. So I just think we have a tremendous opportunity here, and I think you should take advantage of it.

I meant to say one thing about Mr. Green. They are very much a part of not only living up to their --- but by being part of the community. In another world I'm Chairman of the Philly Pops. I don't know if you've been there. And our season sponsor, Parx Racing and Casino. So he is a part of the community and has worked with us, and I salute the Parx and the Greenwood organization for being part of that.

This has been a tremendous partnership. We started off adversaries. We have become close allies, working together to better the casino and racing industry here in Pennsylvania. And I'm very proud of what we've accomplished. And I thank them for being our partners, and I support their --- their testimony here today.

CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Thank you, Sal. Thank you also for this information.

Just a quick note. Again, I'm from Erie and we have Presque Isle Downs. We went over ---

MR. DEBUNDA: I'm familiar with it.

CHAIRMAN HARKINS: --- much of the racing things, and I'm sure you probably know much more than I do, but we have a younger, inexperienced, freshman legislator. I won't call him out. But he went on the news because we have a problem with our school district funding up in Erie, and it is a critical mess, but we are addressing that, but he wanted to know why we couldn't use the money from the Horse Racing Commission or from the --- you know, from this Horse Racing Fund.

And immediately I started getting the phone calls at my office, even at my home that evening. And I explained it thoroughly to, you know, the constituents, who innocently wanted to know why that was. And when I explained to them how --- they understood. But there's so much misinformation and disinformation that many times, you know, as legislators, we can't get that out there. So anywhere I go I try to reinforce that. And we did that in Erie also, but if you can just keep driving that home.

MR. DEBUNDA: I appreciate that. And we find that one of our --- we thought when the slot bill was passed things were done, we were done.

CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Right.

MR. DEBUNDA: We found that with the change in the membership of the legislature and those kind of comments and rumors, that education has become a very important part of our role. So we try to really do a good job of that.

CHAIRMAN HARKINS: And I appreciate that again. And I'm going to ask Senator Tomlinson if he will relay that to --- to my neighbor in the Senate, but I'll turn it over to you, Tom.

SENATOR TOMLINSON: Thank you. Actually, when I guess we first started talking about this bill, I really only wanted to do seven racetracks. I didn't want to do stand-alones. I didn't want to do Class IIIs. I wanted to do racetracks, because I think the history and the tradition of horses and breeders in Pennsylvania is a great one.

And this is not an endowment. This isn't a grant.

They have to race and they have to run for this. I mean, they have to --- they have to produce a winner. You have to produce a good horse. I mean, there's a competition. It's not like, okay, you just get this money and that's it. It goes to people who actually win and who actually earn it. And I think that's a huge difference.

And then the ripple effect that's going through the community is incredible. And I think it's over --- it's over 80 percent of that money that circles around into feed and into people that work here and in the barns and things like that.

So to me, when we were writing this thing, it was --- of course we wanted to make horse racing --- keep that tradition going, but it also was good for York and Lebanon and every other community. We talked about spreading the money around, well, it went into agriculture and it went into horse farms. And it actually helped Upper Bucks horse farms and open space. Open space became more available or more worthwhile because it was worth more as a farm, as a horse farm.

So the ripple effect of this economy, of throwing this money in instead of just giving a couple hundred million dollars to education or a couple hundred million dollars here, it's an industry that produces more. I mean, it --- it does something. And I think that's the key. You just don't --- you just don't put it there and then it --- next year you need another hundred million dollars, and the next year you need another.

And that's the same path we're going down now with the casinos. The way that the Fund got raided, now, all of a sudden, legislators think, okay, let's just --- let's just turn this cell phone into a slot machine and we'll make it easier for us and we'll make more money, when actually they're making less money. And then, of course, that cuts you out and it cuts everybody else out. Well, let's do VGTs at bars and we'll do that. Well, that --- that takes away from the horsemen. That's going to take away from everybody else.

So when we thought this plan out and as we negotiated it, and of course, Class IIs and Class IIIs, and of course, you're right, Class Is --- if you were a Class I, you got a license. You didn't have to compete before the Gaming Commission for a location. You got that license. And that was the advantage of that.

Of course --- and I think, since he's in the room, we should blame Steve Crawford for taking that money off of us. I said that facetiously. It was part of that legislative process. It's part of a leader that we see all the time say, hey, instead of raising taxes, let's grab a little bit of that money, hey, let's take some money off of that because we don't need --- a tenth or two-tenths --- we'll just take it out of this. We'll take it out of the gaming money and we'll take it out of that. And what you're doing, though, is you're ruining 18,000 jobs. You're ruining millions of dollars in investments. You're ruining all --- everything that's been built up. And it's an industry --- it's an economic engine.

And as you drove in on Street Road, there's not a restaurant that you've heard of that isn't here. Every restaurant that you can name, Applebee's, Outback's, Carrabba's, Friday's, Red Robbin, they're all here, Panera, they're all here on --- and there's more hotel rooms in Bensalem than there is in all of Bucks County. This is an economic engine. And it drives more than just the jobs that

are here. It drives jobs in those restaurants that are on Street Road and those gas stations that are on Street Road.

And so the same thing that happened to the Horse Racing

Development Fund they're trying to do to the casinos now. It's an incredible problem, and it didn't hit me until we just started talking about it.

Somebody said that we got a tight budget, we need some money, we can't find money, let's just raid this fund or let's raid that fund or let's raid this industry. So it's very, very dangerous. We created a great thing here, it's been very successful. And this chart is tremendous to show where all this money goes, into jobs.

And that's why I wanted to point out my friend John Servis. If I would have won the Kentucky Derby, I probably would have retired, John, but you're still training horses and a lot of horses. So the money --- they just keep hiring more people, spending more money here. And this money is not just a gift, it's something they have to earn and work for.

MR. DEBUNDA: Thank you, Senator. And I just want to add that the \$20 million that Mr. Ricci referred to as the effect on our purses, that's a third of our purses when we go --- a third. And that would --- we would not be able to compete with other jurisdictions for the horse, the owner, because our purses --- horses only run so many times a year, so you choose where they run. You can put them on a van and run

1 them anywhere. We would not be able to compete. So that would 2 be the death knell of the kind of racing we have here in Parx. 3 And by the way, I mentioned the million dollar 4 races. That purse money comes from the horseman. It's not put up by the track. And we wouldn't be able to fund that if ---. 5 6 CHAIRMAN PETRI: Representative Mehaffie still has a 7 question, I believe. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Real quick. Sal, thank 9 you. And I'm encouraged to hear you're a breeder also, not 10 just an owner. I have a horse farm. When it started --- and 11 12 Senator, you're right. We have to stop raiding the Horse Fund. 13 We must. Because the breeding side is what's suffering right 14 now. You'd agree; correct? 15 MR. DEBUNDA: I do. 16 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: Okay. 17 At this point I have a --- when this started back in 18 '04, '05, we had a gentleman come in and buy a 110-acre farm 19 right by my home. Spent millions and millions of dollars on 20 fence, barns, outsheds, pastures and so forth. And he brought in Real Quiet. And we're all familiar ---. 21 22 MR. DEBUNDA: I bred to Real Quiet. 23 REPRESENTATIVE MEHAFFIE: There you go. And that's what I want to make a point here is, as breeders, and you guys 24 25 --- you know, I've never seen so many horse trailers. When

they brought Real Quiet in here, I never saw so many horse trailers come into our community. And Real Quiet's no longer alive. He did pass away. But at that point, these trailers weren't coming in from just Pennsylvania. They were coming in from Maryland, Kentucky, all over, every state. And we got to remember that, because these farms bring in business, out-of-state business. And we got to realize that when we raid that Horse Fund and we hurt these breeders, we hurt economic development in our areas. So I just want to say that. And thank you so much, Sal.

MR. DEBUNDA: By the way, my horse was called WhisperDowntheLane. By the way, when I --- when I want to breed in Kentucky --- my mare just had a baby a week ago. If I want to breed that horse in Kentucky, I have to send her down to Kentucky, her and the baby, in a van, put her on a farm there for three months, give them money, and hopefully she'll get pregnant and then I bring her back. So all that time that she was down in Kentucky, no money was going to the Commonwealth. So we'd rather be breeding here.

<u>CHAIRMAN PETRI:</u> Final question from Representative Pashinski.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Actually, it's just a comment. The Senator and my fellow colleague down there did a great job. But so did you --- so did you with this visual.

Now, take ---.

MR. DEBUNDA: You notice the lawyer's hanging in that photograph?

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: You know what, I noticed that. But stay with --- stay with the economic development. There should be a chart here regarding the purchase of the farms and the feed and the fence and the buildings and the trailers and all of the people that are employees of those places. And I thought you may want to end with what was the condition of the racehorse industry before the casino industry came in. Because you guys were hanging on a string, the quality of your horses. The breeders were gone. And what happened with the casino industry, it just ignited your industry again. We now attract the people from Kentucky with the quality horses that purchased our farms. In Pennsylvania we have 97,000 farms. I believe 30,000 are horse farms.

So I think those points you may want to, you know, prop it up with --- with some of those facts because I don't people understand that. They don't understand what that one horse brings in. And they don't understand the money that's coming in, you know, through that industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PETRI: With that --- and thank you for your testimony. This hearing will be adjourned. And look for the next one to be scheduled at a casino near you.

MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:33 P.M.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, was reported by me on and I, Jamie Ann Morris, read this transcript and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

б

Jamie Ann Morris,

Court Reporter