

INDIANA GAMING COMMISSION MEETING  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2014  
HELD AT LAWRENCEBURG EVENT CENTER

- - -

Commissioners: Ernest Yelton  
Cris Johnston  
Anita Sherman  
Joseph Svetanoff  
Mike Herndon  
Marc Fine  
Susan Williams  
Sara Tait

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. YELTON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.  
3 I'm usually, or usually we have the  
4 chair open the meeting, but since I'm  
5 introducing our new chair, I will do  
6 so.

7 I'm pleased to announced that  
8 Governor Pence has appointed Cris  
9 Johnston to be our eighth chair of  
10 the Indiana Gaming Commission. Cris  
11 has started with us in September, or  
12 no, January of 19, no 2013. I'm  
13 getting everything confused today.  
14 And actually, though, he was one of  
15 the very first people to work in  
16 gaming in the State of Indiana. I  
17 believe he did a lot of consulting  
18 work for Crow Chesic, did you not,  
19 before the first boat was even open?  
20 So he's got a lot of history with  
21 gaming in the State of Indiana.  
22 He's been with the Office of  
23 Management and Budget for, I think  
24 the whole, almost the whole eight  
25 years with Governor Mitch Daniels, so

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

we worked with him very closely then.  
So I'm gotten very pleased to  
announce that Cris is our new chair.  
I'll turn the meeting over to Cris.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much, Director  
Yelton. It's a pleasure to be here,  
and an honor to serve in this role,  
and try to fill the big shoes that  
Commissioner Bell left, and I'll try  
my best to do so.

As Commissioner, or as Director  
Yelton mentioned, I have been a  
student, an observer of, really  
Indiana in the gaming, in the infancy  
of its gaming industry back in the  
1990's during the application  
process, so it's a pleasure to be  
back serving and working with the  
industry, such an important industry  
to the State of Indiana.

And on behalf of the Commission, I  
wish to thank Scott Saunders and  
Hollywood Casino hosting us here  
today for our meeting in November.

And also what I would really like to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

do is -- this is the second day of a southeastern Indiana swing. And so I want to thank also the folks from Belterra, as well as Rising Star in their hospitality and the tours that we received.

We love having you come to Indianapolis, and your presentations are very thorough and complete and give us an overview of your operations, but there's nothing like being on site, walking around, talking to you about the challenges you face every day and how we can help serve in that capacity. So again, thank you, thank you very much.

What I would also like to do is introduce a new Commission member, Mike Herndon. Mr. Herndon is, has joined us, was appointed back in October. And I probably ought to say whole career, he's had a long and distinguished number of careers in the public service. He served in the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Navy in the 1960's; has been a police detective and managed the Criminal Investigations Unit for 14 years; Sheriff of Shelby County, Indiana for two terms; then was a private investigator; and then worked as the special investigative, Special Investigations Unit manager of Farm Bureau. During that time at Farm Bureau, continuing that public service he was, served in the House of Representatives for two years, from 2001 to 2002. And has served, again, in many law enforcement capacities as a graduate of the law enforcement, Indiana Law Enforcement Academy and the FBI National Academy, and has served as instructor out at Indiana's Law Enforcement Academy. So welcome, Mr. Herndon. And I should say to the Commissioners, the microphones work with an on-and-off button, so please make sure your button is pressed to talk.

1 MR. HERNDON: Well, thank you. It's a pleasure to  
2 be here and an honor to serve. I'm  
3 trying to keep my eyes open and my  
4 mouth shut so that I can learn more.  
5 And I'm just honored to be here and  
6 anxious to serve. Thank you.

7 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. We look  
8 forward to working with you.  
9 So seeing open door notices and those  
10 requirements posted, I'll call the  
11 meeting to order and have the role  
12 call of the Commission. Commissioner  
13 Fine.

14 MR. FINE: Present.

15 MR. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Williams.

16 MS. WILLIAMS: Present.

17 MR. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sherman.

18 MS. SHERMAN: Here.

19 MR. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Svetanoff.

20 MR. SVETANOFF: Present.

21 MR. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Herndon.

22 MR. HERNDON: Present.

23 MR. JOHNSTON: And the Chairman is present.  
24 Seeing a quorum, we'll move into the  
25 first order of business, and that

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

being the election of the Secretary.  
I will say from firsthand experience  
the benefits of being Secretary of  
the Commission are just overwhelming,  
and I'm sure we'll have many  
recommendations or nominations from  
the floor.  
So are there any -- the floor is open  
for nominations for Secretary of the  
Commission.

MR. FINE: I'll nominate Commissioner Svetanoff.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a nomination for  
Commissioner Svetanoff. Any seconds?

MS. SHERMAN: I'm second that.

MR. JOHNSTON: There is a nomination and second.  
Any other nominations?  
Well, with that highly contested  
exercise, I will close the  
nominations. And all those in favor  
of appointing Commissioner Svetanoff  
as Secretary, please say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Those opposed?  
Overwhelming with success.  
The next order of business is the

1 approval of the minutes. Those were  
2 distributed earlier. Any comments or  
3 questions about the minutes?  
4 Seeing none, is there a motion for  
5 approval?  
6 MR. SVETANOFF: Motion for approval.  
7 MR. FINE: Second.  
8 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and second. All  
9 those in favor, say aye.  
10 (Responses "aye".)  
11 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed?  
12 Thank you very much.  
13 Next is the report from Executive  
14 Director Yelton.  
15 MR. YELTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the  
16 Commission. Since our last meeting  
17 I'm pleased to announce that Angela  
18 Bottom -- Angela, will you stand  
19 please -- has been promoted from the  
20 Occupational Licensing Coordinator to  
21 the Executive Administrative  
22 Assistant. Actually, we've modified  
23 her job description because many of  
24 her responsibilities that she  
25 previously had has been done so well

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

by her, we're going to carry them  
over, overlap into her new job.  
Welcome.  
Since our last meeting, the  
Background and Financial  
Investigations Unit has completed its  
reinvestigations of French Lick  
Resort and Casino, Rising Star  
Casino, and supplier Interblock.  
Those reports have been previously  
submitted to you in your materials  
before the meeting, and the Financial  
Director Danielle Leek is here to  
answer any questions you may have  
about those reports. Are there any  
questions from the Commissioners?  
Seeing none, we'll move on.  
Since June the IGC staff has added 46  
individuals to the exclusion list,  
which effectively bars those patrons  
from entering any casino in the State  
of Indiana. Of those 46 individuals,  
10 were placed on the exclusion list  
for tapping, pinching or post, past  
posting debts while in an Indiana

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

casino. Six were placed on the exclusion list for using counterfeit bills in excess of \$500 or taking illegal possession of casino chips, U.S. currency, or belongings valued in the excess of \$500.

We have seen an increase in fraudulent attempts to obtain cash advances, placed 17 individuals on the exclusion list for attempting fraudulent cash advances from our casinos.

One particular individual was placed on the list for stealing a rack of chips valued at \$37,000 and attempting to flea the casino. Not surprisingly, he was charged and convicted with felony theft.

Another was placed on the exclusion list for the theft of a slot attendant's money pouch with over \$6,000, and two dealers were placed on the exclusion list for inappropriately giving chips to different patrons.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

For the year of 2014 we've placed 62 patrons on the exclusion list, bringing the total to 442 individuals.

Our waivered summary for the last quarter, we found that Belterra was allowed to use U.S. coin at the mini Baccarat table games to make change, we calculated the commission, and also at the Pai Gow table when a vigorish is taken.

Due to the carpet replacement at Blue Chip, the casino was granted one time waivers for the following:

The requirement of entering all EGD moves into the EGD system, since the slot machines are only moved off the floor briefly and then placed back in their very same location. They're allowed to test 50 percent of the machines in each section of the move with the conditions that the reports detailing the communication results will be generated before and after the games are tested.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The requirement to submit table game movement to the Commission, and the entry of any gaming table devices into the EGD system, all tables will be credited prior to movement. Also, they will allow slot technicians from a sister property to submit documentations to assist in the disconnection in connection of all slot machines to assist only in the presence of a gaming agent at all times in the area they are working. Indiana Grand was allowed a one time waiver to proactively remove people from their evicted person list. And finally, Rising Star was allowed to establish internal controls that would allow one tip count member during the tip drop and count process for the slot and cage departments. The casino must submit and receive approval to approval of internal controls prior to implementing this request. And that, Mr. Chair, concludes my report.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much, director  
Yelton. Any questions for the  
Director?  
Seeing none, is there any old  
business to be brought before the  
Commission?  
So let's proceed with new business.  
On patrons matters, in the Voluntary  
Exclusion Program, Tammy  
Timberman-Wright.

MS. TIMBERMAN-WRIGHT: Good morning Commissioners  
and Executive Staff. You have before  
you 16 orders regarding the Voluntary  
Exclusion Program. Pursuant to the  
rules of the program, the identity of  
the Volunteer Exclusion Program  
participants must remain  
confidential. Pursuant to 68 IAC  
6-3-2(g). A participant in a program  
agrees that if he or she violates the  
terms of the program and enters the  
gaming area of a facility under the  
jurisdiction of the Commission, they  
will forfeit any jackpot or thing of  
value as a result of a wager.

1 Under orders 2014-186 through  
2 2014-201, a total sum of \$26,706.93  
3 was forfeited by Joe Doe 79 through  
4 94. These winnings were collected at  
5 Ameirstar, Blue Chip, French Lick,  
6 Hoosier Park, Horseshoe, Horseshoe  
7 Southern Indiana and Indiana Grand.  
8 These winnings were withheld as  
9 required by Commission regulations.  
10 Commission staff recommends that you  
11 approve these orders.

12 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions for Tammy? Thank you.  
13 Seeing no questions, is there a  
14 motion for approval of orders  
15 2014-186 through 201?

16 MS. WILLIAMS: So moved.

17 MS. SHERMAN: Second.

18 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second.  
19 Those in favor, say aye.

20 (Responses "aye".)

21 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Thank you very much.  
22 Continuing on with the Voluntary  
23 Exclusion Program and Administrative  
24 Law Judge matters and a removal  
25 request, Erica Sullivan, please.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Good morning. Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning. I present for your consideration order number 2014-202, approving the Administrative Law Judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law seizing a jackpot from a participant in the Voluntary Exclusion Program.

The individual at issue, John Doe 16, submitted an application for voluntary exclusion to the Commission on August 6, 2011, for a five-year exclusion. Just two and a half years later, on or about December 6, 2013, John Doe 16 was discovered at the Hollywood Casino here in Lawrenceburg after winning a jackpot worth \$1,096.25 before applicable taxes. Hollywood Casino seized the jackpot pursuant to 68 IAC 6-3-2(g).

On June 26, 2014, the Commission approved remittance of the monies in order 2014-16. John Doe 16 appealed the Commission's approval within the appropriate timeframe and Commission

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

staff referred the appeal to the Administrative Law Judgment. Commission staff moved for Summary Judgment in its favor on or about July 11, 2014. Appellant John Doe 16 did not file a response.

On August 8, 2014, a telephonic hearing was conducted with the ALJ Commission staff, and Appellant John Doe 16.

On or about September 8, 2014, the ALJ issue its findings of fact and conclusions of law granting the Commission's Motion for Summary Judgment and affirming the seizure of the jackpot from John Doe 16 due to his participation in the Voluntary Exclusion Program when he won the jackpot.

Commission staff respectfully recommends you approve the ALJ's findings and conclusions in Order 2014-202.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. Any questions for Erica?  
What is the pleasure of the Board

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

regarding Order 202 for the ALJ application?

MR. FINE: Move for approval.

MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. Any questions?

All those in favor, say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Motion passes.

Please continue.

MS. SULLIVAN: Now I present for your consideration order number 2014-203, denying a request to be removed from the statewide exclusion list.

On or about March 8th, 2009, Mr. Kyle Pharms was observed via video surveillance unlawfully taking possession of three TITO tickets worth approximately \$1,700, and proceeding to redeem them for U.S. currency. Mr. Pharms was charged with Theft, a Class D Felony, and he pled guilty to an amended charge of Criminal Conversion, a Class A Misdemeanor. The Court withheld

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

judgment for one year and ordered him to pay restitution. When he failed to pay restitution, he served six months in the LaPorte County Jail. On or about May 9th, 2009, Commission staff placed Mr. Pharms on the exclusion list, and he petitioned for removed from the exclusion list on or about August 20th of 2014.

Review of a petition for removal from the exclusion list is not an opportunity to second-guess the initial exclusion, and is not an appeal or review of the exclusion. Review of a petition is a separate process with its own standards.

I was assigned to serve as the review officer. On September 30, 2014, I conducted a hearing on Mr. Pharms' request and submitted findings of fact and a recommendation, which is in your materials.

Mr. Pharms stated at the time he came into possession of the TITO tickets he believed it was "found money", and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

he believes that he has served sufficient punishment. However, when questioned whether he had entered any Indiana casino since he had been placed on the exclusion list, Mr. Pharms stated he had only entered the Majestic Star Casino on one occasion. However, Mr. Pharms had indeed visited a casino on another occasion, winning a \$5,000 jackpot at another casino while he was an excluded patron. He stated multiple times that he was a known craps player and everyone at the casinos know him. As a result of Mr. Pharms' failure to meet the clear and convincing evidence, standard required for removal, I recommend the Commission deny his request for removal in Order 2014-203.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. Any questions for Eric on this matter? Seeing none, is there a motion regarding the recommendation and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

findings of fact of the review officer?

MR. SVETANOFF: Motion to approve.

MR. FINE: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's a motion and second. All those in favor say aye?

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Motion passes. Thank you very much.

Our next topic is suppliers, industry supplier matters and renewals.

Mr. Harcourt, welcome.

MR. HARCOURT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Commission, you have before you order number 2014-204, concerning the renewing of the suppliers' licenses. Pursuant to IC 4-33-7-8 in 68 IAC 2-2-8, a suppliers' license must be renewed annually with a \$7,500 renewal fee. Each of the following licensees has requested renewal of license and paid the appropriate renewal fee.

The order before you was approved for renewal for the following supplier

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

licensees:  
Global Surveillance Associates, Inc,  
aristocrat Technologies Inc., and  
Cummins-Allison, Corp. Commission  
staff recommends that you approve the  
renewal of the licenses of these  
suppliers.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Mr. Harcourt,  
are there any questions?

Seeing none, is there a motion for  
order 204?

MS. SHERMAN: Motion to approve.

MR. FINE: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: It has been moved and seconded.

All those in favor, say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Thank you very much.

The next subject matter of the  
suppliers is the transfers and  
mergers and reorganizations in the  
industry. Danielle.

MS. LEEK: Good morning. Order 2014-205 is an  
on order granting the Executive  
Director authority to issue a final  
approval waiving the application of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

68 IAC 5-1 to a transfer of ownership in GTECH and International Gaming Technologies, which I'll read it. Both GTECH and IGT are current Indiana supplier licensees. Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated July 15, 2014, GTECH plans to acquire ownership of IGT. GTECH will merge into newly formed Georgia Worldwide Limited, and at the completion of the merger, IGT will be a wholly owned subsidiary of Georgia Worldwide Limited.

Under 68 IAC 5-1, supplier licensees that are publicly traded companies must comply with certain requirements before transferring an ownership interest, including a suitability investigation, in order to protect the Commission's interest in the suitability of its licensees.

Under 68 IAC 5-1-8, the Commission may waive a requirement or procedure if the Commission determines that it's impractical or burdensome and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the waiver is in the best interest of the public and the gaming industry and is not outside the technical requirements necessary to serve the purpose of the requirement or procedure.

The Commission has previously investigated GTECH and IGC and its key persons except for one independent director. For this reason, the Commission has determined that there is little to gain from applying the requirements of 68 IAC 5-1 to the present transaction. However, due to the failure to submit an application for an Independent Director, waiver is not appropriate at this time. The order before you will assign the Executive Director the authority to issue final approval of the waiver. Condition upon the submission of the Independent director's application, and a determination that he is suitable pursuant to the Commission's

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

licensing standards, and that no material changes to the proposed transaction have taken place. If there are any substantive changes to the merger, or if the Commission staff concludes that the transaction is unsound after reviewing the application, the Executive Director may decline to issue final approval, and that would require GTECH to appear before the Commission and present the proposal for the consideration. Commission staff recommends that you approve this order, granting the Executive Director authority to issue the final approval, waiving the application of 68 IAC 5-1 to transfer of ownership in IGC to GTECH.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Danielle. On this matter, how many Board members do you have, or directors do you have the material for?

MS. LEEK: There are, at the close of the merger there will be 11 directors. Three of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

them were new and needed to submit for applications. We have two, and there's just the one outstanding Independent Director who has failed to submit by the deadline, I believe.

MR. JOHNSTON: What was that deadline?

MS. LEEK: The original deadline was October 31st, and then they requested an extension, and we gave them extension to this past Monday, on November 17th.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is there anyone here representing GTECH? Mr. Winkofsky, we might have a few more questions for you. Can you give us a background of what's the challenge with the final?

MR. WINKOFSKY: Sure, I can. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman and Commission, director Yelton, Miss Davis. My name is Ed Winkofsky, and I'm here today before on behalf of GTECH. I think it's a combination of unfortunate travel schedule for this individual, this particular director. He had previously submitted applications in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

a round of jurisdictions. I just received a list of those. I'm going to read a couple of those to you. He just filed in Michigan, British Columbia, Missouri, New Jersey and Louisiana, and those all went out the door and he went for his vacation and we have been unsuccessful in obtaining the signature from him necessary to submit the application. I've been in contact with the company this morning. They have a very robust compliance team, are very capable, they're working very hard to submit for approval for this transaction.

Recently received approval in Michigan, in Mississippi, in a couple of others, New Mexico, West Virginia, Maryland. And they're working through in all the jurisdictions to receive approval for this transaction. We expect to have his application as early as next week, and we're continuing with that.

1 MR. JOHNSTON: Questions for our speaker?  
2 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm not sure I understood what you  
3 just said. The applications have  
4 been filed in these other states or  
5 they have not been filed?  
6 MR. WINKOFSKY: Yes, he filed in those other  
7 jurisdictions.  
8 MS. WILLIAMS: We're the only one that he chose not  
9 to complete?  
10 MR. WINKOFSKY: No, ma'am, there are other  
11 jurisdictions on his list that he has  
12 yet to file.  
13 MS. WILLIAMS: And what's the status of the merger  
14 as a result of that?  
15 MR. WINKOFSKY: The merger was not scheduled to  
16 close until, they're targeting the  
17 end of January of 2015. So as far as  
18 we know it has not impacted the  
19 timing in any of the other  
20 jurisdictions.  
21 MS. WILLIAMS: And this vacation has covered how  
22 many weeks, how many months?  
23 MR. WINKOFSKY: I have worked with this company for  
24 a while, and I will tell you that  
25 their compliance team is very

1 diligent, and I think that, they  
2 expressed to me frustration  
3 occasionally, cultural differences,  
4 that this company for a long time has  
5 been an Italian publicly-traded  
6 company. As part of the merger they  
7 have formed this UK company, Georgia  
8 Worldwide. It will be publicly  
9 traded on the New York Stock  
10 Exchange, and everyone in the  
11 Compliance Committee and staff are  
12 excited about the filing requirements  
13 and the ongoing attention that this  
14 will require as a result of the  
15 merger. They think that it will  
16 streamline the compliance function.

17 MR. SVETANOFF: Excuse me. Why haven't they put  
18 their Compliance Committee on a plane  
19 to Italy to get the --

20 MR. WINKOFSKY: Yeah, Luke Orchard is their  
21 Director of Compliance. He has been  
22 to Italy, he has met with Gianmario,  
23 he's also been in Australia.

24 MR. SVETANOFF: The problem I have is, we've given  
25 multiple extensions, and there's

1 basically been no improvement  
2 whatsoever. So it doesn't look like,  
3 at least your timing director, is  
4 taking this very serious.

5 MR. WINKOFSKY: The other thing that I, I just  
6 received this message now, and I  
7 don't know, Danielle, if you know,  
8 but they told me that Gianmario is  
9 previously licensed in Indiana.

10 MR. SVETANOFF: That's even a bigger problem.

11 MR. WINKOFSKY: That makes it worse. The answer is  
12 that we don't have the signature  
13 pages and we don't want to submit an  
14 incomplete application for this one  
15 gentleman. And he is, he has been  
16 made aware of how serious this is,  
17 and you also have the Board of  
18 Directors, he's one of 11 members,  
19 and you have the other 10.  
20 So as soon as we have his signature  
21 pages we will, we will submit it.  
22 And he has been told that on multiple  
23 occasions that, that is a serious  
24 matter.

25 MS. SHERMAN: You said you expected him to submit

1 this paperwork within a week?

2 MR. YELTON: Yes, ma'am.

3 MS. SHERMAN: So as a practical, perhaps to amend  
4 this motion to require that this be  
5 completed by the first of December?

6 MS. TAIT: Yes, we can add that to the order,  
7 the December 1st deadline.

8 MR. FINE: What's the vocation of this  
9 gentleman, what's he do?

10 MR. WINKOFSKY: I don't know him, and I don't know.  
11 I know he has, he has been on the  
12 Board previously and I think retired,  
13 and then was asked to come back as  
14 one of the three Independent  
15 Directors that were required per SEC  
16 requirements, and he agreed to do  
17 that.

18 MR. FINE: Is he essential? I mean, maybe he  
19 doesn't want to be on the Board.

20 MR. WINKOFSKY: You know, he's filed in several  
21 other jurisdictions and seems to be  
22 making progress towards filing.

23 MR. SVETANOFF: He seems to be, I mean, this is a  
24 significant merger we have going on  
25 here, so.

1 MR. WINKOFSKY: Obviously lots of people are  
2 working very hard to make sure that  
3 this .4 million dollar transaction --

4 MR. JOHNSTON: How many other -- roughly how many  
5 other jurisdictions are awaiting  
6 paperwork?

7 MR. WINKOFSKY: I don't, I don't know for him. I  
8 know that he -- I just know where  
9 he's previously filed. I don't know  
10 where he has yet to file. But I know  
11 that the list of jurisdictions that  
12 have to approve is quite lengthy, and  
13 thus far they've only, we've  
14 received, I'm looking at the list of  
15 about seven, so I would guess that.

16 MR. FINE: I'm not sure, I mean, you may want to  
17 comfort me, but I'm not feeling it.  
18 Our state's less than Mississippi,  
19 less than New Mexico, less than  
20 Michigan, because he seems to have  
21 gotten to those states just fine.  
22 And you have this robust team that  
23 doesn't seem to value our  
24 application, the same application  
25 he's seen before, but doesn't really

1 care to do it again on a timely  
2 basis. Why should we give you  
3 another day, why? Tell me why.  
4 We've given you two deadlines, both  
5 of which have come and gone.

6 MR. WINKOFFSKY: Yeah.

7 MR. FINE: I'm just, I'm at a loss to understand  
8 why we would even consider another  
9 day.

10 MR. WINKOFFSKY: I think that the company is acting  
11 in good faith. At each time they  
12 weren't going to make a deadline,  
13 there was no, they were very direct  
14 about that. We called and got on the  
15 phone with staff immediately, as soon  
16 as it became apparent that we weren't  
17 going to make a deadline, and we  
18 requested direction from them.  
19 And we're working with them in  
20 providing everything else that has  
21 been requested so far. This is the  
22 one outstanding piece, and we're  
23 working to get it to you, and we'd  
24 ask your consideration. This is the  
25 parent company of the licensees.

1 It's a publicly-traded company. It's  
2 someone who you have known  
3 previously, and is just struggling a  
4 little bit to get this information to  
5 you now, and we would request your  
6 consideration in light of those  
7 facts.

8 MR. JOHNSTON: I think you get the sense of the  
9 frustration of the Commission.

10 MR. WINKOFSKY: I do, sir.

11 MR. JOHNSTON: And so I ask, I'll put Sara on the  
12 spot that if there was a deadline  
13 placed and that deadline was not met,  
14 then the motion does not go forward;  
15 is that correct?

16 MS. TAIT: Yes, that's correct. If it's the  
17 will of the Commission on the end of,  
18 if you're looking at the draft order,  
19 after the number one it would say:  
20 Submission of the Independent  
21 Director's application by December 1,  
22 2014. We could add that language.

23 MR. JOHNSTON: Additional questions?

24 MR. WINKOFSKY: You guys give me a trip to Italy  
25 out of this, I wouldn't be upset.

1 MR. SVETANOFF: I'm surprised GTECH doesn't pay for  
2 your ticket themselves.  
3 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you for your time.  
4 MR. WINKOFSKY: Thank you.  
5 MS. LEEK: So having heard that, Commission  
6 staff would recommend that you  
7 approve the order granting Executive  
8 Director the authority to issue final  
9 approval based on the conditions we  
10 discussed, which would be the  
11 submission of the application by  
12 December 1st, along with no material  
13 changes to the proposed transactions.  
14 The order would give the Executive  
15 Director authority to issue the final  
16 approval waiving the application of  
17 68 IAC 5-1 to the transfer of  
18 ownership in IGT to GTECH.  
19 MR. YELTON: And the finding is suitable.  
20 MS. LEEK: Yes, and the finding is suitable.  
21 MS. SHERMAN: Can we clarify that is suitable by  
22 changing the word of submission to  
23 receipt, to receipt of the  
24 Independent Director's application by  
25 December 1?

1 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, we will change that language.  
2 MR. JOHNSTON: Do we need to take this as an  
3 amended?  
4 MR. YELTON: No, just motion.  
5 MR. JOHNSTON: Just motion as stated as amended.  
6 What's the pleasure of the Board?  
7 MS. SHERMAN: I move for approval as amended.  
8 MR. HERNDON: I'll second.  
9 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion to second. Any  
10 further discussions or questions?  
11 MR. YELTON: May I interject something, Ed, just  
12 to cover all bases? Assuming the  
13 director is not able or willing to  
14 submit this by the 1st of December,  
15 is it a possibility he would be  
16 withdrawn as a director?  
17 MR. JOHNSTON: I think that's a very real  
18 possibility.  
19 MR. YELTON: I would recommend that the motion be  
20 amended, because as it is, if they  
21 withdraw him as a director, I'm not  
22 sure that would authorize me to  
23 approve it. Rather if he's  
24 withdrawn, then I assume it's the  
25 will of the Commission they can go

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

forward.

MS. WILLIAMS: But if they're required to have three Independent Directors, that means they're going to be required to find another director.

MR. FINE: That could be in the bylaws.

MR. WINKOFSKY: It may be possible to find an Independent Director who is already licensed here in Indiana.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'll remind the Commission that the purpose of this order is not to delay a financing of a very large supplier to the industry in Indiana, and so it will not be -- I mean, the approval has to occur prior to the consummation of the transaction. Do you think December 1 will be attainable?

MR. WINKOFSKY: I do.

MR. JOHNSTON: So with the additional.

MR. YELTON: Let me ask you this. Would you have, the way you're constituted now, would you have to have 11 directors?

MR. WINKOFSKY: Yes, there has to be, our merger agreement --

1 MR. YELTON: Well, maybe then that part of the  
2 motion wouldn't be necessary. If you  
3 withdrew, you still wouldn't have --

4 MR. WINKOFSKY: Well, we would have to find a  
5 replacement.

6 MR. YELTON: Right, as long as that's person's  
7 already licensed. I would withdraw  
8 that request and leave it as a  
9 motion.

10 MR. WINKOFSKY: But then if his replacement,  
11 hypothetically, if his replacement  
12 were to be licensed.

13 MR. YELTON: I would assume if his replacement  
14 were to be licensed there would be no  
15 objection.

16 MR. FINE: Or if they change the bylaws in order  
17 to require a lesser number of  
18 Independent Directors.

19 MR. WINKOFSKY: The bylaws, I also know it was in  
20 the merger agreement so that IGT  
21 submitted so many to the Board and  
22 GTECH submitted so many to the Board.

23 MS. SHERMAN: Do you think it's practical to find  
24 the third qualified already licensed?

25 MR. WINKOFSKY: It doesn't sound like it would be

1 impossible to me. Thank you.  
2 MR. JOHNSTON: Is there a motion?  
3 MR. YELTON: There was a motion.  
4 MR. JOHNSTON: Is there a second?  
5 MR. SVETANOFF: I second it.  
6 MR. JOHNSTON: I guess I went on for further  
7 questions, I apologize. So all those  
8 in favor of the order as amended,  
9 please say aye.  
10 (Responses "aye".)  
11 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed?  
12 MS. WILLIAMS: Aye.  
13 MR. JOHNSTON: The order is adopted.  
14 MS. LEEK: The next order that I have for you is  
15 order 2014-206. This is waiving the  
16 application of 68 IAC 5-1 to a  
17 transfer of ownership in Multimedia  
18 Games to Global Cash Access, which I  
19 will call GCA. Multimedia Games and  
20 GCA are Indiana supplier licensees.  
21 Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of  
22 Merger dated September 8, 2014, GCA  
23 plans to acquire ownership of  
24 Multimedia. At the completion of the  
25 merger Multimedia will become a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

wholly owned subsidiary of GCA.  
Under 68 IAC 5-1, supplier licensees  
that are publicly-traded companies  
must comply with certain requirements  
before transferring an ownership  
interest, including a suitability  
investigation, in order to protect  
the Commission's interest in the  
suitability of its licensees.  
Under 68 IAC 5-1-8, the Commission  
may waive a requirement or procedure  
if the Commission determines that it  
is impractical or burdensome and the  
waiver is in the best interest of the  
public and the gaming industry and is  
not outside the technical  
requirements necessary to serve the  
purpose of the requirement or  
procedure.  
Both GCA and Multimedia have  
undergone suitability investigations.  
They have been, and continue to be,  
subject to the jurisdiction of the  
Commission. For this reason, the  
Commission has determined that

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

there's little to gain from applying the requirements of 68 IAC 5-1 to the present transaction. The requirements are impractical and burdensome, and waiver is in the best interest of the public and gaming industry and is not outside the technical requirements necessary. Based on this, Commission staff recommends that you approve this order waiving 68 IAC 5-1 as necessary to allow the proposed transfer of ownership interest in Multimedia to GCA.

MR. JOHNSTON: Questions of order 206? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.  
(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Thank you very much. The motion passes.  
Disciplinary actions, Chris Gray.

MS. GRAY: Good morning Commissioners and Executive staff. Order 2014-207 is a Settlement Agreement with Aristocrat wherein the supplier did not follow

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the shipment rules. Aristocrat has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$3,000 in lieu of disciplinary action. The Commission staff recommends that you approve Order 2014-207.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Any questions?

MR. YELTON: If there are no questions.

MS. GRAY: If there are no questions.

MR. YELTON: We'll go.

MR. JOHNSTON: Next Order 208.

MS. GRAY: Order 2014-208 is a settlement agreement with Lottomatica/GTECH, wherein the supplier failed to follow the rules regarding the shipment of regulated items. Lottomatica/GTECH has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$3,000 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Questions? Please proceed.

MS. GRAY: Order 2014-209 is a settlement agreement with WMS and contains two counts. In the first count the supplier failed to follow the shipment rules. In the second count

1 a key person failed to timely submit  
2 his application for a Level 1  
3 license. WMS has agreed to a  
4 monetary settlement of \$6,500 in lieu  
5 of disciplinary action.

6 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions?

7 MS. GRAY: The Commission staff recommends that  
8 you approve Orders 2014-207 through  
9 2014-209.

10 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. What's the  
11 pleasure of the Board on Orders 207  
12 through 209?

13 MR. FINE: Move for approval.

14 MR. SVETANOFF: I second.

15 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion to approve and a  
16 second. All those in favor, say aye.  
17 (Responses "aye".)

18 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed?

19 MS. GRAY: Thank you.

20 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Moving on to  
21 occupational licenses. Erica,  
22 welcome back.

23 MS. SULLIVAN: You have before you Orders 2014-210  
24 through 2014-213. Each of those  
25 orders ratifies a settlement

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

agreement entered into between an occupational licensee and Executive Director.

These applicants failed to respond to requests for information from the Commission investigators during the initial background investigation.

While each applicant did ultimately provide sufficient information, the individuals did not provide the information requested by the Commission staff during the initial investigation, resulting in additional requests from legal staff.

Pursuant to 68 IAC 2-3-5(b)(9), an applicant for occupational license must comply with all requests for information, documents, or other materials relating to the applicant and his application during the investigation conduction by the Commission.

In lieu of an administrative proceeding regarding these applicants' occupational licenses due

1 to their failure to comply with the  
2 Commission's request for information,  
3 documents or other materials,  
4 Commission staff offered to settle  
5 the matter if each individual  
6 licensee agreed to an unpaid  
7 voluntary relinquishment of his or  
8 her temporary license and temporary  
9 identification badge for a period of  
10 three regularly scheduled working  
11 days, without using vacation or any  
12 other paid leave time.  
13 All licensees agreed to the  
14 settlement terms offered by the  
15 Commission staff, and Commission  
16 staff respectfully requests that you  
17 approve the terms of the settlement  
18 agreements as described in Orders  
19 2014-210 through 2014-213.

20 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions for Erica? No  
21 questions. Is there a motion to  
22 approve?

23 MR. SVETANOFF: Motion to approve.

24 MR. FINE: Second.

25 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. All

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

those in favor of approving orders

210 through 213, please say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? The orders are adopted.

I need to go back. Before you come

up, Mr. Harcourt, I need to go back.

In my haste as a new chairman we

approved order 206 without asking for

a motion and approval. So we need to

backtrack very quickly here.

So let's go back to Order 2014-206

with Global Cash Access and

Multimedia Games reorganization

order. Is there a motion to approve?

MR. FINE: Motion to approve.

MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. All

those in favor, say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: All those opposed?

Motion is adopted.

Thank you very much. Mr. Harcourt.

MR. HARCOURT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I present

for your consideration Orders number

2014-214, through 2014-221. These

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

orders all deny individuals'  
applications for permanent  
occupational licenses to work at  
casinos throughout the state.  
Pursuant to Indiana Code 4-33-8-34,  
the Commission may not issue an  
occupational license to an individual  
unless the individual has met  
standards adopted by the Commission  
for the holding of an occupational  
license.

An applicant for a Level 2 or 3  
occupational license shall include  
the applicant's criminal history in  
his or her application pursuant to 68  
IAC 2-3-4(e)(14) and 68 IAC  
2-3-4-(f)(10). Any misrepresentation  
or omission made with respect to an  
application may be grounds for denial  
of the application pursuant to 68 IAC  
2-3-4(b)(2).

Additionally, an applicant must  
comply with all requests for  
information, documents or other  
materials relating to the applicant

1 in his or her application during the  
2 investigation conducted by the  
3 Commission pursuant to 68 IAC  
4 2-3-5(b)(9). As part of a routine  
5 background investigation into each  
6 applicant, the Commission  
7 investigators and staff discovered  
8 that the applicants represented in  
9 Orders 2014-214 through 2014-221  
10 failed to provide complete or  
11 accurate criminal history. Several  
12 of the applicants also failed to  
13 respond to Commission requests for  
14 information from investigators or  
15 staff during the background  
16 investigation. The Executive  
17 Director revoked the applicants'  
18 temporary licenses upon completion of  
19 each investigation.  
20 All individuals were given an  
21 opportunity to withdraw their  
22 application from consideration for  
23 permanent licensure at that time.  
24 Detailed information regarding the  
25 investigation into the individuals in

1 each specific order is contained in  
2 the confidential materials provided  
3 to the Commission. Because  
4 applicants failed to provide their  
5 criminal history in their  
6 applications, or failed to respond to  
7 Commission requests for information,  
8 staff recommends that the  
9 applications for permanent licensure  
10 be denied in orders 2014-214, through  
11 2014-221.

12 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Any questions  
13 for Mr. Harcourt? Seeing none, is  
14 there a motion to approve orders 214  
15 through 221?

16 MR. SVETANOFF: Motion to approve.

17 MR. FINE: Second.

18 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second.

19 All those in favor, say aye.

20 (Responses "aye".)

21 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Thank you very much. The  
22 orders are adopted.

23 Licensing, another licensing matter.

24 Eric Sullivan. Thank you.

25 MS. SULLIVAN: You have before you order number

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

2014-222. This order denies an application for a permanent occupational license based on unsuitability. Pursuant to Indiana Code 4-33-8-3(4), the Commission may not issue an occupational license to an individual unless the individual has met standards adopted by the Commission for the holding of an occupational license. An applicant for a Level 2 occupational license shall meet the criteria for licensure outlined in 68 IAC 2-3-4(c). Any misrepresentation or omission made with respect to an application may be grounds for denial of the application. Additionally, an applicant must comply with all requests for information, documents, or other materials relating to applicant and his or her application during the investigation conduct by the Commission. As part of the routine background investigation into this applicant,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Commission investigators and staff discovered that the applicant did not meet eligibility criteria established in 68 IAC 2-3-4(c). The applicant also failed to respond to Commission requests for information from investigators or staff during the background investigation. The Executive Director revoked applicant's temporary license upon completion of the investigation, and the applicant was given an opportunity to withdraw his application from consideration for permanent licensure at that time. Detailed information regarding the investigation into this individual is contained in the confidential materials provided to the Commission. Because applicant failed to meet criteria for suitability as outlined by 68 IAC 2-3-4, and failed to respond to requests for information, Commission staff recommends that the application for licensure be denied

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

in Order 2014-222.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Any questions?  
Is there a motion to approve the  
recommendations of the staff?

MR. FINE: Motion to approve.

MS. WILLIAMS: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. All  
those in favor, say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? 222 is adopted. Please  
proceed.

MS. SULLIVAN: You also have before you order  
2014-223. Under Indiana Code  
4-33-8-3, an individual who's been  
convicted of a felony may not be  
granted an occupational license.  
Indiana Code 4-33-8-11 and 68 IAC  
2-4-2 allow an applicant who has been  
convicted of a felony to request a  
waiver if he or she meets certain  
criteria.

On or about May 1, 2014, Dorina  
Ledsinger applied for a felony waiver  
to work in a licensed position at  
Hoosier Park. The Executive Director

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

appointed me to serve as the review officer.  
On her application petitioner disclosed two felony convictions, including: A conviction for forgery/check deception as a Class D felony, and a conviction for battery as a class D felony.  
Pursuant to Indiana Code 4-35-6.5-11(d)(2), the Commission may not grant a request for felony waiver if the individual has been convicted of committing a felony of fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation under the laws of Indiana or any other jurisdiction. Petitioner's forgery or check deception felony conviction prevents her from obtaining a felony waiver.  
Petitioner also failed to appear for her properly noticed hearing. Therefore, I recommend that you affirm the findings of fact and conclusions of law in denying Miss Ledsinger's application for a felony

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

waiver in order 2014-223.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Questions for Erica on order 223? Seeing none, is there a motion to approve the recommendation and findings of fact?

MS. SHERMAN: So moved.

MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and second. All those in favor, say aye.

(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? Thank you very much. 223 is adopted.

Moving on to casino matters. Chris Gray.

MS. GRAY: Good morning again, Commissioners. You have before you 11 settlement agreements concerning disciplinary actions.

The first settlement is with Ameirstar, Order 2014-224, wherein the casino violated the sensitive key rules. Ameirstar has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions? Continue.

1 MS. GRAY: Order 2014-225 is a settlement  
2 agreement with Aztar and contains two  
3 counts.  
4 In the first count the casino failed  
5 to follow the shipment rules, and in  
6 the second count an employee was  
7 allowed to work with an expired  
8 occupational license. Aztar has  
9 agreed to a total monetary settlement  
10 of \$6,000 in lieu of disciplinary  
11 action.

12 MR. YELTON: Excuse me, Chris. Should we modify  
13 that to Tropicana?

14 MS. GRAY: Actually, the order does say Aztar,  
15 but it is Tropicana. I can.

16 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions? Continue.

17 MS. GRAY: Order 2014-226 is a settlement  
18 agreement with Blue Chip wherein the  
19 casino allowed an underage person to  
20 enter the casino. Blue Chip has  
21 agreed to a monetary settlement of  
22 \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary  
23 action.

24 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions on 226? Go ahead.

25 MS. GRAY: The fourth order, 2014-227 is a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

settlement agreement with French Lick and includes three counts. In the first count an underage person was allowed on the casino floor. In the second count the casino failed to identify the correct winner of a jackpot, paid an incorrect person and later identified the correct person. The third count violated the rules and internal controls for inventorying chips at closed tables games. French Lick has agreed to a total monetary settlement of \$10,000 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions?

MS. GRAY: Order 2014-228 is a settlement agreement with Hollywood wherein the casino failed to secure a room where electronic gaming devices were stored. Hollywood has agreed to a monetary settle of \$5,000 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Questions? Please continue.

MS. GRAY: Order 2014-229 is a settlement

1 agreement with Hoosier Park and  
2 includes two counts.  
3 In the first count the casino failed  
4 to timely notify the termination of  
5 three employees.  
6 The second count violated the rules  
7 for tournament play.  
8 Hoosier Park has agreed to a total  
9 monetary settlement of \$7,000 in lieu  
10 of disciplinary action.

11 MR. JOHNSTON: Questions on 229?

12 MS. GRAY: The seventh order, 2014-230 is a  
13 settlement agreement with Horseshoe  
14 Hammond and contains two counts.  
15 In the first count an underage person  
16 was allowed on the casino floor on  
17 two separate occasions.  
18 The second count violated the  
19 shipment rules. Horseshoe Hammond  
20 has agreed to a total monetary  
21 settlement of \$10,000.

22 MR. JOHNSTON: Questions? Continue.

23 MS. GRAY: Order 2014-231 is a settlement  
24 agreement with Horseshoe Southern  
25 Indiana, wherein the casino allowed

1 an underage person on the casino  
2 floor. Horseshoe Southern Indiana  
3 has agreed to a monetary settlement  
4 of \$1,500.

5 MR. JOHNSTON: Questions? Continue.

6 MS. GRAY: Order 2014-232 is a settlement  
7 agreement with Horseshoe Southern  
8 Indiana wherein the casino failed to  
9 properly delegate an essential  
10 function, resulting in the false  
11 reporting of a bomb threat.  
12 Horseshoe Southern Indiana has agreed  
13 to a monetary settlement of \$10,000.

14 MR. JOHNSTON: Questions?

15 MS. GRAY: Order --

16 MR. YELTON: And reimbursement.

17 MS. GRAY: And reimbursement, yes.

18 MS. TAIT: To the Harrison County sheriff.

19 MS. GRAY: Order 2014-233 is a settlement  
20 agreement with Indiana Grand and  
21 includes three counts.  
22 In count one the casino allowed an  
23 underage person to enter the casino.  
24 In count two a cage door was left  
25 unsecured.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

In the third count the casino failed to pay a jackpot to the correct person.

Indiana Grand has agreed to a total monetary settlement of \$6,500 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Questions? Go ahead.

MS. GRAY: The final order 2014-234 is a settlement agreement with Majestic Star wherein the casino allowed an underage person on the casino floor. Majestic Star has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$4,500 in lieu of disciplinary action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions on 234?

MS. GRAY: The Commission staff recommends that you approve Orders 2014-224 through 2014-234, each of which approves one of the settlement agreements that we had just discussed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. I would like to point out, Sara has checked Order 225 on the Aztar and it does describe a dba as Tropicana. So I think we're in good shape on that Order 225.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Any final, a opportunity for questions? Seeing none, is there a motion to approve orders 224 through 234?

MR. FINE: So moved.

MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. All those in favor, say aye.  
(Responses "aye".)

MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? The orders are adopted.

MS. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Ed, one final time here. Renewals.

MR. HARCOURT: Thank you. Chair members of the Commission, you have before you Orders 2014-235 through 2014-238, regarding the annual casino license renewals for Belterra Resort Indiana, LLC, doing business as Belterra; Caesars Riverboat Casino, LLC, doing business as Horseshoe South; Indiana Gaming Company, LLC, doing business as Hollywood; and Aztar Indiana Gaming Company, LLC, doing business as Tropicana. All four casinos have

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

filed the required paperwork and fees  
necessary for renewal.  
Belterra's renewal date was October  
22, 2014. Under resolution 2003-13,  
the Executive Director has issued an  
internal renewal of Belterra's  
license to bridge the time between  
their renewal date and this  
Commission meeting.  
Horseshoe South's renewal date was  
November 15, 2014, likewise, under  
resolution 2003-13. The Executive  
Director has issued an internal  
renewal of Horseshoe's license to  
bridge the time between the renewal  
date and this Commission meeting.  
Hollywood's license will expire  
December 9, 2014. Tropicana's  
license will expire December 4, 2014.  
At the November, 2013 and March, 2014  
business meetings, by Orders  
2013-168, 2013-209, 2014-53 and  
2013-208, the Commission approved the  
Power of Attorney for each Belterra,  
Horseshoe South, Hollywood and

1 Tropicana respectively. Those  
2 approvals expire upon the renewal of  
3 each casino's license. For that  
4 reason, all casinos must either  
5 request renewal of the Commission,  
6 approval of the Power of Attorney  
7 concurrently with the request for  
8 renewal, or present the Commission  
9 with a new Power of Attorney naming a  
10 new trustee in waiting.

11 Belterra and Tropicana have both  
12 requested renewal of Mr. Ron Gifford.  
13 Horseshoe South has requested renewal  
14 of Mr. Charles Atwood. And Hollywood  
15 has requested of Mr. Larry Kinser as  
16 their respective Power of Attorneys.  
17 Staff recommends that you approve  
18 Orders 2014-235 through 2014-238  
19 renewing Belterra and Horseshoe South  
20 casino licenses, and prospectively  
21 renewing Hollywood and Tropicana's  
22 casino licenses.

23 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. Any questions  
24 for Ed? Seeing none, is there a  
25 motion on Orders 235 through 238?

1 MR. FINE: So moved.

2 MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

3 MR. JOHNSTON: There is a motion and a second. All  
4 those in favor, say aye.

5 (Responses "aye".)

6 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? The orders are adopted.  
7 Thank you very much.

8 MR. HARCOURT: Thank you.

9 MR. JOHNSTON: Michelle Baldwin, on the topic of  
10 rules.

11 MS. BALDWIN: Yes, thank you.

12 Resolution 2014-239 concerns the  
13 readoption of administrative rules.  
14 Administrative rules adopted under  
15 Indiana Code 4-22-2 expire on  
16 January 1st of the seventh year after  
17 they take effect and, unless the  
18 rules contain an earlier expiration  
19 date.

20 The sections addressed in this  
21 resolution are due to expire  
22 January 1 of 2015, unless they are  
23 readopted, and include the following:

24 Bear with me, it's slightly long.

25 They're all found in Title 68 of the

62

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Indiana Administrative Code, and they are 3-1; 3-2; 3-3; 3-4-1; 5-3-7; all 10; 11-4-2; 11-4-4; 11-7-4.1; 11-8-2; 13-1-2; 13-1-13; 14-1-2; 14-1-4; 14-2-1; 14-3-2; 14-3-3; 14-3-6; 14-3-7; 14-6-1; 14-7-1; 14-7-5; 14-8-1; 14-9-1; 15-8-2; 15-8-3; 15-12; 16-1-16; and all of 19.

The statute provides an abbreviated readoption process for the rules that they will not be edited, which none of these will be. As part of this abbreviated process, the Commission staff prepared a Notice of Intent to readopt and file that with the Indiana Register, which was filed on October 8, 2014. The 30-day statutory period for filing an objection to the abbreviated process or request for separation of any of the rules passed without any person filing an objection or a request to separate.

This process also requires the Commission to consider the effect on

1 small businesses. The Commission's  
2 staff prepared an analysis of the  
3 effect on small businesses, which is  
4 included within your materials.  
5 This resolution, if passed, will  
6 readopt the above-mentioned without  
7 change under Indiana Code 4-22-2.5-4.  
8 If approved, the readopted rules will  
9 become effective 30 days after the  
10 final readoption action is filed with  
11 the Legislative Services Agency. And  
12 Commission staff ask that you readopt  
13 all of the above-mentioned sections.

14 MR. JOHNSTON: Very good, very thorough. You  
15 didn't miss a one, unlike me.

16 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

17 MR. JOHNSTON: Any questions for Michelle on the  
18 rules? What's the pleasure of the  
19 Board on the resolution of or  
20 consideration of the resolution?

21 MR. FINE: Move for approval.

22 MR. SVETANOFF: Second.

23 MR. JOHNSTON: Motion and second. All those in  
24 favor, say aye.

25 (Responses "aye".)

1 MR. JOHNSTON: Opposed? The resolution's adopted.  
2 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.  
3 MR. JOHNSTON: The final order of new business was  
4 with the Foundations of East Chicago,  
5 the LDA partner up there, that topic  
6 has been withdrawn and will be  
7 covered in a future meeting.  
8 Do we want to talk about the next  
9 meeting?  
10 MR. YELTON: It's typically scheduled for March  
11 the 19th, 2015, in Indianapolis.  
12 MR. JOHNSTON: Any other business to come before  
13 the Board, before the Commission?  
14 Seeing none, is there a motion to  
15 adjourn?  
16 MR. FINE: So moved.  
17 MR. SVETANOFF: Second.  
18 MR. JOHNSTON: There's a motion and a second. All  
19 those in favor, say aye.  
20 (Responses "aye".)  
21 MR. JOHNSTON: All those opposed?  
22 We wish everybody out in the audience  
23 a Happy Thanksgiving and holidays and  
24 a prosperous new Year. Thank you  
25 very much.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:04 A.M.)

- - -

