## RECEIVED

OCT 1 4 2010

INDIANA GAMING COMMISSION
THIRD QUARTER 2010
BUSINESS MEETING
September 16, 2010

INDIANA GAMING COMMISSION

The Indiana Gaming Commission Third Quarter 2010 Business Meeting, taken by Wendi K. Sulkoske, Notary Public, in and for the County of Hendricks, State of Indiana, held in the History Reference Room, Indiana State Library, 315 West Ohio Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, commencing at 1:00 p.m. on September 16, 2010.

ASSOCIATED REPORTING, INC.
Two Market Square Center, Suite 940
251 East Ohio Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 631-0940

## APPEARANCES

On behalf of the Indiana Gaming Commission:

Tim Murphy, Chairman

Ernest Yelton, Executive Director

Tom Swihart, Commissioner

Mary Shy, Commissioner

Robert Morgan, Commissioner

Marc Fine, Commissioner

Jennifer Reske, Deputy Director

Phil Sicuso, General Counsel

September 16, 2010

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Good afternoon, everyone and welcome to the third quarter of the Indiana Gaming Commission. The meeting is now called to

The first order of business will be to call the roll of commissioners.

Commissioner Swihart?

COMMISSIONER SWIHART: Present.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Commissioner Fine?

COMMISSIONER FINE: Present.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Commissioner Shy?

COMMISSIONER SHY: Here.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Commissioner Morgan?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Present.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Commissioner Shields? Commissioner Shields is absent. All other Commissioners are present and we have a quorum.

The first order of business will be to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Are there any questions, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SHY: I will second.

24

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25



1.3

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor of approval signify by saying aye.

(Commission members indicated aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No verbal response by Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: The minutes are approved.

Next up will be the report of the Executive Director and Executive Director Yelton.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Thank you, Chairman Murphy and members of the Commission.

Our new staffing report will be reintroducing you to many familiar faces. First of all, we have appointed Danielle Leek, Danielle, stand, please, as our Director of Financial Investigations. Danielle has served as our Financial Investigator within the division since 2007.

Our latest background investigator is
Nicholas Moline. Nicholas served as our student
and summer intern from the I.U. School of Law last
year and he joins us and is probably anxiously
awaiting his results from the bar exam.

Next is Ericka Plummer. Ericka? There you are. After a stint with Charity Gaming, Ericka has

been greeting you as our receptionist since 2009.

But she has now been promoted as our VEP coordinator and will be reporting to the members of the Commission after this meeting.

We do welcome a newcomer to our fold,

Justin Armstrong. Justin? Justin is our new

assistant director of the Athletic Division. And

he comes to us from the city of Brownsburg where he

served in its Parks division. Welcome.

Finally, Tropicana has announced the selection of its new general manager, Ward Shaw, who would like to have the opportunity to introduce himself to the Members of the Commission. Ward?

MR. SHAW: Executive Director Yelton and Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Ward Shaw. I just started at Casino Aztar in Evansville just over two months ago. I'm certainly happy to be here and get started with our property there as part of Tropicana Entertainment.

I just wanted to have a chance to introduce myself and let you know that we are certainly looking forward to continuing our success there at Casino Aztar.

I have spent my first couple months understanding our business there and helping our

customers and employees think about some of the things that we are planning for the upcoming future and certainly reconnecting some of our relationships within the community there as well. So I'm excited to be there. I am happy to answer any questions that you have.

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Good luck.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Reinvestigation reports for Harrah's, NRT and Gaming Partners

International have already previously been provided to all of you. Directors Brown and Leek from the Background Financial Investigation Division are here if you have any questions.

So any questions, members of the Commission?
(No verbal response by Commissioners.)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Pursuant to 68 IAC 2-3.5, the Gaming Commission issues certificates of registration to junketeer and junket operator applicants who meet the criteria that have been previously established by the Commission, by our rules as well.

The certificate of registration may be renewed annually if the junketeer or junket operator submits the appropriate payment not fewer than thirty days prior to the certificate

expiration date.

Since our last meeting, the Commission has renewed four junketeer certificates of registration and three junket operator certificates of registration. No new certificates have been issued since June.

Since the June Commission meeting our staff has added thirty individuals to our Exclusion List which effectively and permanently bars those patrons from entering any casino in the state of Indiana.

The following individuals were observed either past-posing or pinching their bets while at Indiana casinos: David Wilson, Alberta Howard, Rolando Almenares-Imbert, Christopher Lovell, Dontay Smith, Victor Cousins, Jr., John Branum, and James Chambers.

The following individuals were observed taking illegal possession of TITO, casino chips, or United States currency in excess of \$500 while at an Indiana casino: Aimie Crowder, Anthony Williams, Billy Tidwell, Beverly Ryan, Pamela Wynn, Deborah Moore, Tiffany Kirksey and Cathy Bruggeman.

Yue Yun Wu was observed illegally resetting

her tiles while paying "Pai Gow Tiles" at Horseshoe Southern Indiana. It is probably a good thing I don't do that, because I don't understand resetting tiles so I would probably be accused of the same thing.

Keith Acus made a fraudulent claim for winnings on a slot machine while at Hollywood.

Keith Alexander, Bukkiah Chodosh, Laniqua Gaines and Patricia Davis conspired to make fraudulent withdrawals from the casino cage at Horseshoe Hammond.

Randi Wagner, a dealer at Majestic Star, was observed taking possession of casino chips while working and passing them to Jason Green who would redeem the chips.

Leon Jackson, while employed as a floor supervisor at Grand Victoria, was observed taking illegal possession of casino chips.

Kimberly Mondray was observed cashing in high denomination chips and placing the proceeds in Jackson's vehicle while parked at the Grand Victoria garage.

Larry Green, Roderick Dee and Daniel Jones were observed at Casino Aztar, Belterra Casino and Grand Victoria manipulating or conspiring to

manipulate the bill validator at various slot machines in an attempt to gain extra credits.

William Sagester was observed placing magnets in and around different slot machines at Hollywood in an effort to manipulate the machine to gain a greater pay out.

All of the individuals in this last group have been criminally charged.

So far in 2010 the IGC staff has placed fifty-three partons on the exclusion list which now contains 189 individuals.

Finally, on our waiver summary, the Casino Association has granted a waiver to all its members allowing two security officers to complete the process of witnessing, escorting, and signing the appropriate documentation to verify manually paid jackpots.

The Association members must submit and receive approval of internal controls describing the procedures that will be followed before implementation.

French Lick's request was approved to place dedicated coverage on progressive displays showing incrementation when the display reads a minimum of \$40,000. The revenue audit department will be

2.3

responsible for daily verification of the incremented amounts.

Horseshoe Hammond was granted a waiver allowing the bill validator count process to proceed before the transference of the table drop to the main bank. The waiver also allows the transfer of the table and bill validator drops to the main bank without a security escort due to the direct access to the main bank from an adjoining, interior door.

And Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, that will conclude the Executive Director's report for this meeting. Any questions?

(No verbal response by Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Executive Director. There being no old business, we will move on to patron matters and Angela Bunton.

MISS BUNTON: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. You have before you twenty-four orders regarding the Voluntary Exclusion Program. Pursuant to the rules of the program, the identities of the Voluntary Exclusion Program participants must remain confidential.

Pursuant to 68 IAC 6-3-2(g), a participant in the 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 won as a result of a wager.

Under Orders 2010-128 through 151, the total sum of \$34,332.46 was forfeited by John Does 69 through 92. These winnings were collected at Aztar, Grand Victoria, Hollywood, Hoosier Park, Horseshoe Southern Indiana, Indiana Live and Majestic Star. These winnings were withheld as required by the Commission regulations.

Commission staff recommends that you approve the remittance of these winnings for John Does 69 through 92.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Do the Commissioners have any questions for Miss Bunton? If not, is there a motion to approve Orders 2010-128 through 151?

COMMISSIONER FINE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye.

(Commissioners responded aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No audible response from Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Orders 2010-128 through

151 are approved. Thank you, Ms. Bunton.

Patron exclusion matters, Joe Hoage.

MR. HOAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

You have before you Order Number 2010-152, which is an appeal of John Doe Number 36's voluntary exclusion remittance. Number 36 submitted an application for a five-year voluntary exclusion on July 4, 2007 at the Ameristar Casino in East Chicago, Indiana. On May 19, 2010, 36 was apprehended at the Ameristar with \$5,000 in casino chips. The money was forfeited according to the terms of the VEP agreement. And on July -- June 11, 2009, the Commission approved remittance of \$5,000 under Order Number 2010-70.

Within the required period of time, John Doe 36 submitted a letter of appeal to the Commission. 36's main argument was that of the \$5,000 that was in his possession that day, \$1,500 of that was the money obtained not as a result of wagers made, but he or she was holding it for a family member who was with him or her that day.

Under the terms of the VEP program, the IGC is only authorized to receive monies that were won or obtained as the result of wagers made.

After reviewing 36's written appeal, the case report submitted by IGC agents, and speaking with 36 personally, and in the interest of avoiding a extensive, long and unproductive evidentiary hearing, Commission staff entered into settlement negotiations with Number 36 prior to filing with the Administrative Law Judge. An agreement was made that the IGC would refund \$500 of the \$5,000 taken from 36 with the Commission retaining the remaining balance.

Number 36 will remain on the VEP list until the natural expiration of that term, and at which time he or she will be required to make a written request to the Commission to be removed from that list and ultimately 36's appeal will be dismissed as a result of the settlement entered into by the parties.

With that said, you have before you an order approving the settlement agreement entered into by the Commission staff and 36 and we would ask that you approve that order at this time.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: That is Order 2010-152? MR. HOAGE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you. Do the Commissioners have any questions of Mr. Hoage? If

not, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER SWIHART: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners indicated aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No verbal response by Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-152 is

approved.

MR. HOAGE: Next up would be Order Number 2010-153. On March 8, 2009 Kyle Pharms, a patron at the Blue Chip Casino in Michigan City, Indiana was observed taking unauthorized possession of three TITO tickets worth approximately \$1,700 from another patron. Pharms was arrested and charged with one count of theft as a D felony to which he ultimately pled guilty to conversion, an A misdemeanor, and was required to make restitution as part of his probation.

On May 28, 2009 the Executive Director took action pursuant to IC 4-33-4-7(a) to exclude Pharms from all gaming facilities in Indiana. Pharms appealed the Executive Director's decision within

the appropriate time line and the matter was deferred to an Administrative Law Judge.

On May 14, 2010, Commission staff filed a Motion for Default Judgment in the matter as a result of Pharms' failure to attend the telephonic pretrial conference. Pharms requested a hearing on the Commission's motion, which was then set for June 11, 2010, at which time Pharms failed to appear at that hearing as well.

On June 23, 2010 the ALJ ultimately granted the Commission's Motion for Default Judgment and issued Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law with that matter.

According to AOSA, if there were no objections to the ALJ's order with Findings of Fact and Recommendation, the Commission is required to affirm and since the Default Judgment was entered in this matter, Pharms is not allowed or eligible to file an objection.

So at this time, Commission staff has prepared an order confirming the ALJ's decision which, if you would grant here today, would grant, would affirm the Motion for Default Judgment entered into Kyle Pharms by the Administrative Law Judge.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Do the Commissioners have any questions of Mr. Hoage regarding 2010-153? If not, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER SHY: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER FINE: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners responded aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No verbal response by Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-153 is

approved. Thank you, Mr. Hoage.

We will move on to license, Occupational License matters.

MR. HOAGE: Before you is 2010-154 with regard to a settlement agreement entered into by Commission staff and William Ponsock. Mr. Ponsock is a level two security shift guard at the Grand Victoria Casino. On May 9, 2010 Mr. Ponsock failed to follow Grand Victoria internal controls when he responded to a security request from the casino's cage regarding a patron presenting false identification.

According to Grand Victoria internal

controls, Section 6.1 provides that all security department personnel will notify Indiana Gaming Commission agents immediately of any violation of IGC rules, regulations, or state statues.

Mr. Ponsock failed to contact IGC regarding the investigation, and upon being questioned afterward regarding the conduct during the investigation he made misstatements to the Commission agents regarding his interaction with the patron and his handling of the identification that was presented.

Commission staff initiated settlement negotiations with Mr. Ponsock prior to filing disciplinary actions against him. As part of those negotiations, he agreed to a voluntary two day relinquishment of his occupational license. The relinquishment was served as a de facto suspension without the adverse affects that the license suspension would have on his license and it would still allow him to gain an occupational license in Indiana or any other jurisdiction should he leave the employment of Grand Victoria.

Accordingly, the Commission staff now has presented to you an order that would approve this resolution which would make Mr. Ponsock have a two

1	day relinquishment of his employment at Grand
2	Victoria. We would ask that you approve that order
3	at this time.
4	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Do the Commissioners have
5	any questions of Mr. Hoage? Mr. Hoage, I have one.
6	MR. HOAGE: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: There is a reference in
8	the second paragraph to Mr. Troy. Is that just
9	MR. HOAGE: Of Mr. Troy? Yeah, I believe
10	that would be a scriber error.
11	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Or yes.
12	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I just wanted to make
13	sure. Is there a motion to approve?
14	COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Motion to approve.
15	COMMISSIONER SWIHART: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and
17	seconded. All those in favor signify by saying
18	aye.
19	(Commissioners responded aye.)
20	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?
21	(No audible response from Commissioners.)
22	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-154 is
23	approved. Thank you, Mr. Hoage.
24	MR. HOAGE: Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN MURPHY: We will move on to

supplier matters and Adam Packer.

MR. PACKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. Order 155 is regarding
Elektroncek d.d. Elektroncek d.d is a supplier
licensee that manufacturers multi-station game
devices. Elektroncek is co-owned by two parent
companies, Elektroncek Group and Aristocrat.
Elektroncek Group has proposed acquiring all of
Aristocrat's shares in Elektroncek d.d.

Ordinarily when an entity seeks to acquire ownership interest in a supplier or casino licensee the entity requesting the acquisition must go through the transfer process. And for companies that are not publically traded, that process is outlined in 68 IAC 5-2.

But the Electroncek case is a little bit different than the ordinary transfer acquisition type case because Electroncek Group, the acquiring party, has already been investigated as part of Electroneck's investigation.

A little bit of background, Elektroncek applied for licensure in 2007. And as part of that investigation, Commission Investigation staff not only investigated Elektroncek d.d., but also investigated parent companies because they were

both substantial owners of Elektroncek d.d.

And Electroncek Group, as part of its role as the substantial owner of Elektroncek d.d., has been under an obligation since Elektroncek got its license to maintain suitability, to provide the Commission with updates that would affect its suitability.

And so the ordinary motivation for doing a transfer application, transfer investigation, is not present in this case because, unlike an outside entity that is seeking to come in and be licensed, Elektroncek Group has already gone through the process as part of Elektroncek d.d.'s investigation.

So with that as background, Elektroncek
Group has requested a waiver of the provisions of
68 IAC 5-2 that would allow it to go forward with
the acquisition of Aristocrat's shares without
going through the transfer application and
subsequent transfer investigation process.

68 IAC 5-2 contains a waiver provision that states that the Commission may waive any provision of the transfer rule if application of that provision would be unnecessary or burdensome and the waiver would be in the best interest of the

gaming industry and the public and, as long as the underlying principle of the rule is upheld.

The underlying principle of the rule is that a company seeking to get an ownership interest in a licensee must be suitable. Well, Elektroncek Group has already been determined to be suitable. So that issue has already been put to rest. And the burdensome process would be the application process.

And since Electroncek is the leading company, with the translation of documents, international travel, et cetera, we have already gone through that with the initial licensure, so it is not necessary in this case.

And for those reasons, Commission staff agrees with the petition for waiver and recommends that waiver to you. If the Commission approves the waiver, it will allow this deal to close without any further action being taken by the Indiana regulators.

So with all that in mind I prepared an order for you that would waive the provisions of the transfer rule for purposes of this transaction.

I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Ouestions of

Mr. Packer? 1 2 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: I have one question. 3 How many occasions have we used this waiver in the 4 past? 5 MR. PACKER: I will lean on the experience 6 of Mr. Brown for that. Do you know? 7 MR. BROWN: Good afternoon. I'm not aware of ever having used this before, especially in this 8 9 That is why we had to kind of work through 10 it a little bit because we had never seen basically 11 a supplier buy itself back. 12 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: That is what I 13 thought. I wanted to ask. 14 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any other questions? 15 not, is there a motion to approve Order 2010-155? 16 COMMISSIONER SWIHART: Move to approve. COMMISSIONER SHY: 17 Second. It has been moved and 18 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: 19 seconded. All those in favor signify by saying 20 aye. 21 (Commissioners indicated aye.) 22 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed? 23 (No verbal response from Commissioners.) 24 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-155 is 25 Thank you, Mr. Packer. approved.

MR. PACKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: We will move on next to

3 renewals and Sherry Green.

MS. GREEN: Good afternoon. You have before you Order 2010-156 concerning the renewal of supplier licenses. Pursuant to Indiana Code 4-33 and 68 IAC 2-2, the Commission has previously approved a permanent supplier license for the following six companies: Gaming Partners International, U.S.A., GEMACO, Inc., Global Surveillance Associates, Incorporated, NRT Technology Corporation, PokerTek, Incorporated, and Western Money Systems.

A supplier's license is valid for a period of one year. Pursuant to IC 4-33-7-8 and 68 IAC 2-2-8, a supplier's license must be renewed annually and payment of \$7,500 for the annual renewal fee must be remitted. Each of these licensees has requested renewal of their licenses and has paid the appropriate renewal fees. The Commission staff recommends that you approve the renewal of the licenses for these six companies.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Are there any questions of Miss Green? If not, is there a motion to approve Order 2010-156?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Motion to approve. 1 COMMISSIONER SHY: 2 Second. 3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor? (Commissioners responded aye.) 5 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed? 6 (No verbal response by Commissioners.) 7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-156 is 8 9 approved. Thank you, Miss Green. 10 MS. GREEN: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Next up will be 12 disciplinary action and Chris Gray. 13 MS. GRAY: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 14 You have before you a settlement agreement with 15 Bally, Order 2010-157, wherein the supplier 16 violated the rule requiring EPROMs to be transported separately from the shipment of the 17 18 slot machine. Bally has agreed to a monetary 19 settlement of \$5,000 in lieu of disciplinary 20 The Commission staff recommends that you 21 approve Order 2010-157. 22 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any questions of 23 Miss Gray? If not, is there a motion to approve 24 Order 2010-157? 25 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Move to approve.

2 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and 3 approved. All those in favor signify by saying 4 aye. 5 (Commissioners responded aye.) Opposed? 6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: 7 (No verbal response by Commissioners.) CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-157 is 8 9 approved. Thank you, Miss Gray. 10 MS. GRAY: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: The next item on the 12 agenda is casinos and Phil Sicuso. 13 MR. SICUSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The first order up for consideration is 2010-158, which 14 15 relates to the reclassification of equity in 16 Harrah's Entertainment, Inc. which is the parent 17 company of two licensees, Horseshoe Hammond and 18 Horseshoe Southern Indiana. 19 It is my understanding that Michael Cohen is 2.0 here from the Harrah's corporate offices and is 21 prepared to address the Commission on that issue if 22 you wish to address that at this time. CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Cohen, are you in the 23 24 room? Thank you. 25 MR. COHEN: Mr. Chairman and members of the

COMMISSIONER FINE: Move to second.

1

(0.885)

Commission, Mr. Yelton and Trustees, Mr. Sicuso, thank you for taking time today for the opportunity to address the Commission. I'm Michael Cohen. I am with Harrah's Entertainment in Las Vegas. We are here today to ask for your approval for the reclassification of the equity interest of Harrah's Entertainment. We are asking for the reclassification for a couple reasons.

One is to consummate a debt for equity exchange that we have pending. The second is to allow Harrah's to use equity as a financing tool, once again, and for setting Harrah's on a path towards becoming a publically traded company again.

The background of Harrah's equity structure was in January 2008 Harrah's was purchased by two large private equity firms, TPG and Apollo. And at that time we put in an equity structure where we had two classes of common stock. One was a voting common stock, which has no economic value, and one is a non-voting common stock for the economic plot.

All of the voting stock and the voting control of the company was put in place of a company called Hamlet Holdings, LLC. That entity is comprised of three members of TPG and Apollo that are both, all licensed by the Commission. The

non-voting stock is held by TPG, Apollo, their co-investors and management company.

When we put this structure in place when the company did not have a publicly-traded equity, we always knew that some day that we would unwind the structure. That is why we are here before you today.

As you know, in the last few years there has been quite an economic downturn, as we all know. And Harrah's has undertaken a number of transactions to shore up its balance sheet through these. Through these transactions, we have reduced our debt by over \$4 billion, reduced our annual interest expense by over \$100 million and extended our maturity so that we have no maturing maturity until 2015.

In continuation of these balance sheet numbers Harrah's undertook in June a debt for equity exchange where we offer holders of 2015, 2016 and 2017 on the secured notes of Harrah's to swap that for equity of the company, and at the same time Harrah's raised \$550 million in cash for the sale of these notes.

As a condition to closing of this debt for equity exchange, we are required to reclassify our

common stock to have a voting common stock just like Harrah's used to have when it was publically traded and like every other publically traded company.

So the specifics of the reclassification is that we are restructuring this common stock. We will eliminate the voting common stock that has no economics. And we will take the non-voting common stock that has the economics and convert it to this new class of voting common stock.

That, again, it will look like a voting stock of any publicly-traded company. Hamlet Holdings, which currently controls Harrah's, will have an irrevocable proxy that will regulate its voting and dispositive control over 89 percent of the stock of Harrah's. TPG, Apollo, and their co-investors will sign this proxy. So effective control of Harrah's still lies with the same folks that you have licensed.

In conclusion, you know, the, we all have seen the difficult economic environment. Harrah's is trying to shore up its balance sheet and give time for the economy, enough time to recover. The last few years Harrah's has only had one financing source to be able to do that. Through this

transaction and this reclassification, we will have 1 the flexibility to raise equity capital going forward as well. 3 4 Thank you for your consideration on this. Т 5 will be happy to answer any questions. 6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Cohen, just to be 7 clear, the only matter before us for consideration today is the reclassification of the equity? 8 MR. COHEN: That is correct. 9 10 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: That is what you 11 understand? 12 Mr. COHEN: Yes, that's correct. 13 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any other questions for 14 Mr. Cohen? If not, is there a motion to approve 15 Order 2010-158? 16 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Move to approve. 17 COMMISSIONER FINE: Second the motion. 18 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and 19 second. All those in favor signify by saying aye. 20 (Commissioners responded aye.) 21 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed? 22 (No verbal response by Commissioners.) 23 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-158 is 24 approved. Thank you, Mr. Cohen. 25 MR. COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Next we will move on to renewals. Mr. Sicuso.

MR. SICUSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to handled Order 2010-159 to 160 together if you don't mind. 159 is in reference to Blue Chip Casino, LLC and 160 is Grand Victoria Casino and Resort, L.P., both wish to be granted a one-year renewal pursuant to those orders.

The staff has confirmed that each of these licensees have requested the renewal in a timely manner and paid the \$5,000 annual renewal fee. The staff's opinion is that both licensees are in substantial compliance with the gaming laws and their licenses should be renewed.

So we do recommend you approve Orders 2010-159 and 160.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any questions of Mr. Sicuso on the two orders? If not, is there a motion to approve Orders 2010-159 and 160?

COMMISSIONER SHY: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER FINE: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners responded aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No audible response from Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Orders 2010-159 and 160

are approved.

MR. SICUSO: Mr. Chair, Orders 2010-161 and 162 as they are drafted relate to the annual renewals of the Majestic Star Casinos. It is my understanding that -- before I give the staff recommendation, it is my understanding that several individuals from Gary have requested and been granted some time to address the Commission. I think now might be an appropriate time to address that.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you. I understand the Honorable Mayor Rudy Clay is in the room. Would you like to speak?

MAYOR CLAY: First, I would like to thank you for the moment and the opportunity. Certainly I thank the Executive Director, Mr. Yelton. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here. We have actually been trying to resolve this issue over the last couple months because we think resolving it would be better than turning the lights out on Majestic I and turning the lights out on Majestic II. That would impact not only Gary, but the state and county as it relates to funding.

I think it is in the best interest to resolve this. We have been working extremely hard to try to do this. And the issue is, of course, that a segregated fund that is sitting there, we are saying that we would like to have the segregated, the money that is in the segregated fund returned to the city. And there is also the issue of property taxes and we are asking Majestic I and II to put that issue on the fast track with the appeals board that is in the county.

I don't think they have a problem with that. So, you know, as mayor of the city it is really my job to try to kind of bring this together. So all we are saying to the Gaming Commission here is we would like for you to listen to our attorney and I do not want to take too much of your time here. I would like to have an opportunity to come up with some of the issues. His name is Mike Howell.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Sure.

MAYOR CLAY: Okay. Mike?

MR. HOWELL: Thank you, Mayor, Honorable

Commission members, Director Yelton and staff.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

The history of the city of Gary and Majestic

Casinos is legend. Most of that history has been

very positive.

Unfortunately in the last few years there has been a dispute developing out of the local development agreement which has stopped money flowing into the city, which leaves the city as well as all of the municipalities in Indiana financially stressed.

The issues revolving around the local development agreements relate to the economic development impact in the community, which is one of the primary statutory concerns of this Commission for licenses and selecting appropriate operators. So these issues are ultimately germane here. We had originally petitioned to be able to bring those issues in front of you.

But since that time, we have had requests from a few constituencies here, including even Commission staff to move forward to try to resolve these disputes in good faith negotiations outside. Those negotiations have commenced. They are ongoing. They were ongoing as recently as a few minutes ago.

Progress is being made on resolving the disputes between the parties. And these discussions have been undertaken because we desire

to resolve them. We believe the casinos desire to resolve them. But more importantly, the casino is in its own process of restructuring its debt operations. And as a result of that, there likely will be a new ownership of the casino coming forward.

The city of Gary will have a fresh start in that relationship going forward as much as the Majestic will observe and obtain its own fresh start from its creditors as part of that process.

Because of our desire to resolve these issues and bring money to the city as promptly as possible, the city has listened to various constituencies in its negotiations and has determined that today it will not object to licensure of the Majestic, but it does reserve its complaints and objection to raise in any kind of suitability dispute should these negotiations not come to prompt fruition.

Because of the nature of these issues, the need for speedy resolution and the likelihood that there is a restructuring in place of going forward that will bring the casino back in front of this Commission, we do agree today not to pursue those objections. We reserve all of our rights based on

1 our understanding that we could bring in front of this Commission a suitability objection should it not be resolved in a timely fashion. 3 4 Based upon those conditions, we won't take any further of your time today. 5 6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Howell. 7 Thank you, Mr. Mayor. 8 I understand we have had two requests to 9 speak today about the Majestic Star renewal from Mr. Macarthur Drake and Councilman Pratt. 10 MR. PRATT: Members of the Commission. 11 12 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Excuse me, are you Mr. Drake? 13 14 MR. PRATT: I'm Councilman Roy Pratt. 15 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Pratt, you have five 16 minutes. Thank you. 17 Mr. PRATT: I would like to have 18 Council Lady Brown brought up because she is here. 19 I will only take three and she will take two, if 20 that is possible? 21 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: That will be fine. 22 MR. PRATT: Mr. Chairman, I got up this 23 morning and read the paper and Mr. Sidel in the

Tribune, and I was encouraged when I read that our

governor, Governor Mitch Daniels, had said in

24

25

April, he was quoted that the Majestic Star and Mr. Barden has serious problems.

And then I got discouraged when I read down below that some gentleman who represents the casino, and I thought was speaking for the Commission, indicated that our chances of getting what we want from the resolution that we sent to you was slim to none.

But I'm going to take the opportunity to say that I think that once you hear the facts from Mr., from our attorney, and once you analyze what has been sent to you in terms of what has happened, you will agree with us that the citizens of Gary need some help.

Let me go through this quickly and say to you that three years ago I was asked by some members of the press, Why are you here? And I responded, I'm here to speak of the resolution that the members of the Gary Town Council sent to this Commission requesting that Mr. Barden not receive the license of Mr. Donald Trump.

However, the Commission decided to issue the license to Mr. Barden, although we had pointed out that allowing Mr. Barden two licenses would give him a monopoly in Gary. Further, we had newspaper

reports of the Majestic Star having financial problems.

In 1988 I introduced the idea of casinos for Gary. It was supposed to be an economic tool to help Gary achieve some financial stability.

In 1995 we were awarded with two licenses because we had introduced the idea of the casino, and we were the most economic stressed city in the state.

Mr. Barden failed to uphold his original development agreement and he failed to pay his property tax of over \$20 million. Our council resolution is here asking that you do not renew the license and give it to a developer, or developers, and allow the city to negotiate like all of the other cities with casinos in Indiana to select a developer who will actually uphold their development agreement and pay their taxes so that Gary can reap the benefits that casinos were originally intended to provide for the state and the local communities of Indiana.

Mr. Barden has completely derailed the drive to improve the economic stability of Gary. He has driven the whole economic development plan into a ditch. So we are here asking that you take the

saw the article.

keys away so that we, the citizens of Gary, and the Indiana Gaming Commission can pull this failure, we can put this failure in reverse, get out of the ditch and start anew.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Are there any questions?

me, Councilman Pratt. In light of your opening statements, have you now learned that

Mr. Fiegenbaum is not a member of the Commission and he does not speak for the Commission?

MR. PRATT: I didn't know. You probably

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I did read the article.

MR. PRATT: Coming down here it said we had slim to no chance. So, you know, I assure you that Mr., when you hear Attorney Drake you will also know that there are some people who are claiming to have, to speak for this Commission, or to speak for the auditor, the state, Lake County auditor in Lake County and they do not.

And you will hear a statement from the auditor theirself, and not an organization, who says that Mr. Barden has not paid his taxes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I just want to make that clear, Councilman.

> MR. PRATT: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Pratt.

MS. BROWN: Thank you. Good morning. thank you for this opportunity to address the Thank you very much. My name is Commission. Mary Brown. I'm a city councilwoman for the city of Gary. I represent the third district. just wanted to talk for a few minutes about the kinds of things that had happened to the citizens of our city because of the lack of revenue that we have not received from the boats that we had hoped to be able to receive.

As I said, I serve as a district council representative, so consequently, I'm in very close contact with the constituency in our city. As you know, we are at this moment in the city of Gary in We are the only city in the state who distress. has appealed for the discretion of the appeal board because we are in distress. We are in dire need of infrastructure for our city, for demolition because we have so many abandoned buildings in our city. We are not able to provide, on a basis that we perhaps should, basic services for the citizens of

the community.

We had hoped, we meaning the citizens of the city of Gary, had hoped that monies that came into our city from the casino revenue would certainly give us an opportunity to provide some of these basic services that the citizens of our community are so deserving of.

Mr. Barden came before the city council. He said there was funding being placed into an escrow account waiting on some certain things to happen that he said the city had agreed to do. Our concern is that those monies that are supposedly in that escrow account be given to the city so that we can continue to provide those basic services. But based on the fact that we feel that he has treated us so shabbily, we do not feel that he deserves to have his license renewed. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mrs. Brown.

MR. DRAKE: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I'm attorney Macarthur Drake.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Drake, you have five minutes. Thank you.

MR. DRAKE: Thank you. Good afternoon,

Executive Director Yelton, staff, General Counsel

Sicuso. Yesterday evening I sent to the Commission



a compilation of documents. I don't know if you each have those. My intention was to try to get those to you.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: We did get those.

Mr. Drake, we got those minutes before we came over for the meeting. And we have not had an opportunity to look at them. However, the staff will take a look at those.

MR. DRAKE: I think Mr. Yelton indicated that he received a letter which was separate to the Executive Director regarding the question that concerns a number of persons in the Gary area, and certainly the Gary county council, with regard to delinquent taxes and the tax issue that the public record indicates that Mr. Barden is involved in.

And I will just, if I could, I will briefly indicate that the documents that we sent to the Commission and ask that they be included, includes the Resolution Number 2931, which is the expression of the overwhelming majority of the county council for the Commission not to renew the license of the Majestic Star for Mr. Barden.

We also attached, well, we ask the Commission to take administrative note of the initial, the developers were two parties at that

2.2

time, Harvey Barden and Donald Trump, and we have attached two certificates of suitability for each of the original developers and we want to make reference to the bankruptcy court's order in the Delaware District Court that was involving the bankruptcy appeal, the petition of Majestic Star, and, in particular, the reference to amazing is not an attempt at disrespect during the bankruptcy, but there is an order that was requested by Majestic Star to pay the taxes, the local and state local taxes and user's fees while the matter is pending which sounded like the proper thing to do.

However, that has not been forthcoming for the city of Gary since there has been a withholding of the seven percent, well, three percent from Majestic I, and four percent of the annual gross, adjusted gross revenue from Majestic II for some two years from the city.

That is what the councilpersons who has spoken to you are referring to when they discuss the financial burden that that withholding has caused and it continues to cause while the ongoing concern in the city's limits continues to be profitable and dollars are made there every day. Nothing is coming by way of that forum to the city

of Gary.

We understand it is coming in through the state through the state's division of the head tax and those kinds of things, but certainly that the three and seven percent, which were part of the bargain and it remains part of the bargain, an obligation the Majestic Star has has not been forthcoming.

We think the suitability of the developer at this point is in serious question. And we also want to note that the property tax problem that the Majestic has is the problem that affects all of the property taxpayers in the city of Gary and certainly in Lake County, Indiana. I'm sure it would all over the state.

The documents that we have attached to our compilation includes a letter from the auditor of Lake County. It indicates that as of September 15, 2010 Majestic's delinquent taxes are \$13.2 million. In fact, \$13,223,096.10. That is only the parcels. Those parcels are described in the document compilation that we submitted to you based on the record. Those are not necessarily all of the parcels. But on those parcels, some \$13.2 million is delinquent.

And the city, based on the information we get, the city of Gary is roughly forty-three percent of that. And when you combine that with the fact that the three and four percentiles are not being paid, you can, we hope, get an idea of the financial devastation that the city of Gary is undergoing.

And, simply put, the city needs to change and is requesting that this Commission uses its powers set out in the statute to put the --

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Drake, you have gone over your time limit. I would appreciate it if you would wrap up it.

MR. DRAKE: Certainly. We request the Commission will have a chance to read it. We certainly hope that the Commission considers the circumstances of the city when it is making this decision and will tell us by way of its rationale why it decided the way it did regarding this renewal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Drake. Is there anyone for Majestic Star that wishes to respond to the, Mr. Drake and Mr. Pratt and the Mayor?

MR. RUSTHOVEN: Thank you, Chairman and

Commissioners. I'm Peter Rusthoven.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Rusthoven, if I may, we will, since we allowed ten minutes for the combination of the other speakers, we would like to give you ten minutes.

MR. RUSTHOVEN: I have the honor to be counsel for Majestic Star. A couple quick things with respect to negotiations. I agree with my colleague, Mike Howell, that the negotiations are proceeding. They are proceeding in good faith. We are hopeful of resolving all of the issues in a prompt fashion.

If I may, I also would like to specifically thank Mayor Clay for his leadership on this. He is a very tough negotiator, but an honorable one and he is working very hard to get this resolved for the citizens he represents. And I think he has done a tremendous job of that.

With respect to the comments about Mr. Barden,
I have had the honor of knowing Mr. Barden for some
time and he is a very honorable man. I would
point to the Commission with respect to that, over
\$300 million in gaming tax and other revenues,
including economic development payments under the
agreements have gone to the city of Gary since the

beginning of casino operations there, which we are very proud of.

We are talking about here in terms of the level of payments that have been displaced separately because of the disagreement, we are talking about in the \$10 million range. That puts this in some perspective in terms of what is going on in Gary when we are talking about it.

Finally with respect to the property tax issue, respectfully, we believe the Commission staff has been provided documentation on this and understands it. It gets a little confusing, but really not all that much.

Majestic Star is current on all its property taxes. A few years ago there was an enormous increase, we believe without explanation, in assessed evaluation.

We are talking about on the order of an 180 percent increase. Every property taxpayer in the state of Indiana, that includes homeowners in Gary, companies like U.S. Steel that is involved in dealing with this issue, has the right to take an appeal, and during the course of the appeal to continue paying taxes at the prior assessed basis. We have done that.

We are current on all property taxes. I believe from 2007 to 2010 we have paid over \$20 million, I believe, in property taxes. Now, why do we have people saying, oh, they are delinquent? Government is, sometimes its processes do not always reflect everything that may really be going on.

The computer records that are kept will show and generate reports of property tax amounts due under the new assessments even if it is already on appeal. So periodically something will be generated that says you are delinquent X amount because you have not paid. But, in fact, the appeal is going on. Every time that happens, Majestic Star contacts the Lake County treasurer or whoever and reminds the appropriate official there is an appeal pending. And so we are current on what we owe. That has never been an issue.

People say, no, they are delinquent. We are not any more than a homeowner in Gary who had his property assessment doubled would be required to pay at the doubled rate while the appeal is going on.

With that, I think that is far short of the ten minutes. I wanted to clarify the record. We

1 appreciate the assistance of the Commission staff, Mr. Yelton, Mr. Sicuso and others in working with 3 the city and with the Majestic Star and really taking a very good active role in those issues. 4 Ι thank you. Do you have any questions? 5 6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Questions? 7 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Yeah. You made a 8 statement of \$300 million has gone to the city of 9 Gary? 10 MR. RUSTHOVEN: Since the beginning of 11 gaming if you add up the gaming tax revenues, the 12 wage, their share of the wagering tax commission 13 and the payments we made under these agreements, I know that as of a couple years ago the figure was 14 \$285 million. I think since then I think it is 15 over \$300 million. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: That is excluding 18 what we are talking about here? 19 MR. RUSTHOVEN: What we are talking about 20 here is a dispute worth \$10 million. 21 MR. BARDEN: That is over and above the 22 property tax. 23 Mr. RUSTHOVEN: Yes, that is not the 24 property tax.

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: That was my question.

25

MR. RUSTHOVER: I'm so sorry. Mr. Barden 1 2 does not need a lawyer. 3 COMMISSIONER SWIHART: I have a question. 4 Have you contacted Peter Baldwin about when they 5 expect to hear your appeal? 6 MR. RUSTHOVEN: Forgive me, we have pushed, 7 I believe, for the appeal to be heard promptly. Mr. Howell indicated, one of the things we talked 8 9 about with the city in our negotiations is that we want to push that harder. 10 11 COMMISSIONER SWIHART: As you know, they 12 are about two years behind. 13 MR. RUSTHOVEN: They are not a party to the 14 negotiations. We will wait for justice when it is 15 available, but we are pushing hard and we are 16 awaiting those efforts. 17 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Rusthoven. 18 MR. RUSTHOVEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Barden, are you here 20 to speak on behalf of the renewal? 21 MR. BARDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and to 22 refute some of the comments. CHAIRMAN MURPHY: You have fifteen minutes 23 24 regarding the renewal. 25 Thank you. I just want to MR. BARDEN:

make a few clarifications and perhaps what, allow what has been said to be put in proper perspective. I think Mr. Rusthoven, our legal counsel, has covered a lot of the territory as it relates to what we have given to Gary over the years and that pales to what we have received in terms of profits and dividends.

Most of the money that has been taken into Gary has gone out the door in either one form or another, to payroll taxes, to real estate taxes, to state taxes. Everyone is getting two or three or four hundred million dollars and we walk away with peanuts, the people that invested.

When the Honorable Councilwoman mentioned that Gary does not have money and it is affecting the city in terms of Gary withholding the funds, the city, I'm sorry Majestic withholding funds from the city, that is probably true in terms of the impact it is having.

However, that is the process in America, and that is a rule of law, I believe, in Indiana. If that, if you feel that you have been done wrong, in our case, the city did not put in the roadways, not one ramp, but roadways, and they cost us tens of millions of dollars.

In fact, we may not be in bankruptcy today had they put those roads in when they were supposed to eight years ago. We would have been able to be competitive. Eight years ago the capital markets were prime for development. Eight years ago when I bought this land, over eight years ago, to develop, to make Gary a destination location, the marketplace was ripe.

All we needed was a road for people to get there, to get off the highway and to get back into the property to see a beautiful lake and not have to go under a bridge, not to be fearful of what is back there in the city of Gary with its reputation, if you will, and its image that existed at the time.

Yes, after trying many, many, many years to get that road completed, we finally had to take some legal action. We sued the city for not completing the road. It went through the court process and we still are in the court process. The city has appealed to the court of appeals. The city has been to the supreme court of the state of Indiana and they have failed.

We have prevailed because we are right. They should have put in roads, or at least they said

an accommodation for the city, and as an accommodation to try to help the people of Gary continue to operate, recognizing that they are stressed financially, we have said let's try to settle this. Let's see if we can give the city some money.

In fact, two years ago we advanced the city over \$4 million which is practically all of the money that we had withheld up to that point. At that time we had some progress but not substantial progress. No identification of a source of funding for the final leg of the roadway. And I think it was a commissioner, I don't recall, who suggested looking at the money we were paying out to Gary several years ago as a means of financing the road.

I don't know if it was a city commissioner now, but I thought it was a good idea. So we tried to negotiate that. However, we are here trying to negotiate with the city now, and Mayor Clay has been very cooperative, to get the city money. And I think in a few days we will be able to announce the city is going to get a substantial amount of that money that is being held in a separate account because the city has identified funds along with

the mechanism for us to apply additional funds and future local development payments to finance the road and to give the city some money.

But that is not cause for us to be beat up on because we are trying to be a good corporate citizen and trying to help the city of Gary. And also to try and cooperate and be a good corporate citizen by providing jobs.

And we are criticized by Councilman Pratt. I know he has a personal vendetta against me. I forgive him for that, I really do. I used to harbor some ill feelings towards him. But I don't any more. I have totally forgiven him. Whatever he says going forward has no meaning because he has proven by his appearance here today and by his articles in the paper and press conference he totally ignores the facts.

He was notified about the property tax and it had been investigated by this Commission that we were current on our taxes and that we were following the law and we were doing what was appropriate and right, but yet he still had a press conference and grabbed the headlines. That is his -- he has to live with himself.

So I will let him continue to squeal and talk

and not lower myself to that level.

In terms of the people of Gary, we have tried to do everything we can, could do, over the last fifteen years to make this a real jewel, a destination location. We have not had a lot of help from the city despite how much we have done for the city, despite the employment. However, I can say that Mayor Clay is trying to work with us now. And I have been personally involved. And I think someone said earlier there is going to be new owners. And Mr. Pratt talked about he wants a clean slate and all this.

The bond owners have monitored everything that is going on here, the people that we owe the money to. The people that lent us the money to buy Trump. They are tough. They are going to be tougher than I am in terms of holding Gary's feet to the fire. If he thinks he is going to get away and take money from these people and not live up to the responsibility, he has another thing coming.

I'm just saying that I've appreciated my time in Gary. I have appreciated my time before this Commission. This Commission and the staff lived up to its word with us. It has been very honorable. And I am just pleased with my experience in the

state of Indiana.

Now, I would like to move on to the regular part of our presentation as it relates to a quick synopsis of the restructuring of the company, which we are very close to resolving and to give you an update on the capital investments that we made in the property to keep it fresh and keep the standards high and to keep the people coming. We are the only company that has --

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Barden, they will have eight minutes when you are finished.

MR. BARDEN: We are the only casino company in northwest Indiana that has shown an increase month after month in attendance and revenue for seven consecutive months. So we are doing okay. Operationally, we are doing fine. It is just that we have built up a lot of debt to try to make Gary a destination location. Trump got away scott-free and made a lot of money at the right time.

The marketplace collapsed on Wall Street.

Everything went to hell. But that's life. Now, in terms of capital improvements, we have, you know, these guys, I will let them talk about some of the specifics and things that we have done. If you go there and visit you will see the place looks pretty



nice. The people are coming. We are holding our own.

The company has been in a cash position of \$58 to \$59 million in cash. Obviously, that is because we have not been paying the interest payments which is part of the restructuring process. But nevertheless, we can loosen that money so we can reinvest in the property. When the new owners take over, I hope they will make substantial investments as I have always wanted to do under the right circumstances.

So I think Gary has been a beneficiary of our presence and hopefully it will be a beneficiary of the new owners when they take over. Thank you.

Now I would like to call on Jon Bennett who will do a quick overview of the restructuring. And then after Jon Bennett we will have Mike Darley and Larry Buck, our COO and general manager come up and give you a quick overview of the property.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Barden.

MR. BARDEN: If you have any questions of me I will take them now.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Barden, Mr. Bennett, unfortunately, you have five minutes.

MR. BENNETT: I will keep my comments

short. Chairman Murphy, Commissioners, Executive Director Yelton, staff, I'm Jon Bennett. I'm the senior vice president and chief financial officer of the Majestic Star casinos and its affiliate. I would like to give you a brief update on the company's restructuring efforts.

As you know, our restructuring began in the late summer of 2008. At that time we began engaging financial advisers and counsel to assist us to evaluate a broad range of financial strategic alternatives, even addressing company policy and the financial condition and capital structure. Our businesses were significantly impacted by the global and financial market crisis which, among other things, caused general tightening in the credit markets, lower levels of equity, and lower consumer and business spending, lower consumer net worth and increased unemployment.

In addition, we were impacted by significant new improvement investments and competitor casino properties in the markets in which we operate. All the markets in which we operate casinos are extremely competitive and investment in new amenities and infrastructure such as roadway development, or in some cases new casinos, along

with increasingly aggressive marketing campaigns and promotions are necessary to expand market share and provide cash flows.

In addition, our Black Hawk facility began to suffer as a result of the smoking ban that went into place on January 1, 2008 and has seen its share of expanded competitor casino facilities. Because of the economic conditions and the increasingly competitive environment in which our casinos operate, our casino facilities were suffering from the declining admissions and lower spending on gaming activities.

While our casinos are viable, cash flowing enterprises, our cash flow would not allow us to sustain both our capital structure and allow us to reinvest back into the casino properties.

From the summer of 2008 to November of 2009, the company's management, financial advisers and counsel conducted meetings and negotiated with its lenders at ad hoc committees of bondholders about restructuring the company's debt.

In addition, we met with other firms that could assist us in debt restructuring and infuse new capital into the company. While the work we did between the summer of 2008 and November 2009

has to a certain degree contributed to the current restructuring negotiations, it became clear in 2009, November 2009, that we were not going to be able to negotiate an essential restructuring plan outside of the chapter, outside of the Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing.

As of November 20, 2009 the company filed voluntary bankruptcy petitions. Since our filing, we have continued to operate our casino properties in the ordinary course in debtor's repossession.

We have invested back into our casino facilities, which Larry Buck and Mike Darley will talk about in a moment, our customers and our employees. For many, our bankruptcy filing has been a non-event. Our management teams have worked diligently to grow the company revenue and cash flow despite a continuing difficult economic and competitive environment.

In addition, over the past number of months we have continued to negotiate with our creditors to achieve a central plan of restructuring. The company still retains exclusivity in its restructuring and a couple days ago filed a motion with the court to seek an additional 120 day extension to the exclusivity.

However, more importantly, tomorrow we plan to file with the court our disclosure statement and plan of reorganization. As I'm sure you can appreciate, current negotiations are fast and furious and we continue to work through issues.

The company and its key creditor constituency have made significant good faith progress on many of the threshold issues that form the basis of a confirmable reorganization plan. And that hopefully our progress will be the basis for a fully potential organization plan.

We believe that the plan will maximize the value for all company's stakeholders --

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Bennett, one minute.

MR. BENNETT: One minute. Okay.

-- significantly leverage the company's capital structure and thus enable the company to emerge from our reorganization better equipped to compete in the highly challenging casino gaming marketplace.

In the event the unanimous creditor support cannot be achieved for our reorganization plan, the company will endeavor to continue to pursue all reasonable avenues to negotiate up to and through the plan confirmation.

We remain cautiously optimist that the plan can be confirmed by the end of this year. And once the plan is confirmed, the company and stakeholders will work diligently towards substantial confirmation of our reorganization and our emergence from bankruptcy in 2011.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Bennett. Any questions for Mr. Bennett?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, if we could, we will like to call to the attention of the Commissioners the IC 33-6-7 which indicates that the infrastructure is the responsibility of the developer by statute.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Gray.

Thank you. Mr. Sicuso, are we ready to move on?

We are out of time. In the sense of fairness, I

think we need to move on.

MR. SICUSO: 2010-161 and 162 together address each license for Majestic Star, as was the case with the other casinos, Majestic has submitted their requests timely for renewal. And they have also submitted a \$5,000 fee for each casino. The investigation staff recently completed its statutory three-year reinvestigation and we have submitted the report for your review prior to

23

24

25

All that combined, the staff has concluded

that based on what we know at this time, the Majestic Star is in substantial compliance with the gaming laws and we do recommend that the annual

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Sicuso, are you asking us to consider both?

MR. SICUSO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Okay. Order 161 and 162

MR. SICUSO: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions the Commissioners have regarding, or discussion, regarding 2010-161 and 162?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Mr. Sicuso, regarding questions, the, any issues with escrow, it is my understanding there are tax issues as far as the Majestic Star?

MR. SICUSO: The question of whether they pay their taxes?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Yes, we investigated that.

MR. SICUSO: Based on our investigation to date, our understanding is that the casino has met

all its tax obligations with regard to property taxes as well.

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any other questions? I only have one comment. I think before we take a vote on the Majestic Star renewal, it is important to know that I believe that at any time the Commission is, may undertake a suitability examination based on what happens after today or what happens in the future.

So we always have that option. With that, if there are no more questions -- are there any other questions on those orders? Thank you. We have a move to approve. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FINE: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners responded aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No verbal response from Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been unanimously approved Orders 2010-161 and 162. Thank you, Mr. Sicuso.

We will move on to disciplinary matters and

Miss Gray.

MS. GRAY: Once again, good afternoon, Commissioners. You have before you seven settlement agreements concerning monetary settlements.

The first settlement is with the Ameristar, Order 2010-163, wherein the casino allowed an under age person onto the gaming floor. Ameristar agreed to a total monetary settlement of \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

The second order is Order 2010-164, is a settlement agreement with Aztar including two counts. In the first count the casino failed to cancel two packs of playing cards.

In the second count, the casino failed to remove the ten from a game of Spanish 21. Aztar has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$4,000 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions concerning this order?

The third Order, 2010-165, is the settlement agreement with Belterra and includes two counts.

In the first count, the casino failed to coin test the machines on three different occasions before the machines were put into service.

In the second count the casino failed to

timely replace the tables in the count room.

Belterra has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$4,000 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

Order 2010-166 is the settlement agreement with French Lick wherein the casino allowed an under age person to enter the casino. French Lick has agreed to a total monetary settlement of \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

In Order 2010-167 Grand Victoria failed to timely replace tables in the soft count room.

Grand Victoria has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

Order 2010-168 is a settlement agreement with Hollywood involving seven counts. In the first count, the casino placed a slot machine in service before it was properly coin tested.

In the second count, the casino failed to timely submit termination paperwork for five employees.

In the third count, they violated the rule requiring the employees to wear their gaming badges.

In the fourth count, the casino violated the rule regarding the storing of cards that are not being utilized in a live gaming table.

In the fifth count, the casino did not follow the procedures regarding found chips, tokens or cash.

In the sixth count, the casino failed to follow their internal control procedures for even exchanges between the poker tables and the cages.

The seventh count violated the procedure for timely verifying funds. Hollywood has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$31,500 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

The final Order 2010-169 is a settlement agreement of Horseshoe Hammond where the casino allowed an under age person on the casino floor. Horseshoe Hammond has agreed to a monetary settlement of \$1,500 in lieu of disciplinary action. Are there any questions?

The casino staff recommends that you approve Orders 2010-163 through 2010-169, each of which approves one of the settlement agreements that we have just discussed.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Are there any questions of Miss Gray? If not, is there a motion to approve

ARRA

Orders 2010-163 through 2010-169?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER SHY: I will second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been approved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners responded aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No audible response by Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Orders 2010-163 through 2010-169 are approved. Thank you, Miss Gray.

MISS GRAY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item on the agenda is Rules.

MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: Good afternoon,
Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Order
2010-170 concerns proposed emergency rules for
server-based gaming. Let me briefly give you a
little background. Over the last several years the
new technology has emerged that allows changes to a
gaming device including the software, the graphics
and even the appearance of the machine to be made
without physically touching or altering the device.

This is in contrast to current slot machines which usually require a physical action such as

swapping the EPROM, inserting a C.D. rom or USB key into the machine to change the software and usually requires you to change the decoration on the device, also.

Casinos are drawn to this new technology because they can then change the game in minutes without requiring the slot vending machine to be physically disabled to work on it. This allows them to modify the games that are available very quickly based on player feedback. And they can change denominations or other software changes very quickly as well.

So far, two main types of server-based systems have emerged. Each type of system utilizes what the emergency rules have termed player terminals. Which for practical purposes, usually appear to the patron as a slot machine they are used to today; although they could use different types of interface in the future.

The first type of system, which is called a server-hosted electronic gaming system, abbreviated as SHEG, in that system the random number generator or the main game software will reside on the server and the player uses a player terminal for interaction with the game.

In the other main type of system, the server is supported by an electronic gaming system, SEG, or random number generator and main gaming software device on the terminal and can be updated from the server.

The emergency rule contemplates both types of systems, but so far most casinos seem to be focused on the server-supported electronic gaming system type. The Blue Chip Casino has requested permission to use about forty of these player terminals on its gaming floor to test the technology.

The Commission staff was given a demonstration of one of these machines and it is very similar in appearance to a traditional slot machine from a patron's point of view. However, because the underlying technology is different than a normal slot machine, certain regulatory issues arise for the need of the emergency rules to be addressed.

Under the proposed rules, any Indiana casino wishing to use server-based technology would be required to undergo the test period. The casino must obtain approval for the test from the Executive Director and during the test period the

casino will be under stringent reporting requirements including the requirements to report any variances to the Commission within forty-eight hours and any jackpot greater then \$10,000 to the Commission within twenty-four hours.

During the test period the Executive

Director reserves the right to end the use of the server-based system at any time if problems or circumstances should warrant it. During the testing period the proposed rules require the presence of a gaming agent who possesses one half of a floor password in order to make substantial changes to the terminal. So we still have control as far as changes.

The state further also required to ensure that patrons are given adequate notice concerning software changes. A player terminal must have no credits outstanding, and must not have been utilized for play for four minutes, and then a message indicating the change will be made to the terminal must be displayed for one minute before the change can be made. These are some issues the rules addressed because of this new technology.

If approved, the new rules will be effective upon filing with the publisher. The Commission

2.3

staff will monitor the test periods that occur conducted by the casino and staff continues to develop final rules.

Commission staff recommends that you approve the emergency rules.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any question?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: I have one question for you. How secure are these with someone coming in, some math person without any, you know, touching and passwords? Obviously, I think they have thought about that.

MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Morgan. They are, the devices, they have a lot of password protection on them. They are, also, it is important to note these devices all have to be certified just as a normal slot machine by the Commission in advance.

We also adopted as part of the rules a set of standards developed by the Gaming Laboratories security standards and guidelines that have to be followed. So it is about a seven or eight page document full of standards they have to follow that include matters of security. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: It certainly does.

J

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SHY: Will the casino have to employ people with that kind of technology understanding, or is the supplier doing most of that?

MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: As far as the installation?

COMMISSIONER SHY: As far as managing the changes? Are they done by the supplier or are they done by the casino?

MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: The changes, it is my understanding that the supplier has trained the casino employees to be able to make the changes. They can modify, they can access this in the back house and then the changes are made to the machine on the floor.

COMMISSIONER SHY: I assume they are in secured rooms?

MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: That is part of the rules that the server has to be in a secured room. Also that any computer access to the server also has to be in a secured room, also.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: One other question.

Where on the technology curve is Indiana with the adoption of these machines with respect to other

states? Is it widely spread, widely used in 1 Las Vegas and New Jersey? Are we on the cutting 2 edge of this thing? 3 MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: It is not widely used. 4 5 We have looked at other states. Las Vegas, they use this on a lot of the floors. It is being used 6 7 in a casino in St. Louis. CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It's not widely used? 8 9 Would we put this right at its infancy? Would you say that? 10 11 MR. NEUENSCHWANDER: It is in the early 12 stages. I think that would be safe to say. 13 MR. SICUSO: We are not the first state to 14 attempt to regulate it. There are at least a half 15 a dozen jurisdictions that have some form that --16 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Does it have technology 17 in active use there? MR. SICUSO: Yes. 18 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It is not 20 widespread. For example, in Vegas at Treasure 21 Island has just a few for an extended period of 22 time. I think is the new Casino, Aria? 23 MR. SICUSO: Aria. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Aria, the new 24 25 casino that just opened not too long ago, I think

it has a substantial number of machines. I don't 1 2 know if there are any other venues out there, I'm 3 not aware. Some states are doing it, but it is not widely used. It is probably very similar to what 5 we are doing in Indiana. 6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you. Any other 7 questions? If not, is there a motion to approve Resolution 2010-170? 8 9 COMMISSIONER SHY: I move to approve. 10 COMMISSIONER FINE: Second. 11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and 12 seconded. All those in favor signify by saying 13 aye. 14 (Commissioners responded aye.) 15 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed? 16 (No audible response from Commissioners.) 17 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Resolution 2010-170 is 18 approved. Thank you. Moving on the next 19 resolution. 20 MISS ELLINGWOOD: Good afternoon, you have 21 Resolution 2010-171 and 2010-172 regarding the 22 adoption of emergency rules concerning professional boxing, sparring, and unarmed combat and amateur 23

This year the legislature adopted House

unarmed combat respectively.

24

25

Enrolled Act 1086 which transferred the duties and powers related to the regulations of professional boxing, sparring and unarmed combat from the State Athletic Commission to the Indiana Gaming Commission.

Under House Rule 1986, the rules of the Athletic Commission became the rules of the Gaming Commission. The last set of emergency rules which were adopted by the Athletic Commission which would overwise continue to be effective until the end of this year need technical correction including changes to references to statutory references as well as references to the Athletic Commission.

Commission staff believes that failing to adopt an emergency rule making these changes may cause a portion of those rules to be problematic.

In addition, the emergency rule also makes a few necessary substitute changes including licensed physicians working at these athletic events and provisions under which bout results might be challenged.

House Rule 1086, which is now codified in IC 4-33-22 also transfers to the Gaming Commission the responsibility of adopting rules regarding the licensure of promoters and sanctioning bodies whose

purpose is to provide onsite regulation of amateur 1 unarmed combat. 2 Indiana Code 4-33-22-18 also requires the 3 4 Gaming Commission to adopt the rules regarding medical testing of amateur unarmed competitors. 5 6 Resolution 2010-172 adopts those rules which help ensure the safety of amateur fighters. 7 Staff recommends the Commission adopt 8 Resolution 2010-171 and 2010-172. Upon adoption, 9 10 staff will begin the regular rule adoption process 11 including public hearing and submission of the rules for approval to the office of the Attorney 12 General and the Governor. 13 14 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you, 15 Miss Ellingwood. Are there any questions of 16 Miss Ellingwood regarding the resolutions? If not, is there a motion to approve 17 Resolution 2010-171 and 2010-172? 18 COMMISSIONER SHIELDS: So moved. 19 COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and 21 second. All those in favor signify by saying aye. 22 23 (Commissioners replied aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY:

(No audible response.)

Opposed?

24

25

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Resolutions 2010-171 and 2010-172 are approved. Thank you.

MISS ELLINGWOOD: You also have before you Resolution 2010-173 regarding the readoption of rules set to expire on January 1, 2011. Pursuant to Indiana Code 4-22-2.5 unless readopted administrative rules automatically expire January 1 of the seventh year after the rule takes effect. Every year the Legislative Services Agency sends to the Commission staff a list of those rules that are set to expire under this provision.

After receiving that list in April, the Commission staff began the process of readopting those rules. The statute provides an abbreviated readoption process for rules that are not being edited.

As part of this process, staff prepared a notice of intent to readopt these rules and submitted it to the Indiana Register which published a notice on June 16, 2010.

The thirty day statutory period for filing an objection to the abbreviated process or a request for separation of the rule passed without response.

Accordingly, Commission staff recommends the

Commission adopt Resolution 2010-173 thereby readopting rules that would otherwise expire. Once adopted, Commission staff will file a rule with the Register thirty days after which the rules become effective.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Any questions of the Resolution from Miss Ellingwood? If not, is there a motion to approve Resolution 2010-173?

COMMISSIONER MORGAN: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER SHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commission members indicated aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Resolution 2010-173 is approved. The next item on the agenda is MBE and WBE status.

MISS RESKE: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

As you know, the Commission has established a WBE expenditure rule of 10.9 percent. Staff has reviewed the 2009 purchasing data for each casino and found the following: Aztar, Belterra, French Lick, Grand Victoria, Hoosier Park, Horseshoe

Hammond, Indy Live and the Majestic Star met the established goal. Ameristar, Blue Chip, Hollywood and Horseshoe Southern failed to meet the goal.

The casinos that failed to meet the goal submitted documentation of their good faith efforts to comply. Based upon our review of that information, the Commission staff recommends a finding of good faith effort for Ameristar, Blue Chip and Horseshoe Southern.

Resolution 2010-174 reflects this recommendation. Further, staff recommends that the commission defer the decision regarding Hollywood's demonstration of good faith effort until the next meeting, which will allow staff the opportunity to engage in further dialogue in order to formulate our recommendation.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Questions for Ms. Reske regarding Order 2010-174? If not, Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER FINE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Commissioners responded by saying aye.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Order 2010-174 is approved. Thank you, Miss Reske. Our next meeting, regularly scheduled meeting, will be November 10 at a location to be announced. So stay tuned.

That being all of the business to come before the meeting today, we stand adjourned. Thank you.

1 2 STATE OF INDIANA SS 3 COUNTY OF HENDRICKS 4 5 6 I, Wendi Kramer Sulkoske, Notary Public in 7 Hendricks County, Indiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the third quarter 2010 8 9 Indiana Gaming Commission business meeting at 10 1:00 p.m. on September 16, 2010, was recorded 11 stenographically and afterwards reduced to typewriting 12 by me and that the foregoing is a true and correct 13 transcript of said business meeting. 14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my 15 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 4th day of 16 October, 2010. 17 18 19 estevie X -20 Wendi Kramer Sulkoske 21 22 County of Residence: Hendricks 23 My Commission Expires: January 2015

24

25