1.0	
1	VIRGINIA RACING COMMISSION
2	December 16, 2015
3	JAMES MONROE BUILDING CONFERENCE ROOM B
4	101 N. 14 TH STREET RICHMOND, VA 23219
5	
6	Commencing at 10:00 a.m.
7	
8	COMMISSION MEMBERS: J. Sargeant Reynolds, Jr., Chairman
9	D.G. Van Clief, Jr., Vice Chairman
10	Dr. Charles Steger Carol G. Dawson I. Clinton Miller
11	1. Crincon Mirrer
12	COMMISSION STAFF:
13	Bernard J. Hettel, Executive Secretary C. Richard Harden, DVM, Equine Medical Director
14	David S. Lermond, Deputy Executive Secretary Kimberly C. Mackey, Office Administrator
15	OFFICE OF ACRECILITURE AND FORESTRY.
16	OFFICE OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY: Sam Towell, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture and Forestry
17	ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE: J. Duncan Pitchford, Esquire
18	J. Buildin Freemora, Esquire
19	
20	
21	
22	CAPITOL REPORTING, INC.
23	REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS (804) 788-4917
24	
25	

1		INDEX	
2			Page
3	1.	Call to Order	3
4	2.	Appeal Hearing in the Matter of Mark Gray	3
5 6	3.	Administrative Process Act Hearing a. TwinSpires Advance Deposit Account Wagerin License	g 60
7	4.	Approval of November 17 th meeting minutes	133
8 9 LO	5.	New Business a. License Renewals i. TwinSpires ii. XpressBet iii. TVG	135 134 135
L1		 b. Limited License Renewals i. Virginia Gold Cup (2016 race days) ii. Virginia Equine Alliance (2016 race 	137
L2 L3 L4		c. Proposed Breeders Fund Budgets for 2016i. VTAii. VHHAd. Withdrawal of Colonial Downs, L.P.'sApplications for SWF Licenses	139 144 146
L5	6.	Public Comment Period	146
L6	7.	Commissioners' Comments	146
L7	8.	Closed Session	
L8	9.	Adjournment	150
L9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

_

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good morning. It's ten o'clock and I'd like to call the Virginia Racing Commission meeting for December 16, 2015 to order. I'd like the record to show that all of the commissioners are present.

The first order of business, I'd like to go ahead and set the date for the next commission meeting, and we're going to schedule that for January 6, that's Wednesday, 2016, at ten o'clock, and we'll let you know where that's going to be held. If for some reason we don't need to meet, we will let you know, but we wanted to get it on everybody's books. Does that work for everybody? That works for the commissioners. All right. Thank you very much.

The first order of business is to hear the appeal in the matter of Mark Gray. Mr. Hettel, will you walk us through that?

MR. HETTEL: Yes, sir. Mr. Gray was the subject of a ruling dated November 16, 2015 from the harness racing at Oak Ridge. The stewards' ruling is a part of your packet. Also in that packet, there is a result from the official testing laboratory, the slip from the detention barn and the supporting documentation.

Also in your packet, you will find a report of Dr. Harden, our equine medical director, describing the substance that was found in the horse, post-race testing, and also you will find the letter of Mr. Gray requesting the action that we are taking today. So with that, if it's your pleasure, Duncan --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We'd like to hear from Dr. Harden.

MR. HETTEL: Dr. Harden first or the state steward first?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It doesn't matter.

MR. HETTEL: Judge Tishuk, go ahead and stand up and introduce yourself.

MR. TISHUK: My name is Paul Tishuk. I'm from Ocean City, Maryland. I've worked for the Maryland Racing Commission for the last 25 years as a steward, judge, and I worked in Virginia in the early 2000s after Colonial opened for three years and then I worked at Oak Ridge since 2001 and worked this last meet in October. I was the presiding steward.

MR. PITCHFORD: Sir, before you go in to your testimony, we need to swear you in. Dr. Harden and Mr. Gray, if I could just do this all at once. Is

anyone else going to give testimony? 1 2 MR. HETTEL: Dave Lermond may. Dave, why don't you be sworn in also? 3 4 MR. PITCHFORD: Okay. Please raise your right 5 hand. 6 MS. MCDONALD: I might need to. MR. PITCHFORD: Ma'am, what's your name? 7 8 MS. MCDONALD: Anne McDonald. 9 MR. PITCHFORD: Okay. Thank you. Please raise 10 your right hand. 11 The witnesses are sworn NOTE: 12 collectively. 13 MR. PITCHFORD: All right. Thank you very 14 much. And also for purposes of the record, I have 15 marked as Exhibit A, a copy of the stewards' ruling dated November 16, 2015. Exhibit B is a copy of 16 17 the laboratory analysis from the Commission's 18 medical laboratory, along with a copy of the 19 detention slip. Exhibit C is a copy of Dr. 20 Harden's report concerning the substance that was 21 found in the medical test, and Exhibit D is a copy 22 of Mr. Gray's appeal letter. 23 I move those be admitted. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All those in favor, 25 say aye.

NOTE: The Commission votes aye.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries unanimously. Thank you.

MR. TISHUK: Okay. Subsequent to the end of the meet, I received a phone call from Mr. Lermond that we had a positive test, which you have in your packet. The horse had -- the lab result -- the lab that we go by is the ticket which you have that corresponds with the same number of lab result so we're certain that is that particular horse, and that was 63968, which corresponds to the analysis.

The test came back with the horse at a reading of 163 picograms per milliliter for Methylprednisolone found in the blood plasma.

Upon receipt of that, Mr. Gray was contacted by Mr. Lermond that his horse was positive, and we then set up a hearing, and it was a telephone hearing between Mr. Gray, Mr. Lermond, the other associate judge there was a judge named Jack Remy -- R-E-M-Y -- and he was on the telephone hearing. Mr. Remy was in my office at Ocean Downs, and Mr. Lermond was here and Dr. Harden was there on that.

During the hearing with Mr. Gray, we listened to his testimony. Upon conclusion, Mr. Lermond,

Mr. Remy and I deliberated, and it was our opinion that Mr. Gray was in violation of Virginia rule of prohibited practices, AC 10-180-35, which is no trainer should allow a horse to appear in a race, qualifying race or officially timed workout when a horse contains in his system any prohibited substance.

That substance, which is methylprednisolone, which is on the Virginia Racing Commission medication changes July 2015 highlights, and under methyl, there's several drugs here, and one of them is methylprednisolone, and that was posted on the website of the Racing Commission in July of 2015 under methylprednisolone, and it says methylprednisolone should not be used, or if it is used, the trainer should have the horse tested at his expense prior to entry to be sure the serum concentration is below the regulatory limit.

Okay. In our deliberation, we came to the conclusion that the horse was positive and that the sanction should be against the horse trainer and owner and a Class 4. The RCI recommendation for that particular classification, which we have a copy of here, is that for the trainer, it's a minimum of a \$1,000 fine, absent mitigating

د 2

circumstances. We issued a fine for \$1,000.

Also for the license owner for first offense is loss of purse and horse must pass

Commission-approved examination before being eligible to race again.

It was our opinion that this rule was violated and that we issue a ruling which was for the \$1,000 fine and loss of purse.

To be consistent with other jurisdictions, I have from the Maryland Racing Commission there was a ruling on 10-13 in Maryland for the same drug, and this trainer received the same penalty, which was for a Class 4 \$1,000 fine and loss of purse.

I also have a ruling here from the state of Pennsylvania. This was on October 21, 2015, and for the same drug, methylprednisolone, Class 4, and that was also a fine of \$1,000 against the horse, and I think we are consistent with every jurisdiction.

Dr. Harden, do you have anything to say as far as the conversation you had with Mr. Gray as far as that?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: You have to speak up. I know you're just talking to Dr. Harden, but all of this is a matter of record. She must transcribe

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

everything you say, so speak up, please.

MR. TISHUK: Okay. Dr. Harden, do you have anything to add?

DR. HARDEN: Well, in the stewards' hearing, Mr. Gray indicated that he had spoken to me upon arrival at Oak Ridge, and I presume that was Friday, perhaps.

MR. GRAY: Thursday.

Thursday. Okay. Prior to the DR. HARDEN: start of the meet, and he'd asked me if our medication rules had changed. And I've had basically that conversation with many people, so I can't specifically say what I answered him, but basically, the answer that I typically give is that our rules are essentially the same as they have been, with the exception of methylprednisolone, which is called Depo-Medrol as a trade name, and I said that we have, you know, got very strict or tightened up on methylprednisolone, and that's my best recollection as to what our conversation was.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I guess we can ask you all some questions or hear all the testimony and just ask questions, but I'll ask -- is it Doctor or Mister?

MR. TISHUK: Mister.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You talked about the RCI 1 2 guidelines and the \$1,000 fine. You talked about unless there are mitigating circumstances. What do 3 4 they mean by mitigating circumstances? What could 5 be some mitigating circumstances? 6 MR. TISHUK: Mitigating circumstances. 7 someone had mysteriously drugged a horse. I've had 8 occasions where someone had an eye-witness where 9 someone had seen someone come to, you know, come to the barn and allegedly, you know, that'd be a 10 11 mitigating circumstance to take into consideration. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you very much. MR. HETTEL: See if Mr. Gray has any questions 13 of him. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. I'll let Mr. Grav 16 talk in a minute. Did any other commissioners have 17 any other questions? 18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Just a moment. I think 19 Mr. Gray has the right to examine each witness 20 against him. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER MILLER: So you might ask him if 23 he has any questions of the judge --24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I was going to do that. 25 COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- rather than him

testifying. He may want to ask a question.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I was going to see if the commissioners have any questions first, but that's fine. Mr. Gray, would you like to ask the witnesses some questions or make any statements on your behalf?

MR. GRAY: Well, as far as Dr. Harden, in previous years we raced at Colonial Downs and I've raced under him. He's been the state vet down there several years, and I think it was three years ago they changed labs and they started using a Kentucky lab, and I requested paperwork to give to my vet that administers injections to my horses.

I know what to give a horse, the withdrawal time on all the medications and the injections, you know, stuff that you can use, stuff that you can't use, the withdrawal times, so I don't run into problems like this.

Dr. Harden will tell you that I have gotten the literature from him, and Thursday before the meet started, I looked him out to make sure. I said, Dr. Harden, is all the medication rules the same as they always are, and he said everything as far as medication is the same, except for they've cracked down on Depo-Medrol.

I said, well, this is a nice time to find out about it a day before a meet is going on, when I have always followed the guidelines that Virginia's had the last three years that I give to my vet, and we know how far out to give Depo-Medrol.

Now, I race in Pennsylvania, I race in Maryland, Delaware, New York, New Jersey, and the vets that I use know what they can use in what states. I know for a fact that I can't use any Depo in the state of Pennsylvania; it's a no-no. And I know for a fact that I can inject a horse three days out with Depo in the state of Delaware. That's one of the states that's on here. Do you understand? It's right here on this paperwork.

Now that being said, this Mid-Atlantic thing, and I'm not saying -- I got a letter saying he injected the horse on September 15 and she done five injections and each one had Depo in it. That was September 15. Now, I give myself 21 days, which is what I've always had to go by with the Kentucky lab.

Now, I'm not entering that literature. I mean I have a flip-top phone. I don't have internet on my phone and I don't -- I can't even turn a computer on. Do you understand? But I know that

if there's a certain rule, that's what I abide by, and I had a bunch of horses for her. She invests a lot of money in the state of Virginia every year and breeds and races horses in a small program, and she relies on this money to make her year break even and to keep going in the business.

Now, I've never had a Depo positive in my life. I'm not saying I haven't had a Bute high or a DMSO high or stuff that everybody else has, but I tried to abide by the guidelines.

The presiding judge told me on the phone conversation that me knowing that I had had him injected and there was a chance -- well, if I'd have known that they changed this rule in July, or if somebody from the state of Virginia had emailed my owner and said warning to your trainer as of July 1st the medication rules have changed in the state of Virginia, then I would have surely made sure the horse didn't get injected with Depo. I would have been like the state of Pennsylvania and left it out completely, because all this literature here now that I have now says no-no to Depo. Right? That's the way it is, so I won't use any Depo.

But what I'm saying is I didn't have any --

now, if we had raced at Colonial Downs this year,
which I go there every year the last week in
August, as soon as I can get in the barn area, I go
down there because I try to get these young horses
used to the track and finish them up and get them
used to the surrounding down there.

Well, if that would have happened this year, I still wouldn't have had a Depo positive, because I would have talked him as soon as I got there the 1st of September and the horses got injected September 15th. We raced a four-day meet two weekends in a place in Virginia called Oak Ridge under bad conditions.

Now we didn't ship back and forth because it was too far to ship, so I moved down there and stayed in a tent for two weeks with my horses and with no hot water and the whole nine yards.

But the situation is like this. If I had known that they had changed the Depo rules in the state of Virginia, then the horse wouldn't have been injected with Depo to begin with.

And the amount of Depo that they're talking about is enough to fill the needle; not the syringe, the needle. He come up -- the level is very minute to where -- I'm not saying the horse

didn't come up positive and I don't know he did, because I have records here where I injected horses the day after. I had a vet inject horses a day after this horse had.

All these horses I had to get in line, because I didn't know whether there was a vet down there that I could use, and it was only two weeks. So I had all the work done in the time frame that I thought I would be safe under the guidelines from the Kentucky lab that I usually go by every year. That's what happened.

But the amount of Depo they're talking about here is enough to fill the needle, not the syringe. That's how much he was over. When I first talked about it, I was worried about it. At the time, I had another filly win a final. She got injected the day after he got injected. She didn't have a Depo find. Maybe some of it go out of the joint and stayed under the skin and that's how he come up minutely high.

He also insinuated because the horse raced so bad in eliminations -- he run all over the track. Well, the track was this deep down there because they hadn't raced on it. It was like a plowed field. That horse couldn't get a hold of the

track. I had his shoes changed from the elimination to the final, and I warmed him up in two seven, which is very fast because he's an erratic horse.

when you look at his runnings, he hasn't raced much this year. It's either lameness or unruliness is why he's not made any money or done any good, and the day he won the final, I set out in the middle of the track and held on to him and I had changed his shoes and he got a hold of the track better.

But the situation here, it's just not knowing.

Me not knowing. Maybe -- like I talked to a guy
that works for the USJA. I've been talking to him
about this, T.C. Lane. He's in charge of the
medications for the USJA, United States Jockey
Association. He said, unfortunately, now that
everything is turning to internet and email, you
have to catch up with the times. Then maybe I do.
I have never been that way.

Like I tell you, I can't turn my computer on at home. Never use a computer. I have a flip-top phone with no internet, and to me, with the small program, I think the owners of the horses should have been emailed fair warning, because I knew

1 nothing about this.

I'm from the state of Maryland. I race at Ocean City. I race at Rosecroft. I race in Delaware. I race in Pennsylvania. I ship to Pennsylvania. All these places, I haven't had a medication find ever, and this is slightly over because of the circumstances where they changed something that we didn't know about.

And if we had, they're stating that we should go on the internet and check stuff like that.

Well, who's thinking about that? I didn't hear it from the other states they had changed their rule until now, all this, you know.

I mean they started testing for cobalt last year at Rosecroft, and they started testing before they told the horsemen. Then two weeks later, they told the horsemen that as of such-and-such date, we're enforcing this if you get a cobalt, if you get one or your horse does, which is the right way to do things. They did it the right way so the horsemen had time to adjust.

Well, they didn't have that on the internet.

They come and told me in the paddock. They had a meeting and told everybody that this is the way it's gonna be.

Well, I didn't receive any literature from Virginia or anybody else saying that as of June 1St Depo was a no-no, and that's what happened. I mean that's the way it is.

We have some literature here from -- obviously, they've had other problems with medication in the state of Virginia with jumpers and high Depos, and they let these guys go because of circumstances citing the following: determined accurate withdrawal dates for a controlled therapeutic medication. I see Depo-Medrol. Two stewards' rulings from this spring eliminating \$1,000 fines of two trainers for spring violations from the Virginia Racing Commission.

Obviously, this has happened and you've had a conflict with this with Thoroughbreds because of guys not knowing the guidelines on Depo-Medrol.

We're appealing this because it's not a little money. The horse race was 43,000. Here's the win picture. It's gonna cost her, along with me, and to us, we're appealing it because we had no idea that they had changed this.

And like I say, I'm not email, computer or internet-wise to this, you know. If I'd have known, it would have never happened.

And like I say again, we're not talking about a big amount of cortisone. When you go to this nanogram stuff, it's enough to fill up the needle is what it come over, and that could easily, you know, because I had horses checked the day after. But that's what happened and that's why we're here, and we're not talking \$1,000 or \$2,000. It's like \$11,000 for her and she counts on this money to make her year and that's why we're here.

If I'd had medication problems before with Depo or something, we wouldn't appeal it because I know what I can do and what I can't, and so do my vets, and we injected this horse well far enough out.

We were giving ourselves 21 days. That was the time, the day before eliminations, you know, for this to be out of your system, and obviously, it wasn't with this horse, because I had one win and I had a couple finish second, and that morning had her go to the box and I don't know. That's what happened.

MR. PITCHFORD: Mr. Gray, do you want to offer copies of anything you just referenced as an exhibit?

MS. MCDONALD: This is the letter saying when we gave the injections.

MR. GRAY: I'm sure you all are wise to this 1 stuff. 2 MS. MCDONALD: It's the ruling about the drugs 3 4 and about the reversals of the Virginia Racing 5 Commission for the Thoroughbreds for similar 6 amounts. 7 That was brought to us by a vet in MR. GRAY: 8 Kentucky. He practices in Kentucky and he emailed 9 us that paperwork. MS. MCDONALD: Here's the winning picture. You 10 11 know, we're also talking about a non-betting race. 12 MR. GRAY: Yeah. It was a non-betting race. 13 It was an early race with a three-horse field. 14 MS. MCDONALD: You know, I breed these horses. 15 If I don't -- I'm trying to help the Virginia program, but if you take my money away, you know, 16 17 we may not be able to. 18 MR. PITCHFORD: Okay. Just for purposes of the 19 record, I have marked as Exhibit E, a copy of the 20 letter from the vet. It's addressed to Virginia 21 Racing Commission, dated October 15, 2015. Marked 22 as Exhibit F, a Mid-Atlantic advisory concerning 23 Depo-Medrol --MR. GRAY: May I say something? 24 25 MR. PITCHFORD: And Exhibit G is a copy of an

article from horseracing.com, July 1, 2015, and 1 2 then Exhibit H is the win picture. You would like those admitted into the record, 3 4 Mr. Gray? 5 MR. GRAY: Yeah. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do we need to make a 7 motion? 8 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman? 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir. 10 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I know that the party was 11 anxious to testify, but I raise my point again. I 12 said he had the right to question the judge and a 13 right to question Dr. Harden, but he began 14 testifying again. We need to give him an 15 opportunity to question, not testify. Any question 16 you have for either of those two witnesses? 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you have any questions 18 of either of the two witnesses? 19 MR. GRAY: No. 20 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: When you concluded your 22 testimony, you said you had something you wanted to 23 say? 24 MR. GRAY: I don't know --25 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear

you.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Speak up.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: He just said he didn't know what it was. Are we going to make a motion at this point?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: What is the motion you're seeking?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: To enter the exhibits.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Do we have copies to look at?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We only have one copy, so we don't have copies to look at. He can pass them down.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Are they short enough to read so we can all hear what's in the exhibits?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Not really. Commissioner Miller, you have more experience in these hearings than I do. What's the protocol for admitting exhibits?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, you've asked for the motion, but it's kind of strange to make a motion to admit an exhibit. I have no idea what it is. It could be a letter from Putin, you know. I have no idea what the contents of the exhibit are. I mean the title of them have been indicated, but

we need a chance to look at them to see whether we 1 2 think they're relevant and material, so we'll have to take time to do that. 3 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a 6 question? On the document, the notice to the 7 horsemen and veterinarians, who published this? 8 What publication? MR. GRAY: It should be on there. 9 MS. MCDONALD: I got it all from the vet in 10 11 Kentucky. 12 COMMISSIONER MILLER: You have to speak up. 13 MR. GRAY: It's probably on one of those pages 14 who published it. I think it's on the first copy, 15 the first page. 16 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't see any source on 17 here. 18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: She's talking about --19 I'll speak louder. She's talking about the one 20 that's headed attention all horsemen and veterinarians. 21 22 MR. GRAY: Yeah. 23 MS. MCDONALD: We got that from the Kentucky 24 vet after. 25 MR. GRAY: It was emailed to us by a vet in

Kentucky that practices there. 1 2 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So you didn't originally 3 get this because --4 MS. MCDONALD: No. We got it after we got the 5 positive. 6 DR. HARDEN: This was -- the letter you have 7 there, attention all horsemen and veterinarians, this was put out by the Mid-Atlantic committee 8 9 trying to clarify some of the confusion that was swirling around the use of Depo-Medrol, and I think 10 11 you got this from Dr. Roberts, Andy Roberts, of 12 Kentucky. 13 MR. GRAY: Yes. 14 COMMISSIONER MILLER: May I ask a question? 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, please. 16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Dr. Harden --17 DR. HARDEN: Yes, sir. 18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- did it clear up the 19 confusion -- without me reading it -- did it clear 20 up the confusion in your mind? 21 Basically, what it says is that DR. HARDEN: 22 any trainer who chooses to race a horse that has 23 been treated with Depo-Medrol despite this warning 24 should at his or her expense get the horse tested 25 prior to entering to ensure that the horse will

1	test below the limit of 100 picograms. That's the
2	bottom left page of the paragraph.
3	COMMISSIONER MILLER: All right.
4	DR. HARDEN: That is in essence consistent with
5	what our statement placed on the internet on our
6	website in July stated.
7	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. May I ask a
8	question?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Please ask.
10	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Sir, when did you get
11	this?
12	MR. GRAY: About a month ago when I got my
13	positive.
14	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. Well, it's safe to
15	say you got this subsequent to the race in which
16	this horse ran?
17	MR. GRAY: Oh, yeah. Yeah.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER DAWSON: This document also says
20	it will be enforced.
21	COMMISSIONER MILLER: May I ask another
22	question?
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Ask all the
23 24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Ask all the questions.

this is the first you became aware of the fact that 1 2 the testing of the threshold 100 whatever it is --3 MR. PETRAMALO: Picograms. COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- picograms --4 5 MR. PETRAMALO: A trillionth of a gram. COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- in blood plasma will 6 7 be enforced? Are you saying this is the first you ever heard of that? 8 9 MR. GRAY: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Dr. Harden, when did 11 this new regulation go into effect? 12 DR. HARDEN: Our regulation --13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: For this particular --14 DR. HARDEN: Our regulation went into effect in 15 2014. The only change we had was on our website, we clarified prior to June our website had went by 16 17 the RMTC recommendation, which was inject one joint 18 with 100 milligrams no closer than 21 days. 19 We have found that that recommendation was not 20 accurate, and so in July, we posted on our website 21 that we recommended you not use Methylprednisolone, 22 but our regulation, our rule had not changed. 23 was merely the guideline accompanying that rule we 24 changed in July.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Mr. Chairman?

25

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Dr. Harden, could you restate what our rule is? Seems there's a little confusion here. We've got a recommendation it was made in July on our website not to use the substance, yet there is a rule on the books and could you clarify that rule?

DR. HARDEN: The rule on the books states that methylprednisolone -- now I'm paraphrasing the rule, I don't have it written, but states that methylprednisolone, one of the 26 controlled substances on the RMTC list of medications, and that the threshold for regulatory action would be 100 picograms per milliliter.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Is there a recommendation with regards to withdrawal in that ruling or a rule?

DR. HARDEN: We name it a guideline rather than a regulation, and the guideline as of July of this year was that we recommend you do not use it, or if you do use it, have your horse tested to ensure that he's below the level.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Was that guideline and that recommendation promulgated only on our website? Were there other efforts to make sure the

horsemen were aware of that? And second question, the way we promulgate the information here in Virginia, is that consistent with other jurisdictions such as Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey?

DR. HARDEN: We're consistent with the Mid-Atlantic jurisdictions, with the exception of Delaware harness. The harness group in Delaware seem to operate differently with this one particular substance, but we're consistent with Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: That's with regards to both the rule and the way we give the information out to horsemen?

DR. HARDEN: I don't fully know the guidelines that are disseminated from all the other jurisdictions, but this is consistent with the guidelines in Pennsylvania and New York for sure and --

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Is the way we've been distributing information for horsemen changed over the last couple of years or is it the same?

DR. HARDEN: Primarily what has changed it is as Mr. Gray said. Horsemen would show up at the meet two or three weeks prior to the actual racing

and we had an opportunity to communicate with them and intermingle with them and talk to them.

With our longer meets no longer occurring, the horses show up a day before they're racing, so I don't have the opportunity for personal communication, and we don't have a system other than posting on our website of how to modify that. We don't send a mailing to everyone, so.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY: I just want to say I have the utmost respect for Dr. Harden. I've dealt with him for years at Colonial, never had a problem. He was always straight up with me. Whenever I asked him a question and I was, you know, I would always go to him as soon as I arrived.

when we were stabled at Colonial, I always had a licensed vet down there doing my work, you know, and she's always there when the meet started, too, and he knows that I use -- Michelle MacDougall was the licensed vet that I used.

But then again, we were always there, I was always there. I was like the first one to move in, you know, two and three stages to do then, and me and a couple others that would be there right away and I would talk to Dr. Harden.

I got a lot of respect for him. He's always told me, you know, what I need to know, and when they changed to the Kentucky lab, he gave me the literature that I asked for and that's what I abided by. That's what I gave my vet at home and that's what we go by.

Like I say, if we had gotten notification of this, to me, something should have been sent to my owner stating warn your trainer that -- they're not saying that you can't use, they said they recommend that you don't use it on this letter, and to me, that's, no, don't use it. Do you understand?

I can't use it in Pennsylvania, now we can't use it at Oak. I wouldn't have used it. Point blank period. It wouldn't have been used if I knew this was going to happen. But we didn't. I didn't know, you know. That's what happened, you know.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'll ask a question, please. How are you notified in other jurisdictions? Are other jurisdictions in the Mid-Atlantic or wherever else you race, do they mail you medication rules or do they rely on the internet also to send that information to noticing trainers.

1 MR. GRAY: Because I race in Maryland, some 2 other things they tell you. They have a meeting and say this is the way it's gonna be. 3 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you get anything in the 5 mail from these other jurisdictions regarding --6 MS. MCDONALD: In Maryland, the Racing Commission sends that stuff. 7 8 MR. GRAY: The Racing Commission, they send us stuff saying it's gonna be changed. They sent me 9 this. This is their guidelines for Maryland, you 10 11 know. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: They sent those to you in the mail? 13 14 MR. GRAY: Yeah. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are there other questions? Yes, Commissioner Dawson. 16 17 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Dr. Harden, I know that 18 the use of this medication is not uncommon in 19 racing and other kinds of horse things. How 20 unusual is it to use it on a three-year-old though? 21 I mean I don't know whether a three-year-old would 22 have conditions that would need joint injections. 23 DR. HARDEN: It's primarily used for arthritic situations or wear-and-tear on the joints, and 24 25 ideally, a perfect horse would never need it. So I would say it's used too commonly in three-year-olds.

I personally would not like to see it used in two- and three-year-old horses, but it is, and the older the horse gets, the more frequently we see it. So it's not unusual in a three-year-old, but again, I would prefer not to have it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: In reading your document here, you talk about the fact that it is a drug that tends to linger a long time in the system, it maybe differs by horse. In other words, one horse would tend not to --

DR. HARDEN: There is some difference from horse to horse, but there's probably much more variation in the veterinarian's technique. When the drug's administered, you go through skin, through the joint capsule into a joint, and ideally, you withdraw joint fluid of the same volume of the Depo-Medrol that you inject. That way, you haven't changed the size of the joint.

Some joints, particularly the distal hock, they have a very, very tiny joint space. You cannot get a cc of joint fluid out of these joints, so when you inject, you increase the pressure within the joint. Some of that medication may seep out of the

needle hole when you withdraw the needle and is now subcutaneous, and it's the subcutaneous administration that prolongs and raises the level that we're seeing.

Another point is our guideline was based on injecting one joint. You have X square inches of joint capsule that can absorb the medication for one joint. You go in to five joints, you now have five times that joint surface that can potentially absorb medication, so it's absorbed at a different rate, and that's why our recommendation promulgated by the RMTC says one joint, because that's the protocol they used in determining that 21-day number.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And in the case of this horse, it was four joints; was it not?

MR. GRAY: Five.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Five.

MR. GRAY: He had both joints in his knees done and the right hind ankle.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So that's a lot of the medication.

DR. HARDEN: Well, I don't know the total dose.

I haven't seen the letter from the veterinarian.

MR. GRAY: It was one cc of Depo in each joint

along with acid, and I think it was, I think 20 1 2 milligrams of Depo. COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Could we look it up and 3 see that? That was on September 15th. The race 4 day was October 15th? 5 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Eighteenth. COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's longer than the 7 recommended interval period. 8 9 MR. GRAY: Yeah. COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So I would suspect 10 Mr. Gray would have expected that medication wasn't 11 12 there any longer, but apparently it was. 13 MR. GRAY: Previous experience from all these 14 things, yeah. It really flabbergasted me when he called me with this. I was flabbergasted. 15 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Now on the other hand, we 16 17 also were given some documents showing that there 18 were some rulings by the National Steeplechase Association on the same matter. 19 20 DR. HARDEN: Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And even though in those 22 cases it was similar, the people didn't know about 23 the rule. DR. HARDEN: There was a significant 24 25 difference. And this was considered a mitigating

circumstance by the board of stewards when they had this hearing.

Prior to July, our recommendation was -- our guideline, excuse me, was one joint 100 milligrams, and we made a comment, a footnote below that said that its use is problematic because it can be detected for 21 days.

However in that particular case, the medication was injected into the sacroiliac joint, but the sacroiliac is not a true joint with a joint capsule in it. So in effect, a large amount of the medication injected into the sacroiliac joint in effect becomes subcutaneous.

The tissues in that area are more akin to subcutaneous tissue than within the joint space, and this was the point of argument that I had and others had relative to the sacroiliac joint, and this is what prompted us to change our guideline in July to say that we recommend you not use methylprednisolone.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And when Virginia changed its guideline, it was following some other states that were doing that too?

DR. HARDEN: Yes. New York in January came out with the same recommendation. Do not use

1 methylprednisolone.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: At all?

DR. HARDEN: At all. And some states, and I'm sorry I can't recollect exactly which states. Some states were saying 60 days if it was in a joint or 90 days if it was in the muscle, and so there was a lot of states were coming with guidelines all over the map, and then basically, it got to be so many possibilities, so many various different joints that it could be injected, and muscles subcutaneously.

I even understand there's a nasal mist that can be used for upper respiratory issues of the same drug, and all of these different permutations became such that it seemed prudent to recommend that you not use the medication.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And of course as most of us know, cortisone does relieve pain, but it doesn't necessarily cure anything.

DR. HARDEN: It relieves inflammation, which subsequently may relieve pain, and the -- there's not a curative effect other than eliminating inflammation and allowing healing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And it makes the horse feel better. But in the meantime, trainers such as

Mr. Gray are operating under the 21-day recommendation withdrawal, and in his case, didn't know or says he did not know of the change. We've already established that the VRC does not send out written notices.

DR. HARDEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It posts on the website, however.

DR. HARDEN: I also in the -- I also communicate with the private veterinarians or the veterinarians that I anticipate being at the track. Now we had two veterinarians from Kenbridge who came to the track, and prior to the meet, I had communicated with them and sent them our regulations and guidelines, but I certainly couldn't send it to every veterinarian in the Mid-Atlantic area because there's too many of them and I don't even know which ones are involved.

DR. HARDEN: I don't think this veterinarian was a racetrack practitioner. I think she had a general practice.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you know whether --

MR. GRAY: Yeah. She has a private practice.

There are no racetracks now that have a barn area,
you know, so she has her own business, her own

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

clinic and she travels.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So she wouldn't necessarily be following race regulations such as the VRC.

MR. TISHUK: What Dr. Harden just testified to, that this also -- we're going under the premiss that this positive was from the injection. also, he just mentioned in his testimony that it's available in a spray.

I had two positives this summer where I worked, and both trainers testified that they did admit it was administered. It was administered in a spray.

So there's nothing saying here that -- he's responsible for the care and custody of the horse. There's nothing to say that two weeks before the horserace that he did not administer it in a spray. We don't know. We're going under the premiss that it was injected, but he also has care and custody of the horse. We have no idea what he did subsequent to the horse being injected. It's available in a spray, and the two that I had this summer, both trainers testified it was administered in a spray.

I think what we're losing sight of is, okay, the horse, you know, there's withdrawals. It could

be overages in the joints. That the foundation of positive tests, it's our trainers' responsibility. He is responsible for that horse, no matter how it got it.

And as far as whether he wasn't notified, that's not our problem as far as making a ruling. The thing is, it's the trainer's responsibility. It's in your rule book. Under trainer, it says duties. A person holding a permit allowing him to participate in horseracing as a trainer shall be responsible for the proper care, health, training, safety and protection of the horse in her or his care against administration of all substances foreign and natural to the horse.

So I think that we're missing the fact that he is responsible. This is the foundation of all our rulings as far as positive tests go. He's responsible for the care and custody of his horse.

They can bring in, you know, there's withdrawals, there's -- Dr. Harden testified that horses react differently. As far as this horse from our ruling as far as I've always been -- the evidence that the test came back positive and we act on that particular --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You all considered the

mitigating circumstances that I'm sure Mr. Gray 1 2 probably shared with you as he shared with us 3 today? MR. TISHUK: Right. As far as our concern, 4 5 there wasn't mitigating circumstances. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. And obviously, the vet's letter --7 MR. TISHUK: In fact, we did not have at that 8 time -- when he testified -- he did not have the 9 letter where the horse was administered. This is 10 the first time I've seen it. There was no letter. 11 12 In fact, when I asked him during our telephone 13 hearing the name of the veterinarian, he did not know the name of the veterinarian. 14 15 MR. GRAY: Yeah. I did. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, sir. No arguing. 17 MR. TISHUK: You said --18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'll give you a chance to 19 respond. 20 MR. GRAY: No. That's not the --21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No arguing. Did you hear 22 me? I will give you a chance to respond, Mr. Gray. 23 MR. TISHUK: Mr. Lermond, Dave, was at the 24 hearing. He had trouble remembering the name of 25 the veterinarian.

MR. GRAY: No. I didn't have any trouble. 1 2 I'll tell you why. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Hold on. 3 4 MR. LERMOND: In my notes, I wrote that it was 5 Dr. Beatrice somebody, but he didn't know the last 6 name. 7 MR. GRAY: It's hard to pronounce her last 8 name. MR. TISHUK: So he did not know her name. 9 MR. GRAY: I did know her name. 10 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Stop, please. Both of you. 12 MR. TISHUK: He didn't know the name. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That's fine. I'd 14 like to ask -- I'm gonna let Mr. Gray respond. Go ahead and respond. 15 MR. GRAY: With talking to Dr. Harden about the 16 17 situation, he's the first one I talked to when I 18 called him on the phone before he had any evidence 19 of the positive. Did I not? Yes or no? 20 DR. HARDEN: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no, no. 22 MR. GRAY: He asked me who administered it, and 23 if I could get a letter stating that they injected the horse on such-and-such a day, this would 24 25 probably go away is what Dr. Harden told me on the

phone.

I said I know who injected and when the horse was injected. Now, her name is hard to pronounce. I can't pronounce it. I talked to her twice a week on the phone. She comes to my farm. Her name is Intervich [ph], and I told him that. I said I can't really pronounce her name because it is hard to announce [sic].

But I did talk to Dr. Harden. Is that not what you told me on the phone? He said could I get a letter from the veterinarian who administered the injection, and I said most certainly I can, and I know when it was injected.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

MR. GRAY: You know, and I called her and she said I will be more than happy to do this. And I do know her name because I've been dealing with her for five or six years. So that is uncalled for, Mr. Paul.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the presiding judge a question?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: You made reference earlier in your testimony to other jurisdictions

and how they handled this, similar infractions with 1 2 \$1,000 fines and forfeiture of the purse. Were you referring to -- that was not with reference to 3 4 Mr. Gray, was it? You made mention of infractions 5 in other states. 6 MR. TISHUK: Right. I have copies of the other 7 rules. 8 VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: He was not the trainer? 9 10 MR. TISHUK: No. 11 VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: okay. 12 MR. TISHUK: If you want to see those, one is 13 from Pennsylvania and one is from Maryland. Different trainers. 14 15 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: They were different. 16 MR. GRAY: Can I ask him a question? 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. You can ask me the 18 question and I'll ask him. I just don't --19 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'll just --20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You can ask me and I'll ask 21 him. 22 I was just going to ask him if MR. GRAY: No. 23 -- there was trainer in Maryland that I talked to the other day that had a Depo positive, and he said 24 25 that he had purchased the horse. The horse had

been injected before he purchased him and he got 1 2 the same thing. He came up with a high Depo and it's the same fine, \$1,000 fine, but he said that 3 he got the fine knocked in half to \$500. 4 5 MR. TISHUK: Who was that? 6 MR. GRAY: Greg (inaudible) MR. TISHUK: I have no idea. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're here to concentrate 8 9 on this case. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Vice Chairman? 10 11 VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: No. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Tishuk, obviously, you 13 have the letter saying that the vet injected the Depo on September 15th. It is possible that, you 14 15 know, maybe there was a spray or something; we don't know that. We know that the horse raced on 16 October 18th and then tested positive. The period 17 18 where the drug should be totally out of the system, 19 is that 21 days? Is 21 days the normal cleansing? 20 DR. HARDEN: Twenty-one days is the normal 21 elimination period for one joint. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: One joint. We've been 23 talking about five joints. 24 DR. HARDEN: Yes. 25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Even if it's in five

joints, would that mean it might take longer to get 1 2 out of the system? DR. HARDEN: We don't know. Yes, I would 3 presume so, but we don't know because there hasn't 4 5 been research done with five joints. You would 6 have to do research for seven joints and three 7 joints and for 11 joints. So the research is 8 expensive. It just has not been done with all the various permutations. The guideline research was 9 10 done with 100 milligrams, one joint. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, ma'am. 14 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Another point, and that 15 is, I think there's been improvements in detection by the laboratories in terms of how sensitive their 16 17 testing is now. 18 Yes, ma'am. Yes. DR. HARDEN: 19 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So it could be that a lot 20 of these horses didn't come up positive because the 21 lab tests weren't quite that sophisticated. 22 DR. HARDEN: Our lab has been able to detect 23 this for several years. 24 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. 25 DR. HARDEN: However, other jurisdictions use

other labs and some labs are not as proficient, and 1 2 that has created, again, some of the confusion, because a trainer might be getting away with it in 3 one jurisdiction, but then all of a sudden, he's 4 5 caught with it because of a different laboratory. 6 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Other questions from the commissioners? Commissioner Miller? 8 9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman, having reviewed the exhibits offered by the petitioner, 10 and since no one has objected to their entry. 11 12 although Exhibit G is incomplete because each paragraph has the ending portion of it cut off, I 13 14 move that for what they're worth, that all those 15 exhibits be admitted to the record. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 17 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: T second. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hearing the motion and 19 second, all those in favor, say aye. 20 The commissioners vote ave. NOTE: 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? The 22 exhibits are admitted. 23 All right. So there are no more questions from commissioners. 24 25 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just have one and I'd

like to ask Mr. Lermond. I know in other medication hearings such as this that we've had, there's always this, you know, I don't know how it happened kind of thing. But we've always maintained that it is the trainer's responsibility, and that if it's a positive, it's a positive. Would you say that's true?

MR. LERMOND: That's correct. It's the absolute and sure rule. Someone's got to be responsible, and horse racing has always said it's the trainer. Recently, they said maybe we should hold the owners responsible, but that never gets very far, so they always come back to that, it's the trainer's responsibility.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The background is, the purpose is we need to protect the public to make sure that the racing industry is honest.

MR. LERMOND: It protects the wagering public and also protects the owners of the other horses in the race to ensure that this horse didn't have an unfair advantage over the other horses that didn't test positive.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And also the health of the horses.

MR. LERMOND: Exactly. That's very important.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes, Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY: I, and she'll verify this. You can go in my barn. There's not a bad-looking horse. I tirelessly worked at that barn 12 to 16 hours a day, seven days a week and they're my life. I treat them as if they were my kids.

I would not do anything to harm a horse, and to me, racing a lame horse is more dangerous than those animals. That's what I'm saying. I don't -- and as far as the Kentucky lab is probably the best lab in the country, they say, but that's the best testing lab in the country, don't you say, Dr. Harden?

DR. HARDEN: Yes.

MR. GRAY: So those were the guidelines we went by and the vet administered it on that day, and if we had known, like I said, if I had known -- yes, it is the trainer's responsibility and I'm responsible for all my horses. That's why I work all day tirelessly to take care of them. They all look good. They're all healthy animals, and she'll testify to that.

She took the horse from another trainer because

they didn't take care of them. If you look out for the welfare of the horse -- I would do nothing to endanger any of them and that's just the way it is. And like I said, if I had known, then we would have never administered any Depo to them.

I will say this. That if you ask any vets,
Depo, they prefer Depo over stuff that they have to
use now, because they think it's safer and better
for the horse. But they made it so you can't use
it, so now they're -- if you ask nine out of ten
vets that practice, and they'll say they don't like
the stuff they have for them now. They don't think
it's as safe as Depo for the horse. But that's
just the way it is. They have to use -- they can't
use it anymore.

Like I said, if I had known then, we wouldn't use it. Yes. I'm responsible for the horse, and I take full responsibility, but I don't do -- and this wasn't a performance-enhancing thing. It wasn't like I was doping the horse, blood doping him. The horse had a high Depo because I didn't know the -- as of July 1St, I didn't know and that's what happened.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: I have one more question, if I might.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Seems to me that there

2

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: This would be for our

3

executive secretary.

4

MR. HETTEL: Yes, sir.

5

is much question, trainer is responsible, there was 6

7

a positive, it was an excess of the 100 picogram

8

parameters, and appears the only question is

9

whether or not he was using his best efforts to

10

operate within what he believed to be the

11

promulgated guidelines.

12

picogram limit is on the books, the 21 day withdraw

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Guideline, I should

say. And we changed that with an email last July.

recommendations that are different from the rules

methodologies have we used, if anything, other than

our website and email, and has that always been

In the past when we have, if we have made

and guidelines that are on the books, what

sufficient to get the word out in the past?

Bernie, if I get this right then, the 100

14

13

is on the books as a recommendation.

15

MR. HETTEL: Guideline.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HETTEL: Well, of course, the new normal is with no racetrack, we now have nothing but chip-in

meets. Dr. Harden alluded to earlier it's impossible to contact every veterinarian on the eastern corridor on what is going on.

Generally, people who work at racetracks communicate internally, as you know, having experience, and it becomes a workable common knowledge. Within all of this, we've done our due diligence to inform as many people as sufficiently and efficiently as we can, but now there is this complication with this new medication.

I think the complication also is here of five joints and the amount, rather than a joint. It certainly complicates this case.

It's regrettable for everybody involved; nonetheless, on the report of the official testing laboratory, there's an excessive amount. Metabolic rate, time of day, horse's ingestion of food, horse's elimination, use of Lasix; multiple circumstances are involved in this, but we did, obviously, do our best to inform everybody who was participating.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Anymore questions? Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY: Our opinion on this is with the

amount of horses that race in the state of Virginia and in the state program, that even if every owner had been emailed or sent something sixty days prior to the meet down there stating this, then it would have never happened.

You know, so we had no -- and as far as the five joint thing they come up with, previous years, I know Dr. Riddle, he practices in Rising Sun, Maryland. A very good vet. He's got a good reputation. He says it doesn't matter if you do one or six joints in a horse. The withdrawal time should be the same on those horses, because I checked with him about it. It doesn't matter.

And we were leaving ourself 21 days and that's what happened. I know more horses than there was in the program. If she had been even emailed. She gets her email every day and I talked to her every other day. She would have told me, Mark, hey, look. You can't use Depo down there, and that would have been it, point blank period, which we have done because I don't want problems.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'll ask a question of

the Racing Commission staff, any of which can 1 If this was on the books in a certain 2 answer. manner and as of July 1, June 1, there was a change 3 4 5 MR. GRAY: July. COMMISSIONER MILLER: July; is that correct? 6 7 July 1? July 15 or there abouts. 8 DR. HARDEN: 9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. July 15. At that time, was this trainer licensed to be a trainer in 10 11 Virginia? 12 DR. HARDEN: No, sir. 13 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Do you send emails of 14 changes to all licensees of the Commission when you 15 have a change in a rule or regulation? 16 DR. HARDEN: No, sir. Not to my knowledge. 17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: How are all of your 18 licensees notified of changes in rules or 19 regulations? 20 In the Thoroughbred side, I'm DR. HARDEN: 21 usually in communication with Mr. Petramalo, and he 22 takes care of the HBPA people by posting on his 23 website. And I'm not sure if you have other 24 communications that you do with the Thoroughbred 25 side.

1	On the harness side, I have very clearly been
2	in communication with Dr. Dunavant, who was the
3	president of the Virginia Harness Horsemen's
4	Association, so he was fully aware of the
5	situation.
6	Now, my personal feeling is that the various
7	breed organizations should disseminate all of the
8	information to their members.
9	COMMISSIONER MILLER: May I ask a question of
10	Mr. Gray?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Are you a member of the
13	Virginia Harness Horsemen's Association?
14	MR. GRAY: No. She is.
15	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Is the owner of the horse
16	
17	MS. MCDONALD: I am.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Are you a member of the
19	Virginia Harness Horsemen's Association?
20	MS. MCDONALD: I am.
21	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Did you get anything from
22	the VA Harness Horsemen's Association relating
23	MS. MCDONALD: I didn't.
24	COMMISSIONER MILLER: or from Dr. Dunavant
25	relating to this change?

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. MCDONALD: I did not.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: That's all.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Any other questions? Commissioners ready to act or do you all need some time to think? All right. Well, thank you all very much for your testimony. you all.

I'm now gonna ask the commissioners to vote on whether we're going to uphold or reverse or perhaps hear a motion to modify the stewards' ruling on the trainer Mark Gray matter, VRC permit number 3694.

Commissioner Miller, do you vote to uphold or reverse or do you give me a motion to modify or should I call --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, the performance of the licensee -- I'll make my speech and then I'll shut up. The performance of licensees in Virginia seems to be pretty good, the general licensees. All licensees of the Virginia Racing Commission seem to comport with our rules and regulations and statutes, in that 99.9 percent of the time, the races occur and there's no violations.

It's a harsh reality and a harsh result in some instances, but a licensee is responsible to comport with all rules, all regulations, all statutes, and

1 | 2

to be knowledgeable of the same, especially prior to any specific execution of their privilege under the license; that is, to run a race.

It's harsh in this case, I think, because it's unclear from the testimony about whether specific knowledge of this change in enforcement was relayed to this licensee, but the licensee has a responsibility prior to executing their privileges, as I say, to check and double check.

Because of that, and the fact that the degree of drug was found in the system of this horse after the race, and in accordance with our rules and regulations, the stewards did what they had to do, and apparently, they could have fined up to \$10,000. They chose to mitigate it to 1,000, and it's harsh to do so, but I think at this point with what we've heard, I would have to uphold the ruling of the stewards.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Commissioner Miller. Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes. I agree with

Commissioner Miller that we do have to uphold this ruling. However, I would like to say that I question whether Mr. Gray has any real culpability, except that of course what we've already heard,

that each trainer has a responsibility to -- for what happens to a horse while it is in his care.

This is all regrettable. I wish for his sake and the owner's sake that it hadn't happened, but it did, and we do have to uphold our regulations, and in fairness to everyone else that holds licenses in this Commonwealth, and as much as I hate to say it, I think that's our responsibility as members of this Commission to uphold the regulations that we have elected to put on the books, and I agree that everybody doesn't have internet access, but it's available if you look for it, and I think in this case, it's a good lesson for everyone else. Look up and see what regulations may have changed before you send your horse to race.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Commissioner Steger.

MR. STEGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think about this in terms of the precedent it might set as to how other laws in the Commonwealth are enforced. I think -- and I have empathy with the trainer and the owner. It's a difficult problem to resolve, but I think at the end of the day, it is the obligation to know the law, and as a result, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would move to uphold the ruling.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Vice Chairman Van Clief.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Mr. Chairman, I, too, am sympathetic in this case, but I would mirror the opinion of my colleagues and vote to uphold and make the comment that unfortunately, this is a good example why uniform rules across state lines are something we ought to be striving for in the future, but I vote to uphold.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. And I also empathize. I reiterate the comments of my fellow commissioners. I think it's -- I feel badly for you all, but you know, at the same time, we need to uphold these medication rules. We're falling in line with the national community, especially when the Mid-Atlantic states come up with uniform medication standards, and I think it's important that we uphold those.

And I know there were some mitigating circumstances that we don't have the test barn down at Colonial Downs; we're ship-in now. There's a transition going on in Virginia, which is, unfortunately, the way you kept up with medication, it didn't work for you.

I hope that you will have the ability and the willingness to go and get on the internet, because that's definitely where the world's going, and I hope you'll do that.

I'm sorry. I'm gonna have to uphold this as well. I just think medication is terribly important. It's probably the number one issue nationally in horse racing right now. Getting everybody uniform around the country is job one, and that's what we're all trying to do, but with my vote, that this Commission unanimously uphold the stewards' decision on this ruling.

Thank you all for coming in. I know it's not what you wanted to hear, but we appreciate you coming in here and speaking with us today with your appeal. Thank you. With that, the commissioners made their decision.

Do we need a ten-minute break?

MR. HETTEL: I think that would be helpful, don't you think?

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Do we need a motion?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't think we need a

motion to have an informal five-minute or

ten-minute break.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, let's have a

ten-minute break. That's a motion.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ten minutes sharp.

NOTE: There is a recess from 11:23 a.m. until 11:49 a.m.; thereafter, the meeting continues as follows:

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's continue. We didn't formally adjourn, so we'll pick up where we left off, please. Next on the agenda is the Administrative Process Act hearing. We are here to talk about TwinSpires' advance deposit account wagering license.

MR. HETTEL: Mr. Chairman, this is a continuation of last month's meeting. Prior to that meeting last month, there was some productive discussions prior to the meeting. Since that time, there's been numerous, numerous emails and conversations amongst the parties involved.

For your information, the packet that has been distributed, this big packet is what we had prepared from last month's meeting, and if you'll follow along.

We have Mr. Blackwell here from TwinSpires.

This was all started by Mr. Blackwell in Churchill

Downs' letter to me of August 14 saying they -
hold on. There's one for every commissioner. Now

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

they're passed down. Okay.

Mr. Blackwell on August 14th through a letter from his general counsel informed me that they would not continue to pay the five percent to the Virginia horsemen, four percent to the Virginia Equine Alliance, one percent to the Virginia Breeders, based on what he believes is an illegally tariffed and discriminatory act by the state -government by the General Assembly.

He's here today to discuss this and we will hear from he and other respondents.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Do they need to be sworn in?

MR. HETTEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Would you like to -everybody that is going to speak during this, would they stand up and be sworn in, please.

NOTE: The witnesses are sworn collectively.

MR. PITCHFORD: One more housekeeping matter before we get started. As the executive secretary referenced, we have a stack of exhibits that are prepared. Exhibit A is a letter dated October 14, 2015, from the executive secretary to general counsel for Churchill Downs, Incorporated,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concerning this issue.

Exhibit B is a letter dated November 12, 2015, from the executive secretary to Mr. Blackwell. Exhibit C is a letter dated August 14, 2015, from the general counsel of Churchill Downs to the executive secretary. Exhibit D is a letter dated September 11, 2015, from the executive secretary to the general counsel of Churchill Downs, Incorporated, and Exhibit E is the transcript of the Commission's meeting of July 1, 2015, which contains a discussion of the same issue that we're here to talk about today.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Are these the same exhibits as we used at the last meeting?

MR. PITCHFORD: Yes.

MR. HETTEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do we need to reenter them again today?

I don't think so. I think it's a MR. HFTTFI: continuation because we had deferred this action until today's meeting, so I think we can proceed legally. I had this discussion with Josh Laws, so you're in good shape.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll open the floor up to Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. I'm Brad Blackwell on behalf of TwinSpires. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to be here today to discuss this issue. Unfortunately, it's an issue that really started back in the 2008 range. I'll make some references to that later.

with regards to our position earlier this year to stop payments to certain groups, it was based on a concern of the constitutionality of those payments.

We feel that the payments in question violate the U.S. Constitution, in that the Virginia ADW law and the economics that it dictates discriminates against out-of-state producers of races to the benefit of instate producers of races, and in fact back in 2008 when the parties who pushed the legislation were discussing the matter, it was clear that the law was passed in an effort to suppress what out-of-state tracks could charge for their signals going in to Virginia via interstate commerce.

The payments in question also impose an undue burden on ADWs and the stream of commerce of taking out-of-state races, bringing them in to Virginia for the consumption by Virginia residents.

The reason we cut off the payments in addition to those concerns was in the interest of bringing the parties to the table to try to work through a deal.

We actually attempted that without stopping payments by reaching out to a number of the parties in question, scheduled meetings, discussed our concerns, discussed efforts to try to move forward, and in our view, those efforts were not met with the proper cooperation in order to get something done.

To that effect, we felt that cutting off the flow of money tends to get people's attention and brings them to the table, so that did work for a while.

We went through the issues and probably disagreed on as many things as we agreed upon, but worked in the interest of trying to establish something that works for everyone.

We were set to have this very hearing last month, as was suggested. The reason we did not was that we were assured at the time by Mr. Petramalo that we could reach a deal. There was an offer made to us at the time that we said would not work. Mr. Petramalo understood that it would not work.

Mr. Hettel was present for this, and the decision 1 was made to have a follow-up meeting to try to work from that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what we found was we didn't really see any movement from there, despite our efforts to make movement to get something done, so we still didn't feel like there was certain cooperation on the issue.

One of the other things that I certainly want to touch upon is kind of the problem. underlying problem is that the economics don't work. The Virginia model takes eleven-and-a-half percent out of take-out. And so not to be insulting to anyone, but in the horse racing industry, the amount of revenue that is available to the entire industry is defined by state statute by the tracks running. It says this percent, which is typically blended to be 20 percent of all wagers, goes back to the industry to compensate the industry.

Historically, that money is split between the track and horsemen and running the show and putting on the wagering or putting on the racing that's wagered upon and the outlet that is taking those wagers, servicing the customer and making those

wagers available to the customers.

The model that was presented by Virginia took eleven-and-a-half of that blended 20 percent off the table and put it in the hands of instate Virginia racing interests, which ultimately is to the detriment and burden of out-of-state producers of content and the ADW companies in this situation who are bringing the wagering to Virginia customers.

When we look at this, those two entities have traditionally been the ones who have been compensated, if not all, but the majority of the money available, because they are incurring the cost and putting on the show that is being wagered upon. They are making those signals available to customers. They're acquiring the customer, servicing the customer and incurring all of the cost associated with that.

The problem is the Virginia model does not leave enough for those entities to be properly compensated and to create a sustainable business model.

Part of this problem, again, is that when this law was passed, it was done somewhat by those parties that benefited the most from it.

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Mr. Miller, if I may, I want to quote you back in 2008 when this law first came into place. This was from a 2008 Virginia Racing Commission meeting, and Mr. Miller said, I quote: I just want to state for the record and make sure this gets in the minutes. I'm deeply disappointed at the Virginia legislature. I may be wrong, but I can't believe that they passed a bill of this impact with so little exploration of the facts. If they would have brought this gentleman in there, perhaps, and probably a myriad of other people dealing with racing nationwide and the complexity of this issue of source marketing fees, together with the host fees and the problems that are encountered nationwide, I'm quite certain with their high degree of intelligence that exists in Virginia legislature, they would have reached a different result. And now I wash my hands of all their motivation.

As I'm also looking at this problem, we have been, unlike the entities that we have been negotiating against, trying to include the industry, trying to include the Racing Commission in the solution because we feel like, one, that it requires cooperation. We think that it is, two,

something that is required by the Interstate Horse Racing Act.

when the Interstate Horse Racing Act was passed by Congress, Congress said that the stated fact of that purpose was to ensure that states cooperate with one another with regards to legal wagering.

As we look at the Virginia model, we do not think that the Virginia model cooperates with other states. We certainly think that it places an undue burden on the flow of commerce coming in to Virginia.

One other point of interest to me is that when I look at the Virginia Racing Commission website and there's a vision set out for the Racing Commission, it says that the Commission is to be a model to which other racing commissions aspire, with a history of excellence and integrity. Participants will find our processing systems to be one of the most efficient and innovative in the industry. Regulations will be easily understood and applied to enable horse racing and wagering at the highest standard of integrity and fairness.

I have to highlight fairness here, but I really think that is what is at issue here, that there has to be a fair model that works for everyone.

The fact of the matter is that out-of-state racing and the ADW companies, all of which who are out-of-state, are generating all the revenue that exists in Virginia for horse racing and all those being distributed, and we feel like those participants should receive a fair value for those involvements in the state.

The last point I really want to bring up, too, is that we actually have a payment dispute of our own here in Virginia. There was a time starting last year where Colonial Downs surrendered their license. We were looking at how the Virginia racing industry was changing, and one of the things that we identified to the Racing Commission and we identified to the Attorney General's office was that we, and I think we had similar thoughts by Colonial Downs, was that the Virginia HBPA was not the recognized horsemen's group. We questioned that and suggested that we should withhold payments similar to what EZHorseplay did, because we did not feel like that group was recognized.

We feel like that period of time went from at least probably November until July 1St when this continued new ADW law was passed and there was another provision that served in that law that says

there is now a mechanism in place to recognize that horsemen's group, and I think this Commission actually recognized that group.

Certainly, we take objection to having made those payments of that period of time when we feel they weren't properly recognized and entitled to those payments. Accordingly, we feel like that group was unjustly rich during that period of time, and that period of time may go back as far as January of 2014, when we understand they did not have a contract in place with Colonial Downs.

So that's something else we certainly again pointed out through numerous communications to both the Racing Commission and the AG's office.

At this, you know, I'm sure we'll hear from some of the other parties involved, but our position is really as an entity that's been licensed in Virginia since 2007, as an entity that has made significant contributions to Virginia racing, to the Virginia Racing Commission, who has serviced and provided a valuable product to Virginia residents as a company who has associated with tracks who provided product to the state of Virginia for purposes of encouraging interest in our industry, for driving quality racing to be

wagered upon which has provided, again, a flow of money to Virginia.

We ask to continue to work and cooperate with the Virginia Racing Commission, but we feel like it's a point where we really need some leadership on this issue. We're certainly willing to step outside with, you know, a representative of the Commission and the parties that we have been trying to negotiate with, in the interest of knowing that we have exhausted our process here, and we certainly look towards the Racing Commission for that help and for that guidance. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't know if you want to start with questions with him or just hear from everybody and then do the questions.

MR. HETTEL: I think once we get all the issues on the table and then ask for specifics.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Petramalo.

MR. PETRAMALO: Where to start? Since 2010, I think, the first full year of the new law, the new law required TwinSpires to pay eleven-and-a-half percent. That eleven-and-a-half precent remained in Virginia to take out, as Mr. Blackwell suggested, generally 20 percent. So eleven-and-a-half was staying here in Virginia and

eight-and-a-half was going to Mr. Blackwell's company.

But since that time through the present,
Churchill has never ever paid eleven-and-a-half
percent because of agreements with the then track
operator, Colonial Downs, and my organization and
the harness horse organization, the statutory ten
percent of the eleven-and-a-half that came to us,
we rebated to them two-and-a-half. So for the last
seven years, they've been paying nine percent.

Now, interestingly, over that period of time from 2010 when their handle in Virginia was \$11 million, it has doubled. For the first 11 months of this year, they've handled \$24 million, so they've done very well by Virginia.

Now, they continued paying us after Colonial Downs shut down, so we were paid for the end of 2014 and through September of this year, and during that time, we were living up to our deal. We were rebating to them. So if he's asking for -- he's asking for the money back, I'm saying, fine, you give us our money back, too.

But in any event, willy-nilly in October, they stopped paying us. They didn't pay us for October. Didn't pay us for November. The sum total that's

1 owed to us is \$189,268.

Now what's interesting here, is I've listened to Mr. Blackwell and I've heard this many, many times before how unfair the legislation is, how it's unconstitutional, et cetera. But from a lawyer's standpoint, that's all well and good, but it does not excuse TwinSpires from complying with the law.

They may not like the law, but the remedy isn't to disobey it. The remedy is to go to the legislature and say please change it, or if they believe it's unconstitutional, the federal courthouse is at the corner of 9th and Broad. But they can't just on their own decide we're not gonna follow the law.

To me, that's the only issue here. You may have some questions about the economics and what makes sense and what doesn't, but respectfully, that's pretty much irrelevant. The question is have they been complying with the law, and I think the simple answer is no.

Mr. Blackwell has talked about discussions recently between the horsemen's groups and Churchill, excuse me, TwinSpires. Jeb Hannum on behalf of the Equine Alliance has been mostly

involved in that and not me. If you're interested in hearing that, I'm sure Jeb can go through it.

But the point is, we haven't been able to reach an agreement.

I don't think it's particularly useful to go through and see who recommended what. The simple point is they haven't complied with the law. They shouldn't be granted a license to continue.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Hannum.

MR. HANNUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is not quite as complex as Mr. Blackwell might lead us all to believe, and that as Mr. Petramalo pointed out, the simple fact of the matter is that the law is the law and TwinSpires has decided to break the law.

We had had a conversation with Mr. Blackwell. I don't have a date in front of me, but about the time the new legislation was passed, and we explained it was our intent to continue with the rebate, but the law required us to seek the blessing of the Racing Commission, and that was a conversation that we needed to have with them.

So we were very surprised when TwinSpires decided not to make any of these payments. We had

a number of discussions to try to reach some sort of resolution, and I don't think it's worth going into the percentages of this and percentages of that, but we laid out two different scenarios we felt were very fair.

Rebates were consistent upon the model that
TwinSpires had been operating under for many years.
Those were rejected. We did have a very lengthy
conference call with Mr. Blackwell a few weeks ago,
which Mr. Hettel participated on, and we asked
Mr. Blackwell point blank are you making money in
the state of Virginia and his response was yes.

So you know, it seems that this is a matter of TwinSpires wanting to make more money, and that's fine, and they're a private company and we don't dispute that, but there's a process, and I think that the law needs to be followed, and there's a process, if you want the law changed, that we all know can be followed.

I think it's just important to point out as my last point that the ADWs are allowed to operate to grow the native industry in Virginia, and those moneys that are collected, the breeders, the horsemen for purses and now for the Virginia Equine Alliance are going back to support Virginia

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

horsemen and breeders.

This year, as this Commission knows, and we've talked about it many times. We moved Heaven and Earth under very difficult circumstances to provide opportunities for steeplechase horsemen, for Thoroughbred horsemen and for harness horsemen, and we did that and we spent a great deal of money doing that, and that money went to the ADW companies as intended, and it's our intention to have more racing next year and going forward, and we want to use moneys to invest in horses and make improvements and to rebuild Virginia racing for the horsemen and breeders.

So it's a very simple proposition that the legislature intended the ADW companies to make contributions to support racing, and that's what we want to do, and TwinSpires is not following the law, and if they don't want to operate in Virginia, then they're free to go, but I would think that later on in the agenda, the Commission would have no choice but to deny their application to operate in 2016.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Thank you. Are there any questions from the commissioners? COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir. 2 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Go ahead. 3 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just have one, and I know Mr. Petramalo addressed this. That this is a 4 5 law in Virginia. It was passed by the legislature. 6 MR. PETRAMALO: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The Racing Commission has 8 no power or authority to change that, correct? 9 MR. PETRAMALO: Correct. 10 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Only the Courts could. 11 MR. PETRAMALO: Well, and the General Assembly. 12 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And the General Assembly. 13 MR. PETRAMALO: Yeah. 14 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So I mean what's the 15 issue? MR. PETRAMALO: That was my question. 16 17 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So that was my question. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Miller. 19 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd just 20 like to kind of create a record here, perhaps. 21 First of all, will someone, anyone, commission 22 staff or the parties for the record so we'll have 23 it in the record. What is the process for the ADW distribution in Virginia? In other words, ADW 24 25 company X, operates in Virginia. Frank, I guess

you could explain it, or Brad.

MR. PETRAMALO: Yes. I can.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: How do the moneys get from the ADW company into the state of Virginia? Who do they go to, and how is it distributed after it gets into the state of Virginia?

MR. PETRAMALO: I can tell you from the horsemen's perspective what happens. Let's take TwinSpires. Every month, we received, the Virginia HBPA receives a -- received an electronic transfer from Churchill Downs, TwinSpires, to our bank account. That amount was as follows -- is calculated as follows.

It was five percent of the Thoroughbred handle in the preceding month. The same occurred with respect to the Harness Horse Association. Five percent of the Standardbred handle generated in Virginia in the prior month sent to the harness folks.

Now, I can make this representation that when Colonial Downs was operating, same thing happened. Colonial Downs got five percent, so that takes you to ten percent. The industry was getting ten percent, the racetrack operator five, the horsemen five.

Now, the remaining percent-and-a-half went to the, quote, state. A half percent went to the Racing Commission and one percent went to the state Breeders Fund. That's basically how it operated.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.

MR. PETRAMALO: Oh, let me finish. Now, on a quarterly basis, the HBPA would calculate its share of the two-and-a-half percent rebate. Remember, I said they were paying nine percent and not eleven-and-a-half percent. So our share as the horsemen was 50 percent; namely, a percent and a quarter, I think. Does that make sense? Yeah. Colonial paid half of the rebate and the horsemen paid half of the rebate, and again on the horsemen's side, we divvied up the rebate based on handle. They sent back basically 25 percent of their handle, and we sent back 25 percent of our handle to TwinSpires.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: The rebate would go back to the ADW company --

MR. PETRAMALO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- and it would be from the Thoroughbred Horsemen's Association and the Harness Horsemen's Association --

MR. PETRAMALO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- and Colonial Downs? 1 2 MR. PETRAMALO: Correct. Basically, I don't know whether those folks did it with electronic 3 4 transfers. We did it with checks. Let's sav we all did it with checks. 5 6 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Right. MR. PETRAMALO: TwinSpires would get three 7 checks; one from the racetrack and one from each of 8 9 the horsemen's groups. 10 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Does anyone in the room, 11 is anyone in the room aware of what rate 12 Virginia's -- I'm calling it a rate -eleven-and-a-half percent that's in the statute? 13 14 MR. PETRAMALO: Right. 15 COMMISSIONER MILLER: What is that comparable 16 rate in other states in which these ADW companies 17 operate? I know it varies from state to state from 18 zero to something. 19 MR. PETRAMALO: That's an interesting question. 20 TwinSpires operates in 38 states. Only 12 of those 21 states require licensing; one of the 12 being 22 Virginia. The other 24, no licensing. 23 For example, our neighbors, West Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, no license requirement. 24 25 Maryland, there is a license requirement. I can't

tell you specifically what TwinSpires pays, if 1 2 anything, in source market fees in other jurisdictions. I believe that it is nowhere near 3 4 eleven-and-a-half percent, and in many 5 jurisdictions, it probably is zero. 6 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Zero. 7 MR. PETRAMALO: Yeah. That's how they operate. 8 Now, let me say something since I'm talking about this big corporation, this big TwinSpires. 9 By the end of the year, if you look at their 10 first three quarters of this year which they 11 12 reported, they probably will handle close to \$1 13 billion in those jurisdictions that I've named. of 14 that, the Virginia handle would probably be less 15 than two-and-a-half percent. So we're small potatoes in the TwinSpires empire. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Can I ask Mr. Blackwell? 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Ask all the 19 questions. 20 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Blackwell. MR. BLACKWELL: Commissioner Miller. 21 22 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Could you further expand 23 on that question I addressed to Mr. Petramalo? I'm glad you asked that 24 MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. 25 question. I think Mr. Petramalo's information is

probably a little stale --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: That's okay.

MR. BLACKWELL: -- because it sounds like it was something probably that was made in the case in 2008.

There are certainly more jurisdictions. If I had time, I could count them on my fingers because I dealt with the majority of them. There are certainly more states that regulate and or license ADW activity than there were in the past.

There's Arkansas is a state that came on recently. That's a state, and I think the fact is most of these states handle these issues differently. The majority of them may be similar to what Virginia had back in our 2007 law, and that was that there was an agreement that may be required with a local track in terms of negotiating deals that were typically included in these agreements, these granting wagering rights.

Certainly, Virginia is by far the worst. I think there's probably gonna be --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: To characterize that, Virginia is the highest.

MR. BLACKWELL: The highest. Right. The highest. That is in terms of how much it takes out

of take-out. And again, that's off the top before any costs are incurred. So there's a number of issues that I want to address based on previous testimony.

California was probably known to be one of the worst at four. California's position was they are such a large wagering state, they would demand a little more from ADWs. One of the -- if you get a smaller part of the very large market, you should be able to still do pretty well.

Now California actually works from the perspective of making sure that the ADW gets a certain percentage back, that they are ensured profitability. So in California, I think the law says that the ADW can get as much as 6.25 percent back to them guaranteed for every wager, and that is actually handed over to negotiation between the track in California.

So those are contractual relationships. So I'm certainly not at liberty to discuss every rate in every jurisdiction because they are persaunt to negotiation in a lot of states. There are states that actually dictate what those fees should be.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Those are the ones I'd like to opine on.

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. BLACKWELL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Given a few examples of other states, what is their rate?

MR. BLACKWELL: What is their rate? California is a state that says the ADW can get up to 6.255, but then the actual rate is determined by an agreement with the track. There's, I'm trying to think of another state that really dictates. I'm thinking New York is five, but don't necessarily quote me on that, but I think it's around five is another state. I'm trying to think. I think there are so few states that actually dictate what those rates are.

Kentucky is a state that basically says there's a tax that goes to the state. Small tax that goes to the state, and then after that there's no requirement. It's actually covered in agreements between the racetracks, similar to most other states and how Virginia was when we first started doing business first in back in 2007.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman, could I follow up with another question?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You have my permission to ask all the questions you want.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Blackwell, as

Mr. Petramalo has pointed out, there has been a system in Virginia that the eleven-and-a-half percent rate that was set by the Virginia legislature has been minimized -- I don't know how to characterize it -- tempered by the fact that there has been a rebate program.

MR. BLACKWELL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Is it as Mr. Petramalo just testified?

MR. BLACKWELL: I don't know how I would characterize it. When this first surfaced, and Commissioner Miller, thankfully, you were in some of these commission meetings. When this first surfaced and eleven-and-a-half was passed by Virginia, we went into these meetings, the ADWs were complaining, there were out-of-state racetracks that were representing they were complaining about the economics and how this doesn't work for the rest of the industry.

what was discussed at that point was, and I think this was initially brought up by Ian Stewart, who was then president of Colonial Downs. He was like, wait a minute. Eleven-and-a-half doesn't have to be eleven-and-a-half. We can actually provide rebates back to these operators to make

sure that this works, and we're actually using this rate as leverage in our negotiations.

It was somewhat ironic to us, because at the time, Colonial Downs was part of the Mid-Atlantic co-op, which is a very large buying co-op buying signals, so they had a lot of protection being a part of that group, but they saw that as leverage going in to some of these discussions that says, hey, we can stick you with eleven-and-a-half, which is kind of somewhat the approach we have been dealing with this year, and if not, we're gonna use that as leverage to negotiate a deal.

So I think each of us probably have our own assessments of how some of these negotiations went, and the truth is always, you know, kind of somewhere in between.

One of the discussions that Jeb had mentioned before, we reached out, talked with the VEA and talked with the horsemen and we were discussing these rebates as had been the practice before to make it, you know, bearable and to cover costs of doing business.

what my perception was is that these organizations were hiding behind another change in the law. A change in the law that occurred with

that last ADW law that this money has to be spent by these organizations for promoting, sustaining Virginia racing and growing Virginia racing. It was like, hey, we don't know if we can make these rebates anymore. I'm like, what do you mean? They're like, well, the law says this.

The reason the law changed was because these groups pushed that language, and I think it was in the best interest of them to get away from the rebate concept of, you know, look. We were giving some rebates before and we're gonna try to get out of this.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: You're speaking of the law that provided that any expenditure of these funds by the Virginia Equine Association or the horsemen had to be approved, subject to the approval of the Commission.

MR. BLACKWELL: Correct. Right. Yes, sir.

And the way that meeting ended was that they said that they would go and check with the Secretary of Agriculture and check with the Commission to see if that was even an option to rebate, and I said I'm sure the Commission won't have a problem with it.

They understand our plight.

We had talked with probably the Secretary of

Agriculture at some point. I maintained
discussions with them throughout the process, and
so we were waiting on that return call to say yes,
we can do this, now let's start, you know,
discussing rates.

We never got the return call and this is where there's probably some disagreement about how long that took. My impression was that took months and we never heard back. That's when we started withholding payments because we grew tired of no progress on any of these discussions.

So when this came up and we stopped making payments, I think their impression was this is a matter of days or weeks in between when this conversation took place and when we received any feedback. We never received feedback on that promise that said it was okay to make those payments.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Would it be safe to say

-- I don't want to put you on the -- well, would it
be safe to say that had TwinSpires received a

communication back from the rebaters, we'll call
them, that's the VEA and the horsemen, had that

communication indicated we feel that the Commission
and the Secretary of Agriculture of Virginia will

be susceptible to approving this rebate program as it has gone on in the past, is it safe to say then you would have continued on, you would have made your adjustments and we wouldn't be here today?

MR. BLACKWELL: I don't know if that's safe to say, because I don't know what the rates were and there's been a lot of gamesmanship in terms of how the rates work.

Before when we were looking at this, and I'd prefer not to necessarily talk numbers on the public record because some of these have been private negotiations. Some parties feel greater liberty than I do to discuss those.

But you know, the fact of the matter is before, under the previous ADW law, I think what was suggested before was ten percent was going to Colonial Downs and horsemen. So the rebate that we were looking at at that point was coming from a ten percent number.

Then when we came back this round, it was like, well, you know, the horsemen, you know, are getting five, the VEA who kind of took their place is only getting four. Then the four, it turned from five to four, and then we started having discussions about rebates, and it's like, well, we really only

make 3.35, because of the four we get, some other people have their hands in our pockets and we feel like everyone has their hands in our pockets as we're trying to make this work.

So the numbers have changed quite a bit, and I think we were looking at it from the perspective of the facts and circumstances have changed in Virginia. I think Virginia is seeking a model now that is maybe a more cost efficient model where it's not as expensive to run racing.

So we're questioning, one, should we be contributing to racing that was nonexistent for a long period of time, then should we be contributing the same amount to a much less expensive racing product.

Again, there are so many complications here and we are looking to try to work together, and I think had we been able to do that back in 2007 or '08 instead of passing a law that only paid the intrastate interest, we probably wouldn't be in this predicament.

I think the problem is that problem surfaced in 2008 and it really hasn't been quite corrected. We try to do our best to work through these issues. Certainly, we take exception to saying we are

breaking the law. We feel like we have been working with the Commission. We have been in good faith negotiations with these groups, consistent with what we did in the past, and that is we try to work toward a solution.

I've also certainly seen other commissions in different parts of the country take a fairly strong stance on these types of issues and say, hey, we're going to continue to when certain groups can't agree on something and even if the law requires something, I've seen a Commission say, you know what guys, you've got to work it out and we're going to make sure you work it out. We're going to basically extend this ADW license on a month-to-month basis until you do what's right and figure some solution to some of these issues.

We've seen different approaches when we're at an impasse as we are here, because these negotiations can be difficult, and I think it's one of those things. We have certainly tried and at times we have questioned whether there's a real interest and effort with the other parties to reach a deal.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Have you since 2009 or '10 contemplated as a company going to the Virginia

legislature and getting this eleven-and-a-half
percent reduced? Now true, it may be that because
of the rebate program that was going on, you may
not have felt persuaded to do that under the

circumstances, but have you contemplated it at all over the past five years or six years?

MR. BLACKWELL: That's a great question. I don't know that we contemplated it. Certainly when this most recent law was passed, we actually spent time speaking to legislators on the issue, because certainly it was a reminder of the problem, and certainly what we saw was a change in Virginia racing that certainly led to additional frustration, and we did speak to legislators, and maybe that's a part of the fix.

To that point, I think another issue that we've had in some of our negotiations is that these groups have insisted that any rebate also required us to give up our rights to do exactly what you're suggesting, and that is go to the legislature and find a solution.

We think that, again, these parties should be working together to find a solution that works for everyone, and for them to say that they're trying to take that right away is certainly something that

5

we felt if we are being asked to give up something that there would be some compensation for that or they work out a deal with us that discourages us from needing to go talk about a change. That's been a bone of contention, is their insistence upon us of giving those rights up.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Petramalo, is there an arrangement with Xpressbet and TVG and what the situation with them is? They're an ADW company --

MR. PETRAMALO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- much like, exactly like
TwinSpires, I guess, as far as the laws are
concerned.

MR. PETRAMALO: We are currently operating under a three-year contract. Let me call it a rebate contract with Xpressbet that expires at the end of this month, and under it we have been rebating under a formula. There's no flat percentage, but there's a formula that gives the ADW a certain return. I think it's 7.125 percent or something like that.

Anyway, we're currently operating under that contract. We are in discussions to renew the contract. Whether or not that's going to result in

the successor contract, I don't know, but we are in discussions with them.

With regard to TVG, we have certainly not since 2008 or '09 had any rebate agreement with them.

TVG has never expressed any interest in a rebate agreement. I'm not sure why. We certainly -- when I say we, the horsemen and the track, were interested in talking to them because we thought it would be helpful to the Virginia program if we were to negotiate a rebate deal with them, and as part of the deal, get us some type of feature presentation on their TV show. But they never bid on it, so we never had any agreement with TVG. So since 2009 or 2010, they have been paying the eleven-and-a-half percent faithfully, or at least with regard to the horsemen when we get our electronic transfer every month from TVG.

Now with Xpressbet and TwinSpires, it was a slightly different situation, because Xpressbet is the -- what used to be Magnon [ph] is now the Stronach. They're a horsemen's organization, a racing organization. They control content.

Golfstream. The two Gulfstreams now, Santa Anita, Maryland Jockey Club, Portland Meadows, Golden Gate up in northern California. So we were more than

willing to rebate to them because they were giving EZHorseplay a break on the host fees, and we the horsemen were partners in EZHorseplay.

with Churchill, it was slightly different, but there was some consideration what we were getting from Churchill for the rebate.

Now, I'm not sure whether I correctly heard Mr. Blackwell say that he didn't understand the rebate program or how it was working.

For the first year, 2010, we had a written contract which flat out said that two-and-a-half percent gets rebated and it's split 50/50 between the horsemen and the track.

In subsequent years for reasons I don't quite remember, Churchill did not want to enter into a written contract; we just continued on a handshake basis and we continued rebating them right up until they stopped paying us. This gets me to another point I wanted to respond to.

Mr. Blackwell kind of suggested that there was something nefarious that went on with regard to the provision in the July 1St law, which says you need the VRC approval, and he was suggesting that somehow we were trying to hide behind that to keep from paying.

First of all, I was there, he wasn't. That particular phrase came from one Mr. Jim Weinberg on behalf of Colonial Downs. That's how that got into the law. We had nothing to do with it.

But more importantly, as long as TwinSpires continued paying us, and even though there's that restriction in the law, we continued paying the 25 percent from other funds that we had. We were unsure about whether we could do it under the law, so we continued paying the 25 percent from other funds just to show our good faith that we would keep going forward with the program.

One final minor point, since I'm a lawyer and I never let anything go un-responded. It's my DNA. The numbers that I quoted, 38 states, 12 with licensing. Mr. Blackwell suggests that's 2008 data. All I can say is I got it maybe two days ago from the TwinSpires website.

MR. BLACKWELL: I would like to respond to any suggestion that I'm being untruthful here. I don't know --

MR. PETRAMALO: I'm suggesting you're being inaccurate. I'm not questioning your motivation.

MR. BLACKWELL: So, Mr. Petramalo, are you referring to how many states TwinSpires operates in

or are you referring to how many states license and regulate ADWs?

MR. PETRAMALO: Both.

MR. BLACKWELL: Okay. It's my understanding there are certainly more than 12. I know of three or four that have come on line in the last year. So if you're citing information from a certain source, I don't know that that's accurate, but I could probably count on my hands how many are regulating the activity. I'll start jotting down states that I know for sure --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We don't need to know that.

MR. PETRAMALO: Let me amend my response.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right.

MR. PETRAMALO: The 38 states came from the website. The 12 states where they are licensed came from the 2015 10Q that they filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, thank you.

Mr. Blackwell, do you all talk with your

competitors, TVG and Xpressbet, as far as getting

together and talking about the issue with the

Commonwealth of Virginia of eleven-and-a-half

percent and maybe getting together and going down

and lobbying for something better?

MR. BLACKWELL: We have not worked together to 1 lobby on the issue. I think when the first law was 2 3 passed in 2007, 2008 -- Frank, when was that? 4 MR. PETRAMALO: Well, the first, very first law 5 was --6 MR. BLACKWELL: I guess the second law that introduced the eleven-and-a-half percent. Was that 7 8 2008? MR. PETRAMALO: I think it was the 2009 9 session, because I believe it was effective July 1 10 11 of 2009, I think. 12 MR. BLACKWELL: So to answer your question, I thought it was 2008 when the eleven-and-a-half was 13 introduced. 14 15 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I believe it was 2008. 16 MR. BLACKWELL: When we learned about that, the 17 ship had sailed, and this is one of the many 18 disadvantages of being an out-of-state operator in 19 a state, is that we're not intimately involved with 20 the legislative process. So we learned of that bill when it was too 21 22 late. The ship had kind of sailed. I think each 23 of the ADW companies joined in a letter to the 24 governor to express concern with that law. 25 We have had conversations at various times

about the problems with Virginia law, so certainly, I would expect Xpressbet and TVG if they have not reached out to the Commission recently, I would think they would have some concerns and there may be representatives from those two groups that are here today that can maybe weigh in on that, because I'm sure they dealt with the same issues that we dealt with.

MR. PETRAMALO: Let me, if I might with your permission add some context here, some history.

The ADW law I think was passed in 2003. 2005 was -- our first ADW company was EZHorseplay, and then subsequently the national companies came on line, came into Virginia and got licensed.

But the law up until whether it was 2008 or 2009, said that in order to be licensed as a ADW company, as part of the licensing process, you have to have an agreement with the racetrack and the horsemen. So for a number of years, we negotiated these agreements.

And to make a long story short, we started -we meaning the horsemen and Colonial Downs -started running into problems negotiating contracts
because the other side, for whatever reason, had
more leverage than we did, and we came to impasse a

number of times and I think we even went to mediation.

That is what spurred us to go to the legislature and said, look, you've got to straighten this out instead of going through this negotiating, mediating, et cetera, and set some specific numbers. And that's how it came about.

Now I'm surprised that nobody seemed to know about this other than Colonial Downs and the horsemen, but that's how it happened.

MR. BLACKWELL: And since we're revisiting history, this was something that played out in 2008, but I think part of where these numbers came from was that I think when ADWs started in Virginia, there was an entity that is still licensing now, TVG.

TVG was one of the pioneers in ADW, and they had agreements with various racetracks throughout the country, including our own, where they had the exclusive rights to take ADW wagers on that content, and at the time, it was for a host fee that I think was about three-and-a-half percent.

So at one point, they were paying Virginia a ten percent source market fee and paying racetracks a three-and-a-half percent source market fee, and

as we mentioned with the blended take-out rate, that was leaving them roughly six-and-a-half percent that they were making in the state.

They were also licensing those signals and making -- charging more than the three-and-a-half to some other ADW companies, so that was kind of where this pricing started.

There was a point when Youbet, another ADW operator, was unable to reach an agreement with Colonial Downs and the Virginia horsemen to gain access through a license in the state of Virginia, and the reason was that the horsemen and Colonial Downs was demanding this ten percent.

what the record reflected that Mr. Petramalo mentioned that Youbet was offering was three percent. He referred to that as a pittance. That that's what that amounted to back then, and it's ironic that now that's the amount we are expected to take, which is less than the three percent the way the law is set up.

So the problem is that the industry has evolved. There was a point where host fees were nominal and there was a point where host fees started going up in Virginia and the Virginia HBPA and Colonial Downs started taking exception to

that. They started seeing those host fees go up and they said, wait a minute. We're not going to allow that. That's what really was one of the other things that prompted the law according to testimony back in 2008.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do any of you all maybe anticipate going to the legislature this year to try to introduce some sort of legislation to fix this issue?

MR. PETRAMALO: We don't think it needs to be fixed. If there's any movement in the legislature to change it, we will oppose it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: I think it needs to be fixed, and I think part of the problem is that again, it requires cooperation among the parties. When I quoted Commissioner Miller back in 2008, I think that was at least part of his point, was that this law was passed in a vacuum. It did not include all of the necessary industry participants to be able to explain how some of these things work.

when you start talking about eleven-and-a-half percent, it may not sound like much when it comes from 100. It may not sound like much in terms of tax on top of the additional cost of a product, but

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it just does not work that way here.

There is a limited amount that can be distributed to the industry. Instead of taking care of local interests, we feel like it needs to take care of the interests that are actually generating the revenue, putting on the product and delivering that product to the state of Virginia.

So again, I think that it requires some cooperation, and certainly we have been willing to cooperate. We have tried to have these discussions and we're continuing to try to have these discussions, and at this point, again in the interest of feeling like we've exhausted our -this process and to feel like we have made a good faith effort, we are certainly willing to talk with these guys today, and we certainly welcome some participation from the Commission in doing so.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If I recall, the gentleman was not sworn in.

MR. MURPHY: I wasn't sworn in.

MR. PITCHFORD: Let's do it.

MR. MURPHY: I'm George Murphy, and I represent Xpressbet. We more or less concur with what Brad is saying.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're having a hearing, so

I'm going to have to swear you in. 1 2 The witness is sworn. NOTE: 3 MR. MURPHY: Again, I represent Xpressbet, and we agree with Mr. Blackwell these are (inaudible). 4 5 THE COURT REPORTER: Chairman Reynolds, I 6 cannot hear him. 7 MR. HETTEL: Step up so the court reporter can 8 hear you. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Step up so we can get you 10 on the public record. Can you start over, please? 11 MR. MURPHY: George Murphy with Xpressbet. 12 agree with Mr. Blackwell the fees are exorbitant, 13 but on the other hand, we know the law is what it 14 is, and I happen to be a lobbyist full-time, so I 15 know what the laws are, but they can be fixed. mean we can go over it and we have discussed it, 16 17 although I haven't discussed it with Brad. 18 certainly discussed it with my client, and the way 19 to fix it is you get a higher rebate, Frank, or you 20 go back over to the legislature and change it. 21 But that's the way you solve it. But it is a 22 problem. I mean how you resolve it is, it can be 23 resolved. I just think we have to work together 24 for the game and get away from the

eleven-and-a-half percent because that's too much

25

1 money. COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Can I ask a question? 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, Mr. Vice Chairman. 3 4 VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Any of the parties 5 might want to answer. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir. 6 7 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: You've all said that out of the eleven-and-a-half percent there's been a 8 two-and-a-half percent rebate and that has worked 9 with nine percent net coming back to the industry. 10 11 MR. MURPHY: I don't think we get 12 two-and-a-half percent. 13 VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: I'll ask Frank this 14 question. 15 MR. PETRAMALO: As I said before, the Xpressbet agreement is different. It's a formula. It's not 16 17 a flat two-and-a-half percent. The two-and-a-half 18 percent flat fee was with TwinSpires. VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: I'll stay specific to 19 20 that then. Has that ever been on the table again, 21 and if so, why was it not satisfactory? 22 MR. PETRAMALO: It certainly was on the table 23 again, and you'll have to ask Mr. Blackwell why it 24 is unsatisfactory. 25 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: I'll ask Mr.

Blackwell. You've been engaged in a program that involved a fee for services or whatever you want to call it --

MR. BLACKWELL: Sure.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: -- of two-and-a-half percent for a number of years now. What's the change this year? Why is that not satisfactory?

MR. BLACKWELL: A couple of factors. One was that that rebate was tied to us waiving our rights to pursue a legislative change, which certainly seems to be resonating here today that that's maybe what needs to happen. So that was an issue.

The second issue was that, again, we've got to get these numbers where they were a certain percentage of ten at one point. Then they were a certain percentage of another number. So if it's the same as before, that was an issue that we are being asked to waive these rights.

The second thing is just things have changed since then. I think since that point when those fees were originally contemplated, host fees have gone up some more and certainly the cost associated with racing in Virginia completely disappeared for a period of time where there was no racing, so then you're asking the question of what are we

contributing to. We're contributing to an industry that does not exist. Where is this money being spent? How is it being spent?

The second question we're going to is, well, now it seems like racing is less expensive. So if you're able to cut your costs and our costs are growing, there seems to be some change that would reflect those two situations.

MR. PETRAMALO: Let me put some economics on the table. Brad has referred to a number of interesting things.

Before July 1, the industry -- when I said the industry, I'm talking the racetrack operator and the horsemen getting ten percent. After July 1St, the industry took a haircut from the General Assembly. It went from ten to 8.35 percent.

What used to go to the industry had been reallocated to the Racing Commission, New Kent County, the vet school at Virginia Tech, et cetera.

So we took a haircut, but what the Equine
Alliance offered to do, and the horsemen, was to
nonetheless maintain the status quo. In other
words, we would continue, quote, rebating the 25
percent of the two-and-a-half percent, but it would
cost us more because it is now based on 8.35, as

opposed to the ten percent. So that's what we had proposed to keep them going along as they had.

Now with regard to the other point, Jeb and Debbie can certainly speak to this better than I. But to suggest that there's no racing, we don't know what's going on, where is the money being spent, well, you commissioners know exactly where the money is going. You have the budgets. You approve the budgets, you know what racing is going on and you know what our plans are.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments from the commissioners? Okay. Are we taking any action on this here or is that going to come up when we consider renewal?

MR. HETTEL: It's two-prong. You certainly can. I think all the issues are on the table. We can go ahead and take disciplinary action against -- from hearing this discussion, a lack of respect for the law, a lack of adherence to the law in my letter to Churchill Downs, TwinSpires, two months ago, I pointed that very notion out that this will all -- we're required to enforce our own law. Having said that, I think there is a necessity for some reprimand and some disciplinary action.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the other thing I certainly wanted to remind you of is that there is a period of time in question where we felt like under duress of our license, we made payments to the Virginia HBPA when they were not a recognized horsemen's group, so we feel like there were payments that were made unjust towards the horsemen.

We understand that an in-state ADW provider did not make those payments and certainly questioned whether they were required under the law as well, so we feel like we have gone out of pocket and paid more than we should in certain circumstances as well, and we ask that be taken into consideration and that the Commission weigh in on that issue as well.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Is it your position then that prior to the legislature putting it in the account, that this Commission's recognition of the H --

MR. PETRAMALO: BPA.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- BPA --

MR. PETRAMALO: Horsemen's Benevolent

Protective --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. That our recognition of them was not -- as a recognized horsemen's group for the past --

MR. PETRAMALO: Seventeen years.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- 17 years is not valid because it wasn't in the statute?

MR. BLACKWELL: No. It wasn't because it wasn't in the statute. We questioned how they were recognized, and from what our understanding is, is that part of their recognition was having an agreement with Colonial Downs, the racetrack, and that's now how the recognition process worked.

That's something that again we questioned numerous times during the licensing process last year, and it's our understanding that Colonial Downs, and given the fact that they were an in-state entity that was much more familiar with the processes, that I expect that the interstate Horse Racing Act may come into play with this issue as well.

But it was our impression there was a question of whether they were recognized at the time. You know, we made those payments again in order to maintain our license. We disagreed with the

approach and we questioned it on numerous occasions, and I'm happy to submit those letters where we questioned it.

Again, it's our understanding that EZHorseplay, the in-state ADW company, did not make those payments based on the same concern.

So that's the situation where we kind of tried to do what was right at the time in order to maintain our license, and it eventually led us down the road of making payments that were not required and were not valid.

So now we're in a situation where there are certain payments that we have not made, that we certainly want to take that into consideration that we feel like we made payments that we question whether those were valid or not, and that may be something that certainly we want the Commission to take a look at and take into consideration when it's looking at payments we didn't make.

MR. PETRAMALO: A couple points in response, please. One, let me remind the Commission that the Commission made a determination that the EZHorseplay payments were due the Virginia HBPA, some 437,000. Now it is true that in October when Colonial handed in their license, they were gone

and we had no contact with Colonial.

We obviously did have an outstanding contract with the Gold Cup which recognized us as the majority horsemen's group. More importantly, we have been recognized by this Commission in March of 1994 as the majority horsemen's group based on the showing of authorization cards and we've continued through that period of time. Nothing has changed.

So this argument that I'm hearing today for the first time is kind of interesting, but I don't think it has merit.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

MR. MURPHY: George Murphy again with Xpressbet. I want the record to reflect that we have continually paid these fees, although we believe as Mr. Blackwell does they are exorbitant, but we continued to pay them, and I think, Frank, we are up to date, as far as I know.

MR. PETRAMALO: Yes. We have a very harmonious relationship with Xpressbet. They have paid us and we have rebated to them.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Until this moment.

MR. PETRAMALO: Until December 31St.

MR. HETTEL: We will discuss that on January 6. Let's keep this on the rails here, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm trying to. 2 MR. HETTEL: I know you are. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I won't be at the January 6 3 meeting. 4 5 MR. HETTEL: Yes. You will. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Anyway, is that it for the Commissioners' comments? Mr. Hettel, you said 7 that --8 9 MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the last thing. I think I pointed this out before, but 10 certainly, based on the suggestion by Executive 11 12 Director Hettel, I just want to point out that we have been a licensee in good standing since 2007. 13 14 So we have again made significant contributions to 15 this state, to the Commission, to the Virginia racing interest and have serviced and provided 16 17 value to Virginia residents, so certainly we feel 18 like we've been actively involved in all 19 communications with the Commission, primarily 20 through Mr. Hettel in terms of here is our 21 position, here is our concerns. Here's the efforts 22 that we are making. 23 At one point, I think it was fairly painful to

even get through negotiations because there was so

much paper and memos being exchanged and it turned

24

25

MR. PETRAMALO: Correct.

into a very formal process, all in the interest of making sure that the Commission was up to date in terms of what was going on, and all of that was in the efforts of complying with the law.

I think suggestions have been made just go file a lawsuit or just go change the law, and I think the approach that we have taken, again, was in the interest of trying to cooperate with these parties of offering some way.

We certainly have made, you know, payments to the horsemen during that period of time, but it was done, and in the effort of seeing that contributions are continued to be made going forward, as opposed to just cutting everything off and seeking a solution that would certainly be only in our best interest. So again, I just want to make sure that all of this is on the table with any type of recommendation or vote.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. I understand that we do have to enforce the law; we can't change the law ourselves, but the disagreement between TwinSpires and the Virginia horsemen is basically the percentage of the rebate.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So that's where the 1 2 disagreement is and we cannot effect that, either other than --3 4 MR. PETRAMALO: Correct. 5 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- making a recommendation or something. So I don't know what 6 7 our options are. 8 MR. BLACKWELL: And again, I think that our request today was to have a break-out session with 9 these groups with some participation from the 10 11 Commission. What we have observed is that the only 12 really movement that we have seen was when we were 13 here last month prepared to go into a hearing 14 similar to this, and Mr. Hettel took Frank and I to 15 the side and said, hey, let's work through this. At that point, I think we thought a deal could 16 17 be had. And the fact of the matter is we're 18 probably not that far apart; however, there have been issues that have been introduced such as 19 20 waiving our rights to seek a legislative change and 21 things of that nature that complicated things. 22 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, sir. 24 COMMISSIONER MILLER: On that point, no one --25 I'll say this, everyone in this room -- No one

making any kind of agreement should ever, no one making any kind of an agreement should have held over their head that they can't go to the legislature of Virginia and seek a redress of any grievance of whatever nature. I'm disappointed if someone expressed that to any of our licensees, that we'll deal with you, but you stay away from the legislature.

MR. PETRAMALO: Let me respond to that. With all due respect, Commissioner, you have practiced law and lawyers all the time enter into settlements to avoid taking their dispute to court.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, I'm not talking about court.

MR. PETRAMALO: Please let me finish. We have been willing to negotiate agreements with Xpressbet and TwinSpires, knowing that they don't like the law. We've been able to reach agreements with them and we give in to their concern by saying, okay, we'll rebate this to you. That settled the matter. Nobody was going anyplace because they had a deal. Now why in the world would I enter into a deal now, only to have TwinSpires next month go into the legislature to try and undo it? It makes no sense.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, if you do it and

they go, you go to the legislature and fight it.

MR. PETRAMALO: We certainly will be there to fight it, but the whole point of an agreement is to avoid fighting and to come up with a settlement.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Hannum.

MR. HANNUM: One final point. We were talking about the horsemen, and I just wanted to, just for the record, remind the Commission that the Virginia Equine Alliance is due through November \$363,000; and New Kent County, 37,000; Virginia Tech, 16,000; Virginia Horse Center, 5,000; Virginia Horse Industry Board, 5,000; Virginia Thoroughbred Association, 5,000; and the Breeders Fund, 42,000. I obviously rounded those numbers off.

So I think we have a model here where we have a company that's willing to follow the law and work with the parties and Xpressbet, and then we have a model where we have a company that has blatantly broken the law because it is taking the position that they don't need to follow it.

I just think that's important that we have two different examples of companies who want to remain in Virginia and we want to work with, but I think those numbers speak to the effect, ultimately, that we will be able to have on having racing next year

1	unless those moneys are paid back to us.
2	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Could I ask Mr.
5	Petramalo? Are the figures that he just cited in
6	addition to the 189,000?
7	MR. PETRAMALO: Yes. Yes.
8	MR. HANNUM: The total amount is over 600,000
9	the exact number
LO	COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'm sorry. I have it
L1	right here.
L2	MR. HETTEL: Six eighty-eight.
L3	MR. PETRAMALO: Commissioner Miller, the four
L4	percent goes to the VEA and then they have the
L5	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yeah.
L6	MR. HETTEL: It's in the break-out in front of
L7	you.
L8	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yeah. I've got it right
L9	here in front of me. I should have looked down.
20	\$688,120.28
21	MR. HETTEL: Those are all the beneficiaries.
22	MR. BLACKWELL: And certainly we can get an
23	accounting of the payments we made to the Virginia
24	HBPA that you think are in question as well, and I
25	would think that number exceeds that amount.

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Just one other question. 2 MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. 3 COMMISSIONER MILLER: This 688,120.28, the total amount that is owed. that is without 4 5 considering any kind of rebate? 6 MR. PETRAMALO: Correct. 7 COMMISSIONER MILLER: okay. 8 MR. BLACKWELL: Commissioner Miller, given your position on the pursuit of, or at least the right 9 if one were to choose to pursue a legislative 10 change, that coming out of an offer certainly can 11 make a difference, and that's one of the issues 12 13 that we were hoping the Commission would be able to 14 weigh in on as we have tried to work through this 15 issue with the horsemen. 16 MR. PETRAMALO: Can you repeat that part? I'm 17 not sure I understood what you were saying. 18 MR. BLACKWELL: I said that this limitation on 19 our right to potentially pursue legislative change 20 has been an impediment on us getting a deal done. 21 That was an issue --22 MR. PETRAMALO: No. I see. 23 MR. BLACKWELL: -- an issue in your last exchange of offers. We made an offer and said that 24 25 we did not want to give that up. The response back

was not a counter offer and not anything that addressed a percentage rebate, but it was we are not going to sign any deal that gives you or allows you to keep that right.

So that was certainly what appeared to break things down. We thought that was an unfair stance. And again, was looking for some help and guidance to work through that issue with these parties.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Blackwell, what in your view would be the appropriate action for the Racing Commission to take to get the result that you're looking for?

MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. Again, I think I mentioned this a couple times, but I would think we would like to see a break-out session to go off the record.

We haven't been comfortable -- I know others, again, have, but throwing out percentages that have either been under an agreement or being negotiated, we don't think that's necessarily fair for those numbers to be discussed in a public forum. And again, we would look for some guidance to work through some of these issues, because it does not

seem like there has necessarily been a good faith effort to work out a deal throughout this process.

We have been told by a number of people, including the HBPA, including members of the Commission, there was a deal -- is a deal to be had here. We just feel like it's something that maybe needs to be facilitated, and personally, while I have come in to Virginia on multiple occasions, including last month, and the fact that I'm here today is an opportunity for us to sit down and discuss through some of these issues and would like if we could potentially work something out.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Have you not had that opportunity over the last couple of months with our representative from the Virginia Racing Commission and Mr. Hettel?

MR. BLACKWELL: To be honest, Mr. Chairman, no. It just does not feel like there has been enough of an emphasis on getting something done. I think that the call that Mr. Hettel set up, it felt like it was much different than what was discussed when I was here in Virginia, and that was where we were at a certain point and said that doesn't work. At that point from what I heard from Frank, and I certainly trusted him that he said we can work

something out and we realized we'd have to do something better than what was discussed on the steps of that hearing.

What I just did not see was any follow-up to that, so for instance, a counter offer that was presented was worse off than the previous offer, and that just does not seem like it was a good faith effort to reach a deal.

And again, I think it's in the best interest of the Commonwealth of Virginia, for Virginia racing, for Virginia ADW customers, for this Commission and all parties involved to reach a deal. Again, I think an opportunity is here today to do that, and we would like to see an opportunity to see if that can actually happen.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I think we need to point out that this Commission can only meet in public.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So there's no opportunity for a private meeting --

MR. BLACKWELL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- unless you have a limit of two commissioners and an executive director.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.

So certainly, we would MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. want to comply with whatever, you know, rules and restrictions there are, but that's what we're requesting today.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't have any real objection to that, but I don't know how much time there is to do it.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Mr. Chairman, I have one last question. Have the parties considered having a formal mediator? Is that something you all considered? Sounds like that's what you're asking us to do. I'm not sure that's our job, by the way.

MR. BLACKWELL: No. I'm not asking for a formal mediation, but I think certainly what has already been helpful today is to hear the perspective of some of the commissioners and some of the people who have worked through some of these issues, that are aware of the issues, are aware of where they started, so certainly it is helpful.

Again, Commissioner Miller's suggestion, and regardless of how that was received, but the stance on the ability to potentially seek a legislative change, that is something that is important.

least you feel like you're not giving away rights 1 2 that you have inherently. 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The moneys that you all owe 4 right now, you claim you don't owe them, but the 5 moneys that you owe, it's nine percent that's being 6 withheld? You're paying one-and-a-half percent to the Virginia Racing Commission? 7 8 MR. BLACKWELL: No. I think what that is made 9 up of is primarily from the VEA from day one. 10 MR. PETRAMALO: No. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What are you all 12 withholding percentage-wise? 13 MR. BLACKWELL: Most recently what we withheld 14 was payments to the VEA, horsemen and breeders, and 15 the reason that was done was because, again, it was initially done in the interest of bringing these 16 17 parties to the table to have real discussions. 18 because it just felt like there was not a genuine 19 interest in getting something done. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. 21 MR. BLACKWELL: So it was done to bring the 22 parties to the table. What happened was 23 originally, the only entity that was cut off was the VEA, despite what the original letter said. 24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

Right.

25

MR. BLACKWELL: The horsemen and breeders kept getting paid, so once that was realized and the only party that was really coming back to the table was the VEA.

Another thing -- I'm sorry to continue, but another thing to materialize was the breeders were involved. We said why is the breeders not part of the discussion, and I think they said they'd never been asked.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.

MR. PETRAMALO: Wait a minute. That's just totally wrong. The Breeders Fund is a state tax. It's not controlled by the Breeders Association. It's a tax that he's not paying.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's get to --

MR. BLACKWELL: And if I may, Frank, that was something that we were not aware of. The only thing that we knew is the law requires us to pay the breeders. The breeders seemed like any other --

MR. PETRAMALO: All you have to do is read the law. It's right in there. It tells you where it goes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. That's enough.

Let me get back to my questions, please. You're

withholding nine percent of the horsemen's money 1 2 and the VEA's money? MR. BLACKWELL: That would have been most 3 4 recently, yes. I think that's what was pending --5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Since July. 6 MR. BLACKWELL: No. No. Not since July. 7 was four percent being withheld that started in July. That's what kind of prompted or was the 8 intent that prompted the discussions. 9 10 MR. PETRAMALO: And that's not paying the state 11 Breeders' Fund. That's ten percent. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But you withheld from the 13 Virginia Equine Alliance \$363,000. MR. BLACKWELL: I'm not certain of the exact 14 15 amount. I don't have that with me. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. You're withholding 16 17 money from the Virginia Equine Alliance, right? 18 MR. BLACKWELL: That's correct. Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You all decided to do that 20 because you thought maybe it could bring the 21 parties together? 22 MR. BLACKWELL: That was the intent. Yes. 23 certainly questioned the constitutionality of the payments, but it was also done in the interest of 24 25 bringing the parties to the table to discuss it --

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.

MR. BLACKWELL: -- because again, our perception was that they were not wholeheartedly pursuing a rebate. It was we talked about it, we need to see if we can, and we never heard anything back from that point.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Then the job of the Commission in my mind is that we have to decide, you know, what laws are on the book and is what you're doing lawful.

MR. BLACKWELL: Sure.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's what we have to get We would love to mediate. We would love to to. bring the parties together and make an agreement, and maybe we can, but right now, you know, there's a law on the books. The Racing Commission wants to regulate, we want to help, and I think we've been extremely flexible up until this day. Maybe there's a little bit more flexibility left, I don't know, but --

MR. BLACKWELL: And certainly that's what we're asking for, Chairman Reynolds.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. But the bottom line is, I'm not going to say you're taking the law into your own hands, but you're withholding money that

is due to other people. So hopefully we can work this out. I strongly urge you all to work that out, but who knows. I feel like you've been working at it forever.

Mr. Hettel, do you have anything to add since you have been involved?

MR. HETTEL: Well, both parties seem to be discussing and trading emails, proposals and counter proposals. The complication we have as a commission, we can't arbitrarily select -- we've got two companies of the three ADWs who are in full compliance; we've got one who is in noncompliance. The issue today is the noncompliance of the existing law, be it good, bad or indifferent. I think it's incumbent upon this Commission to go ahead and take some action this afternoon, be finished with it and carry on.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: That would be we consider going into a brief executive session so we can wrap this up and consider our alternatives, seek legal advice.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: As long as we're going into

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

executive session only to seek legal advice.

MR. PITCHFORD: All right. In accordance with the provisions of §2.2-3711(a)(7) of the code of Virginia, I move that the Commission go into closed meeting for the purposes of consultation with legal counsel and briefing by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body; and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel concerning agenda item number three, the administrative process hearing concerning TwinSpires.com. The Commission will only ask counsel questions and will not engage in deliberations or any other activity.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: So moved.

Do I hear a second? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say aye.

> The Commission votes aye. NOTE:

We have no place to adjourn to, so MR. HETTEL:

this group will have to go on the other side of the 1 2 wall. There is a recess from 1:04 p.m. 3 NOTE: 4 until 1:22 p.m.; thereafter, the hearing continues as follows: 5 MR. PITCHFORD: Section 2.2-3712 of the code of 6 7 Virginia requires a certification by this Commission that the closed meeting was conducted in 8 9 conformity with Virginia law. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Virginia Racing Commission 10 11 certifies that to the best of each member's 12 knowledge, (i) only public business matters 13 lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements 14 under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and 15 (ii) only such public business matters as were 16 identified in the motion convening the closed 17 meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the 18 Commission in the closed meeting. Is there a motion to that effect? 19 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So moved. 21 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say 23 aye. 24 The Commission votes aye. NOTE: 25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hearing none, the motion

carries. We are now back in session. I would ask 1 2 our counsel to read the motion. 3 MR. PITCHFORD: Pursuant to Virginia code §59.1-385, the Commission shall effectively at five 4 p.m. on Friday, December the 18th, 2015, suspend 5 6 the ADW license currently held by TwinSpires, unless prior to that date, TwinSpires is able to 7 demonstrate full compliance with the terms of its 8 9 license, including but not limited to payment of all funds currently owed to the Virginia Equine 10 Alliance, Virginia Horsemen's Benevolent Protective 11 12 Association, and the Breeders Fund, as documented 13 on the spreadsheet presented to the Commission 14 today. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do I hear a motion? 16 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So moved. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second? 18 MR. STEGER: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say 19 20 aye. 21 The Commission votes aye. NOTE: 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing 23 none, the motion carries unanimously. All right. thank you, Mr. Blackwell. 24 25 MR. BLACKWELL: Just for clarification of the

accounting that you have, who presented that? 1 2 Dave Lermond. MR. HETTEL: COMMISSIONER MILLER: Dave Lermond from the 3 4 Virginia Racing Commission. Did you give a copy to him? 5 6 MR. LERMOND: I did. 7 MR. BLACKWELL: I just was not certain who had 8 prepared it. 9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes. Dave Lermond. 10 MR. BLACKWELL: Okay. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You know, certainly, we are 12 willing to keep working with you to try to get some 13 sort of compromise and get a deal done. That's 14 what we want. I'm a customer of TwinSpires. I'd 15 hate to lose you guys, but we've got to abide by 16 the law. So with that, I will say thank you for 17 coming in today. 18 MR. BLACKWELL: Sure. And the question in 19 terms of the payments that we are questioning 20 ourselves to the HBPA, we had brought that to your 21 attention. Is that something that we need to 22 provide information on for the Commission to take 23 action on that matter? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think we can take that 24

matter up at another separate hearing. Let's get

25

you all in compliance first and go from there. 1 2 Any other comments from the commissioners? None. Thank you very much for coming. I'm sure 3 Mr. Hettel or anybody else is available to you for 4 further clarification. 5 6 MR. BLACKWELL: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 8 All right. It has been a busy day. hopeful about a month ago from our last meeting in 9 December that not a whole lot was going on and 10 11 maybe we could just skip the meeting and send 12 everybody off for an early Christmas, but that is 13 not the case. Let's keep moving on. Let's do the approval of 14 the minutes from our last meeting on November 17th. 15 16 Are there any additions or corrections to the 17 minutes? 18 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Move approval. 19 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say 21 aye. 22 The Commission votes aye. NOTE: 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries. The minutes are approved. 24 25 Now we move on to the new business and we go on

to license renewals. 1 2 MR. HETTEL: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to be brief, given the length of today's meeting. 3 4 Applications for ADW licenses were received in 5 order and have taken the staff review scrutiny, and 6 I recommend the application for Xpressbet and for TVG be approved. I also recommend that the renewal 7 8 or TwinSpires be held in abeyance pending compliance of the previous order. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that a motion? 10 11 MR. HETTEL: That's a request for a motion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do we do all three at once? 12 13 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'll make the motion. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 15 MR. HETTEL: Let's do all three at once. MR. PITCHFORD: I'd recommend we do it one at a 16 17 time, since we are on record. 18 MR. HETTEL: Okay. Let's do them one at a 19 time. Okay. I suggest that Xpressbet be -- I 20 recommend that Xpressbet be renewed. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: For one year? 22 MR. HETTEL: For one year. Yes, sir. 23 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'll make that motion. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second? 25 MR. STEGER: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say
2	aye.
3	NOTE: The Commission votes aye.
4	
	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Xpressbet
5	is approved for another year. The motion carries
6	unanimously.
7	MR. HETTEL: Continuing on, Mr. Chairman, I
8	suggest that the application for TVG's renewal be
9	approved.
10	COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved.
11	COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We have a motion and a
13	second. All those in favor, say aye.
14	NOTE: The Commission votes aye.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Opposed? Hearing none, the
16	motion carries.
17	MR. HETTEL: Continuing, Mr. Chairman, I
18	suggest that the application for TwinSpires be held
19	in abeyance pending compliance with the previous
20	order.
21	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Commissioner.
23	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Regarding holding
24	TwinSpires' license renewal request in abeyance,
25	I'd like for our counsel to indicate how the

Commission will handle that, absent having another full Commission meeting before the end of December 31St.

MR. PITCHFORD: Commissioner Miller, what the Commission has done in the past in similar situations is delegate to the chair and executive secretary the ability to approve licenses upon demonstration that certain requirements have been met.

So if the Commission wishes to do so in this situation, it can similarly empower the chair and the executive secretary to grant a renewal upon certain conditions being met.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I would make that motion that we authorize the chairman and the executive secretary to have the authority to issue a license renewal to TwinSpires, should they meet all the conditions and requirements for a normal license renewal for ADW, plus show themselves to be in compliance with our previous license suspension order. Does that cover it?

MR. PITCHFORD: (Nodding head)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that a motion? That's a good motion.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I so move.

1 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor, say aye. The Commission votes aye. 3 NOTE: 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing 5 none, the motion carries unanimously. 6 MR. HETTEL: Mr. Chairman, Section B of that 7 new business, limited license renewals. The Racing Commission has received in good order applications 8 for renewal from the Virginia Gold Cup. I have 9 reviewed that and it's in good order and in 10 11 complete correctness. It's basically a 12 resubmission of a previous application made a 13 couple of years ago and it was renewed last year. 14 I would suggest approval of that request for 15 renewal. 16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second or any 18 comments? 19 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: I'd like to see if 20 maybe Mike can answer this. I was looking for a 21 representative of the Gold Cup. These dates 22 include the same flat racing dates as before, I 23 take it? 24 MR. HETTEL: Go ahead, Mike. Why don't you 25 address that?

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: My question is going to be -- this will just be for clarification, because I'm not absolutely clear on this.

with regards to the condition of the racetrack for flat racing, are there any questions? I know there's been some discussion. I have been made aware that there has possibily been some. Could you address that for us, sir, at this point?

MR. PEARSON: This application addresses the first Saturday in May and the fourth Saturday in October, which are the conditional dates. In those cards, there will be mixed cards, both jump and flat racing. We're still in discussion with the VEA for additional base flat races at Great Meadow, and I think that it's contingent on funding and other plans in the state for racing. Gold Cup is certainly eager and willing to do whatever it can to run flat racing in Virginia. So we're there and we're willing to participate.

COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Let me ask this. Your course, then without any further work, is adequate as it was this year to handle the dates which you're requesting today?

MR. PEARSON: Yes. That was without question.

VICE CHAIRMAN VAN CLIEF: Thank you. That was

my question. 1 2 MR. PEARSON: Any other questions? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioners, any other 3 4 questions? Okay. Thank you. 5 MR. PEARSON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I believe I have a motion 6 7 on the table. Do I hear a second? 8 MR. STEGER: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor of 9 10 approving the race days, say aye. 11 The Commission votes aye. NOTE: 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing 13 none, the motion carries. 14 MR. HETTEL: Subject to that section, Mr. 15 Chairman, is the application by the Virginia Equine 16 Alliance for race days for 2016. It's in good 17 order and a resubmission of a previous application 18 with all complete and necessary documentation. I 19 suggest approval of their request for renewal of 20 the racing application of the limited license. 21 COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second? 23 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Second. 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are there any questions or 25 comments? Hearing none, all those in favor, say

aye.

NOTE: The Commission votes aye.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries unanimously.

MR. HETTEL: Section C is the proposed Breeders Fund budgets for 2016. There are separate submissions from the Virginia Thoroughbred Association and from the Virginia Harness Horse Association. Documents are included in the booklets with breakouts on expenditure. I think again, let's do this separately. I suggest that the VTA's request for breeder fund distribution be approved.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I don't know if -- is the VTA --

MR. HETTEL: VTA, Debbie Easter, is present to discuss if there's any questions.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Did you want to make any comments on it yourself, Debbie, or point out anything?

MS. EASTER: Sure. I will just say that as you all are very aware, we're all working on programs to move racing, promotion, everything that goes along with sustaining and growing the industry.

Those things are all in effect, so the law requires

that we submit a budget by December 1St.

As you know, I think we've previously stated in past submissions, our budget was sort of geared towards keeping people engaged in these last couple of years, more event-type stuff.

I've also put a proposal in the packet in a letter to Bernie about things that an idea that I think is a good idea for promotion of the industry, but until we can shore up a little bit about what our finances are gonna look like with the Alliance and where we're going forward, I can't tell you that that's where we're headed.

So what I would like you to do is approve our current budget, which is the budget that I handed in which is very similar to those in the past, in the hopes that we'll come together with some money for some good promotions for the industry in the near future and come back and just ask you, hey, this is where we went to spend this money.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I have a question about the advertise and promotion section.

MS. EASTER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: At the very end of 2016 there, you've got 10,500 for the promotion of race events in 2016; I understand that.

MS. EASTER: All right. 1 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Tell me about the next Is that an advance for ADW or is that for 3 4 advertising? 5 In the spirit of good partners, we MS. EASTER: 6 always thought that it was in the best interest for 7 us to promote the three out-of-state ADW companies 8 to people in Virginia because it was good for us and it was good for them. 9 So that's something that's been on our mind for 10 11 a while. I'd like to have more money to do it, and 12 it may be a part of this other plan, bigger plan 13 down the road. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Since that's where the 15 revenue is coming from, I think that's probably --16 MS. EASTER: That's how partners work. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- a good idea. Do the 18 other commissioners have any questions or comments 19 on the budget? 20 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment is on the 21 sponsorship to contributions. 22 MS. EASTER: Yes, ma'am. 23 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I notice there not too much change, but I'm happy to see you're also 24 25 supporting the Lift Me Up program in 2016.

_ -

MS. EASTER: Sure. That happens -- I'll tell you why that happens. Some of our events, we partnered with some other what I would call charitable organizations, and so we made the ticket priced so that we could give them back a portion of the ticket price. So that's how those things happen.

They were involved with some of our events at the Gold Cup, as were the Montpelier TRF, and I thought we had one other charity in there, but it's slipping my mind right now.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Is the Jockey Club program one of those?

MS. EASTER: You know, I'm doing some research on the Jockey Club program. You're talking about their program that they put money into the -- after the Thoroughbreds that go on to show.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, okay.

MS. EASTER: We have such little amounts of money, I'm trying to figure out and I'm getting help from the horse show folks, where we can get the most bang for our buck. I don't know that it benefits the state of Virginia, especially in our times of less funds to give away money and promote Thoroughbreds that might not be Virginia-bred or

might not be Virginia-owned, and I'm not sure we 1 2 get for the money we can give to the Jockey Club TIP program that we're going to get our bang for 3 4 our buck there. 5 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. 6 MS. EASTER: We might do something of our own with some of these horse shows in Virginia, but 7 8 I don't have the answer to that right now. 9 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. MS. EASTER: We have a little committee looking 10 11 at that. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Any other 13 questions or comments? Mr. Hettel, we have a 14 motion on the table. You have a recommendation? 15 MR. HETTEL: I seek a motion for approval. 16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved. 17 COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I have a motion and a 19 second. All those in favor, say aye. 20 The Commission votes aye. NOTE: 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing 22 none, the motion carries unanimously. 23 MR. HETTEL: Mr. Chairman, the second part of 24 this request is the Breeders Fund for the Virginia 25 Harness Horse Association. One of the executive

1	secretaries submitted this to the Commission staff.
2	It has been reviewed. Iain couldn't be with us
3	today; he's got some health issues. I don't think
4	there's anybody left from the VHHA who can speak on
5	it.
6	Dave, could you give us a momentary comment on
7	this? This is the individual and general
8	application or submission?
9	MR. LERMOND: Yeah. I would just comment,
10	Mr. Hettel, that this is the exact same amount that
11	the VHHA has received, I think as long as I've been
12	on the Commission, ten or 12 years.
13	MR. HETTEL: Right.
14	MR. LERMOND: It is consistent and I would
15	agree with you where I would recommend approval.
16	COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved.
17	MR. HETTEL: Seek your approval.
18	COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.
19	COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We got a motion and two
21	seconds. All those in favor, say aye.
22	NOTE: The Commission votes aye.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Those opposed? Hearing
24	none, the motion carries unanimously.
25	MR. HETTEL: The final order of business is the

Ι

withdrawal of Colonial Downs, L.P.'s application 1 2 for a satellite wagering facility. That was held open at the last meeting and this is the concluding 3 4 letter from Jim Weinberg of withdrawal. I don't 5 know if we need to take action on that necessarily. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I don't know. 7 MR. HETTEL: Okay. That's all I've got for 8 you. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Well, thank you very much. Now is the public comment period. 10 Those folks from the public who wish to speak, 11 12 please speak now. Speak briefly. Five minutes is 13 your limit, and please identify yourself if you 14 wish to speak. Anybody? Nobody from the public 15 wishes to speak. Commissioner comments. I'll start on my left 16 17 and ask Mr. Steger if he has any comments. 18 MR. STEGER: Mr. Chairman, in light of the 19 schedule, I will make no further comments today. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chairman. 21 COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: Not being quite as 22 prudent as Commissioner Steger, I'd have one 23 comment that I'd like to make before we adjourn. just wanted to say the most important thing 24 25 obviously by far we dealt with here today is the

future of the ADW market here in the Commonwealth.

I would ask Mr. Blackwell and the other parties as well, the VEA, HBPA, please make an effort with the brief time you have.

I have had the pleasure over a long time of dealing with Churchill Downs and their affiliates in a number of capacities. I believe that it is one of the very best operated and run organizations in the business of racing. I do hope that they will be able to remain in the marketplace, so I would ask that Mr. Blackwell and your team make every effort and that the VEA please do the same. I hope you can come to a place to work something out.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm going to reiterate

Commissioner Van Clief's comments. My whole family
is from Kentucky. We grew up at Churchill Downs.

The president of TwinSpires is a good person;
you're a good person. I just hope we can work out
our differences, and I really hope you all can do
that. Other than that, I'll pass it along.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just want to say that in light of the fact this is our last meeting for 2015, I want to thank and congratulate really all of you, especially the chairman, and the other

commissioners who worked so hard all year, and especially the staff of the VRC, who we couldn't do without. So I just want to say thank you to you all and have a happy holiday.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I would just like to say
I am hopeful that TwinSpires ADW company, doing
business in Virginia for a long time, will come
into compliance and continue to do business. I
don't think it's wrong for someone to hope for
someone who has been a good corporate citizen in
the past to continue to operate.

I know that each ADW company probably has some considerable concern about the racing in Virginia. That was expressed by Mr. Blackwell, the extent to which our racing has lessened in Virginia as a product, but Virginia is working. Our horsemen and the VEA, all of them, harness horsemen and Thoroughbred Association, all of them, are working to try to build Virginia racing back up to be a first-class product.

Part of building that back up is the importance of receiving the funds from the ADW companies.

That's a very important and vital part of building

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

racing back up in Virginia.

It is sort of, as Debbie indicated before, as Debbie Easter indicated before, it's a partnership. while the quality of racing in Virginia now may look at a lower level to those ADW companies, they're going to help build it back up to a first-class racing program in Virginia. It's with their help we're going to do that, and hopefully with the help of the satellite wagering facilities to get some of them back up.

The Virginia legislature, in their effort to build Virginia racing, they put a cost on wagering in Virginia. The Virginia legislature was willing to allow extensive wagering, gambling in Virginia, but at a cost, because the Virginia legislature in allowing pari-mutuel wagering and allowing the racing programs to go forward in Virginia, they expect those people participating in wagering -- I don't want to use the word --

The G word. MR. HETTEL:

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- participating in wagering to make a contribution to internal interests in Virginia to build Virginia's economy. That's why we're able to operate at all.

So we can't begrudge the fact that whether it's

1	eleven-and-a-half percent, nine percent, eight
2	percent, 15 percent, whatever it is, the
3	legislature has said that's the cost of doing
4	business in Virginia. We're allowing you to
5	exercise your business in Virginia at that cost,
6	and if you want to wager in Virginia, if you want
7	to operate in Virginia in whatever capacity, you
8	have to pay whatever the legislature says you have
9	to pay, and that's why we had to do what we did
10	here today.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. I'd like to
12	entertain a motion to adjourn.
13	COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved.
14	COMMISSIONER VAN CLIEF: So moved.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
16	COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All those in favor, say
18	aye.
19	NOTE: The Commission votes aye.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Anybody opposed? None.
21	Thank you all for coming.
22	
23	NOTE: The meeting is adjourned at 1:46
24	p.m.
25	

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER I, Sandra G. Spinner, hereby certify that having first been duly sworn, I was the Court Reporter at the meeting of the Virginia Racing Commission at the time of the hearing herein. Further, that to the best of my ability, the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings herein. Given under my hand this 23rd day of December, 2015. SANDRA G. SPINNER COURT REPORTER