

ORIGINAL

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

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
CASINO CONTROL COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING NO. 91-20

Wednesday, June 26, 1991  
Atlantic City Commission Office  
Tennessee & Boardwalk  
Atlantic City, NJ 08401  
10:45 a.m.

B E F O R E:

STEVEN P. PERSKIE, CHAIRMAN  
VALERIE H. ARMSTRONG, VICE CHAIR  
W. DAVID WATERS, COMMISSIONER  
FRANK J. DODD, COMMISSIONER  
JAMES R. HURLEY, COMMISSIONER

PRESENT FOR THE CASINO CONTROL COMMISSION:

BARBARA A. GALLO, PRINCIPAL RESEARCH ANALYST  
KAREN G. BIACHE, ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST  
DARYL W. NANCE, ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST  
THOMAS FLYNN, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSION STAFF:

JOHN R. ZIMMERMAN, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL  
ANTONIA Z. COWAN, ASSISTANT COUNSEL  
DAVID C. MISSIMER, COUNSEL I  
E. DENNIS KELL, COUNSEL I  
STEVEN M. INGIS, COUNSEL I  
LEONARD J. DIGIACOMO, COUNSEL II  
O. LISA DABREU, COUNSEL II  
RUTH S. MORGENROTH, COUNSEL III  
MARY S. LAMANTIA, COUNSEL IV  
LON E. MAMOLEN, COUNSEL IV  
SETH H. BRILIANT, COUNSEL IV  
KELLY L. CAMPBELL, ASSISTANT COUNSEL  
BERNADETTE FRIGEN, PARALEGAL TECHNICIAN  
SHARON HAND, SUPERVISING APPLICATIONS ANALYST  
KAREN KINDLE, PRINCIPAL APPLICATIONS ANALYST

SILVER & RENZI REPORTING SERVICE  
824 West State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey 08618  
609-989-9191 (Toll Free NJ) 800-792-8880

Item Nos. 25 & 16

1                   The record will reflect the motion  
2 carries unanimously.

3                   (All Commissioners present voted in  
4 favor of the motion)

5                   CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Are there any  
6 other questions counsel?

7                   All right. Thank you very much.

8                   MS. GALLO: Item No. 16, "State  
9 versus Trump's Castle Associates."

10                   Mr. DiGiacomo.

11                   MR. DIGIACOMO: Chairman and  
12 Commissioners, good afternoon.

13                   CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Wait until we have  
14 everybody here. I couldn't tell what was going on.

15                   Good afternoon, Mr. DiGiacomo. What  
16 do you have for us today.

17                   MR. DIGIACOMO: This item was last  
18 before the Commission a week ago. The parties have  
19 recently submitted a supplemental stipulation of facts  
20 for the Commission's consideration. Counsel are here  
21 to present the matter to the Commission at this time,  
22 Mr. Auriemma on behalf of the Division and Mr. Fusco  
23 on behalf of Trump's Castle Associates.

24                   CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Let me indicate  
25 that we have some dialogue I think that we want to

## Item No. 16

1 engage in with counsel which we will do. It is then  
2 the Commission's intention so that nobody is  
3 surprised, we will take a brief recess after whatever  
4 dialogue we are going to now have and we will take a  
5 brief recess to convene and discuss the matter and  
6 then hopefully resolve it this afternoon right after  
7 that recess.

8           When we last met in connection with  
9 this matter the Commission essentially addressed a  
10 couple of concerns, one was that the parties address  
11 themselves to a supplement to the stipulation that was  
12 originally filed with a view to identifying the who or  
13 when and how of the details of the matter, and we have  
14 received in response to that a supplemental  
15 stipulation dated today. We also addressed in that  
16 context a request that the Division identify today for  
17 us the basis for its parent determination and not to  
18 seek to proceed in any fashion with respect to any of  
19 the individuals who might have participated in any  
20 fashion in connection with the matter. Those were the  
21 questions that I think we raised at the last hearing.  
22 I will invite each of you to respond as you see fit to  
23 whatever you think is appropriate.

24           Mr. Fusco.

25           MR. FUSCO: I realize that the

## Item No. 16

1 Commission just received the supplemental stipulation,  
2 but--

3 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: We have had the  
4 opportunity to review it.

5 MR. FUSCO: It speaks for itself  
6 and--

7 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Well, it does and  
8 it doesn't. Sort of does, uses an interesting  
9 phrase. It says TCA executive management. We don't  
10 have anybody by that name on our files.

11 MR. FUSCO: Mr. Chairman, if I may,  
12 being aware obviously of the dialogue and remarks that  
13 occurred at the last time that the Commission was  
14 considering this on the 20th, to state the obvious,  
15 this is a settlement agreement and stipulation of  
16 facts. The transaction occurred. There was dialogue  
17 with the Division. The Division took a position that  
18 there was a violation. As a result of that certain  
19 things occurred. Mr. Fred Trump filed certain forms  
20 and that was processed through and Trump's Castle  
21 agreed to enter into this settlement agreement.

22 Had we not reached the settlement  
23 agreement we would have contested the issue. There  
24 are two issues in my view. One issue is the casino  
25 cage alleged violation and the other is a financial

## Item No. 16

1 source alleged violation. The casino cage violation  
2 comes down to a question of whether or not under the  
3 existing statute, regulations and internal controls it  
4 is permissible for any casino but for Trump's Castle  
5 specifically to engage in a front money transaction  
6 with a representative of the depositor. It is clear  
7 and I believe even your staff would advise you of the  
8 fact that the statute, regulations and the internal  
9 controls don't address it. That is in our view a  
10 litigable issue. I am not presumptuous enough to say  
11 what the Commission would decide. It is clearly  
12 litigable. It is not addressed.

13           The violation, to the extent that  
14 exists is that there. It is not provided for in the  
15 internal control submission and therefore we have  
16 agreed with the Division in this stipulation to agree  
17 that that is a violation. I submit that if we  
18 contested this we would not agree and I think a  
19 reasonable question exists there.

20           As far as the financial source  
21 violation, this transaction occurred in the casino  
22 cage in the context of the regulations which governed  
23 that. So in the view of the licensee that is proper.  
24 The procedures that are proper were followed there.

25           The Division took the position that,

## Item No. 16

1 the reasonable position, that this is also a financial  
2 source transaction. That's the way they are going to  
3 color it and if that is so the financial source must  
4 be prequalified under the rules which govern the  
5 financial source. There are no terms to this front  
6 money deposit and removal of chips other than those  
7 which attend that transaction under the law of the  
8 State of New Jersey. There are no terms to it. There  
9 was for a period of time a condition imposed by the  
10 Commission that those chips would not be redeemed  
11 until a point in time when Mr. Trump was qualified.  
12 He has been qualified and that condition no longer  
13 exists. So we submit that and the position of the  
14 licensee would be but for this settlement that there  
15 is not a violation, now, I'm not so presumptuous  
16 enough, of financial source concerns. The Commission  
17 is the arbitrator of that, not the parties. The  
18 parties though evaluated their position. I only speak  
19 for one party, Trump's Castle Associates, and our view  
20 is that on the basis of that evaluation of what the  
21 legal circumstances are, we entered into this  
22 agreement.

23                   The agreement is everything that it  
24 says it is which is a complaint against the licensee  
25 and no other persons. We have stipulated the fact

## Item No. 16

1 that my client is in a position to be comfortable to  
2 stipulate and that's the judgment that it made. It  
3 made it respectfully. That's the judgment. Here's  
4 the stipulation.

5 I will answer any question, but  
6 that's where we are.

7 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Let me hear from  
8 the Division first and then we will see what the  
9 Commission wants to do.

10 MR. AURIEMMA: Good afternoon. The  
11 supplemental stipulation you have today was an attempt  
12 to provide the Commission with additional information  
13 in an amendment to attempt to address some of the  
14 concerns specifically raised by Commissioner Waters  
15 and Commissioner Armstrong last week. Obviously it is  
16 not a unilateral document. It is not the Division  
17 which can unilaterally give in the posture of this  
18 particular case at this point in time unilaterally  
19 present facts. We are bound by some borders within a  
20 particular stipulation. There were discussions over  
21 the past week and this stipulation was the result. It  
22 is what it is and that is, as Mr. Fusco said, as far  
23 as the Castle was willing to stipulate, and would not  
24 go any further and there were discussions as to other  
25 items, but this is what is before the Commission at

## Item No. 16

1 this point in time and it is the best that I on behalf  
2 of the Division could present to you at this point  
3 given the posture of this case. So I hope you would  
4 consider it within that particular context.

5 With respect to the question of the  
6 Division and why we chose again to only prosecute, if  
7 you will, the licensee Trump's Castle as opposed to  
8 any particular individuals, I am going to refer to  
9 what I said last week and supplement it in this way.

10 First, at the time this whole  
11 transaction was reviewed back in January and February  
12 of early this year by the Division, by the director, a  
13 determination was made to proceed with a complaint.  
14 The decision was made at that particular point in time  
15 to only charge the licensee Trump's Castle. That's  
16 not to say that there could not necessarily have been  
17 individuals charged. I am neither saying that they  
18 could be charged or not charged. The decision was  
19 made at that point in time to only charge those  
20 individuals--excuse me, to only charge the licensee.  
21 We have reviewed that particular decision since and we  
22 will remain bound by it. We believe that it was  
23 appropriate in this particular case to only charge the  
24 licensee Trump's Castle. We do that based upon our  
25 prosecutorial discretion and based upon the fact that



## Item No. 16

1 in this particular case we saw an opportunity to  
2 resolve the matter relatively quickly, with a  
3 stipulation of facts, with a complaint, with a  
4 settlement agreement and focused on the real issue  
5 which we believe to be whether or not Fred Trump was  
6 to be a financial source and was qualified as a  
7 financial source or focus to that particular  
8 investigation. That is the basis for the Division's  
9 decision.

10 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: All right, thank  
11 you, sir.

12 Does anybody on the Commission have  
13 any questions of either attorney?

14 COMMISSIONER WATERS: I just want to  
15 go back not to your point, Mr. Fusco, on page seven of  
16 your stipulation.

17 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: This is the new  
18 stipulation?

19 COMMISSIONER WATERS: The old one,  
20 the original one. Would you compare what's--what  
21 appears there at I guess item A with your earlier  
22 discussion as to whether you agree there was or was  
23 not a violation.

24 MR. FUSCO: We stipulate in our  
25 stipulation that the financial source provisions

## Item No. 16

1 referred to here were violated. That we have  
2 stipulated to.

3 COMMISSIONER WATERS: Am I wrong that  
4 I heard you saying something different earlier?

5 MR. FUSCO: No. I said that as part  
6 of the agreement overall that's reached here, meaning  
7 that the licensee was charged and the facts are set  
8 forth as they are, in the context of that the licensee  
9 agreed to not contest whether or not the financial  
10 source provisions are applicable and were violated not  
11 to contest it. I only said before when I addressed  
12 the Commission that had we not stipulated and  
13 litigated, our position is that they are not violated  
14 and that would be our position.

15 COMMISSIONER WATERS: Oh, if you had  
16 proceeded to contest it, you are not attempting to  
17 deny there were violations though?

18 MR. FUSCO: The stipulation accepts  
19 the fact. I am not at all in anyway and I don't mean  
20 to be read that way at all.

21 COMMISSIONER WATERS: Okay. It  
22 wasn't clear to me.

23 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Mr. Fusco, I  
24 have a couple questions. The original stipulation  
25 notes the fact that both transactions were videotaped,

## Item No. 16

1 the transactions were videotaped.

2 MR. FUSCO: Yes, ma'am.

3 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Am I correct  
4 in assuming that the Commission's inspection staff was  
5 not notified that the transactions were going to take  
6 place and they were going to be videotaped?

7 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: You mean before  
8 they took place?

9 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Right. Before  
10 the tape rolled, was our inspection staff notified?

11 MR. FUSCO: I don't know the answer  
12 to the question. I only know that both transactions  
13 were videotaped from the point of the fill being  
14 bought out to the table to ultimately the chips being  
15 distributed to Mr. Schneider, but I do not know. The  
16 answer is I don't know the answer to that question.

17 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Do you know  
18 Mr. Auriemma?

19 MR. AURIEMMA: I may have once known  
20 but I do not know as I sit here today.

21 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: I assume that  
22 if you don't know that then, Mr. Auriemma, presumably  
23 the Division wasn't notified that it was about to take  
24 place?

25 MR. AURIEMMA: No, the Division was

## Item No. 16

1 not.

2 MR. AURIEMMA: So if I read the  
3 second stipulation or the supplemental stipulation  
4 correctly, the first time the Division or Commission  
5 were notified about this was after it happened on  
6 December 19, 1990, anyone from the Commission or  
7 Division was notified about it?

8 MR. AURIEMMA: I believe that's  
9 accurate, yes.

10 VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Anybody have any  
12 other questions of either counsel?

13 Okay, we will recess. We will  
14 reconvene probably hopefully by about 3:00 and finish  
15 the matter

16 (At which time a break was taken from  
17 2:43 p.m. to 3:12 p.m.)

18 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: We will reconvene  
19 and I note the presence of the entire Commission.

20 This again is the matter of State  
21 versus Trump's Castle Associates. The Commission  
22 pursuant to its authority has considered the matter in  
23 closed session over the course of the last half hour.  
24 It can safely and fairly be said that we have  
25 different perspectives and points of view with respect

## Item No. 16

1 to the subject. I will express my own point of view  
2 and then make a motion and I am sure there will be  
3 some comments with respect to the motion in one  
4 fashion or another.

5           This is, in my view, actually I find  
6 myself thinking in terms that I used to with some  
7 regularity down the street. There is one aggravating  
8 factor that is very important to me and there are a  
9 couple of mitigating factors that I view in terms of  
10 how to respond to this proposed stipulation and  
11 settlement. The aggravating factor relates to the  
12 nature of the violation and I, for one, have no  
13 difficulty with describing this with or without an  
14 agreement to do so as a violation of the financial  
15 source regulation. There is no question in my mind  
16 but that there is no other possible interpretation  
17 that could be placed on these facts with the acts here  
18 committed with the intent that they were other than to  
19 have what in effect is a financial source arrangement,  
20 and it clearly was not structured as such pursuant to  
21 statutory procedure.

22           While there are some mitigating  
23 factors, which I will mention in a moment with respect  
24 to that, this is among the single most important of  
25 the statutory protections that have been built. The

## Item No. 16

1 advancing of a financial interest from someone who is  
2 not qualified to do so is intricate, fundamental part  
3 of our regulatory process. This, for example, is to  
4 be distinguished from what I would describe as a  
5 generic problem at a table with a chip fill slip not  
6 being correctly filled out or a credit authorization  
7 not being properly signed or something of that nature  
8 that I would call important but of some secondary  
9 focus. That's the aggravating factor from my point of  
10 view.

11 I am satisfied that there are two  
12 factors that are present here that need to be  
13 evaluated. First, I am satisfied that there was no  
14 intention whatsoever to hide these facts or to have it  
15 done in secret. I think the Division has concluded  
16 that as well. I am satisfied there is no record that  
17 we can--could use to conclude that advance permission  
18 or information was given or sought, but they taped it  
19 and free and full disclosure was immediately and  
20 promptly and fully made and I am--and that's an  
21 important factor to me. The fact that there was never  
22 any attempt to hide this or to make a secret of it or  
23 to cover it up.

24 And, secondly, while it is certainly  
25 clear in my mind that there was a financial source

## Item No. 16

1 problem, it was unique in the sense that it was first  
2 one incident that took place admittedly over a day  
3 and-a-half or so, but one incident, one transaction  
4 with one individual who while not licensed as a  
5 financial source which creates the violation was  
6 nevertheless in close--known to the authorities, known  
7 to the licensee, and someone who when the time came  
8 for us to do it we had no difficulty at all on the  
9 Division's affirmative recommendation concluding he  
10 was qualified as a financial source. This is not  
11 exactly the same thing as going and finding the Joe  
12 Fusco Loan Company someplace and not knowing who they  
13 were or the David Arrajj loan company different from  
14 the Steven Perskie Loan Company.

15 In any event obviously there is a  
16 balance there. As far as I'm concerned with a couple  
17 of important asterisks that balance process leads me  
18 to be able to accept the essential outline and  
19 structure of this proposed settlement even though if I  
20 were doing it all on my own I might do it  
21 differently.

22 There are a couple, however,  
23 important asterisks and my motion will be to accept  
24 the proposed settlement as modified given that it is  
25 before us as a proposed stipulation and settlement and

## Item No. 16

1 given that I propose to modify it, the parties will  
2 have the opportunity to accept or reject the  
3 settlement as modified except that I will direct that  
4 that be done before the close of business today and  
5 the Commission staff be notified as to whether it is  
6 accepted or not. Failing acceptance of the modified  
7 settlement if it is approved by the Commission the  
8 matter will be referred to a hearing on all of the  
9 issues raised in the matter and that hearing will be  
10 held as I will assign it before one of the  
11 Commissioners as a hearing officer.

12 I would modify--I would therefore  
13 move to accept the proposed stipulation and settlement  
14 with the following modifications:

15 First, as to the Commission, the  
16 settlement of the complaint against Trump's Castle  
17 Associates will be considered as without prejudice to  
18 the authority of the Division to file if it chooses to  
19 do so any complaints against any individuals that  
20 might have been involved in the transaction.

21 Second, along the balancing lines  
22 that I have previously outlined given my emphasis and  
23 priority on the seriousness of the regulatory  
24 violation, I will modify the proposed fine to be in  
25 the amount of \$65,000.



## Item No. 16

1                   With those two modifications I would  
2 move to accept the settlement as offered.

3                   COMMISSIONER HURLEY: Second.

4                   CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Comment or  
5 discussion?

6                   Who wants to go first?

7                   Vice Chair having seniority.

8                   VICE CHAIR ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman,  
9 I will support the motion, but there are some things  
10 that I just personally feel I have to say here.

11                   Number one, I would agree that the  
12 fine as stipulated of \$30,000 is not enough but I can  
13 certainly live with the recommendation of the \$65,000.

14                   I guess though based on what we have  
15 been told here not only in the stipulation, the  
16 amended stipulation, but what we have been told on the  
17 record, and based on what we haven't been told that I  
18 almost look at Castle as an entity as almost an  
19 innocent bystander to this whole situation. This was  
20 something which happened, we know happened that was  
21 deliberate, people did it, people planned it, they  
22 carried it out and we still don't know who those  
23 people are, and I want to make something clear, I am  
24 not, and I certainly hope that if the motion passes  
25 and if it is ultimately accepted by the parties that

## Item No. 16

1 consideration is given to finding out, to really  
2 getting to the truth of the matter and finding out  
3 what happened here and who participated and I want to  
4 make clear here, I am not supporting that concept  
5 because we should be out on a witch hunt, but you  
6 know, we put people through the paces here and the  
7 regulatory process day in and day out, week in and  
8 week out. There are 50,000 employees in this industry  
9 that we hold to the highest standards and the way this  
10 entire matter was handled as far as the settlement is  
11 I think an affront to those 50,000 employees. It is  
12 an affront to the service worker who is caught in the  
13 employee locker room smoking a joint and who gets his  
14 license revoked or suspended, to the cage cashier who  
15 steals five dollars. Those people are accountable to  
16 us and they are accountable to us in detail to tell us  
17 what happened and to acknowledge it. Here we have  
18 violations, purported violations committed by  
19 individuals and we still don't know who they are and  
20 they are violations of a very, very serious nature and  
21 I guess the fact that there was not an attempt to hide  
22 this transaction, the fact that it was videotaped to  
23 me is not a mitigating factor. I guess I look at the  
24 deliberateness of the violations here as being an  
25 extremely aggravating factor and I am not happy really

## Item No. 16

1 with how this whole situation has been handled and I  
2 am monumentally disappointed that the Division of  
3 Gaming Enforcement has not pursued this matter to the  
4 fullest extent that it could be pursued.

5 That's basically all I have to say at  
6 this point.

7 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Commissioner  
8 Waters.

9 COMMISSIONER WATERS: Yes, Mr.  
10 Chairman. I guess this brings to the peak one of my  
11 concerns that I have had for a number of years and I  
12 voiced it internally in conversations with the other  
13 Commissioners and members of staff. I guess I have  
14 always been uncomfortable with the fact that my  
15 reputation and welfare so many times depends on the  
16 actions of people over whom I have no control and in  
17 this instance the Division of Gaming Enforcement. Up  
18 to this point in time though I have learned to live  
19 with that and I have seen no indication of any  
20 instance whereas--where I was as uncomfortable as I am  
21 in this one. I think this is unfortunate that I reach  
22 that point. What we have been told by the Division in  
23 this instance is that they know the individuals who  
24 were involved in this affair and they choose not to  
25 file a complaint.

## Item No. 16

1           Commissioner Armstrong covered in her  
2 remarks, I have sat here week after week and at times  
3 have ended up finding some clerk teller or some other  
4 person who violated a regulation, was not an integrity  
5 matter as such, but violated a regulation and stands  
6 responsible for it. In this instance we know that the  
7 people involved are not just the average run of the  
8 mill employees in the house. I guess it's probably  
9 this appearance of a double standard that is being  
10 demonstrated by the Division of Gaming Enforcement  
11 that if it's just an average employee a complaint is  
12 filed very quickly, comes in here and handled and if  
13 the person is found to have violated a regulation they  
14 have to stand accountable for that action and are  
15 fined, suspended and whatnot. This instance where we  
16 are climbing higher into the corporate hierarchy it's  
17 pretty evident, and I don't know why, there is a  
18 reluctance on the part of the Division to follow that  
19 same standard in dealing with those people occupying  
20 those positions.

21           When I came on this Commission I took  
22 an oath to do those things necessary to uphold the  
23 principles of the Casino Control Act. I think it's a  
24 sad commentary that the Division of Gaming Enforcement  
25 doesn't share that view and for an unknown reason

## Item No. 16

1 doesn't do what it would normally do in these  
2 circumstances.

3           As I indicated in closed session, I  
4 am going to support the motion that's been made since  
5 it applies only to the corporate entities in the  
6 penalty that's been assessed, but I guess it's greater  
7 than disappointment to me. I think it's an outrage  
8 that the Division of Gaming Enforcement would take  
9 this position and fail to carry out what I understand  
10 to be its responsibility to enforce the provisions of  
11 the Casino Control Act.

12           Thank you.

13           CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Commissioner  
14 Dodd.

15           COMMISSIONER DODD: In 13 years of  
16 casino gaming in Atlantic City this transaction is  
17 probably the most unique singular action that has ever  
18 taken place out of tens of billions of dollars that  
19 have been moved around Atlantic City one way or  
20 another, and I think the statute is silent on this  
21 particular transaction. We bump into a loophole here  
22 and there and I believe this possibly is one of them.  
23 The intent, as has been said by my colleagues, wasn't  
24 an attempt at subterfuge to get around a regulatory  
25 system, it was meant to avoid the new financial

## Item No. 16

1 structure within The Trump Organization of who got  
2 what first, if you put in money then you had to get  
3 behind the first bondholder and all of those. Again,  
4 we are asked week in, week out to judge each  
5 transaction, each infraction on its own.

6 Now, I don't think there is anyone in  
7 this room that doesn't know how this came down. Fred  
8 Trump didn't wake up in the middle of the night and  
9 say I feel like buying three and-a-half million  
10 dollars worth of chips. Now, if that was part of the  
11 stipulation which are difficult to get on a good day  
12 and having faith in the Division of Gaming, in  
13 extracting the best possible deal I have to go with  
14 that because other times I have been here for over two  
15 years now and we look at these case by case. I still  
16 can't figure out how we got to Jack Gallaway and the  
17 Trop deal when day in/day out we go through, routinely  
18 go through violations that clearly go right to the  
19 CEOs of each organization. So it's whatever mood we  
20 are in. I'm not sure what motivates us on this. This  
21 is a stipulation, very difficult to come by. If they  
22 don't accept it, fine, then it should go right to a  
23 hearing. This is the best we can come up with right  
24 now.

25 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Okay, again, the

## Item No. 16 &amp; Public Participation

1 motion is to accept the stipulation, proposed  
2 settlement as modified on the record here.

3 On the motion all in favor will so  
4 indicate.

5 The record will reflect the motion  
6 carries unanimously.

7 (All Commissioners present voted in  
8 favor of the motion)

9 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: The parties have  
10 until the close of business today to notify Mr.  
11 DiGiacomo that they accept the stipulation as modified  
12 or that they don't, failing which if they don't accept  
13 it or if we haven't heard in either case the matter  
14 will be forthwith remanded for a hearing on the  
15 underlying complaint for a hearing to be held before  
16 the Commission.

17 I think that's all on that matter.  
18 Thank you very much.

19 MS. GALLO: It is now time for the  
20 public participation portion of the meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN PERSKIE: Anybody from the  
22 public desire to be heard in any matter?

23 Come forward. Please state your  
24 name.

25 MR. MORSE: My name is David Morse,