



FOXWOODS[®]

CASINO • PHILADELPHIA

July 22, 2008

Harris M. Steinberg, FAIA
Executive Director
PennPraxis
School of Design
University of Pennsylvania
409 Duhring Wing
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6311

Dear Mr. Steinberg:

I am responding to your email of July 16 wherein you refer to Mayor Nutter's request of PennPraxis to prepare "an independent, third-party analysis of the current casino site plans relative to the Civic Vision for the Central Delaware."

Foxwoods has always been ready and willing to meet with all members of the City administration and its various departments, consultants, boards and bureaus. This was most recently evident from our participation in the hearings before the City Council Rules Committee which ended in April of this year. In the past, we have always welcomed participation in truly independent studies of our casino project – such as the Gaming Control Board and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission reviews - because we believe our project, as designed, has much to offer the Commonwealth and the City of Philadelphia from a civic, community, economic and aesthetic standpoint.

In the case of the proposed PennPraxis study, however, we have to question the legitimacy of the claim of independence of this study when you, on behalf of PennPraxis, have already repeatedly spoken out publicly against our project and the location of any casino on the waterfront because you claim that such a project does not fit within the PennPraxis vision for that area. Indeed, you stated that position most recently in comments you made to the press following the June 26 presentation of the PennPraxis vision at the Independence Seaport Museum. As though there were any doubt left about the lack of independence of the study, Teresa Gillen, senior advisor to the Mayor on casino matters stated: "[The Mayor's] not being coy; he's not sending [PennPraxis] on a neutral fact-finding mission. What he's asked PennPraxis to do is clarify why this is a bad location."

July 22, 2008
Mr. Harris Steinberg
Page 2

Given the preordained result of the study that you expect to conduct, we cannot agree to participate. Moreover, participation in your study suggests that the analysis of this precise question already undertaken by the Gaming Board in choosing the sites for the Philadelphia casinos was not honest, legitimate or independent. To the contrary, as the Supreme Court concluded in affirming the licensing decision of the Gaming Board in the Riverwalk appeal, nothing supports the suggestion that the Gaming Board's actions were not thorough, forthright and undertaken with integrity.

Therefore, we cannot participate in what we essentially see as proceedings seeking to support relocation of our Gaming Control Board approved, Philadelphia City Planning Commission approved, Pennsylvania Supreme Court approved location. If, on the other hand, PennPraxis reaches the conclusion that its vision for the waterfront can co-exist with our site at its present location and incorporates that conclusion into its recommendation, we will be happy to consider providing input as to how we feel your vision can be integrated into our current design at its current location. We are confident that our current design is far from a "big box" development which it has been disparagingly referred to and incorporates ample pedestrian friendly amenities, such as waterfront access, a walking/jogging trail and landscaped areas, to enable the PennPraxis vision to co-exist with it in harmony.

Very truly yours,



James L. Dougherty
President and Chief Operating Officer

PennPraxis_Response to Steinberg Email 072208.doc