MR. DOUGHERTY: Good morning. How's the sound this morning? A little better than yesterday?

This isn't bad. This is about the same amount of people who usually go to Sacred Heart mass this time.

Just a little rehash on yesterday on the symposium.

I want to thank -- I notice a few people are back today -- I want to thank everyone that showed up. This was a -- and because I was asked a couple questions earlier this morning I'm going to just take a second.

And my understanding, there's somewhere in the vicinity of 150,000 fliers given out over -- a total around 600,000 pieces -- advertising this symposium through three or four neighborhoods over a period of a week or so.

Even though I yesterday basically kept this apolitical, the Senate bill 862 is what drove the emphasis to get more input on what was happening on the water front.

Now, today we have a decent amount
of not only neighborhood people but representatives from the I.L.A. here. And it's funny, you would never -- if you talked to some of the people who attended yesterday's seminar, they had no idea, okay, some being new Philly residents that are part of the 3,000 condos in Marie Lederer's legislative district or some of the Old City/Queens Village/Society Hill area who doesn't have the same lineage or family lines in the I.L.A. that people like myself and State Representative Keller, having had a grandfather and a father both put food on the table via the port, it was real interesting and absolutely proved that this was needed. Because we took no time because, again, we went, I think we went so far out of our way to not have any political overtures that we might have did ourselves a little bit of a disservice by not touching a little bit on that bill. You know, that bill has drawn the ire of a lot of people because it's worth, as some people said, the greatest economic
windfall in this area on any one piece of
development other than the stadiums in years.

But what it does, we're not worried about who
owns the land, who owns the distributorships
on these deals, we were concerned about how it
affects the neighborhood. And the bill itself
takes out almost all neighborhood input.

And what happens is, for example,
you know, we just had a smoking ban, so now in
our conversation with some people from the
hospitality industry they say, Hey, it's tough
enough to compete with new hospitality
businesses such as casinos, people who have
done business with casinos in the past, they
say because they have a habit of early on in
their tenure of giving away food and beer.
And now you have an opportunity to smoke. So
it hurts the people along the line, the For
Pete Sake's, who transcend a whole lot of
neighborhoods on Front Street. Okay, so that
was one concern, smoking.

Then you talk about how
neighborhoods have been fighting with the help
of groups like SCRUB, okay, over a period of
years, billboards, and how it gives Delaware Avenue unlimited access. And these were some of the concerns that were raised.

Then it talks about the fact that they would be free from, not only fees, but any oversight of the city when it comes to water and sewage. We had a series of people that live -- it just happens that I'm here not as a labor leader, not as anyone that has political ambition, as a head of Pennsport Civic Association, where I average about 30 calls or 30 visits a week, either between myself or Bernadette Mason, about basement flooding.

It's no longer about water in the basement, it's about a health issue. Okay. It's about an infrastructure issue or concerns of infrastructure. Your house isn't supposed to handle 12 to 13 inches of dirty backed up sewer water like Mike O'Donnell has experienced on the 100 block of Mifflin Street. Which is in the center of Pennsport, is one of the more prominent blocks we have in the sense that long term families, almost every house has a multi-family -- multi-person
family in it, and most are fairly newly
renovated. Over an 18-month period I think he
said he had six floods of 12 to 14 inches of
water. That's a health issue.
Okay. So that's a little bit more
than just the Senate bill. There's no spot in
the Senate bill that explains about the fact
that there'll be no oversight. And it doesn't
have like a little asterisk that says, See
Mike O'Donnell for future information.
So that's why we're here. This was
put together because we had three legislators
who initially had supported gaming. Now,
everyone has a different view, but I'm not
going to speak for them, they can speak for
themselves. But I think they more than
adequately represented their district and
their concerns and the changing neighborhoods
which are in their district.
For example, the things that -- and
I bumped State Representative Keller during
the process yesterday because when he was
talking about $150 million dollars of state
money coming into the Food Produce Center,
most people in the labor movement say, Well,
I'm going to build it, most Teamsters work in there, so it's, oh, it has to work. Okay, well, the way that it was positioned -- again, without fitting into any plans here, two things happened. Yesterday it was understood that they're going to put a road in the middle of it, it's going to be taxpayer money, and the way the road is positioned it will probably hurt future development of the long shore unit. In the process, it also talked about dumping most of the traffic onto Delaware Avenue. Okay, we're talking 400 trucks per morning was the number that was given to us in some of preparation information. Okay, so they're the type of issues that were discussed yesterday morning. And then we talk about the actual gaming institutions. And again, I've told you I've been on record wearing my other hat -- and I didn't talk about my other hat yesterday at all. I have been on the record saying, Hey, I'm for gaming under the right conditions and the right locales. I have supported all type of development on the water front. But
you get to a point where when neighborhoods are legislated out of the process, where the development is once in a lifetime development and you're being steamrolled over.

Because we had the authorities from the state who told us they were given just a folder about what it looked like as well as traffic studies and infrastructure of the casinos. We had the Streets Department basically state the same thing. Basically, the understanding we had that there's been just a complementary sort of cavalier, you know, communication process between the city. So who are we, the neighbors, supposed to go to?

So that's why we decided to have a Delaware River 2015 Symposium. And the 2015 isn't just about the casinos. It's about, we have people in the room, that as State Representative Keller talked about, industry and future development of the port and the need to over -- the need to expand the port because of the people knocking the door down.

And we have people from the Delaware Valley Planning Commission giving you all the cargo
reports on the screen and projections and all that stuff. I mean, that's -- a lot of people were just looking in the air. You want to hear, Where's the green space? And where is our access to the water front?

And on the other side, okay, even deeper down you're starting, you're starting to just -- people just want to know the infrastructure off of I-95, they don't want Schuylkill South. And when I asked the TIP program, the Transformation Information Plan, they have a 12, 15 and 30-year study, Reed Street is not on that. Reed Street is the access and egress that all four prospective casinos on the water front have used as their main outlet for transportation, for vehicle transportation. It's not even on the study. And when we talked about, you know, they're whispering in the ear, if we do something on Girard Avenue we'll have a temporary offramp. But I think we cleared that up yesterday, there's no temporary offramp even on the plan or nobody discussed it.

So these were -- I think it was a
very interesting day. I wanted to come out here early today and say, Hey, look, this has purely been, you know, and the word "good government" is thrown around too frequently it becomes more of an adjective for political campaigns. Okay. I mean, this is something that has been very good because you've had so many people with different interests that realize that we have to work together.

And today we're going to jump into -- we have the Planning Commission here, we have one of the City Solicitor's lawyers whose been involved with the gaming application. And also two of them have been working on the Mayor's executive order on his vision for the plan for the waterfront.

And one of my concerns was, I was very happy that the neighborhoods were all included, but I was a little frustrated that there was nobody from the labor community included. Because there's a ton of jobs. And, you know, I know the Mayor and the local councilman had this structured that way to have community input. And we also know that there's a year left to the Mayor's term.
and that there's also council elections within a year. So as much as we're being apolitical here, we also have to identify the fact that everybody might not be. So just when we walk in here the last thing I want is this not to be a productive -- you know, and it's already, from my opinion, it's already a much more productive symposium than I even expected. Okay. On a Saturday night I had five to seven calls either in reference to about what occurred, how come they weren't included or what's happening tomorrow. It was a beautiful Saturday, okay, so it was a beautiful Saturday. With that, I'd like to just go across the table. We have a couple -- we have a new addition to our front today, another one of our community activists.

And the way we'll handle this is we'll go through -- let me read what we handed out there, we'll read through -- we have Dave Knapton here from City Planning and he's got a few -- he has one or two associates with him. We'll talk a little bit about that. We're
going to talk about development on the water front.

I get the bad news to tell you, Carl Primavera, who is pretty active on behalf of -- he's representing community groups and large development, his dad passed away last night. So keep his family in your prayers. And he'll be represented today here by Ron Patterson, who is his protege.

And then this afternoon we're going to talk about a couple --

MR. Knapton: We're teasing.

Representative Keller: He's his equal, not his protege.

MR. Greenberg: Carl would say he's a protege, Ron would say --

MR. Dougherty: And then this afternoon we'll wrap it up with gaming.

Remember, we will take a look at --

we will take a look at every question and if we feel up here that people either submitted it after the fact, that it wasn't a thorough answer, because we are going to have documents, we are going to have information and facts of what occurred here, will be
available at the Pennsport office in a couple
days. Bernadette asked me to give her a
couple days to get the stuff together.

Any questions you have, any other
communications you have, anything you think you
needed, any reports that you were shown
yesterday or slides that you think you would
like a peek at to compare them to either yours
or just to better educate yourself, feel free.

Significant pieces of paper that
were voluntarily given to us yesterday. You
know, just when you talk about the backed up
sewer, we did get a letter from the Free
Library, Whitman Branch which talked about how
they had to close because of the problem. So
it starts to interfere with just the way our

kids live too.

With that, I'll go to my right,
Marie Lederer.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Thank you.
And thank you for being here.

I had reservations about voting for
casinos. And Bill Keller sits next to me in
the House. And I felt very abused by the 11
mega nightclubs that donned Delaware Avenue
for about a mile and-a-half, 11 of them. And

a mega nightclub was a nightclub that held

between 1,500 and 3,000 people a night. And

the neighborhood was subjected to all kinds of

unsocialized behavior from these people. And

I was like a voice in the wind trying to

curtail some of the activities that went on

there.

So when the casino -- when I knew

the casino bill was going to be coming up I

sent out a newsletter with a poll. And my

then Chief of Staff, Mike O'Brien, headed it

for me. And I thought, you know, that I could

get a lesser percent of yeses than nos. I was

wrong. It came back 68 percent for casinos.

So that's what my people wanted and that's

what I voted for.

But I am concerned that it took us

ten years to get rid of those casinos and not

until we had four or five murders and

stabbings and all kinds of problems were we

able to one at the time close them down. If

these amendments go through on that bill we

won't be able to close them down.

So what happens with this bill is
extremely important. And I am very, very happy that this symposium is taking place because people have a right to know. And I hope we can affect a change. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good morning, everybody. Thanks for being here and again it's early on a weekend and you're taking your time from your family to be here. And as we said yesterday, we believe this is an important issue. And guess what, after yesterday there's no doubt left.

First, I'd like to thank Pennsport and Whitman for coming up with this idea and approaching us with it. Usually you hear that we're going to have the meeting, we'll get together, absolutely we say yes, we'll get together. This is probably the best run, outside of the legislative hearings, neighborhood-run function that I've ever been associated with. And yesterday I think, again, reiterated what we were here and what we were trying to accomplish here.

Yesterday we learned that basically there is no plan. We started out yesterday -- I started out yesterday by saying if we do
this the right way, we slow down and take our

time, we could develop this water front the

way it has to be developed. There's room

along the water front for the residential

condo development that's going on. There'll

be room for the commercial development. And

more than ever we need to sit down and protect

the port industrial.

That is why, that is why the city of

Philadelphia is here. 200 years ago, 300

years ago when they settled here it was

because of the river and that's why

Philadelphia is here. It's still that

important, we have to take that into

consideration.

We learned yesterday that there

was -- there's plans on the board now that

will absolutely be detrimental. And that's

one of the things we have learned that not

many people know about. We've decided,

Representative Taylor and Lederer and myself,

that we're going to send a -- and

Representative Taylor is rehashing it right

now -- we're going to send a letter to the

Secretary of Transportation, Tad Dechert. We
need more answers before we move forward,
before we just, as we say and as I've been
saying the whole weekend, try to jam a square
peg in a round hole. To me that looks like
what's going on here.
We're going to go back tomorrow and
go to our colleagues and go to our prospective
caucuses and go to our respective leaders in
the House and say that this Bill 862 as it
stands has to be slowed down so we can take a
look at it or it has to be changed. It's
going to be impossible for us to vote for the

bill the way it is now. It is detrimental,
not only to the water front but to the
neighborhoods associated with the water front.
So I would again like to thank
Whitman and Pennsport and all the other
neighborhood groups that participated in this.
This turned out much better, I believe, than
anybody expected. And I guess we're going to
have to have more of these since this is so
successful. So once again, thanks for your
participation and I think we'll have another
good day today. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Thank you,
Bill. Good morning, everyone. I am Representative John Taylor, I represent the community just north of here. And I am also Chairman of the House Urban Affairs Committee, and have been so for quite a few years.

One of the challenges of a Committee Chairman is to prepare your committee members and the entire House when any piece of legislation or groups of legislation comes before us. And one of our challenges is to get the proper people in front of us to inform us and to organize that. And that's very, very difficult and a big challenge for our staff.

But what we -- with John Dougherty, he really has been able to put together here with the folks we had to listen to yesterday and today is incredible. And I, like many of you, really didn't look forward to working my entire weekend. However, I was very excited about what we learned yesterday and couldn't wait to get here this morning.

While it was alarming about what we heard from PennDOT and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Streets
Department about having absolutely no plan in place, no adjustments are on the board, they are behind on the projects they're ready to build now, and the fact that there has been very little, if any, discussion or formal discussion was something that we certainly can use I think, is a good reason why we need to slow everything down.

And as alarming as that was, and what was even more alarming was what the Water Department and DEP had to say afterwards. We think that the traffic planning is poor, wait until you get into the water and sewer problem. So we were very fortunate to have that information.

As Bill was saying, we're all playing around with the letter right now to the Chairman of the Gaming Control Commission as well as PennDOT.

I had a discussion on the way up with Ed Goppelt from Hallwatch about, Don't you wish you had done this earlier? And then he says, Well, I guess this is how sometimes this process works. And it's certainly how the legislative process works, unfortunately.
17 Everything comes into a funnel and happens
18 real quick at the end. It's almost a military
19 type of model.
20 But as a result of this and some
21 other discussions we've had with community
22 leaders we are fully engaged and fully
23 prepared for this week to take 862, certainly
24 hold it up like we did last week, open it up
25 for amendments and try to put some common
26
27 sense provisions and take away the absolute
28 greed and arrogance of the casinos that was
29 put in this version of 862. And I'm confident
30 we're going to do that.
31 And I think not only are we going to
32 do that, we're going to go way further than
33 that. If they can legislate absolute details
34 and run over a community, we're going to try
35 to legislate details that give them some
36 rights right in the state legislation. So
37 that would be our challenge this week. But
38 our two days here have certainly helped us
39 prepare for that.
40 MR. LEVINS: Good morning, everyone.
41 My name is Rich Levins and I serve as a
42 volunteer as President and Chairman of the
As many of you may know, New Kensington CDC is involved in various initiatives. We are involved in zoning, we clean and maintain lots and brown fields. We build moderate income housing and recently one of the things we're most proud of is we were able to get historic tax credits where we took a five-story abandoned factory in East Kensington and renovated it and we won the prestigious Historic Preservation Award.

My hope that in this symposium and other initiatives is that, I'm sure most of you have visited Old City at one time, visited the Schuylkill River waterfront or visited the Parkway and at one point said to yourselves, Wow, these people who put this together, planned this, these visionaries really did it right. And my hope is that in 2015 or 2020 that, you know, people who visit the waterfront will have the same reaction and say, Wow, the people involved in this, the leadership at that time really did it right. And I know there's no such thing as
perfection, but ultimately I hope that the water front -- and I recognize it will not just be recreation, it will be residential, it will need to be commercial as Representative Keller said, but a perfect blend of all three I think is the ultimate goal that all of us will be satisfied with.

MR. SHALLCROSS: Thank you, Rich. I'm Herb Shallcross, President of the Fishtown Neighbor Association. We facilitate communications between the neighbors in our area and city agencies such as the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Everyone -- well, I have known for 25 years that the expectation was that Fishtown would be gentrified, it would be developed. The obvious potential of plans east of Delaware Avenue, east of I-95 and Fishtown has been obvious for 25 years. Now, that development logjam is broken. The 25 years people could have been spending to lay the underpinnings for that development have been wasted. There's really no comprehensive plan for anything there. We're here to talk about
You heard from people from the Water Department. I'm not an engineer, it's not really my area, but if you look at the telephone, the electric power, cable, television service in Fishtown, it's almost all on poles above ground. For 40 years communities have been getting away from that. And, you know, the opportunity to do that has been wasted.

Now, it's very exciting that we come here. We have to get on top of this. It's a clean slate. And everyone let the dollar be made inscripted on your corner of that clean piece of paper. Because no one's laying out, though, any overall design or picture, and that has to take place now.

MR. RUBEN: Hi, my name is Matt Ruben, I'm with the Northern Liberties Neighborhood Association. I'm also a co-convener of the North Delaware Casino Unity Coalition which consists of a large number of civic groups up and down the river, represent and serve approximately 200,000 taxpayers. And we are part of a movement that's happening along the river and elsewhere in the city.
recently to increase the attention on planning.

We have initiated our own neighborhood plan that we completed last year. We've initiated an addendum covering the water front in our neck of the woods. And other civic associations, including New Kensington CDC, are also undertaking their own planning initiatives because there has been a really palling vacuum not really in the will to do plans in this city, although that's part of it, and really no political will to implement them and make them have teeth.

There is a Planning Commission plan for the river front. It's, I believe, 24 years old so it's out of date at this point. But it was done. And have been other visions articulated by public and private entities in intervening years, but there's been no political will to coordinate these and get them done.

And I think we're as, and others have said, I think we're really at a place where we need to get those things implemented, not only to do plans right, but we also just
need to do them. And I hope that meetings
like this can be a spur to break the apathy
that has prevented us from getting things done
for our river front.

And I don't know if it's fitting or
not that the, apparently the casinos who were
supposed to be represented here this afternoon
have pulled out, because any plan that's going
to happen for the river front is going to have
to happen around casinos. Because I can't
imagine a worse planning idea than putting big
boxes with no windows on a river.

So I think we're facing real
challenges of planning around what's already
on the river and what's already planned for
the river. But I still think that there are
opportunities remaining for us to preserve a
lot of what we need to preserve about the
river and make it a truly mixed use and
publicly open area.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Thank you.

What we'll do is, again, just if
you're comfortable with it, we will treat this
as if it's a round table and we're just having
cross talk. Just raise your hand. And,
What I'd like to do is start off with City Planning. And I know that Kevin Greenberg, who is the Law Department's representative on the gaming and water front development process, he's on a little bit of a time frame here. So Dave, I'd like to start off with just asking you, earlier this week the Mayor outlined a plan for the Delaware River Front, Penn Praxis is the lead group here, could you just explain the role here of the Planning Commission in that process and what your understanding of what occurred this week?

MR. KNAPTON: Very briefly, and I'll pass this on to Kevin, who is with me here. My name is David Knapton. Is this going to be too loud? Am I booming you out?

MR. DOUGHERTY: Not at all.

MR. KNAPTON: The Mayor's executive order, which Kevin will describe, enumerates a set of tasks, the leadership of the Executive Director of the City Planning Commission, to
study the water front and come up with recommendations. And there are all sorts of a

deadlines, the drop dead date in 2009.
This is important, not the date, but the action. The comprehensive water front plan. Matt Ruben mentioned a 24 year ago set of studies which are still good documents of the entire water front from Poquessing Creek all the way around the Delaware and up the Schuylkill up to Flatrock Dam and past there to River Road in the northwest. These were done with state money to study water front assets and so on. This was done in the early eighties, 1980 to 1984.
And those documents, good as they were, separate the city into separate districts. And the unintentional result of that is that people tend to think about one section, another section and not relate them. So for example, the Delaware water front is North Delaware, Central River Front, South Delaware, three different plans with, to my mind, arbitrary boundaries between one section and the next.

In the defense of the planners, I
can't do it all at once, you do have to have
some workable way to divvy things up. I'm
going to step back just for a moment before
passing this on to Kevin and talk about,
though, the impact of dividing things up.

The city was first designed and
founded by William Penn in 1683, not with an
ideal plan, a grid on totally clear ground.

And you all know the story, you have all heard
it in school, about the five squares and the
street grid and so on and so forth. This has
an impact on the water front because that's an
east-west orientation. It's an ideal plan in
which the water front is only part.

And I think we all know the reality
of the ideal, of the real side, is that from
the 1600s onward the city developed on the
water front, not in -- only incidentally in
William Penn's mind. So the places like Old
Swedes Church, which antedate William Penn, or
streets coming down to the river, Germantown
Avenue coming down or Poplar Street from the
north or Christian Street and Carpenter Street
in the south. All way antedate things like
Rittenhouse Square.

So that's the real side of Philadelphia growth. And it grew along the water front. And we've seen the same thing in the present day where we've made -- the city has made great plans for Penn's Landing and decade after decade has revised the plans for Penn's Landing, part of the William Penn grid of Center City, not the whole harbor.

And in the meantime, with the development of Christopher Columbus Boulevard and the repaving, lots and lots of development north and south of Penn's Landing, irrespective of whatever the Planning Commission has said in 1970 and 1980 and so forth.

So I'm telling you this long story, which you know, because it's important as a way of thinking, well, how are we going to deal with the new phenomenon of casinos as well as low interest rates and tax abatements taking such an incentive to develop anywhere in the city and especially along the great wide road such as Christopher Columbus.
Boulevard. Anywhere from Port Richmond and St. Ann’s Church on Allegheny Avenue down to the wharf, down to south, say, Oregon Avenue. And that becomes, to my mind, a unitary kind of district, not something to be separated out as separate parcels.

This very important point for the south waterfront and also for the north of specialized port facilities in making sure those are as modern as possible. But that, given that mileage that I've just enunciated from Lehigh to Oregon Avenue, it's clearly mileage enough for everybody to play.

Okay, that's the background comment I want to make. And I'll pass it on to Kevin.

MR. GREENBERG: Thank you, Dave. Before I start I just want to commend John and frankly all the Representatives for spending their time and their efforts to set this process up.

I've only been involved with planning along the Delaware River for about a year and-a-half now since I started working on the gaming project for the city, Gaming Task
Force. And the amount of development in that year-and-a-half has been astounding. The growth and plans that are coming for the next year-and-a-half is even more astounding. And the need for this symposium, this type of effort is manifest, which is a large part of why the Mayor issued the executive order this week that he did.

Throughout the process of gaming, first in meetings convened by Councilman DiCicco with Matt and Herb and Bernadette and all the folks who were represented in this room -- well, first we did it as a task force ourselves, and then with councilmen went out to the community groups to try to find out what they were doing in terms of open discussions with the casino applicants. And that led to a sense of involvement on my part when we hopefully roll this out with other people as a certain Delaware order.

What the Mayor did this week -- and I'll just touch on that briefly before I would like to say a couple things to the Representatives on 862 on behalf of the city and on my own behalf as well. What he did
this week was to set forth a process where
we’re going to get a comprehensive master plan
for the Delaware from Allegheny south to
Oregon.

The Mayor’s vision on this is very clear. And the reason we picked those boundaries simply is because other plans, and relatively recent plans, were placed above Allegheny and then in between the port and PIDC below Oregon. So our attempt is to try to fill the gap in plans that have been done this decade.

And the Mayor set forth a series of reasons for him doing so and I'm just going to touch on them real briefly. Excuse me if I walk down them.

First, obviously, the New River City Initiative is how we’re talking about what's happening on the water. But as we all know, this is not only an issue of the city, but something that's been driven by market forces and we're working with them.

The 24-year city plan was developed

and the need for the new plan to include residents, businesses and frankly the broader
public interest of folks who want to use the
water front to have access to open space,
whether you live one block from the river, as
many of you do, or 20 blocks, as I do, the
idea is that all folks in the city want to get
access to this beautiful river and use this
river front. And to include them with that,
the fact that we're going to have this
commercial development. And we need to do
that.

So what the Mayor set up was a
program that has two components -- three
components, the first of which is Penn Praxis,
a consultant for whom we have identified
probable funding. It's foundation type
funding, but it's not going to be done until
it's done with the foundation's support. But
the city is going to backsoft that as
necessary to do a plan, create a master plan
that will be directed by the other two
components of this, which are the Advisory
Group as a whole group, and then a Steering
Committee within that group.

And to those boards the Mayor
generally appointed the various stakeholders
who live here, but not the interest groups and trade groups, be they business or labor, who we expect will be forming this process throughout. It is dominated by community folks and community business associations and local representatives with the Planning Commission as the lead for both the Advisory Group and the Steering Committee.

And within that Advisory Group there is going to be a Steering Committee of nine people. Only two of whom are representatives of the City, Planning Director and the Commerce Director. The other seven members are going to come essentially from the community.

We were told one of them is going to be a District Council Member. There's going to be one representative of the Business District, be it Center City District, Head House Square, South Street or Old City. One representative from the Chamber of Commerce.

Three representatives from community groups which we have designated the community groups themselves get to select from amongst their leaders, which the only thing the city
has asked is that you pick geographically
diverse representatives. Well, and we also
want folks who can give their time as
necessary. But our only requirement is that
within this area they pick geographically
diverse representatives. But we expect the
communities to pick their own folks.

Same things goes for the business
district, for that matter. One City Council
Member from the two District Council Members,
Councilman Clark, Councilman DiCicco, who
represent this area, notice to the Commerce
Director.

Those groups will do what they need
to do to meet, they will report and we have
said that every one of their meetings will be
open to the public, everyone. We want this to
be a full buy-in process that really speaks
for the neighborhood.

Because this plan, as Mr. Dougherty

indicated, is only as good as what -- the
Mayor has only got a year and-a-half left,
this plan is only as good as the plan is good.
If the plan is good it will live and it will
send and it will last well into the next
administration. And the next Mayor, whoever
it may be, will walk in and look at this plan
and say, This is a plan that I want my
Planning Commission to adopt, and it's a plan
that I want my Commerce Director to promote
and I want my neighborhoods and my Managing
Director and my neighborhood offices to
promote. And I want to make this plan real.
And that's our goal here, is to have
it be a plan of the neighborhood and of the
city's needs, be they commercial, be they
infrastructure or whatever. And that's sort
of where we're going on that.
The one problem we have with this
plan, frankly, in our process is that it's on
a time line that while we hope to have it done
in the next 12 months, that's not fast enough
for gaming because the state has dictated to
us what's happening and when. So towards that
end, the city is doing what we can to be ready
for gaming.
And frankly, I think we are doing
better than anybody else in the state has
done. We have a Commercial Entertainment
District Zoning Board now that lays it out
what we think needs to happen to make this
work for the communities. And it's a new
zoning bill that is specific to gaming.

We at the Philadelphia Gaming
Advisory Task Force which produced a 479-page
report, I was proud to be part of the process,
www.phila.gov/gamingadvisory, if you haven't
seen it, it's there. And it lays out exactly
the issues including the water and sewers,
including the traffic, that we knew the city
was going to face. We published that a year
ago this month and it's been out there. And
we would urge the Representatives to use that
as a club as necessary on 862 because we are
ready.

The Mayor did not support or oppose
gaming. He did not pick to have it come here.
That was done for us by the state. But he is
committed that if it comes, and it is coming,
that we are going to be ready to do it right.
And we're going to be able to do it right in a
way that works for our communities and our
neighborhoods. And that's our agenda here.

And that's what the Commercial
Entertainment bill does. And that's what 862
cuts right at the heart out. It targets Philadelphia without justification and goes right after us. And frankly, we don't quite understand the reason. There doesn't seem to be a good reason.

Because we are ready to make gaming come in and make it work, we've established a process that will allow gaming to happen fast without the perennial ZBA hearing process. We've created a forum for public input into the plans. But once they're approved there are not appeals. It's an as-of-right permit.

Then there's -- you know, I don't know if Mr. Dougherty went through the whole list of things that are wrong with the bill, I'm not going to do that here. But just to say the city believes that this bill in its current form, the preemption language, all of the Philadelphia charting language is just patently absurd or unacceptable. We are ready to do it right. We are better ready than any other community in the state.

Frankly, we're better ready than any community that's ever not had gaming, but know
when it's coming. Nobody else has ever got a
report like we've used. That report's being
used as a textbook by gaming professionals in
Nevada this year. So we're ready for this and
we intend to do our part and we hope you can
sell your colleagues on that.

And with that, I'll turn it over to
Ron.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Ron, why don't you
just hold up and we're going to talk a little
bit more about development, if you don't mind.
We'd like to stay on the Planning Commission
the water front, the new initiative at Penn
Praxis. If we can hear some questions from
people in the audience, there's some questions
at the table.

MR. PATTERSON: John, I'll be able
to give you my view of how I think this
legislation will work and how it takes the
specific group and the community right out of
it.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Okay. And there's a
couple other later -- we have a list of
questions. People just want to -- you know,
people are here just to understand the process
too. You've represented community groups and
you've also represented large developers. So
you can explain how the process develops and
who's involved and, you know, the formulas,
the appeal process, the Commonwealth core
process, the whole nine yards.

On this, the Planning Commission,
just to follow-up to my initial question, what
exactly does the Planning Commission see its
role? Will you be lead position or just part
of a support team for Penn Praxis?

MR. KNAPTON: Well, the lead
partner --

MR. DOUGHERTY: I'll call them P
squared from here on in.

MR. KNAPTON: The lead partner, the
executive director, will be the chairperson of
both the Steering Committee and the broader
Advisory Committee.

So in terms of the momentum, keeping
things moving, knowing deadlines, reminding
people of the importance of key topics, it's
fair to say that that person who is the lead
person will help to shape the way in which
everybody's opinions together are grouped and
expressed.

And also we're looking for a deadline. So part of the lead position job is simply going to be meet deadlines. Woody Allen made a joke about that, but it's really very serious about, you know, being there.

Absence is a loss, absence or meet failing deadlines. I'm being very general because at this point the tasks and the goals aren't out there. So you can see why.

MR. GREENBERG: One of the key components in how we set up this executive order, that the Steering Committee gets to steer and advise this process. And one of the things now that we've announced this group on Thursday is that fairly shortly, probably this week, the Planning Commissioner will be reaching out to the various groups to convene them, allow the neighborhood groups to select their own representatives to the Steering Committees and how we get there. But the idea is to let that group dictate the process entirely.

We know this has to happen within 12 months. Praxis has a general work order but
they want to know specifics. And frankly,
they have been directed by the Mayor and they
will be directed by the folks who fund them to
follow the lead of this community-dominated
Advisory Group and Steering Committee.

And the reason we pick the Steering
Committee is you need a group of seven or nine
or 11 or whatever people, it’s nine we picked
in this case, to manage day to day what's
going on. You've got lots of leaders who are
involved, but we want them to have a smaller
group they can go to with every little
question. And now we’ve got that group, or we
will have it once they're picked.

But the idea is to let that group
tell them what their little steps in the
process are. We told them they have to have
public hearings and you have to make public
input. Where you hold them, how you hold
them, frankly that's the kind of thing we want
the Steering Committee, which is going to be
community-dominated, to select.

MR. DOUGHERTY: In your opinion is
this something along the lines of the North
Delaware plan, the New River City plan?
MR. KNAPTON: I'll give two examples, the North Delaware being one, in which a plan for a long distance area starting in Bridesburg and going up was reviewed by technicians and reviewed by every community group and elected officials.

The other example is an urban design study on the Schuylkill River, not on the Delaware, but fairly recently with the underwriting of the Schuylkill River Development Corporation. And that was a kind of a visioning process of looking at our Schuylkill from basically Bartram's Gardens to the mouth of the Schuylkill. And allowing a lot of people from a lot of different parts of the community on either side of the Schuylkill River to come and have input on what they thought they wanted to see and what would be the impact of what they asked for.

So that consultant then gave three very broad pictures, three very broad scenarios. I'm not going to go into detail on that, that's not today's meeting. But the point is, the mandate to that consultant and the product that we got as an end result was
very useful. It was a reflection of public
sentiment and it turned that public sentiment
into, well, what are the costs for these
various options?

I think that's one of the kind of
products we can expect from the Penn Praxis
process. I think I can say that even without
having, you know, a document and working plans
and so forth in hand.

MR. GREENBERG: I would also add,
the seven of you are all members or your

associations can select members to serve on
this committee. So a lot of what the shade of
this committee is is going to be set by what
you want.

MR. DOUGHERTY: For example, the
North Delaware plan, they had a provision in
it, they were not-profit for land acquisition.

Do you foresee something like that coming out
of this?

MR. KNAPTON: Any number of kinds of
land acquisition might be entertained. For
example, we've used urban renewal process.
Now the state law has altered that very
recently. But for this purpose a lot of land
along the waterfront is already in black certified areas so we can already use existing ordinance for that.  

MR. GREENBERG: I would also add that Penn Praxis's work plan includes implementation phase that they're going to recommend. And given what we've all heard over the last year along the waterfront, I think it's safe to say that we all assume some form of non-profit or some sort of other.

entity or include the expansion of these existing entities or some sort of structure along those lines will be adopted. But again, this is where we think that there needs to be some entity, but the exact shape and composition and how it's developed needs to be created through this process. And the hope is that guided by the advisory group Penn Praxis will recommend something that sometime in 2007 we can make real.  

MR. DOUGHERTY: State Representative John Taylor.  

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Thank you, John.
Kev, and to you and the Mayor, good
luck with that process. We'll be glad to
participate. But good luck over 12 months. I
hope you don't get the same reaction as I got
and the District Councilman got on Thursday
when the very groups you're talking about
threw out the District Councilman out of the
meeting and tried to throw me out of the
meeting. So the open transparent process is
required, and we're doing something. But when
the community groups want to have their own
thing without any elected officials in the
room, it's pretty worse.
I'll just make another editorial
comment that you said that the city is well
prepared to have the ability to go ahead and
move forward with the Zoning Board of
Adjustments, et cetera. If they had that
power, let's hope that that would not be as
abused as it has been in the past. Let's hope
we don't have this crazy archaic system where
the District Councilman has total veto power
over anything that's done.
So there is a history in why at
least the legislature has decided to do that.
As I said in the last week based on the latest arrogant bite that was taken out on 862, that, you know, if I have a shot at giving you zoning back, I will. However, it has to be done the way it's supposed to be done, the way it's laid out in the code and things and not with these defacto processes that are used. So all we're doing if we used the process that we've always used, is take it out of the Gaming Board and putting it in the hands of one Councilman.

MR. GREENBERG: That, sir, is why with Councilman DiCicco's help, in fact, we -- the Gaming Task Force back last year when we were looking at this issue, drafted a proposed Commercial Entertainment District ordinance, with the Planning and Law Department's help, amongst others, that would create a specific process for large scale entertainment projects.

There really weren't -- you know, I'm the president of a civic association, and again, when some guy wants to build a fence a little bit higher than it is, you don't want to have all the Council involved, you need a
point person. But this is not that. This is something larger. And our process with this was to put the Planning Commission in that spot, the one who sort of makes the recommendation and go directly to Council. This bill, this Commercial

Entertainment District Ordinance, which became law in March, is only targeting those large scale developments. And through a process that has community input, but at the front end. And frankly, I'm happy to give you as much information as you want tomorrow, I'll give you my card before I leave, call me, we'll work with you so you have the information about what we got in law here in Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Oh, I have that. What I would like to ask all three, actually, if Ron wants to chime in here, if any of you have completely absorbed 862 in its present form to explain to this panel the role of the Commercial Development District or Commercial Entertainment District, that it's
been sort of incorporated into the bill. Is it? Isn't it? Is it? I know it's law in Philadelphia. It sort of absorbed it into the Gaming Commission process, but not really. So I would like from a legal point of view what you think the effect of that is and how strictly it is under the current version of that bill that the Gaming Board would have to adhere to that or not adhere to that.

MR. PATTERSON: I think the key -- REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Maybe just for the audience go through that again, if you would, about how that's a part of it.

MR. PATTERSON: Sure. I mean, I don't know all the particulars, but I think the key is whether the input from the Steering Committee is binding. I represent developers but I also come from a civic background. And, you know, when you do these large scale developments, pretty much half of what you're looking at, if you have any kind of conscience, is what the impacts are on the public health, safety, welfare and traffic. And there's certain uses that even
the legislature has deemed that require additional consideration. And they're under a group of regulated uses under the Zoning Code which has things like massage parlors, pawn shops, pool halls, go-go bars, which the legislature has determined that these uses bring secondary impacts around in the neighborhood with increased crime, prostitution, drugs, et cetera, that they then send to the Zoning Board. And whether that's good or bad. But it gives the -- going to the Zoning Board is a public forum and gives the opportunity of neighbors and civic groups and elected officials to voice their opinion. And if it doesn't meet those standards the Board can deny the applications. So with that said, you know, this legislation to me takes all that public process, for the most part, out of the hands of the neighborhood groups and the civic groups and rests it with the legislature, of course. But I think with the Steering Committee it would have to be binding what their comments are, what their opinions are.
And I gave you one example. Where I lived in Southwest Philly the U.S. Postal Service was relocated. And while they met with us about what our concerns were, we really just got lip service. We had a Steering Committee. In the end they vote their sovereign immunity in saying, well, we're the federal government, we don't have to follow or get any permits or approvals. So our concerns about traffic and impact, noise, lighting, et cetera, they pretty much ignored. And so we were inundated with 60,000 truck trips a week of tractor trailers and delivery trucks going in and out of the postal service. So, again, I think what it comes back to is whatever the input is has to be binding.

MR. GREENBERG: Representative, I think that's a story that's being told a lot, is that they have adopted the provisions of a Commercial Entertainment District. And with two very limited examples, it's just not true. Let me walk through what we would call sort of the high points of the
development, the rules that we created for the
Commercial Entertainment District and I'll
tell you what they do on the current version

of 862.
Actually, to be fair, I don't know
if this is the version of it if there was any
amendments on Thursday. But the version as of
Wednesday, was the last time I looked at it.
I don't think anything's changed.
Regulated uses that Ron was talking
about, we prohibit regulated uses, strip
clubs, massage parlors, whatever, with two
exceptions which are video game arcades and
pool halls, which we felt while they're
regulated uses under the code are appropriate
for casinos. Regulated uses are completely
allowed under the new rules. And in fact, the
existing city rules prohibiting regulated uses
are struck.
Billboards. We have rules that
allowed them to have on-site limited
billboards. A lot of billboards still, I
mean, because it's a casino and you want to
promote it. But they were limited in size,
they could not be flashing, they could not be
neon, they could not be illuminated, they could not be rotating.

For the four casino sites along the river they were limited to 20 feet above the roof line, I believe it was 30 feet in the last version, but a limited high above the roof line.

MR. PATTERSON: I guess that's so you could view it from I-95.

MR. GREENBERG: So you could view it from I-95, you could view it from the bridges.

But at the same time we didn't want to obstruct the views of the whole community and all the highrises housed on the water. I mean, we didn't want them to become towering behemoths. And we also said that they could do -- could not be rotated, illuminated and they had to be accessory, which means they had to advertise the casino.

What the state law -- what 862 now says is this, they basically increased by five the amount of billboard signage they could have, which is above what we thought was a very generous allotment.

They specifically allow illuminated,
flashing, animated and neon signs. So we're

talking about Las Vegas type signs. They
allow non-accessory signs, which means you can
have illuminated, flashing, neon signs for
something that's not the casino. Plus the guy
who happens to own the casino can make a lot
of money selling signs on his roof.

And there's absolutely no height
limit on those signs. Although, we did have
that on Delaware. We did not before the Trump
site location because we didn't think there
was a public purpose to allow access to the
river in terms of use the way there is down
here up there. But near the river we thought
that was appropriate so we did that.

Parking. We had initially said four
spots for every five gaming spots. Four
parking spaces for every five gaming spots.

And this is -- the last version of 862, this
is the change they adopted to meet our
standards. They went from one every ten to
four for every -- to eight for every ten. But
that's what the industry wants.

We picked eight for ten because the
industry says this is what we need on site to
avoid sending cars through the neighborhood.

We want that. So since the industry wants it, we were willing to do that because that made sense. Like I said, we don't want these cars in the neighborhood, that is one provision that is matched in this new version.

Height. We had a limit on height. It wasn't -- I mean, it wasn't a small limit, it was 200 feet. I mean, it wasn't like we were being absurd here. But you would need a variance if you wanted to go above 200 feet. That's gone in 862.

Lot coverage. We had said that they could only cover 70 percent of the lot. 862 says 80 percent. That's better than 100 percent they had in the last version of 862, but it's still not there. 70 percent is a lot higher than what we have.

And just for a real quick thing on lot coverage, because these are river front properties all of the water will drain, to the extent they cover the lot, into the Delaware River. Which means all of our measures and all of our efforts to handle that water will
not be applied.

And because the City of Philadelphia is treated as a single whole, to the extent that these casinos are allowed to have massive runoff into the river that's untreated and has a lot of particulates in it, the burden on every other non-casino in Philadelphia will be higher. Every business up and down this river is going to feel the obligation to make up, they're going to have to do better than they already do to make up for the casinos.

We talked about signs.

Streets and civil engineering. It used to be that we controlled -- we wanted to have, through the zoning process, a traffic management plan so we could look at what intersections does traffic from the properties were flowing in and out. That's something of an issue at Foxwoods. It's more of an issue on the North Delaware where you don't want an entrance to be right at Spring Garden Street where you get some funny turns. Or you get up to Foxwoods where you wouldn't want it to be at the base of the ramp and you would have
some funny turns. You want to do some
dedicated -- you want to figure out how to do
it right.
We don't have that authority to say,
You do this, You don't do this. We didn't
want to veto it, we just wanted to make sure
they were living up to their plans.
Set backs. In our version in the
CED there is a front, rear, side set backs.
There's a requirement for vegetative border
next to residential districts. Now there is a
front set back of ten feet rather than 30.
Access to the water up and down the
Delaware. We had said there should be a 50
foot path, 30 feet for pedestrians and 20 feet
for bikes. It is now down to 30 feet -- down
to 20 feet, sorry. We had also, with the
current version of the fixed bill that's in
Council, which is pending, said that for some
spots along the Delaware you could drop down
to 20 feet if the geography for the way the
river bends or whatever, you need to do some
things, the Planning Commission would have
that authority. They just made it 20 feet
And finally, there's no landscaping plan. Also missing from this are some things that are in that fixed bill. For example, we want to mandate that all trash must be stored inside. That is gone.

So there's a whole series of things that our plan -- and, frankly, how we got this bill is we've drafted one we liked. But then we sat down with the casino operators, we sat down with the neighborhood groups and said tell us what you think. We haven't taken all of their suggestions from either group, but every casino operator has bought in, every neighborhood group has bought in. And in fact, four of the five casinos operators have told us their plans are currently compliant with 98 percent of the CED, with the exception of this area where the river bends, which is one of the things we're fixing.

So we aren't quite sure why this is going to be a problem because they're already building to our code.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Well, Kevin,
862 better we have Senator Fumo saying that,
oh, they just did tremendous benefit to the community by what they put in 862 as it pertains to the Commercial Entertainment District. You would disagree with that?

MR. GREENBERG: I won't comment on Senator Fumo.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: I'm not asking you to comment on Senator Fumo. I want you to just -- what I thought you said, that what they put in with regard to the Commercial Entertainment District in 862 does not give you more control, but rather much less?

MR. GREENBERG: Absolutely, with the exception of parking and lot coverage where they have come very close to what we have, but not -- but didn't get there completely.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: So, I mean, that's what we're battling in the media where it's being spun that 862 is a good government and gave everything that the city already wants is put in that bill, what are you complaining about? We're just going to get the casino -- the Gaming Control Commission to adopt the Commercial Entertainment District
and proceed. And that's not true, right?

MR. GREENBERG: In my expert opinion you have stated it correctly.

MR. PATTERSON: How is the city's version -- excuse me -- enforced or appealed if the application or the design doesn't match the criteria?

MR. GREENBERG: If the application or design --

MR. DOUGHERTY: Excuse me, Kevin.

That was a very interesting question. I don't know if you heard that one.

Would you take your time, Ron, and say that into the mike, please.

MR. PATTERSON: Sure. My question was, if the design, the development design does not meet the city's criteria as stated how is it enforced and what is the appeal process both from the developer's angle, excuse me, and the civic group neighborhood angle?

MR. GREENBERG: Under the CED process right now as it stands -- well, let me tell you, the Zoning Code right now, as you know, Ron, prohibits gambling because gambling
has never been a legal activity. It's one of
those prohibited uses that you just can't
build any place in the city. The CED has
created an exception to that rule which are
the CED Districts. In the absence of a CED
District you couldn't get a zoning permit for
a gambling hall, couldn't get a use of
occupancy certificate.

MR. PATTERSON: So this establishes
a new zoning district.

MR. GREENBERG: It created its own
classification. And then you create -- within
that classification you apply to a new zoning
district. And that CED District which you now
create gambling is a permitted use. And you
get an over the counter permit. In the
absence of compliance with that, which
requires a hearing through the Planning
Commission and their evaluation and evaluation
by Streets and evaluation by Water, all of
which then goes to City Council which adopts

or rejects.

Once Council adopts -- and the
public has a lot of input through that
process. Once Council as a whole, and not a
single councilman, once Council as a whole
adopts that initiative it's an over the
counter permit and it's ready -- and there's
no appeal from that permit by either group.

If Council -- it's like a city overlay, it's
an overlay. I mean, we created a district
where this is an as-of-right permit. So if
Council does not do it, then obviously you
have PZB.

MR. DOUGHERTY: The gaming use and
all its related issues then become right?

MR. GREENBERG: If you got a CED
District and -- yes.

MR. DOUGHERTY: The focus, okay,
let's stay on that, let's not miss that point,
okay. So the Entertainment District, okay,
the minute the Entertainment District is
approved, basically the gaming and all its
related entities are by right from there, at
that point on?

Within the envelope
that's permitted in the district, yes.

MR. DOUGHERTY: The object, okay, is
that sometimes we can't or we don't want to
slow down the process. Okay. But in this
case there's so many issues -- we have one
gentleman faced social issues that go along
with it.

There's the Senate bill that some of
our brothers and sisters in the labor movement
that are here today, if you don't read that
and you don't know who the players are you
have no idea that the same people who own
Foxwoods have some other associated entities
that own the land in which Wal-Mart and some
of them other places are. So that if you
continue to move the casino down, okay,
there's some discussions about moving the
Wal-marts and the some of the other places
down further, starts to affect the livelihood
of the I.L.A., okay.

And there are things, there are
things that, you know, that we're just
starting to digest here. And I don't want
everyone in the room to automatically think
because Senate bill 862 is so bad that the
casino entertainment district is the answer to
all the woes. Because basically from a
neighborhood point of view, the minute you
have that district in place, okay, I mean, the
gaming automatically becomes by right.

MR. GREENBERG: Well, yeah. The idea, John, in terms of tailoring the districts so that we would put the districts essentially the size of the plot that's brought to us. So to talk about the Foxwoods site, the Wal­mart properties wouldn't be part of the district unless through the Planning Commission process, which is a public hearing process, and through City Council, which has a public hearing process, they are made part of that district.

MR. DOUGHERTY: And what we have to -- one of the reasons we're here, in particular, this water front, there's seven or eight neighborhoods. And I'll speak again just for Pennsport.

Pennsport starts on Snyder Avenue about 2000 South, it runs to Washington Avenue, about 900 South, somewhere in that vicinity, okay. On the lower end at Front and Mercy I have widows who lived in the same house which has been handed down from family to family who live on a $300 dollar pension from the sugar house from years ago at the
lower end that are concerned about keeping
their door open and feeling safe and worried
about keeping the water out of their basement.

On the Northern end of Pennsport I
have 25 to 30 houses over $675,000 for sale,
and a double income, rather professional,
okay, double degree group of people that
attend the same civic association. That's
within one little community. And that's so
diverse and the opinions are so different.

So you can imagine when we work our
way from the lower end of Whitman, you know,
up through Society Hill into Northern
Liberties, you have different, you have
different -- so it's not the fact that you
have three or four casinos looking at Delaware
Avenue. You have three or four different sets
of communities and different classes of people
there, okay. And so, you know, you just can't
b
sometimes we misrepresent to them, and it's a tad disingenuous, to that grandmother that lives on the 100 block of Mercy Street who votes for the last so many elections and just thinks that she's being -- you know, her interests are being protected. And they're not.

MR. GREENBERG: I will only say that the CED does not solve every issue that's associated with gaming, you're right. It's our attempt to do right what we can. If you're going to have a huge commercial development there and there are up sides and down sides to this.

And frankly, I think the CED is probably the right balance, although that's

obviously integrative terms to decide for themselves, between going fast and getting something done, and at the same time ensuring the right checks are in place to protect the communities.

What we don't want to do is end up in -- we wanted to create a system that would, frankly, allow Representative Taylor,

Representative Keller and Representative
Lederer to say to their colleagues we're not going to hold this up in court for six years, but we're going to make sure the community is protected. And that's the balance we try to strike.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Just so the audience understands my reference with regard to the zoning and the veto power or the de facto veto power of a councilman, I wasn't just talking about this particular council district or this councilman, but every district councilman where this sort of developed common law, if you will, in the city of Philadelphia is that they have that control.

And, you know, at least Representative Keller and Lederer and I have been involved in situations where we appropriate $450 million dollars for a building project that's held up for eight years with thousands of jobs at stake, and things like that, and it just gets held up for who knows what reason, even if the community all bought in, but. So that's where the thinking comes from.
But again, now, you know, after looking at all the other things that are put in that bill and the testimony we received yesterday about how damaging that is. You know, I will at least put my faith in what you're saying is that there will be an accepting, reasonable process should you have that power.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Planning Commission, now, just because the Mayor -- and we're happy that the executive order came down last week. But I imagine that the Planning Commission had to have some studies on the impact of the casinos on what would happen on a long term infrastructure going or do you have any work product to this point?

MR. KNAFTON: There's one work product which we submitted to Kevin last year. And apart from that -- also economic development work on the river front north and south, but not specific to the casinos.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, okay, how about the infrastructure in general? Like, do you have anything, you have any opinion, has there been a documented opinion, not today's
opinion, has there been anything in the past
that says, Hey, the access and egress off of
the Reed/Washington Street exit, things like
that?

MR. Knapton: For economic
development purposes we do that when specific
projects come up as to the Redevelopment
Authority and PIDC. And that's about the
limit of what I can say.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, I'm the
Chairman of the Board for the Philadelphia
Redevelopment Authority and I haven't seen
anything yet. I don't know about PIDC, but
from my perspective I haven't seen anything
yet. And I make it a point of making sure
that every new development has the proper
engineering when it comes to distribution and
processing of sewage and water and things
along those lines, so.

MR. GREENBERG: Patrick Mulligan,
who is in the room here today from the Gaming
Task Force Staff, worked with Planning and the
Streets, to the extent we have good casino
based traffic studies, they are incomplete.
We know they were done as a high level look
and now that the plans are becoming more concrete there needs to be a lot more detailed look.

MR. DOUGHERTY: The State Rep. wants to talk. I just want to follow up.

Yesterday we had a meeting -- this is relevance of our brothers and sisters at I.L.A., the Food Produce Center. I addressed it during the negotiations at the Penn's Landing Board meeting about dumping the traffic on Delaware Avenue. And I asked, and you were in the room when I asked PIDC, three, four, maybe five times. And they said, Well, we're not sure.

Yesterday we were told that it looks like most of the traffic will be ran in. And the fact that there's already been $150 million dollars or so, and that, you know, put in towards, state money toward the Produce Center. And that there was going to be a road, temporary road and permanent road and there was going to be a permanent bridge.

Does the Planning Commission take into play -- so I just don't want this to get focussed on gaming because this is talking
about jobs for people who live inside the neighborhood, you know, where I grew up at. How does, when we have a plan, who is there to represent the men and women who are working on them jobs in the layouts of the infrastructure that goes with the future development?

Because by putting a road in a wrong place it basically could landlock and cut the ability for some of the larger stevedore companies to develop and grow.

MR. KNAPTON: I think I can give a general answer to your specific question about the Naval Business Center and access. Because one of the basic problems when the city acquired the Navy Base was it was one access, Broad Street. And so from that time on the Planning Commission has been talking about, okay, the second road, the second access and what kind of bridge that would require and how much cost that will be.

Now, the specifics of that I don't know. But I know that from the outset people have said, Well, at some point, depending on the level of development on what used to be called Muston Field, the Naval Air Station
16 Field in the east end of the Naval Base, at
17 some point when that becomes developable and
18 there's a demand for it then obviously there's
19 going to be a traffic issue and a question of
20 how to pay for and where to put a major
21 bridge.
22 So basically the discussion has been
23 so far as I know, informal, but that's so far
24 as I know.
25 MR. DOUGHERTY: See yesterday, and

2 I'll move forward with this, yesterday it was
3 some specific conversation about that. The
4 cost, you know, how long it's going to be
5 there and the answers were probably permanent,
6 permanent, and we think permanent. Also the
7 conversation is a little concerning to myself
8 from a Foxwood perspective and the community's
9 perspective is that PennDOT, the DEP and the
10 Delaware Planning stated that they had been
11 given cursory, just casual type conversation
12 about parking impacts and things along them
13 lines.
14 So that's why I asked you, Dave,
15 what do you see your role? I mean, there's --
16 we didn't even talk about green space and land
acquisition and all these other points of
concern to the people that are here. We are
just looking at the basic points that we
thought were managed.

MR. KNAPTON: Well, one response to
that would be to look at the specific case.
The specific case that -- I think we're
speaking of the same thing -- expansion of the
Naval Business Center from the Food
75

Distribution Center area. The manager of each
is the PIDC. And so what we do in Planning
when looking at a parcel or a development site
where the developer owns both pieces and wants
to develop both pieces, and they're adjacent
to each other, we try to make sure the plan's
internally consistent and that it works.

And if there are a whole bunch of
other stakeholders to that, other property
owners around the perimeter, that's something
else.

But if it's internal to the two
abutting parcels, then that's a matter of the
developer to work on and come back and talk to
us.

I'm making it sound too simple,
but --

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Excuse me.

You're not only making it sound simple, you're making it sound like it's in the planning stage and we had PennDOT in here yesterday, said this is done.

MR. KNAPTON: I'm sorry to mistake then. I didn't mean to say that it's in the planning stage, but only as an example, if two property owners are side by side as the same property --

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I know we're getting off from what we were talking about, but let's just, so we can get this on the record.

DVRPC stood up here and had a slide show and said we have problems that their doing freight movement, we have problems because we have at-grade crossings again into Packer Avenue.

PennDOT then said, Oh, we're going to put a road down there. They're going to put a road across six at-grade crossings just to get into the lower end of the Navy Yard.

But not take into consideration that that's
the future development of the port. They're
going to cut the port right in half. Nobody
is saying a word. Saying, Done deal.

Asked, Well, are you putting it on a
TIP plan so that the federal government will
pay 80 percent of that? The answer is no, the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is going to take

on the whole, they said $75 million dollars,
and they didn't know how much the road was
going to cost. So they're going to take on, I
would say, $150 million dollar burden by the
time they're done. Not even put it on the TIP
list so the feds will pay, be able to pay
80 percent of it. That's planning? They're
sitting there and they're saying, This is what
we're going to do, and this is planning? And
the City Planning Commission has no idea
what's going on.

MR. KNAPTON: Well, I can't speak
for PennDOT.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: And why is
it -- PIDC, isn't that a -- that's a public
entity?

MR. KNAPTON: That's a public
entity, yes.
REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, you're acting like they're private developers.

That's the public's, it's not PIDC, that's us.

It's not like PIDC owns two pieces we want to develop.

We're saying you got to sit down and take a look at this whole thing. And it's not -- it's not a plan, maybe it's a plan, but I'm going to say it's a bad plan. All right.

It's a bad plan. It's not looking five years down the road, not along 30 years down the road like we're supposed to look. It's going to cut off all future development of the port industrial that we're interested in. Just so you can get into the lower end of the Navy Yard.

We say, take your time, again, let's look at this, there's got to be a better way to do this. Not spending $100 million dollars to get a bridge which, from my understanding, may be the largest structure in South Philadelphia by the time they're done with it.

And we're just jamming that in. Everybody ready? Jam. Did anybody know about this going on? It's going on. Plans. City
Planning. Apparently, you had something to do with it.

Off that subject. Back to 862. All right. Kevin, 862, you said as it stands now it takes away all the city's abilities to

regulate strip clubs and everything else?

MR. GREENBERG: On the casinos themselves, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: In 862 there's an associated areas piece. In the associated areas piece this gives, from the way we read it -- and nobody's been able to tell us any different -- the casinos the ability to jump anywhere they want if they could connect it by bridge, pedestrian walkway, variance.

MR. GREENBERG: There's actually even a more scary argument, although I think we would fight that in court.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: No, let's have the scary argument, it's Halloween.

MR. GREENBERG: So in theory the streets or the utilities, or something like that, could connect it to Chestnut Hill, in theory. We would fight -- I think there's a
good argument that you can't go to Chestnut Hill with this, but how far you go --

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But you could reach, through variance, you could reach every property along the Delaware River and you could reach every property across Delaware Avenue.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: We would love to get Chestnut Hill into this battle.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We could use their support.

MR. GREENBERG: Let me put this way, I think getting across Delaware Avenue by a couple of properties or getting up or down the river a couple of properties from where you are is what the author of this version of 862 seems to be contemplating. That is what we think they are contemplating. On behalf of the city I'm not real, real happy with that.

And I think we would try to do what we can do to legally fight that.

But, I mean, I'm here representing the Solicitor, that's going to have to be his call at the end of the day.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So in theory
what we're saying you believe is also to be true, that the current version of 862 will give -- wrap up in a bow and give to the

casinos all future development of the Delaware River?

MR. GREENBERG: I certainly would not say that for the record in any sort of way.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I'll say it. Do you agree with me?

MR. GREENBERG: I think we'd be fighting that, let me put it that way.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: You'll fight it. But that's what this bill does right now?

MR. PATTERSON: There was also a subtlety that was crossed over that Kevin mentioned in the city bill, and it had to do with the approval process.

And typically, when you're looking at zoning there's two parts, there are the uses and then there's the zoning dimensional requirements, the height, the bulk, the set back, et cetera. And you go through the Water Department and the Planning Commission and the Streets Department and they review your plans.
You file with L & I. It either

meets the code requirements. If it doesn't,

and if you choose not to meet them, then you

go to the Zoning Board for variance relief

because you're deviating from the code.

This is a rarely used process

described here, that you go through the

initial steps and the reviewing agency is not

L & I or the Zoning Board, it's City Council.

City Council, with the Planning Commission,
determines whether your plan meets the zoning

code requirements. If it does, you

automatically get your permit. If it doesn't,
you don't get your permit. But back to if it

does, there's no appeal process unless you

challenge the City Council action by saying it

was improperly voted case or they exceeded

Constitutional authority.

So it does take everyone's input out

of the process. Which means that it's very,

very important to look at what the parameters

are in the bill in terms of the uses and the

set backs and everything you're just
mentioning. Because once it's in there, you can't change it. If it's in there and you meet it, you go to City Council, they have to approve it. So it's rarely used because it's a curve ball kind of process.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We've been saying this all along, if this bill gets out in two years everybody will be up screaming and it will be too late.

This bill will not be able to be -- I said it at the Editorial Board, making laws is not an exact science. Where we pass a bill, we pass a law, then we're back fixing it two years later. We pass this bill, 862, in its current form, there's no fixing it. There's no fixing it. Because we are just handing over future development of the Delaware River, and my concern, the port of Philadelphia, to casinos who have no interest in developing, only in their own interest.

MR. GREENBERG: I would take that one step further and say that not only are the zoning codes preempted under this new version of 862, but when the Gaming Act was passed before the provision on zoning was struck.
down, the prohibition -- the preemption was simply limited to land use controls.

The current language preempts all regulatory and police powers which includes fire inspection, it includes fire code compliance, it includes the plumbing codes, it includes all of the building codes, all of the building permitting, all the building inspections. You will have to have a state entity responsible, which doesn't exist. Where they will have to hire folks at the state boards to look at fire codes and building codes and all of the compliance issues and the whole permitting process.

That, frankly, we have L & I inspectors, good, bad, different, they're here and they know what they're doing. Okay. The state doesn't have those folks in Philadelphia and they will be watching over these properties.

And that's something that, again, is one of the things that they just sort of slipped into this version of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, Kevin,
I know this won't give you any solace, but I'm
telling you, they're not only tearing apart
what the city has rights to, they're taking
riparian rights that have always been a
legislative process. It's always been the
purview of the legislature to give riparian
rights and to go through the process, put a
bill in, get it through committee.

Representative Taylor and
Representative Lederer and myself have done
these numerous times. It works, the process
works. Get it through committee, have public
hearings. Get over in the Senate, get it
through the committee, have public hearings.
Have the governors, you know, right from the
beginning saying they're for this, they're
against it. That's taken out of it, that's
taken away from the Pennsylvania legislature.

And on top of it, we had DEP in here
yesterday, we're saying if 862 passes in its
current form what will DEP, the Department of
Environmental Protection, have anything to do
or say about these casino sites? Their answer
was no.
So I don't know, I mean, we have a whole department in the Commonwealth that protects the environment, that's their job. If this bill passes in its current form that department is saying, We don't know who's going to protect the environment, it's not us.

So, I mean, we're here, this is another reason why we should have this, and more often. We believe this goes way too far. As Representative Taylor always says, This is excessive, this is not what we intended, this is not what anybody intended. This is bad.

We're hearing from you -- I think I'm hearing from you -- that they're given the right to, if that's part of the casino district, they could put strip clubs, they could put whatever they want in there and no one has anything to say about it.

MR. PATTERSON: It's in there.

MR. GREENBERG: I think the answer is the way the -- there is a good argument a developer could make that the areas immediately adjacent to and around the casinos -- and how far that stretches I think somebody would fight about -- but the areas
immediately adjacent to and around the casinos
would be exempt from a whole host of our laws,
be they regulated uses, be they building
codes, whatever else.

And our firefighters will have to go
into these death traps to save people's lives,
but we can't make sure they live up to our
code before they have to go in there. And
that does not make a lot of sense, you know,
in this industry or anywhere else.

MR. DOUGHERTY: State Representative
Marie Lederer.

REPRESENTATIVE LEREDER: Kevin, you
said there's a traffic plan. Traffic
presently on Delaware Avenue is not
controlled. The I-95 exit just a couple
blocks down from here that spews onto Delaware
Avenue just north of Washington Avenue creates
gridlock every day no matter what hour of the
day it is. So that is only one of the many
problems.

And does your traffic plan take into
consideration the 3,000 new condos plus the
thousands of cars that will be using Delaware
Avenue and let's not forget the buses, the
buses that casinos bring?

MR. GREENBERG: I may have misspoke.

We don't have a traffic plan. We have a traffic assessment. And this predates the 3,000, this is just after Best-Buy opened because this is when we took the counts. The answer is --

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: What year would that be?

MR. GREENBERG: It was mid-2005, spring/summer 2005.

Patrick, it was April?

MR. MULLIGAN: May.

MR. GREENBERG: May 2005 is when we took the counts.

It gives us some sense of what was there. It is not a plan by any stretch. What we did was we took the May 2005 counts, overlaid casinos and came up with some assessments and predictions. We do not have plans. Frankly, as far as we're concerned, it's the burden of the city folks working with

gaming operators in the state to make sure these plans work for everybody, but we don't have plans until we know what's going on yet.
At this point it's just, what we have is an assessment from last year. 

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: But it's not just casino traffic, it's condo traffic and traffic off of I-95 for people who want to get off maybe in Center City. 

Yesterday, one of the gentlemen from PennDOT said that people in the condos should use mini-buses to go back and forth to Center City. 

MR. GREENBERG: Shuttles. 

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: A shuttle. And that's fine if you're going to Center City. But not everybody's going to Center City. 

MR. GREENBERG: I would only say that that is exactly -- that is one of the driving forces for the Mayor's executive order this week is to try to take that sort of -- and develop a real plan around traffic driven by the community and the business associations over the next year. But it's not there now. And it won't be there by the time the casinos are here. 

And that's part of what's, frankly,
going to make the challenge for the three of you in Harrisburg so difficult. And trying to get the Gaming Control Board to look at these issues and consider them and make the casinos do what they need to do.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Thank you.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Matt.

MR. RUBEN: This is Matt Ruben, for the stenographer.

A couple of things. One is that it seems to me that the associated areas part of this legislation is, in and of itself, a total deal breaker. And that in essence what it does is it says that the Delaware River front is no longer part of Philadelphia.

And the stripping of zoning authority, even more worrying, of regulatory authority, as you were speaking of, Kevin, really makes the Chairman of the Gaming Control Board an imperial viceroy overseeing Philadelphia. And I'm dead serious. Someone who is far away who is charged with regulating an area which is, in effect, being occupied.

And I think that it is incumbent upon our city, and I know City Council has set
aside, authorized the setting aside of funds for this.

I think as long as the associated areas language remains in any shape or form in 862, the original definition did not include the ability to gobble up adjacent property, as long as this definition remains in any shape or form, as long as zoning authority is stripped, even if they photocopy the CED and stuck it in as a state version, as long as zoning authority is stripped and as long as city regulatory authority is stripped, I think it is incumbent morally upon the city to sue the Commonwealth. And I would hope that the Solicitor and the Mayor and the City Council would draw that line in the sand.

We have legislation, I believe Mr. -- Representative Keller was saying, in two years people will be up in arms and it will be too late. And that's the situation we're in now with Act 71 itself. And that was passed and we fell back. And then 862 is passed -- I mean, is being considered, and where the debate and the public's fear is about, Well, if we can put the city's
regulations into the state version then maybe it will be taken care of. And I know that people in the room don't agree with that, but that's what's happening out in the press. And how far do we fall back before we say no and go to war over this? I think that the city must sue the Commonwealth if any of the three provisions I mention are in this bill when and if it is voted on. Do you have any thoughts from what the thinking is in City Hall about this?

MR. GREENBERG: I will tell you that conversations are being had. And I think we want to wait and see what happens on 862. I will only tell you my personal capacity, rather than City Hall capacity, that there are a lot more than three deal breakers in this bill. That deal breakers are not the term that I want because this is not a deal that's worth considering. That it doesn't do anything. I know the Mayor has been very clear that he did not want to slightly improve 862's preemption provision, he wants it out. And he's been very clear on that. The manner of
taking it out, hopefully our legislative
deleation is able to take it out for us and
it never becomes an issue. And I don't want
to go to the hypotheticals. But the Mayor's
take on it has been very clear, there should
be no preemption.

And there are a lot more deal
breakers. And so it's a bad deal and we don't
want to get into the discussion.

MR. DOUGHERTY: State Representative

Matt, are you done?

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Just
one question with regard to the commercial
entertainment districts. And I'll ask this,
with the current version of 862 or without,
let's say it wasn't there at all, I think this

question would apply either way, am I correct
in understanding that as it pertains to
casinos that there's very little, if any,
judicial oversight of that should anything
occur in terms of that district that it is
appealable? That there's particular
provisions that pertain just to casinos in the
current commercial entertainment district?
MR. GREENBERG: I believe the only language -- and I don't have it with me -- of the CED bill that pertains to casinos is allowing of an use. But it would be the same rules that would apply to any -- there would still be judicial oversight whether or not they comply with the building envelope, the signage to whatever else they're permitted for. There would still be judicial oversight over the various permits being properly issued. However, you have to prove error. And our design here was if a casino was developed, licensed by the state and put in a place where City Council, through the Planning Commission and City Council, determined it was appropriate to have it, with a plan of development that is approved by City Council, it would be presented by, the gaming applicant said, This is what we want to build, the Planning Commission will work with them on it, Streets and L & I and Water will work with them on it. And then the City Council will review it to pass it all the way through these public processes. And at that point they would have and it would be able to sort of go.
right to build once you go through the
process, rather than go through a series of
hearings judicially.

Now, if somebody wanted -- if they
get the permit and then they choose to build
five times the sign facing that's allowed or
they put a flashing neon sign which is
prohibited, obviously you still have
oversight. 862, on the other hand, takes that
whole process out and the first appeal is the
State Supreme Court.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Let me just,
instead of asking a question I'll just say
that could you please look at the provisions?
And I hope that you and I maybe will get a
chance to talk more when we're through here
and we get some of this stuff in writing a lot
quicker than our -- then she'll get it for me.
But can you just look at that and see as it
pertains -- the CED as it pertains to casinos,
how different that is from any other bar,
restaurant, commercial, retail or whatever.
We don't need to do that right this
second. I mean, one of the lines, you know,
my friend Mike O'Brien gives us is that under
that provision it may be easier to get a

casino than it will be to get a hotdog stand

because of the particular provisions in the

commercial entertainment district.

MR. GREENBERG: After Tad Dechert

says yes, you got to go through City Council,

but not L & I. And I'm not going to weigh on

it on which one is the easier process.

MR. PATTERSON: Yeah, but isn't it

ture that the review at City Council is really

just a checklist review, do you meet what the

parameters are set forth in the bill or the

code? There's no discretionary review, it's

the checklist. Did you meet the set back? Do

you meet the uses?

MR. GREENBERG: No, actually, it's

actually -- there's no requirement that

Council vote yes or no based on the checklist.

Council gets to undertake a planning

discretion process. Once Council's determined

that it's appropriate to put a casino there,

frankly, I think we would all like to avoid a

situation where we get into a showdown with

the state where Council decides that a given

piece of property is inappropriate for a
casino and the state wants it. Because then we get into inviting the kind of preemption legal fight that the state has not -- and the state has been quite successful with the Parking Authority and some other places where, you know, it becomes problematic. But within that I think what we're really talking about is the building envelope, the traffic impact and sort of figuring out what works and what doesn't work. But the idea is to have a real process that's a partnership. And I will say this, that of the five sites there's some that are doing a lot better than others in terms of working with the communities to figure out what works and what doesn't work, and how to make it within the neighborhood and what doesn't fit within the neighborhood. And there's some that are -- don't even have any specifics at all.


MR. LEVINS: Kevin, earlier this year we had a meeting in Holy Name Church in Fishtown where Herb and I reside. And Darryl
Clarke came up to me and said, You know, your
organization really needs to think about an
initiative to ensure that opportunists who may
come into your community after a casino
applicant receives a license to turn Girard
Avenue into a series of pawn shops, check
cashing, go-go bars, whatever.
And I mean, based on what I've
heard, and I'm familiar with the issues
associated with the Senate bill, but putting
that aside, we're going to be meeting with
Councilman Clarke shortly, do we already have

those protections with respect to those
specific types of industries? Or is there
other zoning overlays that could be done with
his support? I mean, he's the one who brought
it up to us.
MR. GREENBERG: Some of both. With
respect to go-go bars, for example, you're
well covered. There is a restricted use
provision except if somebody has an exemption
from that they're covered.
With respect to pawn shops or payday
lenders or whatever, I don't believe there is
such a provision. And so there's probably a
middle ground. And again, if the Councilman asks, I'm sure our department will be happy to work with him.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Questions about -- yes.

MS. GOODWIN: My name is Rene Goodwin and I have two questions. The first question, if I understand correctly, the purpose of the commercial entertainment district is to create a sort of an oversight body. However, it is also my understanding that if 862 is passed in its present form without major change that that really prevails over the entertainment district.

So am I correct in assuming that the worse of all possible worlds if 862 is passed, the commercial entertainment district is virtually powerless or has power only to the extent that the casinos and/or the State Gaming Control Board is willing to accept its suggestions? That's one of my questions.

My second question is, several months ago I had the opportunity to attend a meeting with the Mayor, other city officials and community representatives. It was the
first go 'round in this particular series of
looking, again, at a water front plan. I
remember the Mayor stated in a sort of a
frustrated fashion repeatedly that he didn't
want to bring bodies of people together to
develop a water front plan, again, only for it
to become a lovely plan on paper that sits up
on the shelf along with some other plans. And
the problem has always been the resources to
implement that plan.

Well, first of all, you're on a fast
track. And I'm just wondering, and I don't
know that you can honestly answer this, but I
am just wondering, is it the intention now,
even on this fast track, that some of the
resources or the primary resources to develop
this new water front plan would come from the
casinos? Because if not, then why are we on
the fast track if we don't have the resources
to implement? Thank you.

MR. GREENBERG: On the first one, I
would go so far as to say I think you may have
understated the problem. With the CED
becoming essentially a moot process. We will
be taking that plan and going to the casinos
and saying, please comply with this, this makes sense. But it will be a please and not any sort of regulatory authority. But it will become a guideline. And at least to the extent of what they said so far the casinos have by and large agreed to go with that. Even if -- and to some extent, the timing works for us in that the extent they want to start construction in January or February and just planning already, they have been planning in a CED world. But -- MS. GOODWIN: Right. And I will respect you in the morning. MR. GREENBERG: And as I said, you may have understated it. With respect to the second one, the Mayor has repeatedly said just that, that this doesn't work if we don't have the resources to do it. And the plan has to sing and bring resources to bear. We have reason to believe there's going to be substantial foundation support, not just for the plan, but for the implementation. We believe that our legislative leaders will, if they see a wonderful plan, find resources to help us
implement it both at the state and at the local level. But the plan has to -- it has to sing for its supper, essentially. And the plan is to do that.

In terms of going on a fast track, I don't think we're on that much of a fast track. I mean, we're going fast. The idea of using Penn Praxis and the foundation money to do this is to allow us to do it in a year rather than five.

But I think the reason we're on a fast track is if we wait five or three years a lot of this development will have already happened. So it's not a question of getting the resources, it's a question of getting this done before it happens through market forces without any sort of planning.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I'd like State Representative Taylor to respond and then we'll go to Flip Renzi.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: This is a question for Kevin, John.

Unfortunately, we need to act tomorrow, tonight. Can you give me your opinion based on our discussion that in the
event that we were able to strip out of this
bill things like the billboard provisions, the
utility/sewage provisions, the associated area
provisions, the riparian rights, a lot of the
new things that were in there. But if was
retained in that, and let's say we can't get
rid of the total preemption zoning, but added

the commercial entertainment district
language, would the extraction of those things
that you think trump the commercial
entertainment district language, would that
make it a better bill or make no difference?

MR. GREENBERG: The Mayor has always
said that we do not expect as the city of
Philadelphia to pick where these sights go.
The legislature has made very clear that the
Gaming Control Board gets to pick which two
sights get these casinos. What we are focused
on is how they get built.

We do not try, and we have never
tried, to preempt. In fact, the version of
the commercial entertainment legislation
amendments that are pending in front of City
Council now, that Councilman DiCicco
introduced in a cooperative effort with the
Administration, say just that, that we expect
the Gaming Control Board to pick where this
goes and we do not ever assert that.
I'm not sure why much more than that
is needed beyond that, frankly, Representative
Taylor. I'll direct your question to the
Mayor. I'm not in a position to say what
would be a deal or no deal or good or bad.
Clearly, you're focusing on things
that need fixing. But whether or not the city
would think it's a good deal or, as Matt
pointed out, deal breakers, there's a lot of
deal breakers in this deal and that's why I
don't think the Mayor's ever wanted to have
this discussion because there's just so many
deal breakers embedded in this piece of
legislation.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Flip Renzi.
MR. RENZI: Flip Renzi, former and
future flood recipient from the 100 block of
McKean Street. And I also have a
family-sustaining job on the Philadelphia
water front.
You keep talking about your plan.
And it seemed like to me that your plan that
you presented to the casino people, they just
took it and wrote whatever they felt like it.
As far as you didn't want billboards so high,
you didn't want anything to light it up and
all this other stuff. And the casinos just
went, nah, we're going to have rotating
billboards.
You also said that the casinos are
allowed to dump their water into the Delaware
River. And any other future business will
have to make up for what the casinos are
doing. I don't know why the residents
couldn't take their water and dump it into the
Delaware River and make the casinos build a
new sewer system.
But what I see in the City's plan
is you really don't have a plan. You could
ride down Delaware Avenue on a Friday
afternoon at 5 o'clock without the 300 new
condominiums or the casinos and you ain't
getting down Delaware Avenue. So as far as
your plan is, you don't have it.
What I'm saying is, taking into
consideration -- or left out of the
consideration, have been the residents and the
laborers on the Philadelphia waterfront.

Once your plan goes into effect, my unprofessional opinion, is the casinos have carte blanche. And they're going to do anything they feel like. So as far as holding up bill 862, that's a good thing. But you keep saying your plan and I don't think you have a plan.

MR. GREENBERG: Mr. Renzi, I think I may have either misspoke or you may have misunderstood me. The city has, at this point I guess, some analysis and we have a process to create this plan that's not there yet.

To the extent we're talking about casino regulation, we have a law, the problem is that bill 862, which we are all sort of faced with the reality of the legislature considering in the next week or so, intends to gut that law and make it moot. We don't like that. That's part of why -- I know I have spoken as strongly on this as I have. And I know all three members of the legislature up here have spoken as strongly as they have both here and in other forums. And I know that's what a lot of our local officials want. There
are state officials who want otherwise.

But if, to the extent that you are right, that we cannot protect residents the way we are regulating residents in a way we are not regulating the casinos, that is the reality if the legislature says the city cannot regulate casinos.

If the city can regulate casinos they will not be allowed to dump water in a way that's inconsistent with other development, they will not be able to build unsafe buildings in a way that's inconsistent with other development. We're going to hold them up to the same process of development that we use for other large development and do it right. We're going to walk them through it and we're going to move fast. But we're going to make sure they go through the same set of processes that other major developments do and then streamline it once they're clear, once they're doing what they need to do to be responsible members of Philadelphia's community.

We don't like casinos, we don't hate casinos, we haven't picked to have them, we
aren't opposing them, they're coming. And so our goal here is to regulate them like we regulate every other business. Knowing in reality that the state has a definitive interest in getting these up fast, and, frankly, so do we. The city is going to get about $30 million dollars a year from these casinos. Not going to solve all these problems by any stretch, but that does go into the General Fund. And we have an interest in starting that in 2009 just like the casinos did. The casinos get a lot more than $30 million, but --

MR. DOUGHERTY: What I'll do is I'll go to this young woman up front, then I'll come back to Jimmy Paylor.

MS. THORPE: My name is Sarah Thorpe, I have two questions, actually. My first was about riparian rights, but I'm going to go to my second question because something that Kevin just said reminded me of something. The $30 million dollars from the -- the host fee that's coming from the state as a part of gaming, we have heard that that is already earmarked to go to expansion of the
25 Convention Center and that money is not

2 at all in any way going to supplement city
3 services that we're going to need once these
4 facilities come. So my question is, how is
5 that money going to be spent? And then if I
6 could ask a second question about riparian
7 rights, that would be great.
8
9 MR. GREENBERG: First of all, Sarah,
10 congratulations on your new job.
11
12 MS. THORPE: Thank you.
13
14 MR. GREENBERG: The $30 million
15 dollars or the $26 to $30 million is the range
16 we're talking about host fees, actually what
17 it is, it's a payment to the General Fund.
18 And so it goes into the General Fund and out
19 of the General Fund we spend money. There's
20 not an earmarked fund for it. So, no, it is
21 not dedicated to the Convention Center. It
22 goes into the General Fund.
23
24     What goes to the Convention Center?
25 Under the Gaming Act, 52 cents on every dollar
26 the casino makes gets paid into taxes.
27 30-some cents of it goes to lower our
28 individual Philadelphia wage taxes, around the
29 state property taxes. 13 cents, give or take,
goes to the race tracks for reasons of legislative compromise. Four percent goes to the host municipalities, which is the $26 to $30 million dollars. And five percent goes to a fund for economic development. Of that five percent the legislature has said for the first ten years in all but two counties of the state can be spent on any sort of economic development. In Pittsburg and in Philadelphia it's use is -- in Allegheny County and Philadelphia County it's uses are very constrained. In Philadelphia it's only for the Convention Center for the first ten years. So that's that five percent.

The four percent that is the host fee goes into the General Fund and like other General Fund money is spent on services or whatever else gets spent that way.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Yes. Riparian rights.

MS. THORPE: Thank you. The second question on riparian rights.

We've discussed a little bit in S.B. 862 about the riparian rights issue that is in
the current amendment. But with respect to riparian rights on a larger scale with the river front, if we are having this increased push for public access to the river front and public green space along the river front, why would we give away riparian rights that are already in the public realm and sell those or give those to private developers when we really don't even have enough public space on the river front already?

Is there talk in Harrisburg about riparian rights and the Governor's moratorium that nobody really understood six months ago about these riparian issues?

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I've always said I never understood the Governor's moratorium because the Governor has veto power. Just to say there's a moratorium doesn't stop any one of us in the legislature from putting a riparian rights bill in. We put it in, and as I explained, it goes through the normal legislative process, public hearings everybody has access to. We believe that system has worked.
We had testimony yesterday from DEP that it's not only worked, it's worked for 300 years. It's one of the oldest licenses granted in the United States. It does work.

As far as 862? Just ripping it all out and just giving whoever wins the casino license in Philadelphia, only in Philadelphia, whoever wins the casino license wins all their problems with riparian rights will go away.

We are opposed to that. We are trying to get it out of the bill. We don't know why it's in the bill. We didn't put it in the bill. It just showed up in the House two weeks ago? It came out of the Senate, it was amended in the Senate with all these things it in, came back to the House. We've been fighting it ever since it came back to the House. We're-- I don't know why it's in there. I don't believe it should be in there.

We're doing everything we can to get it out of there.

MS. THORPE: I think my question was more focused on not necessarily the S.B. 862 for the casinos, but riparian rights for other
development, not necessarily casinos.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Like I said, they've always been the same. We've always worked with them, they have public comment, we've done a number of them that. It's intact now. The way it is now the public has to come and have their comments. If 862 passes just for the casinos, not only the legislators, we don't have anything to say about it, the public doesn't have anything to say about it.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Sarah, I don't know, except for those licensed properties, if you will, the riparian rights have not changed. But for those that get a license on that particular property, they have, for all intents and purposes, are given riparian rights.

Now it's a much more complicated explanation now with these credits that they get and all that. There's no legislative process at all involved in those particular rights. And there's virtually, the way it was drafted, there would be virtually no cost by the time they're done.

But is it going to affect north of
the site, south, it would be the same way.

Which we also think is unfair to anybody else that has to go through this long and sometimes, you know, expensive legislative process. But we're just giving it to them.

And this is just -- the riparian rights bill is one of many elements that were just put in that bill that gives complete full range of authority to just the casinos. It just strips any ability to stop them. And they'll tell you that that's why it's in there. It's not really magic. They'll say, We don't want anybody putting a stop sign up for us in any way. And they strip every single thing out of there.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Jim Paylor.

MR. PAYLOR: John, before I go on, I might have taken two weeks to give you a history of the port so I know I can't do that. So I wrote my notes on my jacket. So I thought it would be shorter, I think.

First of all, let me thank the whole panel. I mean that sincerely.
attended a meeting that allowed input, okay,
from what I'll refer to the working class
people and the people voting along the river
ports. Most of them are familiar that the
demographics of the river ports are changing
drastically which creates a situation that
causes us to talk about the subject that we're
talking about right now.

My comments, however, probably
should have been made yesterday but I wasn't
aware that this was happening. And that's not
anybody else's fault, I'm not blaming you.

But my concern is we have been
speaking here for two hours, and with the
exception of what the state officials have
raised, along with yourself, John, the
discussion has been casino entertainment
district.

Okay. Now, if you look this way or
we look that way, okay, this was industrial
port and still is an industrial port. It
hasn't been talked about for two hours. Now,

again, that might have part of yesterday's

meeting.

But my concern is, I just heard,
well, one of the attractive things that casinos is going to generate $30 million dollars of revenue for the city. It's displacing, it's not new, it's displacing other revenues that existed on the water front at one time. And if you assess that, you probably find out there was $30 million or more.

My concern is right now when I listen to the Planning Commission, and I can't pretend to know about city planning and state planning, okay, I know how to negotiate a contract, I know about the impacts of what you're considering doing will have on what I see is the elimination of working class families along the river water district.

Our members have a right, if not an obligation, to be part of that commission that helps develop water front property for this reason, they've already invested their money, okay. They're the lowest paid longshoremen on the East Coast. They make $40,000 to $50,000 less than every other longshoreman from Maine to Texas and including the West Coast. They have the lowest paid pensions on the East
Coast. That was all done, okay, with the attempt to keep cargo coming in through the port of Philadelphia. Now, at one time this port had 3.7 million man hours, and through automation it was reduced to 1.2 million man hours. Through the sacrifices that these people have made it's now back up to 200 million man hours. That's I.L.A. member hours alone. We are the smallest component, believe it or not, of the logistical chain of moving cargo from a ship across this country. Give you an example. There's approximately 400,000 containers that go through Packer Avenue Marine Terminal. Every one of those containers is taken out and every one of those containers can stay. That's 8,000 truckloads a year. Okay. So think of how many truck drivers are involved in that. Every one of those containers are stripped and stuffed, sometimes long distance, sometimes they're in their own immediate area. How many warehouse people are in there? Those are the jobs, okay, that were created years ago. They did a change now to
create the environment where we can limit it
to Packer Avenue Marine Terminal.

Tioga Marine Terminal, which is
north of the Ben Franklin Bridge, now has a
serious obstacle because the new vessels can't
get under the Ben Franklin Bridge, so that's
been eliminated.

My concern is, when do we start
talking to you about how to replace not
displace those who took industrial type jobs.

Because what I understand is that Philadelphia
still consists of a lot of blue collar people,
okay. It's not just, you know, the people who
are educating themselves and moving into our
area because they find Penn's Landing
attractive or Society Hill attractive.

I've had many disagreements over the
years with Bill Keller. Today I sit here and
I'm on the same page with him because he said

something I've been saying a long time ago but
never been recognized a long time ago, for the
industry to survive you're going to have
residential, you're going to have commercial,
didn't never think that you were going to have
casinos, okay, on the Delaware River.
Now, what I'm going to say is a suggestion to our state officials. I understand, I appreciate all your efforts. I mean that again sincerely. One way to balance this out might be what they did in the West Coast, okay. And I looked into it because years ago I had to try to do some more research. But they introduced a bill when they started to change the San Francisco water front into a commercial area, they introduced a bill that said for every dollar that went into making an industrial site a commercial site you have to put an equal dollar into the industry.

All of our kids are not going to go to college. They're still going to need those industrial based jobs. Something like that has to be considered. And I'm asking the legislators to consider drafting some type of, although it might be a simplified version, me just throwing it out here today, but it might help balance this other bill that you're concerned about and the impact that it would have on it. Okay.

So Flip already asked, Why isn't
labor involved? Labor is not just a partner who negotiates on behalf of working class people, we've taken a different step here. We actually had went out and analyzed what it takes to bring cargo into this facility. And once we did what's called cost per ton analysis, we actually went back to the membership and we said, Here's what it's going to take, this is what's going to be required of you to bring that cargo into the water front. And they did that. So based on their sacrifice and based on their investment, okay, and based on the stake of the 2000 pensioner bills along this area, they should be involved in the Planning Commission because they still live in the area that you're all representing.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Jim is an International Vice-President who grew up in the Pennsport/Whitman area, International Vice-President of the I.L.A.

I'll get you copies of what went on yesterday too. You know, and there's still some of the information flying around.

MR. RUBEN: Could I just say

MR. RUBEN: We get occupied a lot with really, really, really local development issues in this city, and I guess other cities. And we sometimes forget that we're -- a lot of us are unconsciously living at a time when there's a religion about urban development and that religion says -- and it's a false religion -- that industry is dead and that what cities are supposed to do is develop as hospitality destination entertainment centers. And while that is certainly a major component of modern cities, it's not the only thing. And I think that, as I said yesterday, this has always been a working city and that we need to maintain our mixed use certainly for employment and jobs and good jobs that are -- you know, we should encourage all jobs, but I think it's fair to say that a lot of the industrial jobs offer better benefits and wages and a more dignified working experience than some of the more low-end service jobs, including at least some of the jobs that the casinos will bring. And
I think we need to stand up for those.

And I think that we have an opportunity when so many other kinds of manufacturing have left Philadelphia and are difficult, if not impossible, to bring back, we have viable current thriving type of industry here and it would be shameful of us as a city and a state to discourage that because of this fake idea that all manufacturing is dead. And that it's not fashionable and it's not passe.

And you're probably not going to see photos of longshoremen in Philadelphia Style magazine. But it doesn't mean that they're not equal members of this community and that they're not part of the thriving economic base of this city.

MR. DOUGHERTY: If it wasn't, I wouldn't be here.

MR. PAYLOR: John, if I just may add one more thing to that? If you look at the competing ports, New York, they have a pretty kind of smart industrial and style wise in New York. Go down to Norfolk, Virginia, which is a little
less stylish, okay, they're spending not
millions, but billions of dollars in this
industry because, as you say, other
manufacturing jobs are disappearing, okay.
But the projections are that cargo is going to
multiply 300 percent over the next 15 years,
definitely multiply, double in the next three
years.

MR. DOUGHERTY: What we're going to
do is we're going to take a little break here
in about two minutes. Any questions
concerning the Planning Commission. Then
we're going to keep Ron around a little bit to
talk about the process of development from the

large developers' point of view. I have a
couple hands that want to follow up on that.
And just that to finish up our
conversation with our friends from the I.L.A.
here, just so you know, conversation about
this type of input. I don't believe if we
didn't have this little symposium in place,
and the object was some of the neighborhood
and city's control over our own development,
we still wouldn't have been able to come up
with the fact that that location of roads and
things like that which will split up a lot of
your work forces.

You have two hands. Gentleman right there in the sweater. Then I will go back to
Mark Stier who hasn't had the floor yet. And then we'll wrap it up with Rene. Then we'll
break and then we'll have a little discussion with casinos.

MR. GOLDEN: My name is Henry Golden, I work in the I.L.A. Look, I just want everybody to listen to this, and a lot of my friends know this, I'm a gambler. But besides that, and I'm going to shock a lot of them, I love my city.

And I'm going to tell you something, I and a lot of people who are in this room or who know people on a whim will drive an hour, hour and-a-half to Atlantic City to go gambling. Now, you're going to put casinos ten, 15 minutes away from my house. You know what this is going to do? This is going to cause wives and husbands to blow their mortgage payments. It's going to destroy marriages. It's going to destroy savings for children.
And as far as that $30 million goes, these casino owners don't give a shit about thanking the community. Go to Atlantic City. You got billion dollar casino, beautiful billion dollars buildings, you go a block away there's homeless people starving on Pacific Avenue. So that's how much they care about people. So I just want you to think about this, this is going to destroy what good neighborhoods we got left in this city. We have 300-something plus murders a year. This city in certain areas is horrible. We only have the strong points left to help build up the horrible sections. So if you're going to put casinos here, like I said, it's going to destroy marriages, it's going to destroy future savings for children, it's going to ruin our city. And I just wanted you to know that. MR. DOUGHERTY: Yesterday we had some concerns about the social issues, some of the family members of the gentlemen who kept it are in the audience today. And right now we're just trying to not even get to the
point -- the answer so far to us has been,  
Hey, well, we'll throw money at it. We're  
trying to make sure we get all these  
guidelines on where they're at and how they  
get built, the safeguards, before we even get  
to the social concerns.

Mr. Stier.

MR. STIER: I'm Mark Stier,  
Neighborhood Networks.

Three quick comments. One is, one  
of the problems with 862 is there's no reason  
to think that this imperial viceroy, as Matt  
calls it, is going to be concerned at all  
about our industrial jobs or jobs in the port  
and the piece that, controls of the city. And  
people in the city have the ability to go  
lobby our local officials. This is creating a  
government entirely out of touch with the  
people who want to control it.

Second point is, Representative  
Taylor said he wishes Chestnut Hill would get  
involved in this fight. I just want you to  
know that my organization is opposing 862.  
We're starting a lobbying campaign in the next  
couple of days. We have lots of folks in
Chestnut Hill and Mt. Airy and we're contacting all of our State Representatives.

Third point I want to make quickly is, if the city is really serious about stopping this, lawsuit is one avenue to take. It seems to me another avenue to take is for the city to pass an ordinance that says it will not provide water, sewer, fire protection, police protection or access to the streets for any part of the city that the city does not have regulatory control over. You know, if they want to get people to these casinos, let them fly them in with helicopters.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Rene.

MS. GOODWIN: I want to in particular -- I want to thank all the panelists and I want to thank all of you for being here, there should be thousands of us here, thousands of us.

But to the three Representatives in particular, all right, now we've had two days or a day and-a-half of learning lots of things, some of which we knew, a lot of which we didn't know. I don't want to leave here --
a couple of my colleagues who have worked for
the coalition here like Chris Mett, who
devoted a lot of time and effort, to Ed
Kirlin. And we don't want to leave here with
information and feeling hopeless and helpless.
So what can we do to help you help us? Please
help us.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: You could do
what constituents and citizens are supposed to

do. We've got, as you see, we've known --
this has been a learning experience and a
great experience for everybodys been
here. But if you take notice, no press, you
haven't seen any press on this. You haven't
seen press one time say that 862 is going to
destroy everything we're trying to build.
Call the press, call your local
Representatives, call us, call your state
Senators. People have to know that this
cannot just go by the way it is. Call the
leadership in both the House and the Senate.
Believe it or not, I mean, when they
were closing down the Navy Yard one of the, I
don't want to say tricks, one of the tricks we
used were we got a dozen cell phones, and back
then they were the thing -- wasn't a common
thing. And we broke down every worker in the
Navy Yard and we broke down their Congressman,
their State Senator and their State
Representative, and we had them call right
there, we had guys go around on the job site,
Here, Call. They made them call right then
and there.

When I walked up to Harrisburg they
were screaming, What are you doing? Stop
having them call me. Why are you doing that?
I said, I'm doing it because their losing
their jobs, that's why we're doing it. It is
effective. I mean, it's just a good old,
which people have gotten away from, just
picking up the phone, calling your
Representatives and saying, What are you
doing? You're killing us. You're doing the
opposite of what your job is. You're supposed
to be out there helping us and protecting us.
And according to what you're doing here in
this bill, you're hurting us. It's effective.
If you could just go out there and
just those blast e-mails, I mean, I'm not a
tech guy, that works, it's effective. We've
got to do it. We're not going to get cooperation from the press. They're going to ignore us. We've had, which is a decent amount of people the last two days, of course not enough, not enough that we want, spread the word, we don't have much time. We're going to have to go back and fight this

starting Monday, tomorrow morning we're going to go and fight this.

MS. GOODWIN: Thank you.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Can I handle if we have any questions relevant to the Planning Commission? Then we're going -- and Mr. Greenberg. We're going to break for 15 minutes and then jump back in. And then we'll talk a little bit about gaming, we had some cancellations, we'll talk about that. I'm not so sure that's a bad thing as of right now. I think it means you were effective. I think you were effective yesterday and asked the tough questions that needed tough answers and when you don't have answers, you don't show up. Okay.

So questions relevant?

Yes, Christina.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I just make one really quick comment in response to Representative Keller?

Right before the Senate voted on the bill Hallwatch was very kind in setting up a fax thing where individuals could fax their comments and requests not to pass this legislation. The Senate obviously ignored those requests from the over 300 residents of Philadelphia requesting that they do not strip zoning. They voted 50 to zero, it was unanimous. So it doesn't feel like -- I mean, people are doing things, they are trying to reach out and talk to out legislators and it doesn't feel like they're listening. So I don't know how effective that is.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, listen, I'll handle that one. They listen. 90 percent of your elected officials listen. Some have become above even public approach. That's why you have election processes.

MR. LEVINS: John, if I could just follow up one comment to what Representative Keller said. And people lose sight of the fact that with respect to the investors on
these casinos, there's a lot of people in the background who have made their fortunes, if you will, in Philadelphia who are investors. And people like Richard Sprague, people like Daniel Keating who built the Hyatt and then did the stadiums. Our former City Solicitor Kent Jagrio, I butchered that name. Former Supreme Court Justice in Pennsylvania Bill Lamb. I think the head of the Parking Authority. There's a number of people out there. And I'm going to urge the Mayor to kind of put the spotlight on them to think that, Hey, you've made your wealth in this city and maybe you should support our efforts to, you know, address these significant issues and failures with respect to this Senate bill. And I think if the Mayor comes out swinging with those people he may have an ally that has a lot of influence up in Harrisburg.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I think Rich makes a point that probably has not been made. And maybe it is, people think that the casinos are coming to town. They're going to be owned by people in Philadelphia. I think it's only
Pinnacle that's a publicly traded company.

Other than that, I believe the casinos are only coming in to operate. They're going to own somewhere, you know, 30 percent. These casinos are owned by individual people in the city of Philadelphia, that's who owns it, not the casinos, they're the operators. So Richie, I guess that's a point that has not been out and I guess it should be out.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Absolutely. The folks coming in who are owners are not going to have like cowboy hats and getting off planes from Nevada and things, it's local. But I think whatever, in fact, in Rene's question, whatever we can do with the mainstream media and our local papers that would get beyond the city of Philadelphia and penetrate to the leaders that this is backroom dealing that is damaging without -- you know, at least in the House we have to convince our leadership that they don't want to have this on their hands and on their records and just pass this. And the difficulty is is that if it
pertains to Philadelphia people just close their ears, they don't really care. Sometimes they works to our advantage and sometimes it doesn't. But in this case it will not.

So we've had numerous press conferences, meetings with editorial boards and things and you've seen very little in the papers still about the negative effects of this version of 862. So whatever all of you can do to get your opinion out through those mainstream outlets, that would be very helpful.

MR. DOUGHERTY: One of the questions that was submitted yesterday on a card was that when we make the packets available could we break down the ownership of the casinos. So even though that's online we'll put it in hard copy and make sure that that's part of the packets on the follow-up to this symposium. So you'll have access to that.

This gentleman right up front has been here for both days, this is the first time he raised his hand. And then we'll thank Mr. Knapton and Mr. Greenberg.

MR.HIM: Actually, she answered the
question, how do we get it out to the people?
You said 600,000 fliers were out and this is
what we got? I mean a lot of people don't
even know of this stuff. So maybe we have a
Million Man March to Harrisburg and they can
hear us. But how we get it to the people
through the media is going to be key.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Small developer in
the neighborhood turns around and says, How
come I have to pay to hook up water and they
don't? Simple question. Simple question and
we're going to let you know after we break
here, that people don't want to answer it.

Kevin Greenberg, Dave Knapton, thank
you. How about a little hand for --

Take a break. We'll be back in ten
minutes.

(Short break.)

MR. DOUGHERTY: Again, I'd like to
thank everyone for participating this morning.
The fact that we had community groups and
activists and just flat out neighbors from all
over the water front today, along with our,
some of our union leadership that have some
serious questions about, you know, keeping the
port vital as a key to industry in this community.

We had City Planning here this morning, along with part of the Mayor's legal team, to give us a little insight into their views of Penn Praxis and exactly what was going on. I think there was some interesting information come out of that.

As we wind down here I can tell you from my own person that I am really excited about what developed and the amount of input and the high quality of questions. And I believe that not only has this symposium achieved its initial goals, but I think that it's going to go way beyond that. I think our follow-up and our, you know, the information we've gathered and the questions that have been submitted.

In fact, I have one question and I'm glad that they signed this so it didn't look like I wrote it, it said, Please address the issues of campaign contributions by casino interests to state legislatures. Have any financial disclosure statements revealed PACs, et cetera, formed by developers, land
speculators, et cetera? Pat Lowe, 427 West Jewitt Street. And we will put that in the packet, we will follow-up with that.

We've had about 25 questions submitted to us throughout the end of the session yesterday and early this morning. And they're all questions that might have only been partially answered or not answered at all. And we think we're doing really well here in this little two-day symposium. But there's still that much out there to be digested and discussed. So I appreciate Pat for that.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Just for the record, the questions about contributions from gaming entities or investors, they are completely prohibited from doing that. The thorny part becomes, as we said in a prior session, a lot of the owners of the sites throughout, up and down the river, are not foreigners, they're not from different states, they're from here in Philadelphia. And who all had prominent roles in many, many business institutions and politics prior to their
involvement with their gaming interests.

So while they can't contribute now,

many of them were, to be right up front, very

active in the political contribution business

prior to that. But since they are investors

ey can no longer do that. And they don't.

I don't know if that solves the problem, but

ey don't.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Just another

way they're saving money.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: You can add

that to the list.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I appreciate it.

What we'd like to do here is, this

afternoon we were supposed to have two of our

four casinos. Now we're not going to put some

empty chair up there with a casino name on it.

This has been completely productive.

And the initial response, we have

one of the local consultants here, okay, but

there has not been included on behalf of the

tentity that she represents or anyone here, she

just stopped in to digest what was going on.

So I'm not going to ask Barbara Grant, who
does some work for Pinnacle, to do anything other than acknowledge the fact that she was here and the people that were being made contact with were not Barbara.  

We had some understanding and initial commitments that Pinnacle and Riverwalk would have interest coming here and participating. Initially we had Foxwoods and the Sugarhouse tell us that it really wasn't, in fact, quote, unquote, to their best interests. 

And I was surprised at that type of response. Because I had no idea until I walked in here this morning or yesterday morning other than a very productive neighborhood driven agenda, you know, any other topics of conversation. You have driven the symposium. That you have driven the follow-ups. 

So this afternoon I believe that on one hand I would have appreciated having someone from all four casinos here just to hear our concerns. 

The process has moved rather quickly. You know, I will again speak in my
role as Pennsport President. I have been approached for one or two meetings, that's it.

And the questions, I guess it's a mentality inside the gaming industry, but it's sort of everything is sort of if you do this, we can do that for you.

One of my simple questions were early on prior to the smoking ban and the Senate bill 862, my questions were, Hey, we have a lot of little community establishments. Well, you're going to be giving away food and beverage to start up, how does that affect -- and for no better word I used the one or two places, For Pete's Sake is something that transcends a lot of neighborhoods -- how does that affect that? How can we talk about that?

You know the sewer problem. I told you I don't care what title you have, what's on your resume, water in the basement is the same for everybody, okay. The amount of water that's been in my basement and my neighbor's basement is ridiculous. And I'm not believing anything the Water Department says about global warming, okay. It's the one pipe system.
When we get to the more serious of concerns, the evasion. You know, the traffic, when you leave here today if you really want to see firsthand, make a left, go down Delaware Avenue between the Reed Street/Washington exit and the Ikea store, you can count on being in traffic for 45 minutes. The traffic no longer is just on Delaware Avenue, it's on Front Street and 2nd Street. If you decide to wander down Front Street and 2nd Street, take a look at the license plates of the cars in front of you. Ikea is truly that field of dreams, if you build it, people will come. The issues were simple. They were quality of life neighborhood issues.

Since gaming has been rumored in that specific location we at the Pennsport Civic Association have averaged three to four hundred people at every meeting. Not 50, not 120. No exaggeration. Every meeting we have two, three, four hundred people. I mean it has driven a lot of interest. All we wanted was answers.

We've had -- and leading up until
today, one of the reasons why I'm really not frustrated or annoyed or even upset, is that we've listened to the DEP, we've listened to the Delaware Valley Planning, we've listened to PennDOT, we've listened to the Mayor's office, everyone told us that it basically has been a cavalier approach at best. You know, here's our study, you know, we can generate this amount of money. Again, for full disclosure, I get paid by the building, you know, we build buildings. But in this specific case there's a lot of locations where they should be built. In the backyard of a neighborhood that has these issues and concerns not answered is not one of them. Now, again, I'm here as my role as Pennsport Civic Association so I am not frustrated or annoyed because I don't believe they could have told us anything today because they're not telling the authorities in which they're going to reside. They're not telling the DEP, okay, how they're going to handle that. They want control of the riparian rights, they want to build the buildings
outside of Philadelphia code.

And by the way, the Philadelphia code is much stricter than state code. They think that in certain cases you can come down, you form some non-profit, you throw a million dollars at somebody, you make somebody the Executive Director and say, By the way, you know, at the end of the day if there’s some money left you can take care of social woes that are affected or created. We sit here and we ask questions.

And the land wraps that are associated. I’m surprised. I’m not a rookie to the legislative process. Usually you hide the big wraps like on Page 30 of a 40-page bill. That was on Page 2 or 3 where it says you get the continuous piece of land. I guess people were so excited they figured they could just run wild on the water front.

For all intents and purposes I just wanted to ask somebody, Hey, when it was laid out to me in the Civic Association a year and-a-half ago it was a little parlor that was going to bring some restaurants and some development. It was going to fit in to a much
bigger picture. Not the King of Prussia Mall

South on the water front.

This is the first time I took a
little personal privilege. Take a look out at
the water. Take a look from here. It's a
beautiful building. That's a beautiful river.

You know, like I said, and I've heard people
tell stories, I'll give you my family. Okay.

My grandparents came from Ireland,
they came here, my grandfather was a
longshoreman, was lucky enough to become a
State Legislator on the one side of the
family.

My mom's family came here, they got
off a boat, they went to work at the sugar
house. Eleven of my mother's aunts and uncles
lived in a two bedroom house on the 300 block
of Cross Street. I was lucky enough to raise
my baby in that house.

So you see where it's a little bit
different? It's not political. It's more
personal. Okay. I have my mother being the
only -- because she had no father -- being the
only young kid living with eleven of her aunts
and uncles. And the old days until you got
your own house, when you came over you all

stayed someplace.

And you get two weeks vacation from

the sugar house. One, would they would go out

and have a week long binge someplace down the

shore. Or if you couldn't squeeze in there,

just in the neighborhood. But you did nothing

but just visit all the friendly establishments

in the neighborhood. Then the other week they

would all stay and paint the house and redo

the roof and, because that's what they did in

Ireland before they came over.

So that house there, it's a little

bit more personal when it comes to that.

So I'm not expecting somebody --

and, you know, State Representative Taylor

made a great point. We're not getting cowboys

getting off from Nevada bringing the casinos

here, these are people in our own

neighborhoods, these are people that have

grown up in the same environment we have. So

it should be real easy to show up and talk to

people that you've made money off of.

You know, you got lawyers and

investment bankers and friends of mine in the
industry. I mean, they all got two pieces, three pieces of these things. Okay. So I mean, I think it would have been relatively easy to show up here. And I think that it's absolutely disrespectful, but it ain't going to upset me. Okay. I think that it's absolutely, as you have been saying all along, arrogant.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: And obscene.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Obscene. And then you understand why you get bills like 862, because it's easier to pump an extra million dollars into some committee to put trees on certain blocks than it is to answer a question on why you need that extra land and why is somebody taking a good peek at, you know, the whiskey yard and other places to move big box development so that you could have future casino development.

We don't want the initial proposal without safeguards for the neighbors. So we most definitely do not want someone who's just coming to, you know, continue to steamroll us and say, Hey, sue me.
As we're going to lead into Ron Patterson, he's even told us, in certain cases we don't even have a judicial recourse here. I mean in certain entities, and not just with the state level, but some of the other casino points, as for the first time some people followed up, he pointed out earlier there are specific venues and pieces of business that just need Planning Commission and City Council approval. And you really have no checks and balances on that.

So that's why these symposiums are needed. And that's why I really appreciate all the people from the community to partake and these three legislators who have admitted that they had no idea early on the magnitude of what went on and how they stood here. And in some cases have put themselves at the forefront of future political discourse because of this.

So I want to thank you. I think the least that the casinos could have done was show up here and talk to us. So that, you know, when you get the International Vice-President of the waterfront saying, Hey,
look, we expected to move north not have you
move south into our business. They could hear
that from him. Or the neighborhood group that
says, Hey, we want green space.

We know it's not easy. I mean, we
had the Water Department flat out tell us, you
know what, the one pipe system doesn't work,
we're probably going to outgrow it, but with
all the little streets and no money we don't
see any reason why we should handle it at this
present time. We'll just increase the amount
of sludge that the city facilities that handle
that stuff handle. You know, we'll hope that
the new places where we can open up bigger
pipe, we will. But basically, there was no

answer for Mike O'Donnell who stood here and
said he had six floods in 18 months between 12
and 14 inches of water.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sewage.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Sewage. That's a
health issue, as I stated earlier.

So on one hand you're paying taxes
and you're being told you can't handle that.
On the other hand you're being told, who's
going to give control of that away in the
backyard? But we're going to let them hook up
to the water for free and not have to live by
any controls.
So I think it's disrespectful. But
I'll tell you what, it also proves that you've
been successful. It also proves the point
that in this room here -- and as you know,
every five minute break that we took was
loaded with discussion about the topics at
hand today. Nobody said -- look, I haven't
had an Eagles conversation yet. Okay.
Conversations about water, about
neighborhoods, about the road, about the --
you know.

And it blows my mind, is that I've
asked the one question for a year and-a-half,
where -- I said I'm all for the fruit and
produce terminal movement, where is the
traffic going? And yesterday for the first
time we were told, it's all going on Delaware
Avenue, John. You know, there's really no
other avenue, we're going to build a road, a
temporary road, hopefully a permanent bridge,
at the back end and wrap it around to Delaware
Avenue.
It might not be politically correct to take it down Broad Street. After this symposium it's no longer politically correct to take it down Delaware Avenue.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I don't know if John is not upset, but I guess I'm the one that's been upset all weekend. I think we should be upset. And I think we should be angry and I think we should tell them, This is the community getting together to ask them questions. Two right off the get-go said no, two said yes.

What happened? They heard what happened yesterday, that we're asking tough questions, we're getting good answers and now they don't show up. I think that's just a precursor to what's going to happen when they get into our neighborhoods.

They're saying they're going to be good neighbors. Here's their opportunity to show it. And not one of them showed up. I think we should be a little more angry than we are. That's not what this is about. They have to answer to the neighborhoods. I guess they're confident that 862 is going through
the way it is now and they don't have to
answer to anybody.

I'm not sure I'm that confident that
862 is going to go through in its current
form. And maybe they will have to come back
and answer us. And maybe we should remember
that they had a chance to come and they
didn't.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Thank you,
Bill. I would just tend to agree with John,
that based on what happened yesterday, if you
don't have the answers, you don't show up to
reveal that you don't.

And specifically, that is, when
PennDOT spent three hours here yesterday
morning basically outlining the fact that
there is absolutely no planning, they're not
engaged, there's no discussions, they're not
ready to do anything to accommodate traffic.
That there is 500 projects underfunded as
there is. I don't know how any representative
from any casino could answer that question, no
matter what plans they have.
Equally as true is the response by
the Philadelphia Water Department and the
Department of Environmental Protection. And they said that they're not engaged at all on the very pieces of the application that were due to be required about how to handle sewage, storm water and drinking water.

And for the Water Department to say that if 862 as it now stands goes into effect they will have absolutely no say to oversee anything that the casinos do with those connections. And that, I think, was as frightening to us as anything else, if that's the case.

Equally, this morning we heard a very good discussion from the City Solicitor's Department about all the other meanings of 862 and particularly that the spin that the commercial entertainment district added to 862 is good government and it's going to be a better version of that bill is simply not true, considering all the other provisions that were put in that bill. All the other provisions in that bill that we've talked about ad nauseam completely trump the commercial entertainment district provisions that were put into the legislation.
So I don't think it's any wonder
that they're not sitting here. And it wasn't
until quarter after 9:00 this morning that we
found out that they weren't going to be here.
So I agree with you, John, if you
don't have the answer, you're not going to
show up to reveal that.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: I only want
to say that part of the propaganda of the
casinos appeared in our local Fishtown
newspapers, full page ads, Come to the
Fishtown Recreation Center, whatever night it
was last week, To fill out your application
for casino employment.
We don't know where the licenses are
going but you can get your application at
Fishtown Recreation Center.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Rene, if you
don't -- I just want to -- we'll take
questions in a minute.

What I'd like to do is introduce Ron
Patterson. Ron is here to give us an update
on the private sector's point of view. He was
also very helpful having him active in a
community group and talking about the ups and
downs of dealing with an entity as large as the Post Office in a community that he's involved in.

We had Carl Primavera scheduled and Carl lost his dad last night, which we keep him in your prayers, and we'll send that.

But Ron, on short notice, I really appreciate you coming.

Can you talk about, you know, what's driving this market? The waterfront in general, private development. And if you have anything to add from, you were here long enough this morning to hear some of our conversations and see the direction that this public forum is going.

MR. PATTERSON: You have to remind me I'm still under oath.

MR. DOUGHERTY: You're still under oath. We won't ask anything about Klehr Harrison, I promise.

MR. PATTERSON: Just to comment on a few things that were raised.

The Water Department and the issue about the storm water and the sewer. And maybe it was explained yesterday, but I wasn't
here. You know, there’s the theory that you
have storm water which could be handled by a
separate pipe, and sewage, which is everything
from your house, your sinks, your toilets, to
go into a different pipe.

And some communities, townships in
Pennsylvania and New Jersey handle them
differently in terms of how they are treated.

The sewage may go into a sewage treatment
plant. Storm water sometimes is allowed to be
generated and discharged into streams or the
river provided it meets certain discharge
standards.

The Water Department's answer now
that the system is being at over capacity is
to say, Well, if you’re a new developer
consider this, consider putting green roofs on
your roofs. Which means if you have a flat
roof you can put certain amount of inches with
dirt and grass and therefore the theory is
that when it rains -- and it does work, I
think it's up to 50 percent -- that your water
will be retained on the roof and eventually
evaporate. So it therefore doesn’t put a
burden onto the sewer system.
And the second thing they've been doing, and this one and two is in lieu of ripping up the streets and putting in larger pipes, is to say, okay, we want you to put a detention basin or if you have no land to put in a pond to grab all the water and let it out at a slower rate, is to put tanks underneath the ground to capture water and then let it go into the sewer system.

One project we worked on at Broad and South, the answer was that we had to put 125-foot long, four-foot in diameter pipe beneath the sidewalk into which all the storm water would be captured and retained until it was discharged into the system.

So I don't know if that's the right fix, but that's what they're doing in lieu of updating the sewer system.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Ron, just let me comment that under 862 they don't have to listen to the Water Department's recommendations or restrictions.

MR. PATTERSON: Right. So who knows what -- I mean, consider how much and how many people will be there, what demand
that would put on the system. It could
continue the flooding.
Now, I've heard flooding happening
here at 100 Mifflin and the like. Where I
live down by the stadiums we have the same
thing. At certain times there are back-ups in

some of the homes in Packer Park. Which you
think that's not in the direction where the
water is going, but yeah, it is, it's going
towards a different direction there. So we're
feeling the same impact.
And I don't know, if somebody had to
do a calculation, I bet they probably would
justify its own treatment system on site with
the amount of people that would be there. But
we're not seeing those numbers, we have no way
to engage it or handicap it.
REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: There were
estimates yesterday that they would have in
each site between 6 and 9 million people
visiting a year at each site.
MR. PATTERSON: And I think -- are
they proposing overnight stay there, hotel or
anything?
REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: They didn't
say, they just said that they would have
between 6 and 9 million people per year
visiting over the course of the year.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, at the very
least you take a toilet flush, which could be
one to three to five gallons. If you add in
where you have hotel stays or overnight where
you have kitchens and sinks and bathrooms and
tubs, you're up to maybe 100, 200 gallons a
day per room. And that's really what the
formula is. So it's just staggering to think
that if you times that by 9 million what the
gallonage would be.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Don't
forget the 3,000 condos.

MR. PATTERSON: That's true.

So, you know, I represent developers
and we're result oriented. And, you know, we
like -- we're hired to give people their
development permits. Whether it's good or
bad, the River Front Moratorium, because of
riparian rights, put the brakes on a lot of
large projects. And maybe it's a good thing
because some of these issues weren't
considered and they surely weren't -- if they
were, which we did have to go through Water Department and Streets Department review -- did not factor in the casino impact.

We did go through a whole litany of reviews and approvals. And I have to say that the city agencies are very well staffed to the most part and they're very smart. And we do take our plans through Water Department for review for sewer and storm water. We take them to the Planning Commission for review of the design layout. And then we take them to the Streets Department for locations of curb cuts, how parking garages and parking lots are designed. And once we get all those prerequisite stamps we then file with licenses and inspection for zoning permits. Because you need your zoning permit in order to get your building permit.

And that process is you file your plans and you do have review at the agency level to determine whether the uses you're proposing are permitted in the zoning district in which the property is located.

And then there's a second set or level of review, as I mentioned, that is a
dimensional review. What is the density? Do you meet the set backs? Do you meet the
height? Do you meet the floor area? Do you meet the rear yard? Do you meet open space?
Do you meet landscaping? Do you meet the minimal design for loading docks, for loading
spaces, for parking spaces, for drive aisles, for approved landscaping and planning
materials?
And once all that is done, if you do meet all that, what you get is a by-right permit and it's issued over the counter without any input from the civic group or community or legislators because you're entitled to have permitted uses if you meet the code.
If you don't, then you could either revise your plan to meet the code or you can then seek relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment requesting variance relief from what's required. And that of course is a public process.
And there's really two elements to that once you get to the Zoning Board. And one is to show that the use you want to do
there is approvable because there's a hardship on the property, that the property is in disrepair, that the zoning is changed, that the character of the neighborhood is changed. And the second, once you overcome that burden, is that there's no adverse impact on the public health, safety, welfare and community. And that's really what opens the door to the neighbors and civic groups and elected officials to go into the hearing and voice their opinion.

Which brings me back to what I heard this morning, was that that last piece of the puzzle is being removed from both the House legislation and the city's legislation. So that someone is going to sit down and write the parameters and say, These are the uses that are approved in this district and these, if there are any, are the parameters for which you can build a building. And if you meet that, and it's pretty much -- I still disagree, it's a check off item -- you meet it you meet it, you get your permit. You present it to City Council, they review it, it sounds like it's a
non-discretionary type of event. It's a

resolution, so to speak. You review it, it
meets it, you get your permit.

And yes, there would be public
hearings. But we all know public hearings
sometimes are just a forum to hear the views
and opinions of the public, but it doesn't
offer them a means to then challenge the
legislation unless certain events occur like
you would at the Zoning Board. I mean, the
Zoning Board has its good and bad points, but
it also affords the general public the
opportunity to speak their mind. And if they
don't like the outcome, to appeal a decision.

And this legislation, as I see it,
takes it out of that realm. If you meet the
criteria that's been established ahead of
time, everything goes through.

MR. SHALLCROSS: If I may ask a
question?

MR. PATTERSON: Sure.

MR. SHALLCROSS: For example, when
you say when the plans go to the Water
Department for approval. Now you take just
the example of North Delaware Avenue. There,
are -- you know, Bridge and Powerton's under construction, well, one's completed, I think it's -- no, it's under construction -- there are several more that are already approved and the promised ones are still in the approval process. To what degree does the Water Department take into account the aggregate of these proposed projects that as yet aren't using the system when they're evaluating the next project?

MR. PATTERSON: That's a good question because, you know, we apply for and get approval for many projects. Not all of them get built. Some of them get resold or flipped, as we say. And now a lot of them aren't getting built.

Now, what I don't know is that if you come in and say, I have 3,000 units and we're going to attribute 2,000 gallons for each unit, if they then take that off and factor that in to what the capacity of the system is or do they wait until it actually constructed and say, okay, now we know that there's more discharge into the system. I
don’t know that.

I think what they’re saying is that they look at what the system is and they say,

Here is your amount of discharge and if there’s still capacity, they approve it. I don’t know if they add in all the proposed projects.

At a certain point the systems are at capacity. And the state, I believe in the middle of the summer, imposed a moratorium in certain areas of the city saying that the Water Department can no longer give approvals to hook-up to the system because it’s incapacitated until someone gives them money to install larger piping and additional treatment systems they’re not going to approve any further discharges. And one of the areas is in Manayunk and the other one is in Northeast Philadelphia.

So in that respect, they do take a closer look. But I do not think they’re taking a running tally of what the projects are. But that’s just my impression.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Rene, you
got a question or a comment?

MS. GOODWIN: Yeah, I did. I have a

question on something else, but Mr. Patterson,
on the moratorium on those two areas are you
talking about moratorium as it relates to the
sewage aspect or is it also a concern about
the supply or is it just the sewage?

MR. PATTERSON: Just discharge

sewage.

MS. GOODWIN: Just discharge, okay.

My issue is that it has come to my

attention that on June 2nd the community
groups had a deadline by which they had to
submit additional written testimony to the
Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. However,
that deadline did not hold for the casino
applicants, it was, in fact, Friday,
October 13th. That seems unfair.

Also it has also come to my

attention, and I have sort of known part of
this, that two of the four casino applicants
along Columbus Boulevard have in their traffic
studies looked at a broader area, a broader
impact than right in front of their nose. Why
is that relevant?

Well, I'll tell you why. One of the things that's come out of this whole symposium for me, and as Chair of River Front Communities United, was been primarily focussed on Foxwoods. I now wish to broaden my focus somewhat because it's now painfully clear, particularly because of Bill 862, that there can be no boundary lines. It doesn't matter where the casino goes on Columbus Boulevard, we must, the communities along the water front, really band together because we are all going to be affected by this.

I still don't want Foxwoods. But as somebody put it eloquently just a little while ago during the lunch break, it doesn't matter even if we win this one and get Foxwoods not approved, we haven't really won at all because there's going to be one and we are all going to be affected. So we really need to recognize that and act on that in a very aggressive sort of way. That's all.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: I think, Rene, on the public input I think a lot

they've depended upon 862 being passed,
they're dependent upon 862 being passed in its current form. I'm certainly confident that that is not going to happen. But if to the extent that we can delay it for some time and must rework their entire schedule.

And I think you were here when we described, Bill and Mary and I, that, you know, a letter has already been drafted to the Secretary of Transportation as well as the Chairman of the Gaming Board based on PennDOT's testimony here yesterday. I don't know how they can possibly issue a license when there's no plan even considered.

PennDOT testified here yesterday that they're not changing anything. And all the rhetoric about temporary ramps that the casinos are putting out just flat out is not true. So that's alarming enough. To ask that the entire process be slowed down, not to mention the number of additional amendments that we'd like to do to the bill.

As you know, there is stuff in 862 that anybody concerned about good government would be for. Our job in the next five legislative days is to convince them, if you
are concerned about any version of good government, there's plenty in 862 that should make you very, very concerned. And I think we've started that process. So let's hope that that time line that you spoke about will be very flexible.

MS. GOODWIN: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Other questions or concerns for Mr. Patterson?

Step right up, Mark.

Do me a favor, Mark, just come on up and use the mike so everybody will hear you.

MR. STIER: Mark Stier of Neighborhood Networks.

One thing that we haven't really talked about is what's the purposes of 862?

Now, part of me is political scientist and I'd like to stay with fact that, you know, part of me is community activist. And community activists tend to exaggerate a little bit.

But I want to look ahead just a moment. What would be the purpose of putting in place something which really undermines the whole planning process that we're talking about?

Interesting enough, this morning we
had really two very different conversations,

one about a plan process being developed in
the city that many of us think is long
overdue, and that might actually be a good
process and lead to a good result. On the
other hand, we're talking about a bill that
makes this process impossible, that basically
gives the Gaming Commission the authority to
really determine everything that happens up
and down the river.

Now, I'm sitting here thinking, why
would anyone want that? And when you look at
things like the enormous size of the buildings
they're talking about, when you look at the
billboards they're talking about with the
flashing lights and the animation and the neon
and all that stuff, that the city of
Philadelphia prohibited, but the Gaming
Commission would allow.

When you look at the fact that this
is really a cancerous kind of a situation

where you have a casino that has authority
over, I mean, a Gaming Commission that has
authority over one area that can be extended
up and down the river, it seems to me that
what people are thinking about in the future is recreating a Las Vegas strip along our water front. With the big hotels, that's why they need the highrises. With all the billboards, that's why they need to do away with the billboard laws, without access to the water front, which is why they need to narrow the bike path and pedestrian path from 50 feet to 20 feet.

I think what may happen in the House of Representatives in the next week is going to determine the future of this water front. And this is the choice we're going to have right now between Las Vegas strip or something that, even if we don't like the casinos, at least puts the casinos in a context that makes the water front an attractive place for all Philadelphians.

So I hope we can find some way to make clear to the rest of this city and to the legislators that this is really a -- this is a critical week for the history of this city.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Mark, keep in mind, just from the legislative side, and I'll let Ron respond, that our challenge is
that we've focussed on what we feel are very damaging provisions of 862. The challenge is is that there's a lot of other provisions that aren't so damaging. Matter of fact, would be helpful, that a lot of people want to see cleaned up. It's not unusual to have a bill with good and evil in the same bill. Therein lies the dilemma for the Governor as well.

So there's a lot of politics being played here too for people who really are never going to see a casino face to face in their life. I would venture to guess that 90 percent of the legislature will never actually see a casino in Pennsylvania, will never run into one, will never go to one. They don't care, but they want the tax relief.

So the problem is, if that bill does -- even if the bill was pushed forward then you have a Governor in the dilemma of not -- of either being for good government or bad government and he's going to get criticized either way no matter how he votes. As will we. But I think that, you know, our goal will be to open it up, do surgery and extract those damaging parts, put it back together and keep
the good parts in it, and hope we can move forward in that regard.

But you're absolutely right. What the City Solicitor and the Planning Commissioner described this morning was a planning process that would be absolutely moot the minute that 862 hits the desk of the Governor if it's in this form and if he signs it. You can plan all you want, it's not going to matter.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: And Mark, as you know as a political scientist, this started out as a good government bill. It was amended. I mean, this bill didn't start out in the form it's in now. It was amended with all this stuff. So like I said, we've got our work cut out for us. And we really have a lot of hard work to do within the next five days.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Ron, you want to respond to anything Mark said?

MR. PATTERSON: Yeah. I mean, to do planning and zoning this way by doing that bill or that ordinance, that really cuts against the logical way that cities are laid out and how planning is supposed to evolve.
And that's why you have industrial districts which primarily are near the water, and then you build out from there with buffers. You have industrial, then you have light industrial, then you have commercial, then you have light commercial, then you have residential, but maybe multi-family apartments, then you go into row houses, then you go into single family attached or detached homes and then green space and parks and schools. So that there's a reason for that. There's an orderly fashion. And one is supposed to buffer the other. That's why you don't see or you're not supposed to see or a code doesn't allow that you have residential in a manufacturing district or an industrial district. And there's considerations for that. Because once you get into the industrial areas you're supposed to have wider streets and residential you have smaller streets. And you're supposed to -- if you do run up against a competing use district you're supposed to have buffers with landscaping and the like.
So what this does, it just takes, it
carves out a piece and says, we're going to
forget all about the planning and orderly
fashion and we're going to put it here. And
doing it that way it really puts the burden on
you guys as the legislators to, hopefully,
you're going to place your own thoughts about
protecting the impact to the neighborhood
because of that. And you may not be able to
do that.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Just so you know,
besides being a lawyer, he's also an
environmental engineer.
Sandy.

MS. SHEA: Hi, Sandy Shea from the
Daily News.

Representative Taylor, you were
talking before about the surgery that's
required for these new evil amendments in 862.
However, the zoning preemption was in part of
the original bill which you all three
supported originally and it's not an issue in
this particular one. So can you talk a little
more about -- because I'm still a little
confused about you're either or all of your
support of the zoning preemption piece of this bill.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Probably, and every time we spoke about this, whether it's a press conference, community group or even with you, Sandy, at the Editorial Board, we described the fact that, yes, we had a decision to make when it was put forth whether or not we wanted to allow the age-old version of one councilman has total veto power over anything that goes on in his or her district versus the state being able to bypass that. That's a tough call. It was part of a larger bill, and, yes, at least in my case, I supported that.

The difference now is that what has come back in an 862 goes beyond that times 100. And almost to the point that I said publicly in the last few weeks that if I get a chance to see the attitude and the arrogance and the greed that's coming from those proponents of this type of legislation, it's so disrespectful, and that if I get a chance to knock out the entire preemption, I'll do it. So that's all part of the amendments.
we're going to try to put forth to do that.

And we had a good discussion this morning when Kevin Greenberg from the City Solicitor's Office said that this city is willing and able and ready to accept this challenge and move forward. We hope that they do move forward in a way that is not historical and does not adhere to the age-old version of having one councilman be able to tie up a project indefinitely, you know, similar to what they did on many, many times.

But now with all this other stuff going in, and it's beyond, Sandy, I think what we heard yesterday is beyond what even Bill and Marie and I felt that was in the bill. Instead of us feeling better after this symposium I think that in my case I feel a whole lot worse when the Water Department says not only are the utility hook-ups for basically free, but now there is absolutely no ability for the Philadelphia Water Department or the DEP to oversee anything that happens in terms of the sewer system here in Philadelphia if 862 would go forward.
And he had offered a lot of other provisions that you weren’t here for that would indicate that even the commercial entertainment district language that has been put in 862 now that has been used as the good government version and an improved version, it, in fact, is meaningless because of all the other provisions that we have cited.

The commercial entertainment district provision was allegedly put in the bill to give some parameters to the Gaming Control Commission. When, in fact, all those other items completely exempt that very provision that they’re talking about being good government.

So I certainly admit to the fact that, yes, I voted for that. I won’t vote for it again. And, you know, on balance it looks like that wasn’t even good enough for these guys.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Sandy, I know you keep going back to that and you point it out to us all the time, but 862 that we have voted for no longer exists. I don’t know where they go, bill heaven somewhere, I don’t
know, bill limbo, wherever they go.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Bill hell.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But that no longer exists. And if we keep saying, you know, but you did this. Yeah, we did it, okay. But we are here now saying that this version of the bill is absolutely, we cannot vote for it, we have to change it, this is wrong for everybody. I hope that some day the newspapers would get in line with us and say -- besides saying that we voted for something that doesn't exist anymore, maybe somebody could say, Hey, they're on to a good thing here, they caught this in time. We're doing everything we can to change it. We're making the right moves, we're talking to the neighborhood groups. I think we're doing good things here.

MS. SHEA: For the record, we did say that.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Oh, we did?

Well, now we can talk about this bill and how bad this bill is, that would be helpful.

MR. LEVINS: Earlier on I mentioned
many of the very successful Philadelphians who are investors in these casinos. And one of the names that I omitted is Brian Tierney who has a controlling interest in the Inquirer and Daily News. So I hope people like Brian Tierney would realize that this Senate Bill 862 really takes away the power of visionaries of the future, if you will.

I mentioned visionaries of the past who were responsible for the Parkway, Schuylkill Water Front and Old City. This bill strips the ability of future visionaries to come to the surface. And I would hope people like Richard Sprague and Brian Tierney fight along with us to make sure that this bill never gets signed by the Governor.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Sandy, did you have anything else that you wanted to talk about?

I only introduced you as Sandy, you said that you worked for the Daily News, that adds a different twist in here. Do you have any other questions or concerns?

MS. SHEA: No, thank you.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I appreciate you taking the time out to come down here today.
too. Thank you.

Dr. Moylan.

DR. MOYLAN: Just as a curiosity, casinos or not new, casinos are in many urban areas and rural areas. But have they ever tried to put them in as urban or congested area as they are here? And is that why it's explaining some of the extra apparent confusion that we're having? Why there's so many problems.

And by no means am I in favor of them just being thrust upon us. But if they have no history of trying to put it in such a congested area, that may explain why we're having all these problems and that's where the lack of communication is. So I don't know if that's something that's been discussed or addressed.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I don't think we're having problems. We know what this bill says, we know what the bill takes away from the community and we're saying that's wrong.

DR. MOYLAN: And I'm in full agreement with that. I'm just saying from
their perspective they're just used to walking
in and saying, We're here, Now welcome us.
And we're now offering such a unique
situation.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: You know,
this is where maybe I have -- here I go again,
when did they get a vote? When did they get a
chance to put -- when do they get a chance to
do that? They do what gets passed, they don't
get in. I mean, as the city has said, we'll
work with them, we'll make sure it works,
we'll make sure we do it right. But you just
don't take away all their problems and forget
any community involvement in it. That's what
this is about.

MR. MULLIGAN: I can answer your
question. Pat Mulligan.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Pat Mulligan, how
about you answering that question?

MR. MULLIGAN: I sat on the Mayor's
Gaming Task Force and we found out that
there's never been or no casino has ever been
plopped into an urban environment such as
Philadelphia ever before. We are the test
case. We are truly the test case. All right.
And I want to make a statement and I
want to follow-up on something this gentleman
said.

Now, I was involved in the stadium
process early on in building this -- in
helping getting those stadiums built in South
Philly. Okay. And the city was actively
involved. And when the city decided with the
community and the community agreed to have
these things housed in South Philly the city
worked with the community on building
restrictions around their neighborhoods to
prevent this volume of traffic that comes down
Broad Street and go into their neighborhoods
when they have game day, when they have large
events, it protects the community.
I have seen every single traffic
study that these casinos have put out. I know
there's supplemental stuff being put out that
I haven't seen yet that's been produced in the
last couple weeks.

What really concerns me -- and I'm
not a native Philadelphia, all right. I
didn't grow up in the city, I wasn't born here
and all that, but I love the city.
What really concerns me is that not one of those traffic studies -- they all address about traffic on Delaware Avenue, they all address how it's going to come off 95 and into their front door, they don't address how they're going to protect the community. Not one of them has addressed in any of their traffic studies how they're going to protect the community. How they're going to keep that traffic, other than signs, out of the community.

And I think as our legislative body and all, you know, 862 kills us because the city does not have a say anymore. We can't come to that developer and say, how are you going to protect this community from your development, from your overflow of traffic? And I think as a community we got to find a way to do that.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Rene.

MS. GOODWIN: Yes. John, we focussed a great deal on the negative aspects of 862, as that should be. But as the day wears on and we are almost overwhelmed with information, I wonder if the legislators can
just briefly restate the positive aspects of
862 and its original intention lest we do not
forget them as the amendments move forward.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Rene, in
862, and I don't have it in front of me so, I
mean, the bill is this thick, but I know that

a lot of the backroom controversy with regard
to suppliers and manufacturers and legislative
dictates about who is going to be suppliers.
And in fact, many of the political connected
people like are involved in the casino
investment or involved in these suppliers,
there was a mandate that the casinos had to
use suppliers before they could purchase slot
machines. There was dictates on who was going
to be the manufacturer who was allowed to sell
certain percentages and things. Definitions
about who was a public official. Percentages
of ownership. And there's a couple other ones
that I'm not remembering. But all those
things that smack of backroom self-preserving,
self-protection of the investors who are
involved in the political process is due to be
removed.

So it is curious, while we'll do
that -- but none of that really, if you think
about it, a lot of that benefits the casinos
as well as the other negative provisions too.
So in addition to being, those
provisions being good government, for example,

there's no longer a mandate for the use of
suppliers. They're going to phase that out.
Not only are they going to phase that out, but
they're going to create a slush fund, pardon
the use of that term, but they're going to
create monies to pay the suppliers when they
sue because they are already in.
So if you look at the overall theme,
not only did they straighten out ostensibly
some shaky dealing, but along with what we
think are the negative provisions, now you got
complete sweeping off the table of any
restrictions whatsoever.
Some of those restrictions were not
good about what they -- how they could buy,
who they had to buy through. But you add to
it the riparian rights, the billboards, the
associated areas, the no smoking, the no
utility oversight. And they make no bones
about it, we do not want any obstacles
whatsoever. Not only do we want no land use oversight that would cause lawsuits, we don't want anything.

So some of those things actually work for many legislators that they're going to feel good about because the rest of these provisions that we find negative not only just deal with Philadelphia but in truth only deal with this section of Philadelphia.

So our first challenge is to really invigorate our fellow legislators in the city, and then to extend it to beyond to say, you shouldn't feel good about this at the end of the day that you're casting a positive vote for this.

So there's already a built-in number of pure anti-gaming votes. Add to that the Philadelphians who were pro gaming in general, there may be an exception or two to that, but I don't think there was, and then maybe you form a coalition enough to beat all this back.

MS. GOODWIN: But wasn't it a Philadelphia legislator that helped craft this bill?

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Certainly
there's a Philadelphia legislator that's defending this bill.

MS. GOODWIN: Thank you.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Gentleman.
And then we'll come back to you, Sandy.

MS. SHEA: I just wanted to add a point of information.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, why don't we take -- before the question we'll take a point of information.

MR. PAPPAJOHN: It seems that so much of Act 71 and S.B. 862 have been written and enacted to really further gaming in Philadelphia, obviously. But more protecting the interests of gambling operators rather than residents of the adjacent neighborhoods where these things will go.

And I think while you've properly identified some of the merits of 862, there's some other things that could go in there which would make it even better for people along the river, specifically legislating CBAs and special service districts for the neighborhoods that will be affected.
MR. PAPPAJOHN: I'm Matthew Pappajohn.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: No, identify what CBA means.

MR. PAPPAJOHN: Oh, Community Benefits Agreement. Just identify -- legislate and identify a source of funding or a fund that will be set up to enrich neighborhoods and at the same time mitigate the harms that will be inflicted by these things. And there will no doubt be harms, as we all know.

And the special services district, it is something that could be modeled after what goes on down at the stadium. And I think the big part of it is the state's taking responsibility for some of this financially. You're a 54 percent partner in the enterprise. That's a lot to ask a casino to do after they're already ponying up 54 percent. So somehow between the state's share, the city's share and the operators' share of the proceeds there's got to be
something done for the neighborhoods. And it

should be legislated and not left to chance, I

think.

I think another really important

thing would be to legislate that there can't

be two casinos within two miles of each other

anywhere along the river front or anywhere in

Philadelphia, for that matter, anywhere in

Pennsylvania. Act 71 says you can't have two

casinos within ten miles of each other to

protect operators' interests. Why not do the

same for neighbors?

And I think that's it. I think

those are --

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: And just for

the record, that ten-mile provision was in

there to protect the racing industry so that

somebody wouldn't plop a casino right next to

a race track.

MR. PAPPAJOHN: There are slot

parlors in race tracks. So really it's --

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: It was to

protect that entity. And you know, for the

record, the discussion about slot machines all

began with saving the racing industry, which
is a very big -- that plays well in Pennsylvania because it brings in the agricultural community, and therefore, a lot of legislators.

MR. PAPPAJOHN: I think slot parlors at race tracks are not necessarily a bad idea. I doubt that most of them are plopping them down next to the neighborhood.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Can you put your name into the record for me, please?

MR. PAPPAJOHN: My name is Matt Pappajohn. I live in Fishtown.

MR. PATTERSON: Matt raises a good point. Because oftentimes when if I go to the Zoning Board with a matter and I'm opposed, it's not because people are against the use, they want to try to minimize the impact. And which leads you to a developer's agreement or proviso conditions that are attached to the permit. It could vary from the hours of operation to the changing of traffic circulation and the like.

And you know, they often work very well and sometimes result in deed
restrictions. What it does is also takes the
enforcement away from the city or adds to the
city's enforcement by empowering the people
who signed on to the agreement, which could be
a civic group, to have the ability to enforce
privately if the city no longer has the
resources or L & I inspectors, as the case
would be, to go out.
So the developer's agreement
would -- that kind of thing would be nice if
there was an opportunity to do that. Then
it's surrounding impact to communities could
have their concerns addressed. If they get
over the threshold of saying that we're okay
with the use.
MR. DOUGHERTY: Sandy, you had a
point of information?
MS. SHEA: Oh, I just wanted to
point out, the Representatives were very good
in acknowledging and bringing to light all the
bad stuff of 862. The one good thing was it
eliminated the one percent ownership that
legislators and elected officials could have,
and now they can't have any ownership at all.
So that's one of the other positives.

MR. DOUGHERTY: And also, initially,
most of one discussion, Act 71, I mean, you
very infrequently had any conversation about
Act 71 without a great emphasis on the wage
tax reduction and property tax relief. And
they're just things that people have a lot --
I mean, it just seemed that any conversation
initially somewhere along the line there was a
serious discussion about that. And rightfully
so. People, you know, have interests in that.

But it just seems that right now our
symposium is not only about the next six
months, our symposium is about the next
decade, okay. Our symposium here understands
that there has to keep an industrial base,
okay. We understand that we have, what I
refer to as a working to stay middle class
group of neighbors along a big portion of that
water front, okay.

But we also have a very different
approach to some of the other neighborhoods.
The condo explosion, okay, the loft explosion,
the need for green space. The fact that, you
know, I have been lucky enough to visit a few
other water front locales, you know, the open amphitheater, the better use of Penn's Landing, the better use of marinas, the dredging of the river. I mean, these are topics that are serious points of discussion that will develop over a period of time.

With all due respect, we sung a lot of praises about the executive order of the Mayor. But the last election process didn't go too well that he had. And so what happens is we don't want things to either get tied up in court or become some thought process that takes forever.

We had questions and concerns about things that are being done like the traffic from the Food and Produce Center. We had the sewerage overflow. The, you know, the lack of green space. We hear all the time, well, it's difficult, you can't get to Penn's Landing, I-95 separates it.

In fact, in one of the arguments one of the makers of the bill had with some of our elected officials, what do you care, it's so far from the neighborhoods? It's really not. Okay. Anybody ever walk across the South
Street Bridge? Talk to the close to 2 million people that visit the ice skating rinks. I'm down there three or four times a year. We have an ice skating program for the Variety Club. And that's prior to IKEA and movie theaters and Long Horns and things along them lines.

So these are issues that are big picture issues. We just don't want it stuck in that normal long term Philadelphia process.

You heard some of our speakers here talk about Ed Bacon on one hand and then talk about our inability to get anything done on either side of the water, the Schuylkill or the Delaware.

We believe that for a lot of years there wasn't as many people in them neighborhoods, and now there are and there's a lot of interests. So we just tried to channel that, focus in in the right direction.

It just happens that we have something called Bill 862 that has brought all neighborhoods together, normally where we might have a little difference, we put that aside for the big picture.

Not everybody in the room doesn't
have the same view of gaming. We have the
same view of lack of input in gaming.

MR. PATTERSON: I think it brings an
awareness to how all the pieces of the puzzle
fit. And I think that's really what the
catalyst probably has been in terms of uses
and in traffic and in design. And I think,
like you said, I think the traffic impact is
probably a larger issue. And you're limited
by geography and the physicalities of the
street in order to address the traffic.

You know, the example that I gave
about the Post Office facility, we were able
to at least get them to agree that all
industrial traffic to and from the facility
would go on a new street that they were going
to dedicate off of Island Avenue. But it's
awfully difficult to put a dedicated street
here on Delaware Avenue to say all the traffic
coming or going to the casino can take it's
own dedicated ramp exit off of I-95.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Let's stay right
there. We had the Delaware Valley Planning.
If you want to get some federal funding you
have to let them know what you're doing, okay,
the process.

We had PennDOT. We got a Governor that transcends bi-partisan, gets along with everybody, gets along with people in Washington. So it's not -- in some cases we have some people in office that are paralyzed by their specific party affiliation. Okay.

We got a Speaker and a Governor both from the region, two different parties but from the area, they communicate.

We got agencies that aren't talking.

We got a game plan, we got transportation, you know, TIP program that doesn't have any of these locations on any of their -- in their game plan. They're telling us they got $900 million dollars worth of money and that will get them to Vine Street at best. And they're saying that they're not sure that I-95 can handle the additional traffic it's taking right now from a structural standpoint.

So if the pipes can't handle the water and the roads can't handle the traffic, thank God the skies can handle the clouds. You know what I mean?

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: May we
better check 862.

MR. DOUGHERTY: That's why we're here. This isn't -- I don't want anybody to think -- this is only the beginning. This is the first of what we expect to be many.

Now, if it's all right we'll start to wind up a little bit. And I'm going to go around, we'll get questions, final statements. Okay. Ladies before gentlemen.

HER HER: You're making a good point with, you know, lack of communication and the lack of organization. I was just wondering what your next step is and what the panel's next step is in dealing with some of these issues that we're bringing up and addressing over the last few days.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I can tell you what my immediate role will be, communicate with my brothers and sisters from the Whitman Association, some of the other civic associations, to see how we can gather the information and get it out. We will try to gather this, answer some of the pending questions, get some of the copies of the traffic reviews. A lot of people haven't had
access to them. And we want to make sure that everything that went on here we have some accessibility.

I believe that the dialogue that has not only been opened up between us and the legislature, but between some of you and legislature. We'll never be able to -- you can't -- there's no price put on that. We had people in the room in the last two days talking to each other that I never thought would happen, productive conversations, I just never thought your paths would cross. They're now working together.

And I believe that you already heard State Representative Taylor say he's going to shoot off something to the Gaming Commission first thing tomorrow stating that, Yo, you have people in this area, the water front development process, who have not communicated. How can you give them a gaming application at this time without this communication being kept?

So I think that you have a series of things. You have us from a civic association, civic body, continuing to gather information,
help facilitate the answers to questions,
trying to transcend each other's concerns and
visions and try to continue to move forward
and also prepare for the next one of these.
And where do we do it, and how do we do it,
and on and on and on.
I believe that the legislature has a
much more obvious problem. They have their
Senate bill right in front of them, it could
be any day this week. So they're going to go
back later tonight, tomorrow and start to
handle their -- I don't know what the proper
wording is -- reworking of it.
Also, they're going to file off some
letters that, you know, obviously come with a
little bit more drag, right, wrong, or how we
think, you know, than we have at this present
time. Saying, Hey, this is what we picked up
here. The first question -- the first letter
or two they had they were working on this
morning together. That's all good.
We have a lot of the community
newspapers are here. We have a lot of the
community groups are here. We have some of
the think tanks here, some of -- you know, we
have the newspapers here, we have the media here yesterday. You know, it was funny, I had somebody talk to me, he was joking with me, said, Yo, I thought about running for office, I'm thinking about moving now. And we were joking in the back, it's sort of like one of the Batman movies, the later Batman movies where it's dark and the fog is coming from manholes and, you know, that's the perception. And if you listen to some of the people here that are the people in position to talk to us. And there's also, there's a little bit of a -- there's still people lobbying hard, as much as we're here saying, Hey, we don't want this, there's still people in the background saying, They don't need anything, push it. I can tell you there was one or two speakers I had conversations with in preparation for this who kind of went soft on me between now and then. I didn't want to put them in an awkward spot. One day he's telling me how bad the sewer system is, and the other day he's trying to convince me that there's a
possibility that a lot of it is because of the additional flood. I said, try to tell that to Mike O'Donnell.

And I've had conversations with the Mayor, the Managing Director and the Water Commissioner about this. I've sent letters off two and a half years ago about these issues. I'm just glad that -- but I did that in three or four different hats. This one's purely about generating some sort of game plan.

And in the last six weeks since we've been marketing this, dropped off 600,000 fliers, an executive order was signed. I'd like to think that we had just a little bit to do with that executive order being signed.

And then the Governor sent a letter out, by the way, pretty detailed, which will also be in the packets we put out opposing this.

Our friends from the longshoremen union are understanding how they might be saving one industry by plopping a road, but it might be separating them from future growth.

We have International Officers who have roots
12. in the neighborhood here representing them.
13. And staying the whole day.
14. That's not me closing, that's
15. somebody's phone.
16. Any other quick questions? Mark?
17. Rene? Eddie? How about we start to try to
18. bring this to a -- my mom's birthday, she
19. ain't feeling good, I got to get down the
20. shore.
21. MR. STIER: I just want to say that
22. as we move forward I hope we think a little
23. bit about an agency that's not here and the
24. solution that we haven't talked too much
25. about, and that's using public transit.
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3. You know, we have a -- I made a
4. proposal about three weeks ago about using
5. public transit to move parking off site. And
6. I'm working with a transit guide to try to
7. make it a little bit more detailed to get more
8. information to release it publicly.
9. But my understanding is the Port
10. Authority has been studying transit on the
11. water front for a while. And that there's
12. some study there, I can't get my hands on it,
13. I can't get anyone to tell me whether it's
real or not, but I would like someone with a
little more authority like some of the folks
up there to investigate it.
Because, you know, when you build a
transit solution the most expensive thing is
track. We have the track up and down Columbus
Boulevard. We have an abandoned train track
from Tasker that goes down almost to the
sports arenas. And we can put parking off
site and move people up and down on trolleys.
And I think that would dramatically improve
the impact of those casinos on the local
neighborhood. So I hope you can consider that
as a possibility as well.

MR. DOUGHERTY: We appreciate that.
Just tongue and cheek, we're outside
yesterday, we had Joe Brooks here from Penn's
Landing, and we were saying that the traffic
we were going to try to have the River Ferry
run back and forth to SuperFresh on Sunday
afternoons. Okay. I mean -- but there's --
you know, we joke and laugh, but you're right,
we have the tracks, you've made that point.

MR. STIER: That's 80 percent of the
cost. And we get federal money because the
existing track would count as the local
contribution. So we go right to the top of
the federal list of getting money for things
like this.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Eddie Kirlin.

MR. KIRLIN: Yeah. Ed Kirlin,
Pennsport.

I hope from here on out we can stop
calling these community benefit agreements,
call them casino community destruction
mitigation agreement, because that’s what they
are. And at the end of the day, what do we
know?

We know that we got a sewer system
that’s clogged now and we’re going to add
sewage of 12 million to 18 million more
people.

We know we got Delaware Avenue
that’s clogged now, it’s gridlocked, and we’re
going to add the traffic from 12,000 to 18,000
million more people a year.

We do know that we have three State
Representatives that give a damn. They’re
smart and they’re doing their job.

And we also know that they're
proposing to build casinos on land that they
don't own or else the riparian rights stuff
wouldn't be in the legislation 862.
And the last time up it was an
$800 million project. So we're giving away
$300 million dollars. I would encourage you
fellows to tell your state legislators to
don't give up there, it's a huge give away,
it's just as good as a payoff. Thank you.
MR. DOUGHERTY: Rene.
MS. GOODWIN: Mr. Patterson, you

were talking a little earlier about the
certain ratio or the guide of water disposal
per person, I'm not as intimately acquainted
with the other casino applicants as I am with
Foxwoods' application, in their Phase 3 of
their program they are proposing two 500-foot
high structures, one would be a condominium or
some sort of residential towers, rental or
condominium, the other one is a hotel. I
don't know what the other dimensions are, so I
don't know how many living units, but I just
wanted you to know that.
And the other thing, one day I was
kind of fooling around and I was looking at
the map of Philadelphia in relation to this whole casino issue. And it occurred to me that if you start with Chester Downs in Chester and you go to at least one casino on the water front, the other casino either being on the water front or East Falls, and then the fourth location, Philadelphia Park, you have a stunning four large gambling opportunities within about a 50 to 55-mile area. Is that the way to move this city forward?

MR. DOUGHERTY: One interesting piece of conversation we picked up yesterday, Philadelphia Park, a lot of their water comes into the Philadelphia system, until this point has not had any conversation with the Philadelphia Water Department.

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I want to thank not only our legislators, our community leaders, but all the professionals that came down and you, yourself. We'll see you in a couple months.

Thank you.

(End of Sunday, October 15, 2006 session.)