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MR. CROSBY: Good morning. Today is Friday, April 27, 2018. This is an adjudicatory hearing before the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. My name is Steve Crosby. I'm the chair of the commission. I'm joined here today by my colleagues, from my right to left, Commissioners Gayle Cameron, Eileen O'Brien, Enrique Zuniga, and Bruce Stebbins.

The entire commission will
collectively provide -- preside over this hearing. We have many members of the media here today. I wanted to take a moment and express the gaming commissions sympathy to all of you for the recent and unexpected loss of your esteemed colleague, Lana Jones, of WZB news radio. Lana will be fondly remembered for her kindness, her professionalism and her extraordinary contributions. She's worked with many of us for a long long. We've left an open seat for her today in honor of her memory.

The purpose of the hearing today is to determine whether Stephen A. Wynn remains a qualifier under Massachusetts law relative to

Wynn Resorts, Limited; Wynn Massachusetts, LLC, and all affiliates.

By way of background, as part of the initial casino licensing process, the commission determined which individuals and entities would be required to participate in our background investigation to determine whether they were suitable to be associated with a casino. Those individuals and entities are referred to by us as qualifiers. Based on his association at the time with Wynn Resorts, Limited, and its Massachusetts affiliate Mr. Wynn was designated as a qualifier as part of that process, which we referred to as our RFA1 process.

Given the change in circumstances, this hearing has been convened to determine whether Mr. Wynn remains a qualifier.

Before I outline the process that this hearing will follow I'd like to clarify the scope of this hearing. The hearing will be limited to the question of whether or not Mr. Wynn is still a qualifier. The hearing is not a form for the commission to consider Mr.

Wynn's suitability, nor is it a vehicle to address the suitability of Wynn Resorts, Limited; Wynn Mass, LLC., or any other qualifier. As appropriate, those issues will be reviewed in separate proceedings.

Nothing we have done or said prior
to this time suggests any outcome or any predisposition for the outcome of those issues or those proceedings.

With that in mind, this hearing will proceed as follows. First, we will ask our legal counsel to discuss the law that governs the matters before us. Next, counsel for Wynn Resorts will be offered an opportunity to present evidence as to why he believes Mr. Wynn is no longer a qualifier. They will be expected to address each of the topics raised in the hearing notice, including the specific issues outlined in Addendum A. This may be done via the submission of documentary evidence, witness testimony or a combination of the two.

Any commissioner may, of course, ask a question of counsel or any witness at any time.

At the conclusion of Wynn Resorts presentation, we will ask counsel for Mr. Wynn to present evidence on behalf of Mr. Wynn addressing the issues presented.

At the conclusion of both presentations we will offer an opportunity to present brief closing comments. At that point the commission will adjourn the proceedings and gather privately, as we have in all such other situations, with our legal counsel to deliberate over this matter and reach a conclusion. A written opinion reflecting the decision will be issued shortly thereafter.

As a preliminary matter, we'll mark three items as evidence in this hearing. First, the hearing notice, which was sent to counsel for Wynn Resorts and Mr. Wynn will be marked as Exhibit 1.

Next, the record will reflect that Wynn Resorts and Mr. Wynn each submitted a brief outlining their respective positions. We will mark the brief, including all attachments submitted by Wynn Resorts as Exhibit 2, and the
brief from Mr. Wynn as Exhibit 3.
Do any of the commissioners have any
opening remarks or questions?
MS. CAMERON: I think you covered everything, Mr. Chair.

MR. CROSBY: Thank you.
Do either of the petitioners have any objections or other preliminary matters to address before we begin?

MR. DIGIACAMO: No objections.
MR. CROSBY: Okay. I will now have our stenographer swear in our guests.

MR. GROSSMAN: We just ask -- good morning. We just ask that any individual who plans on testifying at this hearing, please rise and raise your right hand.
(All witnesses sworn)

MR. CROSBY: With that, we'll
invite our legal counsel to begin by presenting the law that governs the present matter.

MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. And good morning, Mr. Chairman, and the commissioners. I would like to provide an overview of the law governing the designation of qualifiers. The principals of such designation are probably fairly well understood, but to ensure a uniform understanding by all here today I'll run through some of the key aspects of the law as it applies to this proceeding.

The law governing the designation of qualifiers is primarily from two sources. The first are the general laws, Chapter $23(k)$, and we'll go through those momentarily.

The second source of law is from the commissions regulations, primarily section 116.02. Both areas of the law essentially provide for the same requirements. So, for clarity sake here at this hearing today, and I'll just run through the requirements in Chapter 23(k). They apply to particularly three sections of Chapter $23(k)$ in sections 4,13 , and 14 , and we'll get into the specifics momentarily.

As we know, the singular issue to be
addressed by this proceeding is whether Steve Wynn meets the legal requirements to be designated as a qualifier. So, I'll focus on those rules that apply specifically to the designation of an individual qualifier as opposed to an entity qualifier. Before I get to the specific
classifications I would just like to note one important distinction that the law draws. And that essentially is that there are two classes of qualifiers. There are mandatory qualifiers and discretionary qualifiers. And as the name suggests, if someone falls into the category of a mandatory qualifier the laws they must be designated by the commission as a qualifier. If they fall into the category of a discretionary qualifier, the law, of course, allows the commission to make the determination as to whether such designation is necessary to achieve the principals that are driving the gaming law or not.

So, with that, I'll note that in the
memorandum that's been circulated already, we ran
through all of the particular categories and classes of qualifiers. So, I'm not going to read them here right now. But, instead, I'll just identify the specific questions and inquiries that the law suggests that we ask as part of this proceeding, and we'll break it up, as discussed, into the two categories, mandatory and discretionary.

The first, under the mandatory category, there are six inquiries that the law says we need to ask as they apply here. The first is whether Steve Wynn has a financial interest in the gaming establishment. And for purposes of clarity, the gaming establishment, when referred to, means the actual building, structure, and premises presently being constructed in Everett, as opposed to No. 2, which is whether Steve Wynn has a financial interest in the business of Wynn Mass, LLC.

Wynn Mass, LLC., is, of course, the actual entity that was awarded a gaming license by this commission.

No. 3 is whether Steve Wynn is a
close associate of Wynn Mass, LLC. The term close associate is actually defined in the law in Section 2 of Chapter $23(k)$. And the definition was laid out in the memorandum, and we can get into that a little bit later, if need be.

No. 4 is whether Steve Wynn is
involved in the financing of the gaming establishment.

No. 5, whether Steve Wynn can exercise control and provide direction to Wynn Mass, LLC.

And, No. 6, related to No. 5, whether Steve Wynn can exercise control or provide direction to a holding, intermediary or subsidiary company of Wynn Mass, LLC.

In the present situation, Wynn
Resorts, limited, is the holding company for Wynn Mass, LLC. Accordingly, this particular provision that $I$ just mentioned, No. 6, essentially covers all members of the board of directors and all officers of Wynn Resorts, Limited. They would essentially be designated as qualifiers under the law as they have the ability
to exercise control or provide direction to the company.

There are, of course, other ways individuals could fit into this sixth category, too. For example, as a shareholder who owns over 5\% of the stock of the company, as they, too, may be able to exert influence or control over the company.

So, there is certainly some discretion linked into this particular qualification as well.

Those are the six mandatory categories of qualifications. So, if Steve Wynn falls into anyone of those six, the law says that the commission shall designate him as a qualifier.

In contrast, we have the discretionary qualifiers. And for purposes of these proceedings there is one inquiry that the statute says we shall make. And that is set out in Section 4, paragraph 11 of Chapter $23(k)$. And it says that the question is whether Steve Wynn has a business association of any kind with the
gaming licensee. And, unlike close associate, the term business association is not itself defined. But what we do know, though, is that the association should be of a quality and nature such that one's designation as a qualifier will in some way advance the paramount policy objectives of the gaming law by ensuring the strict oversight of the gaming licensee.

Since this is a discretionary category, the commission need not designate everyone who has any business association with the casino, however small, as a qualifier. There are certainly other vehicles in the law that may be used to address these types of associations.

So, those are all of the applicable categories of qualifiers that are at play here today. This hearing, then, is intended to provide the commission with the opportunity to gather the facts necessary to determine whether Steve Wynn presently falls into anyone of those aforementioned categories.

Some categories are, by their
nature, more black and white than others. For
example, the petitioners have submitted documents purporting to demonstrate that Mr. Wynn is no longer an officer or director of Wynn Resorts. If you accept those filings, you may find that on their face they establish those facts by substantial evidence.
However, when it comes to
determining whether there is an existing business association between Mr. Wynn and Wynn Resorts, there will likely not be any one piece of evidence that will carry the day. To that end, in the hearing notice that was served upon each of the petitioners and is included in the hearing packet here today that has been marked as Exhibit 1, the commission outlined a number of subject areas that the petitioners are expected to collectively address in their respective presentations.

Evidence presented in response to these areas will help answer the business association, close associate, financial interest, and control and direction inquiries that I previously discussed. The list in the hearing
notice, though, is not exclusive and it's not exhaustive. So, a further inquiry is certainly appropriate, as necessary as part of this particular proceeding.

In sum, a collective absence of evidence that Mr. Wynn falls into any of the aforementioned qualifier categories or any direct evidence that he does not would tend to demonstrate that he is not a qualifier. The opposite is also true, though. The presence of substantial evidence that Mr. Wynn does fall into any one of those categories would suggest that he is a qualifier. The significance of this review, of course, is that if an individual is deemed a qualifier, they must be found to be suitable.

And, with that, I'll conclude my comments and just note that certainly if any questions of law, whether substantive or procedural relative to this hearing arise, that General Counsel Blue and I are here to answer any questions.

MR. CROSBY: Thank you very much.
MS. CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. CROSBY: I think we're ready to move to the other side.

MS. SINATRA: Thank you, and good morning.

My name is Kim Sinatra and I am the general counsel for Wynn Resorts. Thank you for having us here today on our petition to remove Mr. Wynn as a qualifier from the license of Wynn, Massachusetts.

I will have a very modest role here today; which is, I'm here to answer any questions that you might have. Our presentation includes our new CEO Matt Maddox who will give an update on the actions taken since Mr. Wynn's resignation on February 6th, that the company has taken in order to evidence his separation from the company.

We will then go to Frank DiGiacamo, a partner from Duane Morris and Jacqui Krum, the General Counsel for Wynn Mass who will address the regulatory and staff issues that have been outlined in the hearing notice.

We have submitted a brief and some
documentary evidence. We will not go through them in detail, but to the extent that there are any questions with respect to those matters, we remain available.
So, I'm going to turn it over to

Matt.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. If we could pull the presentation up. I really appreciate the opportunity to speak here before the commission. And, as Kim pointed out, what I'd like to do is just walk through the last 60 days to just continue to evidence the changes that we've been making and the things we've been doing as it relates to distancing ourselves and our company from our former chairman and CEO.

As soon as this comes up, we'll get started.

So, to kick it off, on February 7th I became CEO of this company. It was a time of crisis and people were completely unsettled.

And one of the first things I
decided to do was hold town halls with all of our employees, 25,000 people, and remind them that
this company is not about a man. It hasn't been about a man for 18 years. It's not -- Steve Wynn is not of Wynn Resorts. Wynn Resorts is about 25,000 employees. It's about the people that grow this company everyday. And we've launched an internal campaign and an external campaign called, We Are Wynn, that just signifies and tells the world internally and externally that what Wynn Resorts is is a 20 billion dollar company with 25,000 employees. And that's what it represents.

On top of those town halls talking over 15,000 people in a 30 -day period trying to remind them that, don't be worried. We are going to be strong. We are going to keep growing. Your job is safe. No one is going to buy us. Because right now people are nervous. You're safe. This is the best job in the business. On top of that, in a parallel
process, we realized that we had to quickly distance ourselves from issues that admired the company. And with -- in litigation, founder-based issues, that really would never
allow our company to move forward.
So, on February 27th, I got our
Board of Directors together and set a strategic priorities list, two weeks after I become CEO.

I said, the first thing I want to do is get rid of the billions of dollars of litigation that existed between Universal Entertainment and Wynn Resorts because that existed between two founders, not two companies. I called Universal Entertainment in Japan, asked them to meet me at a mutually-inconvenient place. We met in Hawaii. In two days we were able to settle a lawsuit where we thought it was worth 1.9 billion. They thought it was worth 6 billion dollars to them. We settled for 2.4 billion dollars, wiped away all claims and are in full cooperation.

Immediately thereafter I realized that if you're going to settle something for 2.4 billion dollars we should equitize the balance sheet. Because, as you know, we are always risk-averse when it come to debt. So, reached out to probably one of the best known
conglomerate -- integrated resort operators in the world, Galaxy Entertainment. They're headquartered in Hong Kong. They operate in Macau. They're a 40 billion dollar company. And over a 30-day period, I was able to work with Francis Lloyd and his team and they ended up investing -- bought 5.3 million shares in our company for 927 million dollars, coming in as a passive shareholder and helped us effectively finance the Universal litigation, which continued to remove the admired past of founders fighting each other so we could move on.

During that same period, Steve Wynn and Elaine Wynn agreed to drop a lawsuit between themselves about who had control over whose stock, who could sell, who couldn't sell. And a shareholder agreement that had locked both of them up disappeared.

The first thing that $I$ did was call Steve Wynn. I didn't talk to him about business during this period after he resigned. But I called him and I said, your 12 million shares need to go in strong hands for this company. We
can't have it dumped into the market into hedge funds and create more chaos.

Out of 12 million shares he sold 4 million shares immediately through JP Morgan and Jeffries into those exact hands, the market, the hedge funds, et cetera. It was not -- it was a really contentious day.

I immediately went out and found Capital Research. They manage over a trillion dollars. They're one of the biggest investors in the world. And T. Rowe Price, probably the largest investor in gaming. Worked carefully with them and they agreed to take the remaining 8 million shares of Steve Wynn's holdings or 1.4 billion dollars so that the company could have strong share holdings. So, we were able to place, in the last 60 days, $13 \%$ of our company in Galaxy Entertainment, T. Rowe Price, and Capital, which is solidifying the shareholder base that's going to help make decisions in the future.

So, on top of that, I've been really proud of what our board has been able to do. If you look at the last 60 days, and then you go
back and you think about -- and look at all companies that have gone through board refreshment. In 60 days we've had four board members resign or say they're not running. And we've refreshed our board with three new diverse female directors. GE, as you know, who's headquartered here, has gone through a massive board refreshment. It's been almost a year that they've been working on it. Gone from 18 to 12, replacing people.

In 60 days we've had $40 \%$ change, and our board has said, we're not finished. We're still on the way. So, while it may feel like things aren't moving fast, they're moving at lightening speed. The changes we're making to distance ourself from our former chairman and CEO and to focus on the future.

If you think about the people that we brought on, just -- I'd like to make these points. Betsy Atkins. If you were to look her up, she has been on over 20 pubic company boards. She's known as a corporate governance guru. She's turned around multiple companies from a
board of directors in terms of corporate governance, and she was excited to take the role.

Dee Dee Myers is one of the best people in crisis communications, strategic communications. And she is one of the right hands for Keith at Warner Brothers in dealing with sexual harassment, in dealing with gender issues at Warner Brothers in Hollywood. She's leading this effort. She wrote, Why Woman Should Lead the World. She's one of the smartest people that I've met. I talk to her a lot and I'm really excited that she's on our board.

And, in fact, there is a little bit of controversy about, should Dee Dee come on the board because Dee Dee didn't have any public company board experience. And all public company -- well, public companies almost make that a requirement. And I made the impassioned speech to our board, that's exactly why women aren't on boards. That's exactly why. Because if you have that requirement you have a limited pool. So, why don't we lead in this effort, why don't we pick someone that's really smart, that's
going to be great for our company, and is breaking the mold. And our board had the courage to to it.

We also brought on Wendy Webb.
She's a 20-year veteran at Disney, a finance expert. Ran all shareholder services for Disney during that time. Was in the $C$ suite at Ticketmaster.

All three of these people have joined our board and we are now in the top 40 of the $S \& P 500$ in terms of female representation on our board of directors. And it's something that I'm very proud of. It's something we've been able to accomplish over the last 60 days.

MS. CAMERON: Mr. Maddox, if I can just comment on that, please.

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MS. CAMERON: Obviously these women are amicably qualified.

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MS. CAMERON: And you've been at a high level of that company for a number of years.

MR. MADDOX: Yes.

MS. CAMERON: You're amicably
qualified two years ago, five years ago.
MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MS. CAMERON: And just can't -- I
just have to make the point that there is an issue around women and now women are more valuable to the board.

I see what you're doing, but, you know, it just seems to me that the company, as a whole, didn't value women until they got in trouble at the board level.

MR. MADDOX: Commissioner Cameron, maybe it's because there is new leadership. I'm a 42-year-old man. I have a 12-year-old daughter. I have a 10-year-old daughter, and I have a 10-year-old son. And if you think for one second that I want my 10-year-old son to have any additional benefits or any -- or have a better environment in the work place than my 12-year-old daughter and my 10-year-old daughter then that's not true.

I am part of the generation that believes this. I'm part of the generation that's
driving this. And, so, I don't think it's anything about what the company did do or didn't do. I think crisis sometimes creates opportunity. You can either let crisis drag you down or you can take it and make something great out of it, and that's what we're doing. That's what I'm committed to do.

Also, not just the strategic moves that we've made in terms of financial distancing ourself from Mr. Wynn, we've also launched a full cultural and diversity department led by Brinn Quimitt. (Phonetic) And she is known as one of the top leadership development people in the country. She has a full staff. We've already rolled out leadership development programs. We have a womens leadership form that's going to be hosted next month. We've rolled out our Wynn's Resorts Back of House campaign.

And here is what I believe. The only way to really understand what's going on is you have to give set benchmarks. Starting Monday, the Fortune 100 Greatest Companies to Work For are coming in and surveying every one of
our people, on a confidential basis.
Confidential. They don't have to put their employee number in. Every one of our people. And they're going to answer 60 questions, and a lot of them relate to the issues that we're talking about today.

And then we've also brought in --
MR. CROSBY: All 25,000 employees?
MR. MADDOX: All 12,000 employees.
We're launching it in North America only.
So, the 13,000 people in Macau, it doesn't translate across culturally. They have a different process that they're going to do. But we're doing it there, too.

We've also brought in Mercer for -who is the best in gender-pay equality. They are launching a full study on those. And we're going to take those results, whatever they are, and we're going to be transparent about them and we're going to improve on them. It's the only way you improve.

So, the things that we've done over the last 60 days, I think, are showing how
quickly we are moving into the future and how we're continuing to think about, we're going to lead this industry. I'm committed to lead this industry on these types of issues, not just on service, not just on great product, not just being five star. We're going to lead in gender equality. We're going to lead in diversity. It's something that I'm committed to. And we have already reprogrammed all of our sexual harassment training. We've realized, actually, that having employees provide sexual harassment training, it's, actually, a little bit uncomfortable for people. And, so, we're bringing in a third party, a couple third parties to review how you do it to make it very formal and to work through everything.

So, while I think we were doing
industry standard before, we're going to leapfrog the industry in these issues because it's important. And we are going to have this done in the next 90 days.

MS. CAMERON: Mr. Maddox, I assume the training will include the fact that it should
apply to everyone in the company?
MR. MADDOX: Absolutely. Top down.
MS. CAMERON: Because the policy is only as good as the implementation.

MR. MADDOX: Starts with me right at the top. These are things I'm leading on it. I have employee communication April 6th, I wrote a letter to all employees. It's posted all over the Back of House with We Are Wynn signs that talks about this. That talks about how important it is to me and how we are taking this seriously. These aren't issues that you're defensive about. These are issues that you look at and say we can be better and we're going to be better. We're not defensive. I think we were fine in the past. That's not the point. How can we do better? We are doing things right now to lead this industry. So, one quick thing I'd like to do is if we could just put a video up. The reason this is important is because $I$ don't want people to think Wynn, the name, is associated with a man. Yes, it's a man's last name, but it is a brand that customers come to respect.

In fact, we poled hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of customers checking into our hotel, into Wynn. $60 \%$ of them that we poled had never heard of Steve Wynn or any allegations. $60 \%$ of people checking into Wynn.
$40 \%$ of the people had heard of him and had heard of allegations. And, of that, $90 \%$ of the $40 \%$ or, let's say, $36 \%$ of those said, we love the property, we love the service, we love the food, all the things they love. We actually don't care who's running it. That doesn't mean anything to us.
$4 \%$ out of everybody that we poled said, this -- what we've read about could influence our decisions in the future.

So, I'm only giving you that as context that the reason that we are continuing to talk about our brand is because, two things. 1 , $75 \%$ of our profit comes from China. And $95 \%$ of our customers over there have never heard of Steve Wynn. He only went there one time last year for two days. His picture is no where. He's not on any TVs. He's not on any hold music.

We didn't embrace a cult of personality in China because it was the wrong thing to do, like we did in the United States.

And what we're doing now is
redefining our values and our behaviors in what Wynn stands for. And that's what we're -- and we're going through that process in detail and we're going to instill those values in the brand.

And, so, if we could just play this video quickly. And I only have a couple more minutes.
(Video playing)

MR. MADDOX: The point of that, the point of that is that is the culture of the company, and that's what I'm instilling everyday is the 25,000 people are Wynn Resorts.

If you think about what it is that we stand for and what it is that these 25,000 people do, what we stand for are the opportunity for people maybe without college educations, for 25,000 people that aren't high skilled to make

75,000 or $\$ 100,000$ a year and live the American dream. You get to buy a house. You get to put your kids through college. There are very few businesses left in this country that do what we do. And the reason we do it better than everybody else is the reason that we're at the top. We have the best customers. It's really simple. They tip the most, which means our people make the most money. And they get a better life. That's what we're here to do. That's what we're about and we're about change. Thinking about what we're doing in Everett right now. 2.5 billion dollars that we're investing. We have eight -- we've hauled off 840,000 tons of dirty dirt, enough to fill Fenway Park. We've cleaned a site up. We have 1600 people working on the site everyday. 1500 to 1600 construction workers working on the site everyday. We're going to be employing 3500 to 4,000 people and making a better life in a hallowed-out middle class, which is existing throughout the country.

We're very focused on doing the
right thing. That's what this company is about. And, as CEO, I can tell you, there is no association with Steve Wynn. There is no business association with Steve Wynn. I'm my own man. And Kim Sinatra is her own woman. We are moving this company forward. We're excited to move it forward. We're excited to think about the future. But we're taking these issues very seriously. We're not defensive. We're on offense.

So, what I'd like to end with is, the Wynn brand is strong. And I understand it. And I believe in it globally. I also understand the cultural sensitivity here. And we've heard it loud and clear from the beginning. And, so, we are -- we will use, if the commission is okay with it, we'd like to propose that we change our name to Encore Boston Harbor. We're ready to change the wrap on the construction fencing today. It's already been prepared. We're ready to pass out tee-shirts, Encore Boston Harbor, to all 1600 construction workers.

By the way, it's interesting that we
decided to pick this day. Today is the topping off of Encore Boston Harbor. We're hosting all 1600 construction workers. I'll be speaking to them after this meeting. We're giving them all lunch on the casino floor to celebrate the topping off of the largest private investment in Massachusetts. It's really exciting.

So, what $I$ want you all to know is that we're listening. We're paying attention. And we are cooperating, as best we can, with your staff. And we're excited about the future.

With that, I think I'll turn it over to Frank DiGiacamo.

MR. ZUNIGA: Actually, I may have a clarifying question, Mr. Maddox.

You mentioned that survey that you conducted where $40 \%$ of your clients -- it was a 60/40. 40\% had not heard of --

MR. MADDOX: 60 either had not heard of any allegations.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right.
MR. MADDOX: 40\% had.
MR. ZUNIGA: Was that North American
clients? Are you including your Macau clients? How did that break down?

MR. MADDOX: No. That was an
internal survey. We hired an outside group to stand at our front desk and ask people questions. So, it was people actually checking in to Wynn.

We've actually gone out in the field with Heart and Mind. It's an extensive survey in all of our key markets. They're in the field right now asking all of these questions to thousands and thousands of people in key markets. The first survey $I$ was referencing were actually people checking in to the hotel.

MR. CROSBY: But only in North
America?
MR. MADDOX: Yeah, only in Wynn Las
Vegas. Only at Wynn Las Vegas, yup.
MR. ZUNIGA: You also, in the materials that you included in your presentation, there is this note that says the company has separated the chairman and the CEO roles.

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: You're the CEO.

Correct?
MR. MADDOX: I'm the CEO.
MR. ZUNIGA: Is that chairman
position filled or is it vacant?
MR. MADDOX: It's filled. A
gentleman named Boone Wayson was named chairman.
MR. ZUNIGA: Boone Wayson?
MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: And he's prior --
MR. MADDOX: Prior board member.
MR. ZUNIGA: Prior board member?
MR. MADDOX: Yes. Yes. I believe
the board thought it was important, since we are a gaming company, to have a chairman of the board that was a gaming executive during this refresh process.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right.
MR. MADDOX: So, that's, I believe, why Boone Wayson was chosen.

MR. ZUNIGA: Okay. There is also -in your presentation you mentioned there is the passive investment of Galaxy Entertainment?

MR. MADDOX: Yes.

MR. ZUNIGA: As well as 8 million shares or so between T. Rowe Price and Capital Research?

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: Are those also passive investments?

MR. MADDOX: They are.
MR. ZUNIGA: Do they envision to get any further than the 5\% under which they are, to your knowledge?

MR. MADDOX: Well, Capital Research and T. Rowe Price are institutional investors.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right.
MR. MADDOX: There are no
stand-stills or lock-up agreements or shareholder agreements with any of those investors. They could sell tomorrow. I just reached out to Capital and T. Rowe because they're the largest investors in gaming.

MR. ZUNIGA: Mm-hmm.
MR. MADDOX: So, I'm not sure what their intentions are.

But I can tell you that Galaxy has
said, publicly, that they do not have intentions to go above the 4.9\%.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right. Go ahead.
MR. STEBBINS: Two quick questions.
MR. MADDOX: Sure.
MR. STEBBINS: One related to the board. You talked about you had four board members who were either planning on leaving or were not running for re-election with the board.

You've introduced us to the three new board candidates.

Can you tell me how many more board spots you have left, to the degree you can tell us about your future plans to fill those remaining board seats.

MR. MADDOX: We -- the board of directors is going through a refresh right now. So, I don't -- I don't actually have an answer for how many more candidates we will fill or how many will come down.

I do expect that this summer there will be additional candidates named to the board. I'm not sure -- but $I$ don't know about, you know,
any additional people stepping down. I'm not privy to those conversations.

MS. SINATRA: I may be able to help you on numbers.

So, the bylaws provide we have to have between 7 and 13 board members. The board has flexed in size overtime, depending on retirements, additions. And, so, there isn't a static number.

I do know that there will be
additional changes to the board and that this was just a first step. And I think that the idea is to make it an orderly transition. This is about as much as a public company can take at one swat, which is a 30\% turnover.

MR. ZUNIGA: So, how many board members -- I'm sorry.

How many do you have currently with the recent additions?

MS. SINATRA: I think this gets us at 11.

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: Okay.

MR. STEBBINS: One other quick question.

You pointed out a number of meaningful steps you've taken to solidify and promote cultural improvement.

To the degree you can say a number of these initiatives, I would suggest, don't happen overnight.

MR. MADDOX: Mm-hmm.
MR. STEBBINS: How many of these initiatives, you know, have been on the back burner, have been discussed previously with the company? How many of them are kind of new roll-outs? I mean, are a lot of these things just coming to the forefront since February?

MR. MADDOX: No, that's interesting.
In 2013 I was named president with the idea that I would be the eventual CEO. And the concept that the board laid out was Steve Wynn would retire from CEO in 2020 when his term was up, but probably still remain on the board.

All of these events accelerated my succession to the CEO role.

But when you are in that role you keep a list of things that you would do differently. Because you have to be your own leader when you step in.

So, it wasn't that, oh, what do we do right when we became -- right when I became the CEO, pulled the management team together. And they were familiar with the list. And we said, let's get going. Here are things that we've been wanting to do in the past, here are things that we have talked about extensively. Now it's time to make these things happen.

MR. STEBBINS: Thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Sure.
MR. CROSBY: Mr. Maddox, what is the organization that's doing this big 12,000 person survey?

MR. MADDOX: Fortune.
MR. CROSBY: The company is called
Fortune.
MR. MADDOX: Yeah. The Fortune
magazine.
MR. CROSBY: Oh, the magazine.

Okay.
MR. MADDOX: They put out -- it's probably the most popular survey nationwide. You've seen it branded, I'm sure. 100 Greatest Places to Work.

MR. CROSBY: Oh, oh. Yes, right. I didn't know they interview all 12,000.

MR. MADDOX: Well, all 12,000 people have the opportunity. They come in. It's on-line. It's 60 questions. We added 15, which are all sort of related to the issues that we're talking about today. But there are 60 standard questions. And then we encourage as many employees as possible to take that survey. It doesn't mean everybody is forced. It's not mandatory. But I expect really high turn out.

MR. CROSBY: Will we be able to see the unexpurgated results of that?

MR. MADDOX: Sure.
MR. CROSBY: That would be
interesting.
MR. MADDOX: Sure.
MR. CROSBY: Anybody else?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

MR. CROSBY: Sure.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Maddox, you've talked about -- and I think I saw you on Squawk Box earlier this week. That you have had some contact with Mr. Wynn since his separation from the company. Is the correct?

MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Could you just describe to the commission since the separation the approximate number of times, the nature of the contact, and when the last contact was?

MR. MADDOX: There was significant contact between the day he resigned and the day we signed his severance agreement. Because every -- we had to really work through his entire life that was built into the company, what was his and what was the companies. So, significant communication as to fair value of couches, chairs, can't go in the plane.

So, lots from the 6th to the 15th. From the 15th to when we settled Universal, very
little because $I$ was just -- I don't know if he ever called. Oh, yeah, I did put this in.

And then after the shareholder agreement went away, I had lots of communication with him, numerous calls about getting those 8 million shares in strong hands.

The last time that I spoke -- we don't talk about business.

The last time -- let me be clear.
He's asked me, how's business, of course, probably two or three times. And I've given the same answer that I give to anyone under regulation.

The last time I talked to him was just a couple of days ago because I called him. And I said, are you going to not vote your shares in this upcoming proxy election as your $13(d)$ indicated? Because we have a proxy election right now with directors. And he was actually a shareholder of record when that happened for 12 million shares.

So, I called directly. Because we're trying to understand who is voting for who.

I called him directly to ask that question. And he indicated to me that he will follow what he put in his $13(\mathrm{~d})$, which he would not be voting his shares.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you.
MR. CROSBY: Mr. Maddox, you talked about having a list of stuff that you would like to do when you took over after pull of the question of some of the diversity initiatives and so forth that Commissioner Stebbins asked you about.

It's implicit in that that you felt there were some issues that needed to be addressed when you took over. Am I right in perceiving that?

MR. MADDOX: No. When I was
referring to the list, it really had to do with the transactions that we made. So, the Universal litigation, the 2.4 billion dollars, equitizing the balance sheet with some people that are operating in Macau, settling the on-going feud with Elaine Wynn, six years of litigation with Elaine Wynn was tiresome and distracting.

So, those were the things that I had on my list. I also had on my list leadership development programs. And, you know, we had been talking a lot about diversity and inclusion and how to roll those things out in an effective way.

So, those were not suppressed in anyway, but it's something that we had talked about a lot, how do we do this. And this really gave us an opportunity to use it as a spring board and to realize we probably should -- you know, now is the time and we can make this happen.

MR. CROSBY: Anybody else?
MS. CAMERON: Mr. Maddox, you have given us information about the importance -- you understand the importance of separating from Mr. Wynn at this point. Contacts, they're all non-business.

Would you say the board also shares that understanding that that is an issue that we have to pay attention to when it comes to control, those contacts with Mr. Wynn? Do they understand that as well? And, particularly, the
board members who are long standing.
MR. MADDOX: Absolutely.
Absolutely. I think you will see -- I haven't seen, but I'm assuming you have seen their communication with Mr. Wynn. And they absolutely understand this.

We know, for sure, this investigation needs to be thorough, pristine, and transparent. We're committed to it, and the board is committed to it.

MR. CROSBY: You're talking about your own investigation?

MR. MADDOX: That's right. We're committed to it, the board is committed to it. It's the only thing that you can do in these situations.

And, so, yes. The answer is yes.
MS. CAMERON: Thank you.
MS. SINATRA: And from a proof perspective. We did submit an affidavit outlining all of those contacts. Many of them are none. We also have put in place a process by which any senior officer or director who has
contact, direct or indirect with Mr. Wynn reports that contact to us.

So, I think that everybody understands exactly where we are on that topic.

MR. DIGIACAMO: And, commissioner, we will get into that further as the hearing proceeds.

MS. CAMERON: Thank you.
MR. CROSBY: This actually jumps ahead to Mr. DiGiacamo's submission. But you did write, "Additionally Mr. Wynn no longer communicates with or otherwise remains in contact with any officer or director of Wynn Resorts."

That sounds like it's not quite the case. And it, frankly, seemed to me to be pushing the envelope. Nobody is asking that there not be any contact whatsoever, even with old friends, but that's what you wrote.

MR. DIGIACAMO: That statement was a looking-forward statement and with respect to business association terms. But understanding the chairman's comment, we'll address that.

MR. CROSBY: In your testimony
you'll address it?
MR. DIGIACAMO: Yes.
MR. CROSBY: All right. Fine.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Yeah. There are
communications. And Jacqui Krum will go through those with some specificity and then present the evidence. And, then, should the commissioners have any questions with respect to those various communications, we're prepared to answer those.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Anybody else?
All right. Next step, Mr.
DiGiacamo.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Mr. Chairman, commissioners, Frank DiGiacamo. Good morning.

Just an evidentiary matter first.
We would like to have the PowerPoint that Mr. Maddox referred to, the one with the video, I think marked as Exhibit 4. Is that the next? Thank you.

As already been stated several times here today, and by Mr. Grossman, the purpose of today's meeting is to consider the legal question, the legal question as to Mr. Wynn's
status as a qualifier in connection with the category one license held by Wynn Mass.

Chapter $23(k)$ and the commission's regulations set forth the criteria that determined whether or not an individual is a qualifier.

If an individual no longer meets those criteria, that individual, quite frankly, is no longer a qualifier. And through the evidence submitted by way of exhibits through our brief and through testimony today, it's our position, it will be clear that Mr. Wynn's status should no longer be that of a qualifier.

In connection with the hearing notice received, that notice requested that Wynn Resorts and Wynn Mass have a person designated who will testify on behalf of the companies with respect to the items set forth in Addendum A. And that person is seated to my right. That's Jacqui Krum. She's the senior vice president and general counsel of Wynn Mass. We also submitted an affidavit of Ms. Krum.

And I move that we mark that as

Exhibit 5.
MR. CROSBY: I don't think we've seen that, right?

MS. CAMERON: Yes, we have.
MR. CROSBY: Oh, we did?
MS. CAMERON: Mm-hmm.

MR. CROSBY: Oh, last night?
MR. DIGIACAMO: The purpose of the -- the affidavit addressed the specific items set forth in the hearing notice, the April 19th hearing notice; particularly, those items set forth on Addendum A. There were 12 areas of inquiry upon which the representative of the company should be prepared to testify to.

And following receipt of the hearing notice, including the addendum, Ms. Sinatra reached out to the various board members, contacted the board members and officers of Wynn Resorts and Wynn Mass, provided a copy of that hearing notice. And, as a result of that, those individuals responded to Ms. Sinatra. And the responses are detailed with some specificity on the affidavit, but Ms. Krum is certainly prepared
to expand upon those, should the commission have any specific questions with regard to those.

So, the affidavit sets forth the various inquiries by number and then provides general responses from those directors and the specific officer who responded.

And with respect to the qualifier
status of Mr. Wynn. And at risk of being somewhat repetitive. As set forth in the exhibits and the SEC filings, Mr. Wynn clearly is no longer an officer, no longer an employee, and more significantly, no longer a shareholder of Wynn Resorts.

So, the mandatory qualifier status with respect to those positions is not in doubt and supported by SEC filings, supported by the submission made by Mr. Wynn through his counsel as well.

There is a -- as set forth in his
PowerPoint, the various categories. And I'll point to the one that defines the term close associate.
A close associate is an individual
defined who holds a financial interest, whether direct or indirect in the licensee. As a result of his divestiture of his shares, Mr. Wynn no longer holds such an interest.

More specific, the close associate designation also encompasses a person who is entitled to exercise power over the business of Wynn Massachusetts. Mr. Wynn no longer has that power as a result of his resignation from his positions and the divestiture of his shares. He's not able to influence any significant influence over the management of the operation, as Mr. Maddox eluded to. He's making those decisions as chief executive, delegating to those individuals who have responsible to the specific property.

So, Mr. Wynn clearly no longer has a financial interest, no longer can exercise control. He's just a member of the public. Not a shareholder, not an executive in any regard.

Now, as part of the separation, there are two significant agreements that were attached to our brief.

And that -- the first is the separation agreement that was entered into by Mr. Wynn and the company on February 15th. And that agreement sets forth the specific terms of the separation. So, this agreement, in itself, is a tool, a mechanism, a contract by which this separation is being effectuated.

He resigned immediately from the
board. He received no additional financial benefit. There are sections in there regarding his vacating of the villa at the Wynn Las Vegas property. Continuation of health care benefits and administrative support for some brief period of time. But this agreement is part of the separation of Mr . Wynn from the company.

There is also the surname rights agreement, which is also referred to in the separation agreement, and we're prepared to answer any questions with respect to that.

So, turning to the business association term. Again, these -- these agreements are really the only agreements between Mr. Wynn and the company that currently exist.

And the purpose of those agreements and the effect of those agreements is to disassociate Mr. Wynn from Wynn Resorts and Wynn Mass.

MR. ZUNIGA: Mr. Chairman, what do you collectively call these agreements? The separation agreement is one of them?

MR. DIGIACAMO: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: Any others?
MR. DIGIACAMO: There is the surname
agreement. And that's --
MR. ZUNIGA: Surname, yes.
MS. KRUM: Surname rights agreement.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Yeah. The surname rights agreement, which was referred to in the separation agreement was entered into in August of 2004.

MR. ZUNIGA: Is that surname rights agreement still in effect?

MS. KRUM: It is in effect. It has a perpetual term. And there are no -- there is no payment for it under that agreement.

MR. ZUNIGA: So, the company has the right to use the Wynn name, last name, and logo,

```
if I remember correctly the terminology?
```

MR. DIGIACAMO: Yes.
MS. KRUM: Right.
MR. ZUNIGA: That has been settled as he's being remunerated in whatever case in the past?

MS. KRUM: Right. So, under that initial agreement it said that, you know, the consideration has already been received.

MR. ZUNIGA: Has been received.
MS. KRUM: Yeah.
MR. ZUNIGA: But you have the option to discontinue that. Is that not correct?

MS. SINATRA: That's correct. And the change in the severance agreement was that to the extent that the company elects to cease using the Wynn name in anyway Mr. Wynn has the right to reclaim it.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right. But until you decided that --

MS. SINATRA: We have the right -it's a royalty free right.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right.

MS. SINATRA: We actually got it on the cheap. I don't think he ever got paid.

MR. ZUNIGA: When was that, in 2004?
MS. SINATRA: In 2004.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Again, these
agreements are part of the process of disassociating from Mr. Wynn.

This slide -- and I wanted to show the effect of the qualifier status and really to demonstrate how it serves no regulatory purpose at this point given Mr. Wynn's status to deem him a qualifier.

So, really, if the commission were to continue to require Mr . Wynn to qualify, three things could happen. First, he would submit the qualification and found suitable. That could occur.

Mr. Wynn could submit the qualification and be found unsuitable.

Or he could refuse to submit the qualification and ultimately found unsuitable based on his failure to cooperate or refusal to cooperate with the investigation.

Under two and three, the result of a disqualification in the gaming world is, at that point, a disassociation from the unsuitable person. That disassociation has already occurred here.

This commission even in some of the earlier rulings with respect to the Suffolk Downs application, for example, allowed for a divestiture trust for one of the shareholders, Rinado. And the purpose of that trust was to present -- to put in place, and you approved an orderly process by which that applicant at the time could disassociate from an uncooperative qualifier.

So, in that situation this
commission approved a trust to ultimately -- that set forth the terms of a divestiture should that licensee had been selected.

That is consistent with what other gaming regulatory agencies have done in the unsuitability context.

New Jersey had a series of cases when they came on-board early. In those cases,
when shareholders, and significant shareholders were found unsuitable, the regulators allowed for the disassociation of that unsuitable person and made that a condition of licensure.

The disassociation was a termination of any existing employment relationship and a divestiture or a redemption of their share. That has already occurred here.

So, if this board were to deem
Mr. Wynn a qualifier, he has already disassociated. He could not disassociate twice. It's an impractical result. And I think that supports the specific arguments that Mr. Wynn does not meet the legal definition of qualifier.

With respect to -- turning back to, I guess, now Exhibit 5, Jacqui Krum's affidavit. I want to walk through the process by which we made inquiry into the specific items in the hearing notice.

I don't know if, Jacqui, if you just want to address those.

MS. KRUM: So, on April 19th, Kim
Sinatra sent out an email to the board of
directors and officers of the company asking them to respond to the Addendum A that was part of our notice.

She copied Frank DiGiacamo and myself on that email and asked them to respond to all of us.

As a result of those responses that we received and additional responses in follow-up questions we were able to compile my affidavit accordingly.

MR. DIGIACAMO: I don't know if the commission has specific questions.

MS. O'BRIEN: Did you speak directly to the people you reference in the affidavit?

MS. KRUM: I spoke to some of them directly with follow-up questions. Most of them answered the questions in email format. So, I used those emails to compile the affidavit and if I had follow-up questions I did reach out to them.

MR. CROSBY: You're saying that even people who have been long-time friends, in some cases, practically since boyhood, have decided
and are promising not to have any relationships, even casual, not to bump into each other at their summer house or.

MS. KRUM: I wouldn't go that far that they're not ever going to bump into each other. What they have said that they will do is if they do have any communication they will report it and we will be able to report that into the commission. They also have committed to not have any business communications. So, if it is social, that's what it would be.

MR. CROSBY: Right. Okay.
But the statement does -- the statement in the document is a little more explicit than that. It does say, no longer communicates with or otherwise remains in contact with any officer or director.

And that's on page -MS. KRUM: That's actually in the brief.

MR. DIGIACAMO: Yeah, that was the brief, and that was a bit of advocacy. And, again, that was from the date of that brief
moving forward.
MR. CROSBY: No. No. But I mean going forward. I mean, it's fine, but you're just representing, in that statement, that there will be no communication.

MR. DIGIACAMO: To the extent -that was not meant to be. So, that interpretation or that position was not meant to be put forth if that's how you're interpreting.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. I mean, I wouldn't want, you know, that kind of a communication to be a breech of what you have put to us under oath.

MS. KRUM: I think the purpose of that communication was to demonstrate that there will be no further business communications with Mr. Wynn at any time.

MR. CROSBY: Okay.
MR. DIGIACAMO: I think it also should be pointed out that a single director, even if Mr. Wynn had communication with that director, that director then could not then, on their own accord, significantly influence a
decision by Wynn Resorts. That's done at the executive level.

So, you know, those types of casual conversations, my term, personal in nature, the reference in the brief was to be specific to business-type communications.

MR. CROSBY: I think from my
standpoint, I mean, the boxes that are the formal boxes seem to me to be clearly have been checked and checked expeditiously.

And, you know, the close associate, you know, the law defines what that is, and the word entitled is in the word close associate. So, it doesn't mean just a friend. It means somebody who is entitled to exercise power. And I think you've suggested that's a pretty slim, if not next to impossible. It's not entitled in anyway because of some business relationship.

There is the practical reality. If there were, for example, an effort to remove a board member who is a long-time associate, it would be very tempting, I would think, for him to want to lobby, whoever, on behalf of his
long-time friend, the board member. And that's maybe a little bit outside close associate, but it's within your commitment that there won't be any business communications. And I think that's something that we want to be able to rely on.

But there is -- these are human beings. Human beings are involved here. There are multi-year relationships involved here. And I don't want us to kid ourselves about the possibility of some kind of nontrivial, powerful influence by a very compelling, powerful personality on such things.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a follow-up question on that?

MR. CROSBY: Sure.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Attorney Krum, in your filings you described a process that the company is going through internally for a notification process for communications. Can you describe that, please? MS. KRUM: Sure. So, as one of the things -- and I will tell you that the communications that the board of directors
communicated to me, it was a discussion, for instance, on a broken tape that Mr. Wynn had been listening to in China. They were casual, social conversations. A number of the board members reached out to thank him for resigning and telling him that they thought he had done the right thing for the company.

On a going-forward basis, we have been -- we've asked all the officers and directors to please notify us as soon as they hear -- as soon as they receive any communication from Mr. Wynn and what the subject matter of that communication is so that we can say whether it's personal in nature or whether it does cross the line into a gray area. And we would be prepared to share those communications with the gaming commission.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So, that is something that you could do within 24 hours, let our Investigations Enforcements Bureau know?

MS. KRUM: Can I not commit to 24
hours as people do sleep and live in different times zones? But I will do it as promptly as
possible.
MR. BEDROSIAN: We could probably figure out an appropriate time frame.

MS. KRUM: Thank you.
MR. DIGIACAMO: We've asked the directors to report to Jacqui within 48 hours of receiving any such communications. We can certainly work with staff with respect to the specific turn-around on those.

MR. STEBBINS: Just as a quick follow-up on that point.

Ms. Krum, in your affidavit you talked to making those notifications by officers and directors available to commission upon request. I'd strike the "upon request."

MS. KRUM: I assume the request is on-going, so.

MR. STEBBINS: Yes. Thank you.
MS. O'BRIEN: That was my question, whether they've been asked to or directed to.

MS. KRUM: We have asked them to do that at this point, and we will follow-up with a more formal direction that that is the policy.

MR. STEBBINS: One other question on this affidavit, Ms. Krum. You talk about, inquiry No. 11, which is in the middle of page 5. You say, the only debt obligation owed to Mr. Wynn by Wynn Resorts relates to his city ledger account.

MS. KRUM: Actually, that's not a debt owed by Wynn Resorts to Mr. Wynn -- sorry. It's not a debt owed by Mr. Wynn to Wynn Resorts. It's a -- he put up money as part of his city ledger. So, that's the balance that's left and that would be a debt that, essentially, would be repaid to Mr. Wynn.

And, Matt, I'm not sure if that's been done or whether it's in progress.

MS. SINATRA: So, many of our directors have money on account. Under Sarbanes we never wanted to be in a position where either officers or directors owed money to the company.

So, to the extent that they eat in the restaurants or had retail or any other services from the hotel, they were covered by a balance that was kept at the hotel.

We're in the process of winding down all of the relationship with Mr. Wynn. And, so, when that's concluded, we'll return his money.

MS. KRUM: And just to give you some additional information. On March 31, 2018, the balance was $\$ 230,769.42$. So, that, obviously, will be returned to him to the extent that it is still there.

MR. ZUNIGA: Can $I$ follow-up a little bit on winding of financial relationships.

Mr. Wynn had a substantial amount of art that he owned or lent to the -- for use to the company.

How is that -- can you give us a little what update on that situation?

MS. SINATRA: By the end there wasn't that much overlap, but there were a few pieces that he owned that we had on display in various places. We've settled that out. He took his art back and we kept a few pieces that are vases in one of the restaurants, but we've settled out any on-going relationship with respect to the art.

MR. CROSBY: What happened to
Popeye?
MS. SINATRA: Popeye is still
waiting.
MR. CROSBY: Who owns -- So, Wynn
Resorts owns Popeye?
MS. SINATRA: We do, yes.
MR. CROSBY: Okay.
MS. KRUM: And there is a few boxes in storage, but that is the extent. When we went through the inquiry with all the officers and directors that was the extent of property that's still owned by Mr. Wynn that's on property.

MS. SINATRA: Yeah, we'd love to see Popeye over there on the Mystic River for sure.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And to state the obvious, Mr. Wynn is no longer on the property?

MS. KRUM: That's correct. He's vacated his villa.

MR. CROSBY: Other questions for
Wynn Resorts?
MR. ZUNIGA: I got a hypothetical, if you don't mind.

Is it fair to say that had you not settled that lawsuits that you did with Universal and Elaine Wynn, the relationship with Mr. Wynn would have been one of -- that either puts you at odds or in the same interest, depending on those lawsuits.

In other words, he might have been exerting indirect influence if those lawsuits were still on-going.

Is that a fair statement?
MR. MADDOX: I think if we wouldn't have settled all of those issues with all of those three different former and current shareholders, then you're right, it would have been hard to move the stock on.

So, yeah, it would have been -- I think you're right, it would have been more complicated. And that's why on February 27th I said, we have to reduce the complication and we have to solve all this litigation, not just for Mr. Wynn or the company, but for Universal and for Elaine and this fight that had been going on for six years. It's not worth it. So, that was
step one to just clear the debts.
MR. ZUNIGA: So, that leaves now Ms.
Elaine Wynn as the largest shareholder?
MR. MADDOX: She is.
MR. ZUNIGA: But she's not currently
a board member?
MR. MADDOX: She's not.
MR. ZUNIGA: And you mentioned an
annual meeting coming up?
MR. MADDOX: Yes.
MR. ZUNIGA: Will there be board nominations at that time or board --

MR. MADDOX: No, that was the three members that we appointed last week were in our proxy as the new board members that will be coming up.

MR. STEBBINS: I'm sorry. One last quick question for Attorney DiGiacamo. And you might have said it and I apologize if I missed it.

Do you have a definition of what business association means?

MR. DIGIACAMO: Well, certainly the
-- it's certainly our position that neither the separation agreement nor the surname agreement are a business association, the type of which that regulation was meant to address.

It's not of the nature or the extent that would prompt a regulator to want to regulate the individual that has that type of association. First off, it's part of the disassociation; particularly, the separation agreement from Mr. Wynn.

And the surname agreement, since he receives no financial remuneration and it was entered into in 2004, we would submit that it's not a type of business association that requires him as a qualifier under the regs.

MR. STEBBINS: Thank you.
MR. CROSBY: Is that it for Wynn
Resorts?
All right. Thank you very much.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you.
MR. CROSBY: And we will ask the representative of -- does anyone want to take a break or are you all right?

Let's take a quick break while the groups change.

Before we do break, we do have a tradition that the Gaming Commission of introducing distinguished public officials who are here. And I just noticed that Mayor Carlo DeMaria is visiting us. Welcome Mayor. Nice to have you here.

We'll take a five-minute break.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Mr. Chairman, one evidentiary matter just to move the second PowerPoint into evidence.

MR. CROSBY: Exhibit 6.
MR. DIGIACAMO: Thank you.
MR. CROSBY: Okay. Thank you.
We'll be back in five minutes.
(Break taken, 11:12 - 11:25 a.m.)

MR. CROSBY: We are reconvening our public hearing on the Steve Wynn application relative to his qualifier status.

I apologize. We've had some
technical difficulties. Our Internet feed of our live stream is compromised. It's available in some places, not in others. But we will go ahead. It will be recorded and will be posted as soon as we get the recording back.

I think we now are to the next item on our agenda, which is representation of Mr. Wynn.

MR. KELLY: Yes. Good morning. Brian Kelly and Joshua --

MS. CAMERON: Green button.
MR. KELLY: That will help.
Good morning. Brian Kelly and Joshua Sharp of Nixon Peabody for Mr. Wynn. We appreciate you inviting us here today. And I don't disagree with a lot of the legal analysis and the factual statements made by the commission's counsel and the company's counsel.

I would note that with respect to the evidence that we've offered, we have, in fact, attached numerous documents to our brief, which are now in the record. And that would be our evidentiary record.

I do think, at the risk of having everyones eyes glaze over, I would like to address the law very quickly and succinctly with respect to whether or not Mr . Wynn is a qualifier. Because that's why we're here. And it's our clear and unequivocal position that at this stage, under the existing law, and under the relevant facts, he's not a qualifier and he's no longer relevant to any on-going proceedings here.

So, as I have viewed the law and the analysis, and I think we're consistent with commission's counsel, there is really six different possible ways you could conclude somebody is or is not a qualifier. And I think the first four can be wrapped up pretty quickly and then can be given a fairly quick analysis.

And the first four arise out of Chapter $23(k)$ Section $14 s$ A and E. And those are the four provisions which talk about a qualifier can be any person with a financial interest in a gaming establishment, any person with a financial interest in the business of a gaming licensee. No. 3, any person participating in the financing
of a gaming establish. And, No. 4, any close associate of a gaming licensee.

Now, in light of the fact that he has sold all his stock. He stepped down from a position of authority. I think those first three prongs are pretty clearly no longer applicable. He's not a qualifier under that.

If you go to that 4th prong; that is, is he a close associate of a gaming licensee. He's not. That's a term, a phrase, a close associate. It just doesn't mean anything you want it to mean. It's not, like, he's friends with this person or he's friends with that person. He's got a lot of close associates in Las Vegas. He's got a lot of friends. He's lived there a long time. And that's not what it means.

The phrase close associate is defined by the statute itself. And that would be in Section 2 of Chapter $23(k)$. And the close associate definition applies to people who have relevant financial interest, which he doesn't. Or is entitled to exercise power. He's not.

He's out. He sold his shares. He has no position. So, I would submit to the commission that those four prongs are clearly no longer applicable. He's not a qualifier under those four items.

You get to the 5th potential way to analyze whether or not he's a qualifier. We'd respectfully submit that doesn't apply either anymore. That's under Chapter $23(k)$, Section 4. And that's the one referenced by commission counsel about whether or not the person is a -has a business association of any kind with the company.

And, again, that is a technical
term, and we have submitted, in our brief, that that has been defined. That has been defined by the superior court in Massachusetts in the case that we site by Judge Sanders back in 2013. Case called Gibbons v. Galvin. And it's sited in our brief at page 5 at the top. And she defines; albeit, analyzing a separate statute, but in the same context. That a business association would denote a joint enterprise or transaction between
one or more individuals of a financial or commercial nature. That doesn't exist here anymore. Again, sold his shares, stepped down. He's no longer a qualifier under that prong.

Finally, you could get to the 6th potential way to assess whether a person is a qualifier. And that would be the catch-all provision found in 14(h) of Chapter $23(k)$. And that pertains under to people who can exercise control or provide direction to a gaming licensee.

Again, here, he's lost his capacity to control or direct this company. And, as such, under the law, he has no right to be deemed a qualifier. And we think both the facts that we have submitted to date and the law, he should not be considered a qualifier. And that we respectfully submit that should be the commission's conclusion.

Now, there is one point I want to make clear. The company counsel eluded to it, said he won't be voting his shares. And that might seem like a curious statement given that he
has no shares, right. But there is kind of an unusual quirk in the corporate law, which is, I best paraphrase it, is this, that when a corporation calls an annual meeting like this company has done for May 16 th, they have to set what's called a record date. The record date is the date where anyone holding shareholders as of the date is on the list.

And the reason $I$ say it's kind of a strange quirk in the corporate law is that after the record date, but before the annual meeting, sometimes people sell all their shares. That's what he's done. He's out. He sold all his shares. However, as a technicality under the corporate law, he could if he so chose, and he doesn't so choose, vote his shares.

That's what company counsel was eluding to with respect to, he doesn't intend to vote his shares. A, he doesn't have them anymore; and, $B$, under this little gap in the record date and the annual shareholder meeting timing, he's not going to vote his shares even if he wanted to. So, I wanted to make that clear to
the panel.
MR. CROSBY: That's what you're referring to in your footnote on page 3 of your brief?

MR. KELLY: Yes, sir. Yes.
MR. CROSBY: Okay.
MS. O'BRIEN: Is there any legal prohibition in him exercising the proxy share vote?

MR. KELLY: No, I don't think there is.

MS. O'BRINE: So, he could, in theory, despite his representations that he's not vote on May 16th?

MR. KELLY: Yes. That is the corporate law, but he has no intention of doing so. He conveyed that to the company. And if you want to make whatever decision you make effective as of the date of the annual meeting, May 16 th, then it's -- there so no technical gap at that point.

MR. ZUNIGA: Does he have intention of attending the annual meeting, do you know?

MR. KELLY: No, he does not.
So, that, $I$ think, is the applicable
legal analysis. I agree that the separation agreement that has been discussed that was entered into on February 15 th is an important document. It makes it clear that he's got no more duties and no more responsibilities to the company, and vice versa.

It also makes it clear that he has no further authority to act on behalf of the company. And didn't get any severance. And, as noted, to the extent he was allowed to live on the property until June 1st, he's already gone.

So, for those reasons, for the reasons that have been discussed by everyone else, and based upon the facts in the record and under the law that applies to qualifiers, we'd respectfully submit that the commission take this under advisement and issue an opinion ultimately, which concludes the same thing, he's not a qualifier.

So, going forward, if there is
issues that the commission is concerned with, it
should be addressed with the company, not Mr. Wynn.

MR. CROSBY: Questions? Issues?
MR. ZUNIGA: I don't know if this would have been a question for the company, but let me pose it to you. And I can always come back to counsel Sinatra, if needed.

There was, as part of the separation agreement, there was a registration rights agreement relative to how they could sell, Mr. Wynn was going to be able to sell the stock when he did sell.

Originally, it was -- the agreement provided that there was a sale restriction of a third of his shares per quarter.

But is it correct that the company must have waived that provision for him to be able to sell those shares prior to those quarters?

MR. KELLY: I don't know all the nuances of the sale itself and who had to waive what. All I do now is he sold 100\%. He's got nothing left.

MR. ZUNIGA: Is that your
understanding, too, Ms. Sinatra?
Please come up, if you don't mind.
MS. SINATRA: As part of his
separation agreement, Mr. Wynn was granted registration rights. His -- most of his shares were unregistered shares because they were pre IPO shares. And, so, they were not tradable freely on the exchange. And, so, we agreed, subject to sales limitations. And the reason that the sales limitations were negotiated in the first place is that we wanted to be sure that there was an orderly movement of those shares and so he didn't go out and dump 12 million shares on one day, which would have really destabilized the company.

He ended up being able to sell the first four million shares that he sold -- and, I'm sorry. I don't want to give you a tutorial on the securities laws, but under Rule 144, which did not require the exercise of those registration rights.

We then registered the remaining 8
million shares and they were sold on a registered basis to both Capital and to T. Rowe Price.

And, so, the short answer to your question is, yes, we waived the restriction because the sale was orderly.

That's been fully performed. And, so, that portion of the severance agreement has been fully performed.

MR. CROSBY: Ms. Sinatra, while you're up here, did I understand Mr. Maddox's story right? It sounded like he was talking to Wynn about selling the shares and said he didn't want him to sell them to hedge funds and some kind of category of buyers, and Wynn immediately went out and sold a bunch of his shares to, precisely, the people Mr. Maddox had asked that he not sell to.

Did I understand that correctly?
MS. SINATRA: I think that is a relatively accurate pracy (phonetic) of what Mr. Maddox testified to.

Mr. Wynn was -- and we were eager for him to fully divest from the company. And
the negotiations took a little bit longer than maybe he wanted them to. And, so, he did sell four million shares in advance of the placement to the long-term investors.

MR. CROSBY: Does that suggest an adversarial kind of relationship between Wynn and Wynn Resorts at this point?

MS. SINATRA: It's been difficult.
It's been very difficult.
MR. CROSBY: Anybody else?
MS. CAMERON: No.
MR. CROSBY: We talked about this vaguely -- vague kind of relationship that possibly could come in under the 6th category about, based on his long-term relationship and the force of his personality, that he might be able to exercise influence over certain members of the, possibly the staff or of the board.

Does he have any interest in that?
Can you speak to -- you know, others, the commission -- the people at Wynn Resorts have talked about testifying that they will not be in contact on any substantive matter whatsoever and
that there is going to be a formal process in place to record any such -- any contact, including substantive contact.

Will he make similar
representations? What's his frame of mind about that?

MR. KELLY: Well, he certainly has no interest in abandoning long-time friends and they have no interest in abandoning him either.

So, to the extent he has long-standing friends in the Vegas area, he's going to continue to be friends with them; however, with respect to the actual, legal standard is, on that catch-all provision, is whether or not an individual can exercise control or provide direction to a gaming licensee. And he hasn't done that. He won't do that.

To the extent the commission is concerned with what may result in the future, I think it could be satisfied with conditions upon the company itself. To the effect of don't take direction from him with your business. I think, as you pointed out earlier, it's pretty hard not
to bump into people you've known for 30 years, et cetera in your local community.

MR. ZUNIGA: To that end, there are a number of projects, let's say, Lagoon in Las Vegas, a property across the street that Mr. Wynn envisioned the project.

Do you foresee any kind of contact to the effect of what was envisioned for those projects?

MS. SINATRA: No, we really don't. And, so -- and part of probably the process that wasn't always apparent to the public is Mr. Wynn always worked with a large number of creative collaborators. So, he may have been the conceptualizer of many things that our company executed upon. There are a great number of creative talents who -- new ones that we've recruited, old ones who we continue to work with.

But I think that management has really revisited all of those capital projects, reprioritized some of them.

So, I do not envision Mr. Wynn participating, frankly, at all with respect to
those matters.
MR. CROSBY: Anybody else? Anybody
else? Okay. I think we are then finished. We have the opportunity -- we have offered an opportunity to either or both parties to do sort of a summary wrap-up if you wish.

MR. KELLY: I think you may have
heard enough from me. My view is fairly
straight-forward. He's not a qualifier. Neither the law nor the facts that you have support any decision otherwise. And we respectfully ask you to so rule after you've conferred amongst yourselves.

MS. SINATRA: I believe that the company rests upon its brief and testimony and documentary evidence. Thank you.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Great.
Thank you all very much. We will now, as long as anybody else -- nobody else has questions or issues. We will adjourn, as our practice has always been, when there is any kind of adjudicatory process with any controversy, we will adjudicate in private and we will report out
as soon as we can with a written decision on our deliberations.

And, I guess, if it's -- do I
need -- is this a temporary adjournment or is
this --
MS. BLUE: You're closing the
hearing.
MR. CROSBY: I'm closing the
hearing. So, I guess a need a motion to adjourn.
MS. CAMERON: Move to close this
hearing.
MR. CROSBY: Second?
MR. ZUNIGA: Second.
MR. CROSBY: Any discussion?
All in favor?
ALL: I.
MR. CROSBY: Opposed?
The Is have it unanimously. We are adjourned. Thank you very much.
(Hearing concluded)
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