



Massachusetts Gaming Commission
RFA-2 Application Review
Category 2 License for Slots Parlor

Report to the Commissioners for: Category # 4—Building and Site Design

Commissioner James F. McHugh

February 21, 2014

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

1. Introduction

- Criteria ----- 4
- Rating System ----- 4
- RFA – 2 Category # 4 Question List ----- 5

2. Overall Rating (Provisional) ----- 6

3. Criteria Rating Summary ----- 7

4. Review Detail

- Criterion 1 Demonstrate Creativity in Design and Overall Concept Excellence ----- 8
- Criterion 2 Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities ----- 10
- Criterion 3 Compatibility with Surroundings ----- 12
- Criterion 4 Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle of the Facility --- 14
- Criterion 5 Security ----- 16
- Criterion 6 Permitting ----- 18
- Criterion 7 Other ----- 20

5. Appendix - provides additional information

- A. Design Review
- B. Traffic and Parking Review
- C. Energy and Sustainable Design
- D. Permitting, Design, and Construction Schedule Review
- E. MGL c. 23K, §5, §9, and §18

1. Introduction

Criteria

- Criterion 1 (Questions 4-1 to 4-9): **Demonstrate Creativity in Design and Overall Concept Excellence**
- Criterion 2 (Questions 4-10 to 4-22): **Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities**
- Criterion 3 (Questions 4-23 to 4-36): **Compatibility with Surroundings**
- Criterion 4 (Questions 4-37 to 4-59): **Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle of the Facility**
- Criterion 5 (Questions 4-60 to 4-68): **Security**
- Criterion 6 (Questions 4-69 to 4-77): **Permitting**
- Criterion 7 (Questions 4-78 to 4-79): **Other**

Rating System

Color coding and rating explanation

INSUFFICIENT	Failed to present a clear plan to address the topic, or failed to meet the minimum acceptable criteria of the Commission.
SUFFICIENT	Comprehensible and met the minimum acceptable criteria of the Commission; and/or provided the required or requested information.
VERY GOOD	Comprehensive, demonstrates credible experience and plans, and /or excels in some areas.
OUTSTANDING	Uniformly high quality, and demonstrates convincing experience, creative thinking, innovative plans and a substantially unique approach.

Question List

Criterion 1. Demonstrate Creativity In Design and Overall Concept Excellence

- 4-1 Overall Theme
- 4-2 Relationship with Surroundings
- 4-3 Architects, Engineers, and Designers
- 4-4 Color Rendering
- 4-5 Schematic Design
- 4-6 Proposed Landscaping
- 4-7 Alternative Presentation
- 4-8 Parking
- 4-9 Transportation Infrastructure

Criterion 2. Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities

- 4-10 Gaming
- 4-11 Non-Gaming Amenities
- 4-12 Exhibition Spaces
- 4-13 Conference Space
- 4-14 Serving the Surrounding Community
- 4-15 Entertainment Venues
- 4-16 Public Spaces
- 4-17 Description of Hotel
- 4-18 Other Facilities
- 4-19 Quality of Amenities
- 4-20 Art
- 4-21 Tourism Diversity
- 4-22 Diversified Regional Tourism

Criterion 3. Compatibility with Surroundings

- 4-23 Egress from Gaming Establishment Site
- 4-24 Adequacy of Existing Transportation Infrastructure
- 4-25 Traffic Mitigation

- 4-26 Parking Facilities
- 4-27 Adjacent Land
- 4-28 Delivery of Supplies and Trash Removal
- 4-29 Signage
- 4-30 Minimizing Noise and Lighting
- 4-31 Integration with Surrounding Venues
- 4-32 Site Improvements
- 4-33 Stimulating Retail Activity
- 4-34 Extreme Weather
- 4-35 Regional Water Facilities
- 4-36 Sewage Facilities

Criterion 4. Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle of the Facility

- 4-37 LEED Certification
- 4-38 Compliance with Environmental Standards
- 4-39 Stretch Energy Code
- 4-40 Alternative Fuel Vehicles
- 4-41 Storm Water
- 4-42 Water Conservation
- 4-43 Energy Efficient Equipment
- 4-44 Energy Efficient Gaming
- 4-45 Lighting
- 4-46 On-Site Energy Generation
- 4-47 Off Site Renewable Energy
- 4-48 Building Envelope and HVAC
- 4-49 Energy Consumption Monitoring
- 4-50 Advanced Building Controls for Energy Efficiency
- 4-51 Centralized Heating and Cooling
- 4-52 Shifting Peak Energy Use

- 4-53 Met Zero Energy
- 4-54 Sustainable Building Construction
- 4-55 Ongoing Sustainable Site Operations
- 4-56 Testing of Clean Energy Technologies
- 4-57 Energy Contracts
- 4-58 Public Education on Clean Energy, Sustainability, and Waste Management
- 4-59 Grid Failure

Criterion 5. Security

- 4-60 Surveillance
- 4-61 Emergency Evacuation
- 4-62 Emergency Response
- 4-63 Regulatory Accommodations
- 4-64 Remote Regulatory Surveillance
- 4-65 Excluding Minors
- 4-66 security of Premises
- 4-67 History of Security
- 4-68 Computerized Accounting and Auditing

Criterion 6. Permitting

- 4-69 Permit Chart
- 4-70 Permit Chart Attachments
- 4-71ENF
- 4-72 EOEEA Certificate (ENF)
- 4-73 EIR
- 4-74 EOEEA Certificate (EIR)
- 4-75 Environmental Assessment, Findings, and Impact Statement
- 4-76 Host Community Zoning
- 4-77Permit Appeals

Criterion 7. Other

- 4-78 Other Uses of Facility
- 4-79 Site Plan

2. Overall Rating (Provisional)

Each of the 79 questions which comprise Category 4 roll up into one of seven Criteria summarized on the following page. In turn, the seven Criteria roll up into this Overall Rating for Category 4, Building & Site Design. All criteria are not created equal. Criteria 1 through 4 are considered most important to Building & Site Design because they establish the critical elements for each applicant’s proposal. Criteria 5 and 6 are considered “threshold” criteria necessary for an applicant to realize a compliant development. Criterion 7 contains information related to the site and contingent future uses and provides a basis for the boundary description of the gaming establishment to be included in the license. All three applicants offer similar programming for gaming and there is little to distinguish any applicant in this respect. All three applicants essentially score equally on Criteria 5, 6, and 7. Therefore the following comments focus on the first four Criteria: Creativity and Overall Concept; Quality Amenities; Compatibility with Surroundings; and Sustainability.

<p>VG</p> <p>S</p>	<p>Leominster PPE This Applicant offers a well-documented overall design concept emphasizing an upscale entertainment venue with three features—gaming, dining, and live entertainment—each of which is a draw in and of itself. The dining is directly accessible from the building exterior. The Applicant has demonstrated that it is focused on an excellent customer experience in all its offerings, supported by observation of <i>Maryland Live!</i></p> <p>Overall the application is sufficient to very good. It excels with its approach to a balanced entertainment venue. It meets all requirements for utility connections and improvements, storm water management, green energy, and LEED Gold target. It proposes a centralized heating and cooling plant with a cogeneration facility of 1.5 MW generating capacity—reflecting a long-term investment, improved energy performance, and protection from grid failure. Parking and landscaping plans were well developed and thoughtful.</p> <p>Only 3 of 79 questions were rated “insufficient” and two of these were in common with the other two Applicants. The third, question 4-39 “Integration with Surrounding Venues,” is somewhat of a misfit for this site which is relatively isolated from existing development. A concern does exist that the Applicant’s schedule to open the facility by the end of 2014 is overly optimistic, and that the coordination of permitting and construction could delay the opening 3 to 6 months.</p>
<p>VG</p> <p>S</p>	<p>Plainville SGR This Applicant provides an integrated design approach marrying the existing harness racing venue and simulcast with the slot parlor in a well-developed concept. The application highlights the continuation of harness racing as a feature of the site, thereby connecting with the local economy and horse racing industry (e.g., horse farms) in Massachusetts.</p> <p>Overall the application is sufficient to very good. In addition to harness racing, it offers non-gaming amenities including meeting and conference space, and, on a small scale, a performance venue. Its site plan benefits from an integrated parking garage for customer convenience and a visually attractive track and open space. It makes a strong presentation on connections with regional attractions including Gillette Stadium, Comcast Center, Wrentham Outlets, and TPC Boston (championship golf course). It meets all requirements for utility connections and improvements, storm water management, green energy, parking, landscaping, and LEED Gold target. It credibly demonstrates the ability to recycle all stormwater and rainwater fully and effectively. It also added credibility to its LEED scorecard with a LEED Gold Action Plan.</p> <p>Plainville proposes as part of its traffic plan to make a cut through the Route 1 median barrier to improve access to the site from I-495. There is a risk that this plan will not be permitted by MassDOT and/or the Federal Highway Administration which, if not resolved soon as proposed or in some alternative plan, could delay the opening of the project. Though the Applicant proposes an early opening with 500 slot machines it is not clear if this would be allowable or desirable ahead of the final traffic improvements.</p>
<p>S</p> <p>I</p>	<p>Raynham RP This Applicant presents a phased approach, including a temporary early-open gaming facility, with ample room for future slot parlor and commercial development possibly supported by the potential South Coast Rail Project. It incorporates gaming, simulcast, and multipurpose space into an internally focused facility set in a large parking area. However, when compared to the other submissions, the application is less developed in its design and documentation and is rated insufficient to sufficient.</p> <p>Its Phase 2 proposal is essentially a large box and many of the non-gaming amenities are not as well-defined as the other applicant submittals. The exterior is dominated by electronic signage. Its landscape proposal lacks detail. The volume of parking is unjustified and detracts from the overall look of the site. Further, the Applicant only commits to LEED Silver target in conflict with the LEED Gold target established by the Legislature.</p> <p>Based on observations of Parx Bensalem in Pennsylvania, Parx is capable of building and operating a successful slot parlor venue. Of the three applicants, this is rated lowest in Category 4, Building & Site Design because it lacked detail and overlooked some requirements.</p>

3. Criteria Rating	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
1. Demonstrate Creativity in Design and Overall Concept Excellence	S VG Leominster presents a well-documented overall design concept and package that is consistent with the proposed uses and with an upscale entertainment (gaming, dining and live entertainment) venue. Its site and landscape proposal reinforces the design. Plainville provides adequate information to describe the design approach and integrates gaming with live racing and simulcast. Its site and landscape proposal addresses storm water and runoff. Raynham incorporates gaming, simulcast, and a multipurpose space into an internally-focused facility set in a large parking area. The exterior is dominated by electronic signage and its site and landscape proposal lacks the detail necessary for full evaluation.	S	I S
2. Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities	VG Leominster rose above the others offering a well-defined performance venue, the best restaurant features, and providing the most robust floor plan details. Leominster also made a convincing argument that their proposal is a well-balanced, three feature venue (gaming, dining and live entertainment) in which any one is a draw in and of itself. Plainville and Raynham propose simulcast in addition to slots. Plainville highlights its track and the perpetuation of harness racing as amenities, and emphasizes its location as a regional nexus of venues. Construction cost per square foot was considered as an approximation of the quality of the building. Raynham fell 25% to 30% below Leominster and Plainville. Also, Raynham responses to several questions were less detailed than the responses by the other applicants.	S VG	I S
3. Compatibility with Surroundings	S Leominster and Plainville generally responded to all questions with sufficient detail and documentation. Plainville in particular provided innovative plans for wayfinding and recycling. Both fell short on providing sufficient information within the traffic studies and did not include, among other items, an analysis of roads and intersections impacted within a broader geographic area. Raynham also fell short on traffic studies: in addition Raynham provided conflicting information on site entrance and did not justify its overabundant parking. Raynham gave insufficient responses relative to site improvements (insufficiently detailed plans) and recycling (response was least detailed of the applicants).	I S	I S
4. Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle of the Facility	S VG Leominster commits to the LEED Gold target and the Stretch Energy Code. Its Central Heating Plant system with absorption cooling makes the design energy efficient and less reliant on the grid for its power. Limited on-site renewables are proposed. Leominster has a good stormwater management plan and conserves potable and irrigation water uses. Plainville commits to LEED Gold target and the Stretch Energy Code, supported by a detailed implementation plan. Its mechanical system is comprised of distributed rooftop units balanced by an efficient envelope and significant on-site renewables supported by a solar analysis. The stormwater plan utilizes the track infield for full on-site retention and exceeds best practices. Raynham's proposal commits to LEED Silver target instead of the targeted Gold, but will meet the Stretch Energy Code. Raynham proposes a centralized mechanical system but provides no detail. Mention is made of a significant ground-based solar array but it is not located on the plans. Their site approach acknowledges the proximity of water resources and mitigates discharge but maintains significantly more impervious surface area than the other proposals.	VG	I
5. Security, Monitoring, Surveillance, and Emergency Procedures	S Much of the information regarding equipment and procedures provided in this section appears to be industry standard. Much of the information provided by Leominster was taken directly from their existing <i>Maryland Live!</i> facility. This level of detail allowed for a more in depth understanding of the overall security operations proposed for Leominster. Similar detail was lacking in some of the responses from the Raynham and Plainville applications. It is anticipated that the selected licensee will provide more information on emergency procedures and meet all life safety code requirements.	S	S
6. Permitting including ENF, EIR, Local Permits, and Zoning	S Each applicant provided a summary of required permits and associated documentation. Leominster completed an ENF under the MEPA and Raynham has completed an ENF and Draft EIR. They need to complete the MEPA process and obtain local permits. Both have routine permitting issues and should be able to meet their anticipated schedule. Leominster's schedule relies on an early construction start before the MEPA process is complete. The temporary slot parlor proposed in Raynham may be delayed due to permits and roadway construction. Plainville has completed the MEPA process and has obtained most local permits. The only non-routine permitting issue is obtaining MassDOT and possibly FHWA approval for a break in access on Route 1, or if unsuccessful, for alternative roadway improvements. The delay in resolving this issue could postpone the opening. Each applicant has zoning approval.	S	S
7. Other Future Uses; Site Plan	S Much of the information provided was general in nature; Leominster provided clarification indicating that reuse of the existing building with a south facing entrance represents the preferred alternative from those included in the application. All applicants' site plans were sufficiently clear to provide a basis for defining the "gaming establishment" in the license.	S	S

4. Review Detail

Criterion 1: Demonstrate Creativity in Design and Overall Concept Excellence

This criterion addresses the overall concept and design approach proposed by each applicant and, additionally, offers an opportunity for the applicants to distinguish their proposal in the spirit of the gaming legislation: “recognizing the importance of the Commonwealth’s unique cultural and social resources and integrating them into new development opportunities.” This is a holistic criterion, comprised of nine questions, to address Massachusetts Gaming Commission goals related to distinctive design that reflects Massachusetts culture and values; high quality design; respect for context; and sustainable solutions. The questions within this criterion are grouped in order of importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY IMPORTANCE		
Group 1— Design Approach	4-1 Overall Theme 4-4 Color Rendering 4-5 Schematic Design	These questions capture the key elements of Criterion 1: the applicant’s description of its overall concept for the Slot Parlor development; an image of that proposed concept; and the schematic design documentation that illustrates the proposed development and highlights its distinguishing features. See Appendix A, Design Review, for background and further detail.
Group 2— Setting	4-2 Relationship with Surroundings 4-6 Proposed Landscaping	These questions examine how the Slot Parlor integrates with, and improves, its site and its setting. These are supportive of the overall design approach in group 1.
Group 3— Supporting Elements	4-3 Architects, Engineers & Designers 4-8 Parking 4-9 Transportation Infrastructure	The proposed Design Team is secondary to the approach presented in the questions above. Parking and Transportation Infrastructure information are an important aspect of the overall concept. As presented in this criterion they are considered descriptive; the evaluation of these items is more fully considered under Criterion 3 below.
Group 4— Optional Deliverable	4-7 Alternative Presentation	This item is not a requirement of the Category 2 license. No applicant provided an alternative presentation within its formal application materials.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S VG	S	I S
Leominster presents a well-documented overall design concept and package that is consistent with the proposed uses and with an upscale entertainment (gaming, dining and live entertainment) venue. Its site and landscape proposal reinforces the design. Plainville provides adequate information to describe the design approach and integrates gaming with live racing and simulcast in a site-specific solution. Its site and landscape proposal addresses storm water and runoff. Raynham incorporates gaming, simulcast, and a multipurpose space into an internally-focused facility set in a large parking area. The exterior is dominated by electronic signage and its site and landscape proposal lacks the detail necessary for full evaluation.			

Criterion 1: Demonstrate Creativity in Design and Overall Concept Excellence (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S VG	S	I S
4-1 Overall theme 4-4 Color Rendering 4-5 Schematic Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upscale entertainment venue, branded as “<i>Massachusetts Live!</i>” Renderings provided Schematic Design package suggests upscale retail development Quantity and quality of Schematic Design package provides additional detail compared to competing proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasizes tradition of place linked to harness racing and surrounding communities Renderings provided Concept images reflecting local/regional context not reflected in submitted documents Quantity and quality of Schematic Design package adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repurposes existing site to provide entertainment and gaming facilities. The quantity of parking, although reduced, still detracts from overall site design Renderings provided Schematic Design package emphasizes multiple phases Quantity and quality of Schematic Design package lagged competing proposals
Group 2 Rating	VG	S	I
4-2 Relationship with Surroundings 4-6 Proposed Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed site is on a dead-end street, separated from adjacent neighborhoods, in an area designated for development Response acknowledges separation from residential neighborhoods Landscape approach is clear and well developed, including planting plan with plant types and grading plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed site currently houses harness track and is separated from adjacent parcels Response highlights potential relationships with other regional venues Landscape approach shown at conceptual level, with materials and site improvements suggested but not described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed site is former Raynham Park dog track and is visible from Route 138 Proposed design accentuates visibility with large exterior LED screens Response does not address relationship with adjacent properties Master Plan layouts show limits of building and parking but landscaping and site improvements not shown Response fails to present a clear approach to landscaping
Group 3 Rating	S	S	I S
4-3 Architects, Engineers & Designers 4-8 Parking 4-9 Transportation Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design team information provided for appropriate disciplines Team members have casino experience 1601 spaces provided exceeds 1:1 ratio Parking well-defined with emphasis on patron convenience (e.g., designated valet area) Provides for taxis, buses, valet and shuttles Refers to satellite parking if needed Nearby fueling and convenience stores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design team information provided for appropriate disciplines Team members have casino experience 1,620 spaces exceeds 1:1 ratio Parking well-defined and includes structured parking in proximity to gaming facility Provides for taxis, buses, service, and horse trailers but internal site circulation may result in conflicts Nearby fueling and convenience stores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design team information provided for appropriate disciplines Team members have casino experience 2,425 spaces far exceeds 1:1 ratio The large area of parking dominates the site Provides for taxis and valet at main entrance; mentions buses but not indicated on plans On-site fueling station No convenience store services planned
Group 4 Rating			
4-7 Alternative Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable: no alternative presentation provided with application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable: no alternative presentation provided with application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable: no alternative presentation provided with application

Criterion 2: Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities

This criterion seeks to understand the amenities offered, quality of finishes, customer experience, and the interrelationship of the Slot Parlor with the community and supports the objective of 23K §18 (5)*. It is comprised of 13 questions which are grouped in order of importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY IMPORTANCE		
Group 1—Description of Facilities **	4-10 Gaming Amenities 4-11 Non-Gaming Amenities 4-15 Entertainment Venues 4-18 Other Facilities 4-19 Quality of Amenities	These questions provide an overall assessment of the product offered by the applicant, including appearance, experience and the quality of amenities. These items relate most directly to the gaming legislation requirements. See Appendix A, Design Review, for background and further detail.
Group 2—Socio/Economic/Cultural	4-14 Serving the Surrounding Community 4-20 Art	These questions address how the Slot Parlor integrates with the community as a neighbor and a business. This set is considered important to creating a gaming establishment of high caliber.
Group 3—Tourism	4-21 Tourism Diversity 4-22 Diversified Regional Tourism	These questions are mentioned in the Statute as set out below. The Team considered them but recognized these are more fully considered in Category 3, Economic Development and are not as much a factor in Category 4.
Group 4—Optional Amenities	4-12 Exhibition Space 4-13 Conference Space 4-16 Public Spaces 4-17 Description of Hotel	These amenities are not a requirement of the Category 2 license. Where such amenities are offered by an applicant, they are captured in the Group 1 responses.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	VG	S VG	I S
<p>Leominster rose above the others, offering a well-defined performance venue, very good restaurant features, and providing the most detailed floor plans. Leominster also made a convincing argument that their proposal is a well-balanced, three featured venue (dining, performance, gaming) in which each feature is a draw in and of itself. Plainville and Raynham propose simulcast in addition to slots. Plainville highlights its track and the perpetuation of harness racing as amenities, and emphasizes its situation as part of a regional nexus of venues. Construction cost per square foot was considered as an approximation of the quality of the building. Raynham fell 25% to 30% below Leominster and Plainville. Also, Raynham responses to several questions were less detailed than the responses by the other applicants.</p>			

*c. 23K §18 requires the commission to evaluate how each applicant proposes to advance several objectives, including, “(5) building a gaming establishment of high caliber with a variety of quality amenities to be included as part of the gaming establishment and operated in partnership with local hotels and dining, retail and entertainment facilities so that patrons experience the diversified regional tourism industry; ...”

** This group draws on c. 23K, §9 (a) (17) which sets minimum requirements for the application, and states: “ the number of hotels and rooms, restaurants and other amenities located at the proposed gaming establishment and how they measure in quality to other area hotels and amenities.” The answers provided by all of the applicants to this group were qualitative at best inasmuch as none provided any community baseline data from local and regional gaming establishments, restaurants and other amenities. In conjunction with HLT, construction costs per square foot were derived for each applicant and served as a proxy for quality.

Criterion 2: Gaming Establishment of High Caliber with Quality Amenities in Partnership with Local Facilities (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating*	VG	S VG	I S
4-10 Gaming Amenities 4-11 Non-Gaming Amenities 4-15 Entertainment Venues 4-18 Other Facilities 4-19 Quality of Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearly identical gaming amenities Two quality dining restaurants with outside access intended to attract patrons aside from gaming, plus food court Performance venue with 430 seats Limited information re: other amenities Day care—arrange on site or off site for staff No local or regional comparisons. Did respond with several attachments indicating the quality and richness of the finishes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearly identical gaming amenities Restaurant, Doug Flutie pub, food court Entertainment provided in Doug Flutie Pub for up to 100 people Harness racing and simulcast provided as non-gaming amenities Limited information re: other amenities Day care—no on site facilities; vouchers for staff No local or regional comparisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearly identical gaming amenities Chain feature restaurant, food court Multi-purpose room (15,000 sf) which can be used for entertainment, but no indication of seating, stage, etc. Simulcast provided as non-gaming amenity Limited information re: other amenities No day care planned No local or regional comparisons but references Bensalem facility
Group 2 Rating	VG	S	I S
4-14 Serving the Surrounding Community 4-20 Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers to provide performance venue for charitable purposes and local talent. <i>Maryland Live!</i> testimonials provided in support Notes combination of performing arts and visual arts. Offers to involve Massachusetts-based artists with potential for revolving exhibits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes benefit of attracting “incremental visitation” to region Emphasizes continued use of harness track as unique attraction that benefits community Offers to involve local art institutions, colleges, etc. in selecting art works and creating revolving exhibit as part of “art program” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the quality of its facilities will draw patrons to the region, benefitting all Acknowledged but offered few specifics except to say it has a senior staff member who has an eye for art Verbal statement offered on possibility of limited racing at Brockton Fair
Group 3 Rating	S	S	S
4-21 Tourism Diversity 4-22 Diversified Regional Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ties rewards programs and cross-marketing with local merchants and attractions No distinguishing response regarding diversified regional tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ties rewards programs and cross-marketing with local merchants and attractions Response emphasizes nexus of regional attractions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ties rewards programs and cross-marketing with local merchants and attractions No distinguishing response regarding diversified regional tourism
Group 4 Rating	S	S	S
4-12 Exhibition Space 4-13 Conference Space 4-16 Public Spaces 4-17 Description of Hotel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exhibition space provided No significant public spaces No hotel in initial phase and no commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of spaces including track infield, track itself, and 200 seat multi-purpose space in clubhouse No significant public spaces No hotel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multipurpose room, 15,000 sf, can be used for exhibits, conferences No significant public spaces No hotel in initial phase (their Phase 2) and no commitment

*Absent direct comparisons for quality, cost per square foot was derived for each applicant and served as a proxy for quality. See Appendix A, Design Review, for background and further detail.

Criterion 3: Compatibility with Surroundings

This criterion solicits the applicants' plans on mitigating impacts to traffic, local services, and utilities. It is comprised of 14 questions which are grouped in order of importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY IMPORTANCE		
Group 1—Transportation Adequacy, Mitigation, Improvements	4-25 Traffic Mitigation* 4-23 Egress from Gaming Establishment 4-24 Adequacy of Existing Transportation Infrastructure 4-26 Parking Facilities	Question 4-25 question derives from the gaming statute G.L. c. 23K, is specifically called out in §18 (8) as an objective that each applicant should advance, and that the Commission shall evaluate and issue a statement of findings for same.* Questions 4-23, 4-24, and 4-26 are closely tied to 4-25 and are therefore included in this group. See Appendix B, Traffic and Parking, for background and further detail.
Group 2—Utilities, Services, Neighborliness	4-28 Delivery of supplies and trash removal 4-29 Signage 4-30 Minimizing Noise and Lighting 4-32 Site Improvements 4-35 Regional Water Facilities 4-36 Sewage Facilities	These are important issues related to utilities, logistics, impacts on surroundings and warrant careful consideration
Group 3—Less Applicable	4-31 Integration with Surrounding Venues 4-33 Stimulating Retail Activity 4-34 Extreme Weather	These questions have more relevance for Category 1 license applications.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S	I S	I S
Leominster and Plainville generally responded to all questions with sufficient detail and documentation. Plainville in particular provided innovative plans for wayfinding and recycling. Both fell short on providing sufficient information within the traffic studies and did not include, among other items, an analysis of roads and intersections impacted within a broader geographic area. Raynham also fell short on traffic studies: in addition Raynham provided conflicting information on site entrance and did not justify its large quantity of parking. Raynham gave insufficient responses relative to site improvements (insufficiently detailed plans) and recycling (response was least detailed of the applicants).			

*c. 23K §18 requires the commission to evaluate how each applicant proposes to advance several objectives, including, “(8) ... utilizing sustainable development principles including but not limited to: ... (iii) efforts to mitigate vehicle trips;”

Criterion 3: Compatibility with Surroundings (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S	I S	I
4-25 Traffic Mitigation 4-23 Egress from Gaming Establishment 4-24 Adequacy of Existing Transportation Infrastructure 4-26 Parking Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site less than ½ mile from I-190 via Jungle Rd. Multiple traffic mitigation measures including road widening, signalization improvements, shared access with Wal-Mart, signage on Rt. 117 Traffic study area limited; did not assess traffic on Rt. 117, (10% of traffic) Trip generation rates are reasonable; high percentage of trips will use I-190 Committed to operating shuttle from Leominster commuter rail station and to discussions with RTA Parking meets zoning and is sufficient for facility demands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site less than ½ mile from I-495 via Route 1 Preferred site access features a break in Route 1 median which MassDOT is unlikely to approve. Plans for alternative access using existing jug handle needs to be developed for review by MassDOT and could result in less customer convenience Traffic Impact Study limited to vicinity of Project; did not assess traffic on Rte. 152, a legitimate alternate access route; did not include I-95/I-495 interchange Trip generation estimates are low Discussions initiated with RTA Garage parking connected to building provides 2/3 of spaces. Parking exceeds zoning requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site located on Rte 138 (Broadway), 1.7 miles from I-495, 3 miles from Rte. 24 Will widen and signalize Rte. 138 Conflicting information for design of both N and S Slot Parlor driveways Traffic Impact Study limited to the vicinity of Project; no description of assessment of capability of Rte. 106 (40% of projected traffic); no Saturday analysis Trip generation estimates are reasonable No plan to work with RTA Parking appears to greatly exceed potential demand without justification
Group 2 Rating	S	S VG	S
4-28 Delivery of supplies and trash removal 4-29 Signage 4-30 Minimizing Noise and Lighting 4-32 Site Improvements 4-35 Regional Water Facilities 4-36 Sewage Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parcels described; compatible with surrounding uses Adequate plan for supplies, trash, recycling Adequate signage plans Mitigates off-site noise, lighting Detailed presentation on site improvements—landscaping, exterior lighting, linking site to surroundings Potable water demand reasonable; good utility access; public water supply adequate; mitigation requirements minimal Sewage projection reasonable; good utility access; public utility has sufficient capacity; flow mitigation required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parcels described; compatible with surrounding uses Excellent trash and recycling program Wayfinding clearly depicts signage strategy; use LED to extent possible Mitigates off-site noise, lighting Landscaping plan with narrative provided; no lighting plan Potable water demand reasonable; good utility access; public water supply adequate; mitigation requirements minimal Sewage projection reasonable; good utility access; public utility has sufficient capacity; flow mitigation required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parcels described; compatible with surrounding uses No aggressive recycling program Electronic signage at building and site entry described and documented Mitigates off-site noise, lighting No landscaping or lighting plan provided; will remove 18 acres impervious area (asphalt) and restore to plantings and recharge areas Potable water demand reasonable; good utility access; but public water utility needs to update its permit for authorized water withdrawal Sewage projection reasonable; good utility access; public utility has sufficient capacity; flow mitigation required
Group 3 Rating	S	S	I
4-31 Integration with Surrounding Venues 4-33 Stimulating Retail Activity 4-34 Extreme Weather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewards program with local businesses Extreme weather—Will cooperate with local officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewards program with local businesses Extreme weather—shelter to patrons and several options for community use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information on specific programs Extreme weather—shelter to patrons

Criterion 4: Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle of the Facility

This criterion considers responses regarding sustainability, both in the process of design and construction and across the life cycle of the facility. This criterion is comprised of twenty-three questions covering a broad range of concerns—including overall approach to sustainable design for the building and site; energy codes; mechanical, electrical and plumbing approaches; specific equipment and systems; on-site and off-site renewable energy commitments; and ongoing sustainable practices—which are grouped in order of importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY IMPORTANCE		
Group 1— LEED and energy performance	4-37 LEED Certification* 4-39 Stretch Energy Code* 4-54 Sustainable Building Construction	These questions require the applicants to document their intent to design and construct a facility that meets contemporary performance requirements and expectations for buildings of this type. They provide a comprehensive overview and are supported by questions in Groups 2 and 3. See Appendix C, Energy and Sustainable Design Review, for background and further detail.
Group 2— Energy sources and use; renewables	4-41 Storm Water* 4-42 Water Conservation* 4-43 Energy Efficient Equipment* 4-46 On-site Energy Generation* 4-47 Off-site Renewable Energy* 4-48 Building Envelope and HVAC 4-51 Centralized Heating & Cooling 4-49 Energy Consumption Monitoring* 4-55 Ongoing Sustainable Site Operations 4-59 Grid Failure	These questions require the applicants to document the anticipated energy sources and uses critical to a high-performance building. Commitments to on-site and off-site renewables and energy consumption monitoring are important parts of gauging the environmental performance of the proposed gaming establishments; and the focus on sustainable site impacts related to storm water, water (including irrigation), and ongoing operations are important to facilities with substantial paving and overall site footprints.
Group 3— Finer grain sustainable strategies	4-40 Alternative Fuel Vehicles 4-44 Energy Efficient Gaming Equipment 4-45 Lighting 4-50 Advanced Building Controls for Energy* 4-52 Shifting Peak Energy 4-56 Testing of Clean Energy Technologies 4-58 Public Education on Clean Energy	These questions require the applicants to document specific sustainable strategies that may be considered at a finer grain than the overarching approaches in Groups 1 and 2. Accordingly, these are deemed of secondary importance under this criterion.
Group 4— Other	4-38 Compliance with Environmental Standards 4-53 Net Zero Energy	These questions were not substantively addressed for the Slots Application and may have more applicability to the Casino Applications.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S VG	VG	I
<p>Leominster commits to the LEED Gold target and the Stretch Energy Code. Its Central Heating Plant system with absorption cooling makes the design energy efficient and less reliant on the grid for its power. Limited on-site renewables are proposed. Leominster has a good stormwater management plan and conserves potable and irrigation water uses. Plainville commits to the LEED Gold target and the Stretch Energy Code, supported by a detailed implementation plan. Its mechanical system is comprised of distributed rooftop units balanced by an efficient envelope and significant on-site renewables supported by a solar analysis. The stormwater plan utilizes the track infield for full on-site retention and exceeds best practices. Raynham commits to LEED Silver instead of the targeted Gold, but will meet the Stretch Energy Code. Raynham proposes a centralized mechanical system but provides no detail. Mention is made of a significant ground-based solar array but it is not located on the plans. Their site approach acknowledges the proximity of water resources and mitigates discharge but maintains significantly more impervious surface area than the other proposals.</p>			

*These questions derive from the gaming regulations, G.L. c. 23K are specifically called out in §18 (8) as objectives each applicant proposes to advance, and that the Commission shall evaluate and issue a statement of findings.

Criterion 4: Utilize Sustainable Development Principles in the Construction and During the Life Cycle ... (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S	VG	I
4-37 LEED Certification 4-39 Stretch Energy Code 4-54 Sustainable Building Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commits to LEED Gold target (64 credits), many in energy category Commits to meeting Stretch Energy Code. Redevelopment of existing building cited in support of sustainable construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commits to LEED Gold target (66 credits), enhanced by a detailed implementation plan and energy study Meets Stretch Energy Code with detailed backup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commits to LEED Silver target (50 credits) with possibility to reach Gold Little definition of specific measures to reach LEED or Stretch Energy Code
Group 2 Rating	S VG	S VG	I S
4-41 Storm Water 4-42 Water Conservation 4-43 Energy Efficient Equipment 4-46 On-site Energy Generation 4-47 Off-site Renewable Energy 4-48 Building Envelope and HVAC 4-51 Centralized Heating & Cooling 4-49 Energy Consumption Monitoring 4-57 Energy Contracts 4-59 Grid Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central heating plant (CHP) is robust with combined heat and power system, cogeneration, and absorption cooling making it very efficient Stormwater and water conservation plan meets expectations Uses energy efficient equipment 2% on-site generation. Balance of 10% of required renewable energy to be procured Will sub-meter and trend log Backup energy capability but no plans to serve as a designated critical facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relies on high-efficiency distributed rooftop equipment Detailed support for energy efficiency Stormwater plan has been developed further than other applicants and exceeds industry standards Uses energy efficient equipment 14% on-site generation, with potential to reach 25% on-site, exceeding required 10% Will sub-meter and trend log Backup generators but no plans to serve as designated critical facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses conventional central plant, minimum description of system with no mention of cogeneration Stormwater plan can meet DEP standards but maintains larger impervious area than other applicants Uses energy efficient equipment Proposes 15% on-site generation but solar field not located on site plans and no other supporting documentation provided Will sub-meter and trend log Backup generators and designated multi-purpose room as available during emergencies
Group 3 Rating	S VG	S	I S
4-40 Alternative Fuel Vehicles 4-44 Energy Efficient Gaming Equipment 4-45 Lighting 4-50 Advanced Building Controls for Energy 4-52 Shifting Peak Energy 4-55 Ongoing Sustainable Site Operations 4-56 Testing of Clean Energy Technologies 4-58 Public Education on Clean Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 dedicated EV spaces indicated on parking plan plus casino fleet of hybrid or EV vehicles Energy efficient slot machines LED lighting typically Building automation system (BAS) Cogeneration and absorption chillers provides ability to shift peak energy Recycling and solid waste to be contracted; green cleaning program Will work with Massachusetts Clean Energy Center (CEC) Lobby kiosk plus signage for public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 dedicated EV spaces Will consider energy efficient slot machines LED lighting typically with goal of 15% below ASHRAE baseline Building automation system (BAS) Peak load shifting not included Recycling and solid waste including diverting food waste; green cleaning program Willing to discuss with Massachusetts Clean Energy Center (CEC) Lobby kiosk plus energy materials available at Information Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans for EV or preferential parking Energy efficient slot machines LED lighting will be explored Building automation system (BAS) No plans for shifting peak loads Recycling but no mention of solid waste; green cleaning program No plans to be a BETA site for Mass Clean Energy Center testing (CEC) No specific plans for public education
Group 4 Rating	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-38 Compliance with Environmental Standards 4-53 Net Zero Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These items did not apply to the Slot Parlor/Category 2 applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These items did not apply to the Slot Parlor/Category 2 applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These items did not apply to the Slot Parlor/Category 2 applications

Criterion 5: Security, Monitoring, Surveillance, and Emergency Procedures

This criterion seeks to understand the security procedures of the facility and how the facility will respond to an emergency situation. It is comprised of nine questions divided into three groups of equal importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY EQUALLY IMPORTANT CATEGORIES		
Group 1—Security Features	4-60 Surveillance 4-65 Excluding Minors 4-66 Security of Premises 4-67 History of Security	These questions address the ability of the facility's system and/or systems to oversee all operations of the facility in an efficient manner in order to maintain the security and safety of the patrons, staff, and grounds; and to insure minors are not permitted in the gaming facilities.
Group 2—Regulatory Coordination	4-63 Regulatory Accommodations 4-64 Regulatory Surveillance 4-68 Computerized Accounting and Auditing	These questions require each applicant to address regulatory requirements.
Group 3—Emergency Procedures	4-61 Emergency Evacuation 4-62 Emergency Response	This section deals with internal procedures to be implemented during an emergency and what the facility will offer local and state authorities in the event of an emergency. These responses are important to local fire, police, and EMS services to determine the potential effect this facility would have on these services.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S	S	S
<p>Much of the information regarding equipment and procedures provided in this section appears to be industry standard. Much of the information provided by Leominster was taken directly from their existing <i>Maryland Live!</i> facility. This level of detail allowed for a more in depth understanding of the overall security operations proposed for Leominster. Similar detail was lacking in some of the responses from the Raynham and Plainville applications. It is anticipated that the selected licensee will provide more information on emergency procedures and meet all life safety code requirements.</p>			

Criterion 5: Security, Monitoring, Surveillance, and Emergency Procedures (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S	S	S
4-60 Surveillance 4-65 Excluding Minors 4-66 Security of Premises 4-67 History of Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides full camera coverage of the facility including all public areas, back of house areas, and exterior premises. Provides recording and storage capabilities Provides for identification of minors before entering facility by trained staff Will maintain dedicated and trained security staff which will follow existing security manual used at other facilities Works with local law enforcement, uses Uniform Crime Reporting data as metric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides full camera coverage of the facility including all public areas, back of house areas, and exits. Makes no mention of exterior spaces. Provide recording and storage capabilities Provides for identification of minors before entering facility by trained staff Will maintain dedicated and trained security staff which will follow existing security manual used at other facilities No clear metric provided to assess history 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides full camera coverage of the facility including all public areas, back of house areas, and exterior premises Provides recording, storage capabilities Provides for identification of minors before entering facility by trained staff Will maintain dedicated and trained security staff. Currently working on a security manual for this facility No results of the history except to state they use daily and monthly incident reports to address any issues
Group 2 Rating	S	S	S
4-63 Regulatory Accommodations 4-64 Regulatory Surveillance 4-68 Computerized Accounting and Auditing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 637 sf for Commission and 1039 sf for State Police. Indicated they will work with Commission to provide appropriate space once requirements are set forth Will provide access to surveillance room and ability to take control of any camera or other surveillance equipment on site Intend to install and maintain centralized accounting and auditing system similar to other facilities with access to gaming floor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 550 sf for Commission and State Police and 500 sf for data system. Indicated they will work with Commission to provide appropriate space once requirements are set forth Will provide access to surveillance system by the Commission within space allotted to Commission with full camera control Applicant will provide space for Commission system including installation and integration into their system, but does not intend on maintaining Commission hardware or software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 206 sf for Commission and 333 sf for State Police in Phase 1 and 603 sf for Commission and 1108 sf for State Police in Phase 2. Indicated they will work with Commission to provide appropriate space once requirements are set forth Will provide access to surveillance system by the Commission within space allotted to Commission with full camera control Applicant indicates outside vendor to provide a centralized accounting and auditing system
Group 3 Rating	I	I	I
4-61 Emergency Evacuation 4-62 Emergency Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided emergency plan from another facility as a guide for this facility Did not provide much information on Emergency response procedures beyond calling 911 and working with local first responders. No information provided on the use of local first responders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information provided on Emergency Evacuation procedures Emergency Action Plan provided that included procedure for numerous events including active shooter/terrorist response. No information provided on the use of local first responders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided emergency plan from another facility as a guide for this facility Emergency Action Plan provided includes procedure for numerous events including active shooter-terrorist response. No information on use of local first responders

Criterion 6: Permitting

This criterion addresses the permits required for the projects, the status of the permitting process, zoning and zoning compliance. It is comprised of nine questions divided into the following two groups of equal importance as follows:

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY EQUALLY IMPORTANT CATEGORIES		
Group 1—Permitting	4-69 Permit Chart 4-70 Permit Chart Attachments 4-71 ENF 4-72 EOEAA Certificate on the ENF 4-73 Draft and Final EIR 4-74 EOEAA Certificate on the EIR's 4-75 Environmental Assessments, Findings and Environmental Impact Statements 4-77 Permit Appeals	The permitting questions request that the applicant provide a summary of the permits, copies of the permits and other related documentation. Key issues and the risks that may be associated with completing the permitting process in the anticipated schedule were evaluated. See Appendix D, Permitting, Design and Construction Review for background and further detail.
Group 2—Zoning	4-76 Host Community Zoning	This criterion includes zoning requirements and how the project will meet them.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S	S	S
Each applicant provided a summary of required permits and associated documentation. Leominster completed an ENF under the MEPA and Raynham has completed an ENF and Draft EIR. They need to complete the MEPA process and obtain local permits. Both have routine permitting issues and should be able to meet their anticipated schedule. Leominster's schedule relies on an early construction start before the MEPA process is complete. The temporary slot parlor proposed in Raynham may be delayed due to permits and roadway construction. Plainville has completed the MEPA process and has obtained most local permits. The only non-routine permitting issue is obtaining MassDOT and possibly FHWA approval for a break in access on Route 1, or if unsuccessful, for alternative roadway improvements. The delay in resolving this issue could postpone the opening. Each applicant has zoning approval.			

Criterion 6: Permitting (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S	S	S
4-69 Permit Chart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit documentation was provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit documentation was provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit documentation was provided
4-70 Permit Chart Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to complete MEPA EIR process, obtain State permits (DOT) and local permits (Planning Board) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MEPA filings are complete. Needs to obtain MassDOT and possibly FHWA approval for off site roadway improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to complete MEPA EIR process, obtain State permits (DOT, DEP) and local permits (ZBA, Planning Board and Conservation Commission)
4-71 ENF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 to 10 month permitting period extends beyond the start of construction and needs to be reviewed by MEPA, MassDOT and the City of Leominster 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most local permits have been obtained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to include an alternative analysis in the EIR process to evaluate a larger buffer from sensitive resources (ACEC, wetlands)
4-72 EOEEA Certificate (ENF)			
4-73 EIR			
4-74 EOEEA Certificate (EIR)			
4-75 Environmental Assessment, Findings, and Impact Statement			
4-77 Permit Appeals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 month permitting schedule is reasonable providing the roadway improvements are approved by MassDOT/FHWA in this period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 month permitting period is reasonable for Phase 2, permanent slot parlor Permitting could delay the opening of Phase 1, temporary slot parlor
Group 2 Rating	S	S	S
4-76 Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is in a Multi-Use District and has received zoning approval in a Special Permit from the ZBA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is in a Commercial District and has received zoning approval in an amendment to the 1998 Special Permit from the Planning Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is in an Industrial District and has a letter from the Building Inspector indicating the Slot Parlor use is by-right

Criterion 7: Other

This criterion addresses pro forma information related to the site and contingent future uses. It is comprised of two unrelated questions grouped together.

GROUPING OF QUESTIONS BY IMPORTANCE		
Group 1—Other Questions	4-78 Other Uses of Facility 4-79 Site Plan	These questions address the ability of the facility to be used for other proposes should gaming operations cease and the historic ownership of the property and any land options, agreements and/or environmental information.

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Overall Rating	S	S	S
Much of the information provided was general in nature. Leominster provided clarification indicating that reuse of the existing building with a south facing entrance represents the preferred alternative from those included in the application. All applicants' site plans were sufficiently clear to provide a basis for defining the "gaming establishment" in the license.			

Criterion 7: Other (cont.)

	Leominster PPE	Plainville SGR	Raynham RP
Group 1 Rating	S	S	S
4-78 Other Uses of Facility 4-79 Site Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in a Multi-Use District. Systems and spaces are suitable for expanded entertainment / retail venue and could be adapted to manufacturing / industrial uses. • Clarification provided indicating north site with existing building and south facing entrance would be pursued as their preferred alternative • Parcel information, Assessor’s Map, Book and Page information was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in a Commercial Interchange District. Clear span and structural system and parking offer possibilities for business, hotel, commercial or conference center • Parcel information, Assessor’s Map, Book and Page information was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in Industrial District. No mention of spaces or amenities that could be re-used. Applicant noted that it is hard to image a non-gaming operation on this site. • Parcel information, Assessor’s Map, Book and Page information was provided.