



NOTICE OF MEETING and AGENDA
December 10, 2013

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. The meeting will take place:

Tuesday, December 10, 2013
1:00 p.m.

Boston Convention and Exhibition Center
415 Summer Street, Room 151 A&B
Boston, MA

PUBLIC MEETING #93

1. Mohegan Sun/Sterling Suffolk, LLC Discussion - VOTE
2. Other business – reserved for matters the Chair did not reasonably anticipate at the time of posting.

I certify that on this date, this Notice was posted as “Gaming Commission Meeting” at www.massgaming.com and emailed to: regs@sec.state.ma.us, melissa.andrade@state.ma.us.

12/4/2013
(date)

Stephen P. Crosby
Stephen P. Crosby, Chairman

Date Posted to Website: December 4, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.



Massachusetts Gaming Commission

XFINITY Connect

maxwellchance@comcast.net

+ Font Size -

**Re: Revere only Casino****From :** maxwellchance@comcast.net

Tue, Dec 03, 2013 09:17 PM

Subject : Re: Revere only Casino**To :** mgc coments <mgc.coments@state.ma.us>

I'm sending this letter to you by post, because it keeps coming back undeliverable

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
To: "mgc coments" <mgc.coments@state.ma.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2013 9:11:32 PM
Subject: Fwd: Revere only Casino

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
To: "mgc comments" <mgc.comments@state.ma.us>
Cc: "Facebook" <notification+pihk5vv_@facebookmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2013 9:02:53 PM
Subject: Revere only Casino

I am writing regarding the Revere only Casino. I won't waste your time going over all the bad points of a casino in the middle of a busy city and even more destructive of a casino in the middle of neighborhoods, and forcing it down our throats when we voted NO on Nov 5th which should have ended it. To put matters worse the plans that were shown have changed dramatically, because there are no plans and if there are plans in the making they cannot reflect what was agreed on since you are moving the casino and racetrack to another location not agreed upon. You have only heard from the Revere citizens who want a casino, many do not.

The casino sooner or later will lessen and even go under since the US is now saturated with casinos not doing well, leaving destruction in their path, expressly the neighborhoods, families and the economy that only the top dogs, politicians and the casino backers will profit from "the house always wins". We are a diverse community and have witnessed the melting pot and survived happily, now that could all be destroyed, leaving our new citizens homeless, foreclosed on and in dier blithe.

For all these reasons and more that I can't even participate, please make your decision with wisdom in mind and not the greed that always pops up its ugly head with politician's that work only for themselves and not the people who put them there to protect our environment and then of course the backers who know they will win every pot or they wouldn't invest.

We have been plagued here on the north side of the tunnel with the airport, horse tracks, dog tracks and whatever downtown Boston wants to hide trash. There are many other venues that could be put at Suffolk Downs that our children can get real jobs from and not cleaning toilets and serving drinks, making beds and the such. If a vision of this land was used for technology or ecology we could be proud to live north of the city. It seems downtown Boston gets the convention halls, viable offices and good paying jobs.

Please look deep and try to see a real economic growth industry on that land for the future of our neighbors and their children. This should be our chance to shine.

Sincerely,
Diane Cataldo
Native East Bostonian and proud of it.

From : maxwellchance@comcast.net

Tue, Dec 03, 2013 09:11 PM

Capt. John A. Rogers
36A Beachview Rd
East Boston Ma, 02128

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

To Whom it may Concern,

My name is John Rogers. I am a resident of East Boston as well as a teacher and ferry boat captain here. I wanted to take the time to write you a personal letter to express my concern.

I support the people's decision from the November 5th vote. Now with the news that Suffolk Downs may push through with a Revere only proposal I can't help but be overwhelmed with feelings of alarm. As you know, the people of East Boston cast their vote 56% "NO." Furthermore, in 13 of the 14 East Boston precincts the majority vote was "NO." The public's opinion is clearly obvious. Please uphold our democratic decision.

According to Mass General Law 23K, § 15(13): if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities. I recognize the modified proposal will be "Revere only." However, casino visitors will still exhaust our Boston roads as well as other resources. Don't allow Suffolk Downs to manipulate the law. Please deny any future proposals finagled by the Suffolk Downs administration.

The decision of East Bostonians (despite \$ 2,000,000 invented by Suffolk Downs) is a victory for our community. I am vehemently encouraging you to honor and uphold the public's decision against the Suffolk Downs casino. If the casino is approved it will greatly deteriorate people's faith in the voting process. Please don't allow the agenda of wealthy individuals to triumph over the Commonwealth.

Thank you for taking the time to read this heartfelt letter,

Capt. John A. Rogers
M.Ed.

Reilly, Janice (MGC)

From: Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:12 PM
To: Reilly, Janice (MGC)
Subject: Fwd: Winthrop Town Councillor Elect letter to Massachusetts Gaming Commission
Attachments: Letter from Boyajian Town Council- Gaming commision.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Richard Boyajian <voteboyajian@gmail.com>
Date: December 6, 2013 at 12:04:42 PM EST
To: "Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)" <Elaine.Driscoll@MassMail.State.MA.US>
Subject: Fwd: Winthrop Town Councillor Elect letter to Massachusetts Gaming Commission

Elaine I was not sure if I sent this to the correct place so I wanted to forward this to you as well since you are listed on the commission website
thank you
Rich Boyajian

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Boyajian** <voteboyajian@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Dec 6, 2013 at 11:59 AM

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commissioners:

My name is Richard Boyajian, I am a citizen of Winthrop Massachusetts and will take the office of Winthrop Councilor at large on January 2, 2014. Enclosed is a letter voicing my concerns about the revere only casino proposal. I thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.

Thank you
Rich

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

*Richard Boyajian
Councilor At Large Elect
Winthrop, Massachusetts 02152
voteboyajian@gmail.com
617-823-0559*

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

RE: REVERE---ONLY CASINO AT SUFFOLK DOWNS

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of my soon to be constituents , I write today to voice my growing concern over an accelerated effort by Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC ("Sterling Suffolk") to fast track the altered resort casino development originally proposed at Suffolk Downs in East Boston.

On November 5, 2013, Our neighbors in East Boston rejected this proposed casino at Suffolk Downs. I am writing to advocate that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission uphold the result of their vote and to respect the gaming licensing process as it was designed by refusing to allow a hastily prepared and revised, Revere only Suffolk Downs proposal to move forward. The very fact that their gaming partners have changed during this short time frame also raises "**red flags**" in our surrounding community.

Massachusetts Gaming law requires projects located in multiple municipalities to receive approval from each host community. The law states: If a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. [M.G.L. c. 23K §15(13)]

East Boston's "NO" vote invalidates the current Suffolk Downs casino application involving the land parcel in East Boston and Revere. The Revere's citizens voted yes to "a resort-style casino at the Suffolk Downs racetrack property, located partially in the City of Revere and partially in East Boston. If approved by both the voters of Revere and Boston, then Suffolk Downs would have be allowed to proceed and then need to win a casino license from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. **That did not happen.** Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs per Massachusetts gaming law should be dead in the water. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Furthermore, state gaming law affirms voters' right to be fully informed about the proposed projects which will affect their communities. M.G.L c. 23K §15(13) requires not only "a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community in favor of the license," but also: 1) that the vote be held "no less than 60 days but not more than 90 days" after the host community agreement is signed, and 2) that the text of the host community agreement as well as an approved summary be made publicly available in a local newspaper and on the municipality's website no later than 7 days after the agreement is signed, to remain accessible online at least through the election. A revised, Revere only casino proposal required a new host community agreement, a new 60-90 day window, which is a timeframe that is impossible to meet before the December 31, 2013 deadline for Regions A & B Category 1 RFA-

*Richard Boyajian
Councilor At Large Elect
Winthrop, Massachusetts 02152
voteboyajian@gmail.com
617-823-0559*

I understand Sterling Suffolk desire to pursue a drastically altered design and to take accept their new partners, whose own proposal was also rejected by Massachusetts voters. Nevertheless, the Commission cannot allow a gaming applicant to circumvent the very process that is required by the Gaming Act merely because the applicant did not get the results they wanted. These laws were designed to first and foremost protect the Massachusetts citizens and their democratic rights. I am very concerned that this is being forgotten and citizens will again feel that government has ignored their desire in order to move a favored project forward at citizen expense. I do have concerns, as a newly elected official, I am being asked to listen to my constituents and if the law is ignored then this process has confirmed their mind-set that citizens of the commonwealth are being ignored and their fate has already been decided in a "back room" deal.

I appreciate the opportunity to state my position to the Commission, and request the Commission's uphold the process that was designed to protect our citizens from special interest manipulating a process in order to make a profit over the voice of the voters. If this revised proposal is designed well, then following the rule of law will allow the Suffolk project to compete on a level playing field with other proposals rather that give the appearance of favoritism by allowing them to arbitrarily make material changes to the public proposal after being told "No" by the citizens of East Boston.

Sincerely,



Richard N. Boyajian

Reilly, Janice (MGC)

From: Ziemba, John S (MGC)
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Reilly, Janice (MGC)
Subject: FW: Comments of City of Everett Regarding - "Revere Only Proposal"
Attachments: SUFFOLK RACEHORSE - Ever_001.pdf

John S. Ziemba
Ombudsman

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109
TEL 617-979-8423 | FAX 617-725-0258
www.massgaming.com

follow us on



From: Judy A. McDonald [mailto:JMcDonald@k-plaw.com]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Ziemba, John S (MGC)
Cc: drodrigues@ci.everett.ma.us
Subject: Comments of City of Everett Regarding – "Revere Only Proposal"

Dear Mr. Ziemba:

At the request of Attorney Silverstein, attached please find correspondence regarding the Comments of City of Everett Regarding – "Revere Only" Proposal.

A hard copy will be mailed by first-class mail as well.

Thank you.

Regards,

Judy McDonald
Legal Assistant to Jonathan M. Silverstein, Esq.
Kopelman and Paige, P.C.
101 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
phone: (617) 654-1784
fax: (617) 654-1735
jmcdonald@k-plaw.com

This message and the documents attached to it, if any, are intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL and/or may contain ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please delete all electronic copies of this message and its attachments, if any, and destroy any hard copies you may have created and notify me immediately.



KOPELMAN AND PAIGE, P.C.
The Leader in Municipal Law

101 Arch Street
Boston, MA 02110
T: 617.556.0007
F: 617.654.1735
www.k-plaw.com

December 6, 2013

Jonathan M. Silverstein
jsilverstein@k-plaw.com

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL
AND BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Re: Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC
Comments of City of Everett Regarding "Revere Only" Proposal

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission:

This office represents the City of Everett as a Surrounding Community to the Category 1 gaming facility proposed by Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC ("Suffolk"). As you know, Suffolk's long and widely-publicized proposal to construct its project in East Boston, at the location of the Suffolk Downs Racetrack, was rejected by East Boston voters on November 5. On the same date, Revere voters approved the plan and attendant Host Community Agreement, whereby Revere would receive substantial benefits in return for hosting relatively minor ancillary facilities to support the Category 1 facility to be located in East Boston.

Everett understands that the Commission is considering whether to permit Suffolk (after the votes in East Boston and Revere, and less than one month before the RFA-2 application deadline) to completely reinvent the project so as to:

1. Construct the entirety of the Category 1 facility in Revere (where no portion of the gaming space, hotel space, retail space, restaurant space, spa space or other publicly accessible buildings were previously to be located in Revere);
2. Accordingly present entirely new building and site design plans;
3. Propose entirely new vehicular access/egress, which previously was to be in Boston and now will be in Revere (even closer to the City of Everett);
4. Negotiate an entirely new Host Community Agreement with Revere;
5. Substitute an entirely new applicant; and
6. All without requiring a new referendum election in Revere.

The City of Everett respectfully requests that the Commission reject Suffolk's request and the tortured interpretation of the Expanded Gaming Act ("Act") and accepted election law in this Commonwealth that would be required to accommodate it.

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
December 6, 2013
Page 2

A. Surrounding Communities, Including Everett, Would Be Unfairly Prejudiced By The Proposed "Revere Only" Proposal

There are many reasons the Commission should reject Suffolk's post-hoc suggestion that it should be permitted to completely reinvent its project and submit an RFA-2 application for a proposal that was never voted on and has yet to be explained in any detail, just a few weeks before the RFA-2 deadline of December 31, 2013. First and foremost among these reasons, from the standpoint of the City of Everett and other surrounding communities, is the havoc that would result for surrounding communities were the Commission to entertain Suffolk's new proposal.

Everett and Revere are abutting communities and are closely tied to one another by roadway and other infrastructure, and they have a number of inter-municipal agreements, including mutual aid agreements, that implicate various public services. The Suffolk Downs property is just over 3 miles from Everett, and it is beyond question that a significant portion of the patrons and employees of the Suffolk project would utilize Everett's roadways and services.

Accordingly, Everett has repeatedly (through its Mayor and through the undersigned) attempted to initiate surrounding community negotiations with and to secure funding for impact analyses from Suffolk. Inexplicably, however, Suffolk has literally ignored each of Everett's attempts in this regard, refusing even to respond to Everett's attempts to initiate such a dialogue. Furthermore, no information has been provided to Everett regarding Suffolk's own impact analyses.¹

Suffolk's above-described conduct in refusing to engage in surrounding community discussions with Everett is troubling in and of itself. However, Everett would be particularly prejudiced were the Commission now to allow this wholesale reinvention of the Suffolk proposal, given that: (a) an additional month has been lost since the November 5 election, during which Suffolk has continued to rebuff Everett's attempts to engage in surrounding community negotiations; (b) Suffolk is now, apparently, no longer even going to be the applicant, raising questions about who would even be the appropriate party to engage in such negotiations; (c) the entire development plan is changing, bringing the development and access drives even closer to Everett; (d) there is absolutely no detail available regarding these new development plans, (e) there is less than a month left before the RFA-2 deadline; and (f) the Commission has indicated a strong reluctance to afford surrounding communities additional time to seek to negotiate surrounding community agreements.

¹ Everett recognizes that Suffolk may prefer not to negotiate with it, since Everett is a Host Community to a competing proposal. Though Suffolk contractually obligated Revere not to engage in surrounding community negotiations with any competing project (an obligation that is certainly not in the best interests of the City of Revere and is facially inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Expanded Gaming Act), Everett is under no such obligation.

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
December 6, 2013
Page 3

Though I am writing on behalf of Everett as a Surrounding Community, I would imagine that other Surrounding Communities may have similar concerns, even if they are communities with whom Suffolk has engaged in prior negotiations, given the dramatic change in development plans and identity of applicant. In any event, Everett respectfully submits that it would be severely and unfairly prejudiced were the Commission to allow Suffolk to proceed with the so-called “Revere Only” proposal.

B. Allowing Suffolk To Submit An Application For A “Revere Only” Project Would Be Inconsistent With the Act and Generally Accepted Election Law Principles

In addition to being prejudicial to Everett as a Surrounding Community, allowing Suffolk to submit a RFA-2 application would simply be inconsistent with the Act and with generally accepted principles of election law.

As the Commission is aware, G.L. c.23K, §15(13) precludes submission of a final application unless the applicant has first received a favorable vote on a ballot question supporting the proposal. The statute explicitly links the proposed vote to the Host Community Agreement, requiring that the Host Community Agreement be posted and published and remain so until after certification of the ballot vote. Clearly, therefore, the vote required under Section 23K is not as Suffolk has suggested, a mere “land use” vote—rather, it is a referendum on the Project as proposed and described in the Host Community Agreement.

Here, the Host Community Agreement between Suffolk and Revere (“Revere HCA”), which was the subject of the November 5 election in Revere, clearly does not contemplate construction of the primary Category 2 facility (or any substantial amenity thereof) in Revere. Indeed, under the heading “IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT”, the Revere HCA provides (in Section 1.A.5):

As planned, the Project would be constructed within the municipal boundaries of the City of Boston and no new significant construction is currently proposed on the portion of the property located in the City [of Revere]... [Emphasis added]

Indeed, all of the development plans widely-published and touted by Suffolk (and thus clearly in the minds of Revere voters) showed the entirety of the Suffolk project being constructed in Boston, including vehicular access to the facility. As to construction in Revere itself, the Revere HCA simply indicates the parties “anticipate” (without obligation) that Suffolk “**will construct on the Revere Property certain improvements to existing racing-related structures (such as barns, maintenance buildings, and the like) and surface parking improvements accessory to the Project.**” Revere HCA, Section 2.C.2 [Emphasis added].

KOPELMAN AND PAIGE, P.C.

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
December 6, 2013
Page 4

Suffolk's suggestion that Section 2.N of the Revere HCA somehow put Revere voters on notice of the potential that the entire Category 2 gaming facility could be shifted into Revere is patently meritless. That Section, entitled "EXPANSION OF THE GAMING FACILITY", states:

If the Owner seeks to expand its gaming facility onto the Revere Property or beyond the Property onto property located within or outside the City, the Owner shall promptly notify the City and the Parties shall negotiate in good faith an amendment to this Agreement to mitigate the negative impacts, if any, upon the City of such expansion. [Emphasis added].

Merriam-Webster defines the word "expansion" as "the act of becoming bigger or of making something bigger; the act of expanding." This definition is, of course, consistent with common sense. No reasonably objective voter, having reviewed the Revere HCA and the myriad descriptions of the Project released by Suffolk and widely covered by the media, would believe he/she was voting to approve anything resembling the "Revere Only" project now being promoted by Suffolk.²

To allow a "Revere only" application to be submitted would clearly undermine the clear intent of the Act, which explicitly links the required ballot vote to the project described in the Host Community Agreement. It would also be patently inconsistent with generally accepted election principles, which require that election actions linked to written documents be undertaken with full knowledge of the content (and thus the import) of those documents. *See, e.g., Capezzuto v. State Ballot Law Com'n*, 407 Mass. 949, 955-56 (1990). In *Capezzuto*, the Court invalidated an initiative petition, where the required number signors had not seen the final version of the petition. Rejecting reasoning of the State Ballot Law Commission that the differences between the versions seen and signed were minor and non-substantive, and that the substance of the final version was orally described to the signers, the SJC reasoned:

A signature requirement would be meaningless if the person supplying the signature has not first seen what it is that he or she is signing. Further, and more importantly, loose interpretation of the subscription requirement can pose a significant potential

² I note that reference has been made to a single statement made by Suffolk's principal Chip Tuttle at one public event that he would "keep his options open" if there were a split vote. This ambiguous statement was not circulated to every voting household, posted on Revere's website or otherwise disseminated to voters. In any event, it clearly did not put Revere voters on notice that the Project, described in the Revere HCA as being "constructed within the municipal boundaries of the City of Boston" with "no new significant construction [being] proposed in" Revere, would be completely discarded in favor of a new project entirely within the bounds of Revere. As Chairman Crosby indicated at the Commission's November 21 meeting (Transcript, p.215, l.4), it appears that Suffolk indeed may have contemplated this eventuality and would want to keep its "options open." If this is the case, Suffolk should have done so clearly and explicitly, in a way that reasonable voters would have understood when reading the ballot question and the HCA. It certainly did not do so. As Chairman Crosby aptly stated, "I would assume if he had that in the back of his mind that he and his team would be smart enough to make sure the host community agreement would anticipate that... expand does mean expand. It doesn't mean replace." (Transcript, p.215, l.8-13).

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
December 6, 2013
Page 5

for fraud. A person permitted to describe orally the contents of an initiative petition to a potential signer, without the signer having actually examined the petition, could easily mislead the signer by, for example, omitting, downplaying, or even flatly misrepresenting, portions of the petition that might not be to the signer's liking. This danger seems particularly acute when, in this case, the person giving the description is the drafter of the petition, who obviously has a vested interest in seeing that it gets the requisite signatures to qualify for the ballot. Additionally, the proposed law in this case is a highly detailed, nine-page document. As is the case with all laws, the precise language chosen would be of great significance. Given these facts, it seems unlikely that an oral description of the proposed law's substance could possibly convey anywhere near the same amount of information, or in as accurate a manner, as would firsthand review of the proposed law's text by the signer.

Capezzuto, 407 Mass. at 955-56 [emphasis added]. Though extensive publicity regarding ballot measures may sometimes minimize concerns regarding voter confusion (see, e.g., Massachusetts Teachers Ass'n v. Sec'y of Com., 384 Mass. 209, 220 (1981)), the extensive publicity in this case only heightened it, given that all of this publicity related to a Boston-only development plan, and Suffolk has now completely abandoned that plan.

The reasoning of the SJC in Capezzuto is particularly apt here. The Revere HCA was clearly drafted in a way to minimize concerns Revere residents may have regarding the construction of a gaming facility in their city, and it makes clear that the proposal they were voting on involved construction of the project entirely “within the municipal boundaries of the City of Boston and [with] no new significant construction” to take place in Revere. It must be assumed that a reasonable voter determining whether to vote in favor of the Project would be influenced by these representations. Under these circumstances, it is completely implausible to suggest that Revere voters believed they were voting to authorize construction of an entire Category 1 gaming facility in Revere. To allow Suffolk to completely substitute a new “Revere only” project after misleading Revere voters to believe the Project would essentially be “Boston only”, based on Mr. Tuttle’s isolated statement that he would “keep his options open” creates exactly the type of risk of fraud and confusion against which the SJC cautioned in Capezzuto.³


³ I am aware that certain comparisons have been drawn between this case and the Commission’s allowance of the substitution of applicants pre-election in Plainville. As the Commission is aware, the undersigned is counsel to Plainville and twice appeared before the Commission with respect to the Plainville substitution of applicants. The undersigned would respectfully disagree with any such comparison. First, as noted, the substitution of applicants was prior to the election in Plainville; indeed, the Commission expressed substantial concern that the voters should be educated as much as possible prior to the election regarding the substitution of applicants, so that Plainville voters would be aware of the substitution prior to voting. More importantly, the substitution of applicants in Plainville did not in any way change the proposed project itself. The site plan was to remain the same; the structure was to remain the same; the entrances and traffic mitigation were to remain the same; even the name of the facility was to remain the same; perhaps most importantly, the Host Community Agreement was to remain the same. None of this is true relative to Suffolk’s proposed “Revere only” project, which literally would not keep any of these aspects of the development the same.

KOPELMAN AND PAIGE, P.C.

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
December 6, 2013
Page 6

On behalf of the City of Everett, I thank the Commission for its careful consideration of this important matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if there is any further information I can provide in support of this request. I respectfully request an opportunity to appear before the Commission to discuss this matter further at its meeting on December 10, 2013.

Very truly yours,


Jonathan M. Silverstein *JS*

JMS/jam
cc: Mayor

487691/09312/0001

Reilly, Janice (MGC)

From: Dan Rizzo <drizzo@revere.org>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:10 PM
To: Crosby, Steve (MGC); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC)
Cc: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Letter to Gaming Commission
Attachments: Letter to Mass Gaming Commission 120613.pdf

Importance: High

For your review.....see attached.

Daniel Rizzo
Mayor
City of Revere
281 Broadway
Revere, MA 02151
781-286-8111



In Massachusetts, the term "public record" is broadly defined to include all documentary materials or data created or received by any officer or employee of any governmental unit, regardless of physical form or characteristics, unless it falls under one of the statutory exemptions to the Public Records Law. G. L. c. 4, § 7(26). Consequently, email is subject to the disclosure, retention, and maintenance provisions as required by law. G. L. c. 66}

The City of Revere Massachusetts



City Hall

281 Broadway
Revere, MA 02151
(781) 286-8110
(781) 286-8199 Fax

Daniel Rizzo
Mayor

Office of the Mayor

December 6, 2013

Chairman Stephen Crosby
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, Suite 720
Boston, MA 02109

RE: Proposed Casino at Suffolk Downs

Dear Chairman Crosby:

I would like to thank you and the Gaming Commission for taking the time at your meeting this week to discuss the resort casino proposed by Mohegan Sun for the Suffolk Downs property in Revere. I was very encouraged to hear comments from the Commissioners regarding the rights of Revere's voters and our City's enthusiastic support for a casino.

Long before the November 5th referendum, the City of Revere has supported expanded gaming within its borders. I use the term "expanded gaming" because Revere has hosted gaming operations for almost 80 years, and was the home to two separate racetracks until the closing of the Wonderland Greyhound Park in 2010. Revere's elected leaders have been courting a casino for almost 20 years. In 1996, Revere became the only community in the Commonwealth with a zoning district allowing casino gaming – a district that included the Suffolk Downs property. The Revere City Council further rezoned the Suffolk Downs property in 2007 to keep pace with various proposals in the General Court regarding casino gaming.

Many in Revere – myself included – were disappointed that the original plans for a casino at Suffolk Downs did not include substantial development on the Revere side of the property. Prior to the November 5th referendum, I made numerous public statements expressing my hope that Revere would receive more gaming development in the future. Many community leaders and residents in Revere expressed similar sentiments during the referendum campaign. As noted by Chairman Crosby at this week's meeting, our Host Community Agreement "practically begs" for additional development in Revere. This was by design.

You should also know that during the course of negotiating our Host Community Agreement, my administration and representatives from Suffolk Downs regularly discussed the prospect of having the project situated entirely within Revere, in the event that the East Boston referendum prevented a two-community project. The re-opener provisions in our Host

Community Agreement were specifically drafted to allow for a pivot of the project to Revere. While the City and Suffolk Downs aggressively supported a two-community project, a Revere-only development was clearly a possibility that we anticipated and incorporated into our Host Community Agreement.

On November 5th, over 60% of Revere voters supported the development of a gaming establishment at the Suffolk Downs property off of Winthrop Avenue in Revere. The summary printed on each ballot used at the election clearly stated that the Host Community Agreement would be reopened if the gaming establishment was expanded on the Revere side of the Suffolk Downs property. Voters then affirmed what I have known for a long, long time and that is, their support for hosting a gaming establishment within our borders. They also delegated to me as their Mayor, the authority to negotiate additional mitigation in the event that a project change resulted in increased gaming development at Suffolk Downs.

As I mentioned at your meeting this week, not one single Revere resident (at least up until yesterday when I received one email in opposition) has contacted me to question whether Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun can proceed with the project based upon the vote on November 5th. To the contrary, everywhere I go in Revere, residents come up to me and express their support for the project and their excitement that the casino will be situated entirely within Revere.

Since November 5th, Revere's elected leaders have joined me in taking every step necessary to carry out the will of the voters. On December 2nd, the Revere City Council voted unanimously to pass a resolution in support of the project proposed by Mohegan Sun at the Suffolk Downs property, and in support of the validity of the November 5th referendum. On December 3rd, the Revere Planning Board voted unanimously in favor of a zoning amendment affecting the Suffolk Downs property, as proposed by Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun. I expect that the City Council will vote later this month to pass the zoning amendment requested for the project.

In addition to our voters and elected officials, the business community in Revere wholeheartedly favors expanded gaming at Suffolk Downs. I invite you, or a designee, to come to Revere to speak with some of our local business leaders about this issue. I am confident that you will come away with an appreciation for Revere's strong and continuing support for Mohegan Sun's project at Suffolk Downs, which will be a catalyst for additional economic development in our City.

The project proposed at Suffolk Downs will create 2,500 construction jobs and 4,000 permanent jobs, with a preference given to Revere residents. Mohegan Sun is one of Connecticut's largest employers and has a strong track record of hiring and training local employees, and working with local businesses, community leaders and cultural and tourist organizations. A resort casino in Revere will help re-energize our regional economy (one of the hardest hit by the economic downturn) through job creation, economic development opportunities, and tens of millions of dollars in transportation improvements.

Finally, between elections in a representative democracy, it is incumbent upon our elected officials to uphold the will of the people. In Revere, our City Councilors and I, as Mayor, are unanimous in this understanding, belief, and desire. Because of Revere's longstanding support for casino gaming within its borders, and because of the great benefits a casino at Suffolk Downs will bring to Revere and the region, Revere's elected leaders and I will continue to represent the overwhelming majority of voters who turned out on November 5th to say YES to expanded gaming in Revere.

I thank the Gaming Commission for its consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Daniel Rizzo
Mayor

cc: Speaker Robert DeLeo
Senator Anthony Petruccelli
Representative Kathi-Anne Reinstein

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jim Iannuzzi <jmiannuzzi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 11:22 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere East Boston Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Hi , My name is Jim Iannuzzi. I live and own an Italian Restaurant in East Boston. I am writing this letter to show my support for Suffolk Downs Casino and Track. This would bring a great deal of travelers and people from other areas to a couple of great towns. This area should be a destination with the first public beach in the country , A horse track for many years and an airport, they all go hand in hand. Not to mention the T service to Down town. Please say yes for Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun This would bring in much money to both cities and also many many jobs. Thank you and Happy Holidays. Jim Iannuzzi.

Sent from my iPhone

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Mary Ellen Welch <maryellen225@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 11:07 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Another Concern About Suffolk Downs

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commission Members,

In my first note to you I forgot to mention another concern about the Suffolk Downs partnership. The Vornado group has set up a blind trust that means they will not have their workings investigated as part of the vetting process. I think that this is wrong because it takes away the transparency of the process.

I speak as a Boston resident who followed the development plan at the old Filene site in Downtown Crossing. This Vornado group tore down the Filene store and left a huge, gaping hole on Washington and Franklin Streets for a very long time and then abandoned the project. It was a disgrace! Thankfully Mayor Menino got another developer interested in doing the project.

So, I request that you open the blind trust to see if there is anything that needs to be brought to light for us, the citizens. I thank you in advance for your work.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Welch
225 Webster Street
East Boston, Massachusetts 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Peter Chipman <pchipman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 10:51 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Applicant Suitability

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed Suffolk Downs casino.

As you know, the host-community approval process as crafted by the state legislature was intended to allow the communities that would be most affected by any proposed casino the opportunity to reject such a proposal through a direct vote. The people of East Boston having soundly defeated the original Suffolk Downs proposal, it is clear that for the MGC to accept Suffolk Downs's revised plan would be a violation of the intent of the law.

The fact that the revised proposal puts the casino operations completely on the Revere side of the town line is immaterial; the new plan would affect East Boston just as much as the original one would have. I strongly urge you to respect the democratic process and the intentions of the legislature by rejecting Suffolk Downs's proposal.

Yours,
Peter Chipman
East Boston, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 10:49 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Jeffrey Turco

Email

jrturco@aol.com

Phone

(617)539-9979

Subject

in support of Revere proposal

Questions or Comments

Dear Commissioners:

As a resident of Winthrop, and a former Town Council President, I write to urge your approval of the request to allow a Revere only casino to move forward with the licensing process.

While I was privileged to serve as Winthrop's Town Council President, I had had occasion to meet with Mssrs. Fields and Tuttle. From the beginning, they met with various elected and appointed leaders in Winthrop to determine and address our concerns and to answer our questions. They engaged in a two way discussion that was refreshingly surprising. Most importantly, they demonstrated a true openness for an ongoing partnership with Winthrop.

In addition, the municipal leadership of Revere and Winthrop have collaborated on numerous regionalization projects and partnerships over the past several years. I think it fair to say that the relationship between our two communities has grown closer over the past few years as we have sought to create greater efficiency's and to jointly address our mutual public safety concerns.

Finally, the people of Revere voted overwhelmingly to support a casino in East Boston/Revere. The elected leadership at both the state and local level in Revere have all supported this effort. The people of Revere went into the November 5th election with eyes wide open and clearly and resoundingly said, 'yes, we want a casino.' The fact that the casino will be a Revere only casino does not change the equation. Mayor Rizzo deserves great credit for making clear to the people of Revere what the expected benefits would be to the community.

As a former resident of Revere, I take umbrage at those who would impose the results of the Boston vote on the people of Revere. The vote of the good people of East Boston should, and will be respected and consequently there will be NO casino in East Boston. At the same time, the vote of the good people of Revere should be, and with your approval will be respected and Revere will be allowed to move along in the licensing process.

I thank you for your time and consideration of my input.

Please accept my best wishes for a Blessed and Happy Christmas and my appreciation for all of your hard work in making this process work.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey Rosario Turco

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 10:48 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

James Leaver

Email

idleaver@verizon.net

Phone

(781)784-5540

Subject

Pending Revere casino vote

Questions or Comments

To the Commission,

It is absolutely untenable that the Commission might approve Suffolk Downs loose proposal for a racetrack in Revere based on that community's favorable vote for a casino primarily to be located in East Boston to be run by Caesar's.

Any such vote at this time will destroy the credibility of the Commission, and the voters' faith in the casino law and licensing process.

Sincerely,

James D. Leaver

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 10:20 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

June Chiarella

Email

junechiarella@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)289-7240

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

i am totally against the Revere Casino when I voted it included East Boston no where did it say Revere only this planned area is one of the most heavily populated areas in Revere the traffic and degenerates it would attract would cripple that area . Gambling can be an addiction go to Foxwoods some day and see the senior citizens lose their last dollar. That land could be put to use in a better way we are known in the State of Massachusetts for our hospitals and education I am sure we could find a better use than a Casino please please do not approve this.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: No Eastie Casino <noeastiecasino@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 10:14 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)
Cc: Blue, Catherine (MGC); Grossman, Todd (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Reilly, Janice (MGC)
Subject: Request for Public Comment / Participation in Dec. 10 Open Meeting
Attachments: No Eastie Casino Formal Request for Public Comment at 12-10 Meeting.pdf
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission,

Given the importance of tomorrow's decision regarding whether Mohegan Sun may move forward with a Revere-only casino development without a new agreement and vote, No Eastie Casino respectfully requests an opportunity to represent the 4,281 East Boston residents (and the 4,232 Revere residents) who voted "no" -- as well as casino proponents in Revere who voted "yes" on a proposal that no longer exists -- in stating our case before the Commission.

Attached, please find No Eastie Casino's formal request for a No Eastie Casino representative to provide a brief, narrowly tailored public comment at the meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on December 10, 2013. Additionally, as the letter states, we request the opportunity to show a brief (approx. 5 minutes) collection of video clips as part of our testimony. The video, we believe, will demonstrate that the Mohegan Sun proposal before you is fundamentally different from Suffolk Downs' proposal on which voters decided Nov. 5 and shed light on the developer's and City of Revere's stated intentions prior to the vote. You can review the draft video here: <http://youtu.be/vBksrSxOsS0>

Please let us know if you have any questions about this request. We can be reached at this email or by phone: 617-416-5558 (Atty. Matt Cameron). Thank you as always for the Commission's commitment to public participation in the licensing process.

Best Regards,

Matt Cameron, General Counsel
Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

No Eastie Casino

NO EASTIE CASINO

December 9, 2013



BY EMAIL

CHAIRMAN STEPHEN CROSBY
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street
10th Floor
Boston, Mass. 02109

RE: Request for Public Comment at December 10, 2013 Open Meeting

Dear Chairman Crosby:

The Commission faces a critical discussion and vote at tomorrow afternoon's meeting in connection with the legality of new applicant Mohegan Sun's stated plans to proceed with casino development in Revere with a new host community agreement and subsequent referendum in violation of M.G.L. c. 23K §15(13). As we have done in the past, we respectfully request that we be given the opportunity to briefly address the Commission on behalf of the organized opposition to a casino at Suffolk Downs to discuss our legal position on this and related matters.

We have also prepared a brief (approx. 5 min.) collection of video excerpts which we believe the Commission may find helpful in its ongoing efforts to divine the intent and motivations of the proponents of this project as well as what information they provided to voters in both host communities prior to the November 5th referendum. We would request the opportunity to enter this video (available here: <http://youtu.be/vBksrSxOsSQ>) onto the record in the course of our appearance. While we recognize that this is a somewhat unusual request, we believe that this video provides some of the best available objective evidence as to the strength of our position.

As you are aware, Sterling Suffolk LLC is no longer an applicant for a gaming license. However, if the Commission finds that these former applicants have any standing to continue to appear before it, we would request equal time to address our significant concerns arising from recent developments since our last appearance before the Commission on November 21, 2013. We will be filing our formal written comments later today. Thank you as always for the Commission's commitment to public participation in the licensing process.

Very truly yours,

NO EASTIE CASINO

Matt Cameron, General Counsel
Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

cc: Commissioner Gayle Cameron
Commissioner James F. McHugh
Commissioner Bruce Stebbins
Commissioner Enrique Zuniga
Ombudsman John Ziemba

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Craig Mael <cmael@town.winthrop.ma.us>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:55 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC)
Subject: Opposition to Revere Only Casino
Categories: Purple Category

Good Day,

Dear Mr. Chairman and Fellow Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. This letter is submitted by Craig Mael, Winthrop, Massachusetts. Town Councilor, Precinct 4 and is written specifically for the purpose of conveying my feelings about a Revere only Casino project and that it should not be furthered. I do so personally and with the following sentiments.

The Town of Winthrop is a picturesque, seaside residential community with approximately 17,000 residents. Winthrop has two roads that connect it with its neighbors: Main Street, which travels to and from Orient Heights in East Boston, and Revere Street, which travels to and from Beachmont in Revere.[1] The Suffolk Downs property is located less than one mile from each of the Town's two access points. In fact, many homes in Winthrop are closer to the Suffolk Downs property than are homes in East Boston or Revere. The adverse impacts of any casino development at Suffolk Downs will be felt particularly hard in Winthrop.

The vote by the Citizens of the proposed Host City have caused Winthrop residents to be increasingly alarmed about the integrity of the Suffolk Downs casino proposal.

The casino legislation clearly stated that if a proposed casino was to be located in more than one host community, as is Suffolk Downs, both host communities must vote in favor of the casino. The law states,

??[i]f a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license.? M.G.L. c. 23K § 15(13).

Suffolk Downs did not win a favorable vote in both communities. It was overwhelmingly rejected in the Host City of Boston. Therefore, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 23K § 15(13), the Suffolk Downs proposal cannot move forward.

As the proposed Casino in the host City of Boston failed to secure a majority of the voting public, the existing casino legislation requires the following procedure to be applied. The existing law clearly states the developer "shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election." M.G.L. c. 23K § 15(13). In other words, if Suffolk Downs wishes to go forward with a Revere-only casino, it must execute a new Host Community Agreement and must win a new referendum based on the new proposal.

Stated simply, the Act explicitly describes the procedural requirements to be followed in the event: (1) a proposed gaming establishment is located in more than one host community; and (2) a host community votes against the proposal.

Following the loss in East Boston, Suffolk Downs now claims it should be able to scrap its original plan for a "world class resort casino" with a racetrack, and move forward with a scaled down plan, crammed onto a much smaller portion of the property. Suffolk Downs is pretending "and in fact actively asserting " that neither of these provisions in the law govern

its actions. Suffolk Downs' effort to move forward with a Revere-only casino is a deliberate effort to circumvent both the letter and the spirit of the law.

If there is a willingness at this stage of the project to not accept the terms of the existing governing law, what will their course of action be in the future relating to any mitigation promises made to both the host and surrounding communities?

Suffolk Downs' willingness to flout the clear intent of the law is particularly disturbing for Winthrop. As a ?surrounding community,? Winthrop may be forced to enter into a Surrounding Community Agreement with Suffolk Downs and to rely on that written agreement in order to mitigate the known and expected ill effects of the casino. **If Suffolk Downs is willing to ignore the clear intent of the law and legal process before it even receives a casino license, it is also likely to ignore the intent and spirit of any mitigation agreement or legal obligation it has with the Town of Winthrop.**

It should be noted that the Host Community Agreements with both Boston and Revere required Suffolk Downs to use its ?best efforts? to mitigate the adverse impacts of a casino by, for example, hiring local residents or purchasing from local vendors. A contractual requirement that a party use ?best efforts? is wholly subjective, cannot be enforced, and depends exclusively on the party's desire to comply with the spirit of the agreement.

In light of Suffolk Downs' disingenuous legal argument that it can move forward with a Revere-only proposal without executing a new Host Community Agreement and winning a new referendum, **Can Suffolk Downs be trusted to treat small surrounding communities such as Winthrop fairly or honestly? The negative impacts of a casino are undeniable. The reason that the casino developer will be required to develop a mitigation package is just that. There are going to be issues to mitigate.**

The Suffolk Downs property is located in the middle of a densely populated residential area. The traffic in East Boston, Revere, and Winthrop is already problematic and will certainly get worse if the casino is installed, thereby interfering with the ability of local residents to get to and from work. Statistics clearly demonstrate that crime, substance abuse, domestic violence, and home foreclosures all increase dramatically within 10 miles of a casino. With the only two access points to Winthrop located less than one mile from the Suffolk Downs property, Winthrop will be particularly hard hit and has few resources to combat these additional problems.

It must also be mentioned that Winthrop already hosts the MWRA water treatment facility and a portion of Logan Airport. A casino at Suffolk Downs will add a *third* significant burden and problem that must be mitigated for our community. All three of these projects impact the quality of life in Winthrop. Not in one instance were the residents given the opportunity to voice their opinion or vote to change the impact. The Town of Winthrop has been unfairly in the position of hosting all of these projects and the impact has been enormous. The impact of the health costs to the citizens of the community from the airport alone should be more than enough for any one community in the Commonwealth. Instead the Town of Winthrop has possibly all three and no representation in the matter.

Suffolk Downs' actions and conduct over the course of the past several weeks is a harbinger of things to come if it is awarded a casino license: disregard and disrespect for clear legal requirements and legal procedures; partnership with unscrupulous companies; and actions that put its financial interests above the interests of surrounding communities.

In closing, the Town Council of Winthrop asks the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to overturn the application of Suffolk Downs for a Revere only Casino. In doing so the Commission will be simultaneously validating the rights of the citizens of East Boston of their vote, the spirit of the existing law of the Commonwealth and helping to protect the citizens of Winthrop in their desire to maintain their homes and community without the need for further mitigation to offset the less than desirous effects of a Suffolk Downs Casino that currently will violate the spirit and intent of the law.

Respectfully,

Craig G. Mael
Precinct 4 Town Council
617-329-5002 (c)
www.craigmael.com
TWITTER @precinct4

IMPORTANT NOTICE. The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you received this communication in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error please send a return e-mail, and then delete this message, together with any attachments. Thank you.

Help make the earth a greener place. If at all possible resist printing this email and join us in saving paper.

IMPORTANT NOTICE. The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you received this communication in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error please send a return e-mail, and then delete this message, together with any attachments. Thank you.

Help make the earth a greener place. If at all possible resist printing this email and join us in saving paper.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:52 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Carrie Van Horn

Email

carriebritt@hotmail.com

Phone

(617)388-5282

Subject

No Eastie casino vote

Questions or Comments

Hi -
I'm writing in regard to the fact that Suffolk Downs is moving forward on a casino bid when East Boston residents clearly voiced that they DON'T want a casino. The vote for a Eastie/Revere casino that was made in November will clearly be violated if Suffolk Downs is allowed to move forward without their neighbors approval. Please stop the Revere only casino plan!!
- an East Boston Resident who voted NO CASINO

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Rafael Mares <rhmares@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:51 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Comment re Suffolk Downs Proposal

Categories: Purple Category

I'm a resident of Revere, MA and I'm writing today to urge you not to permit Suffolk Downs to proceed with its casino application. As I'm sure you are aware, the exact question residents of Revere were asked in the ballot question is:

Shall the city of Revere permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located at Suffolk Downs in East Boston at 525 William F. McClellan Highway, East Boston, Massachusetts?
The new proposed casino would not be located in East Boston. In addition, the developer of the project has since changed and I imagine many other details of the proposal as a result of the smaller property size. Allowing a Revere-only proposal to go forward under these circumstances would make a mockery of the process established under the Massachusetts Gaming Law.

Thank you for your attention.

Rafael Mares
222 Bellingham Avenue
Revere, MA 021521

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: tkmaddal@aol.com
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:24 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: azoppodition to MassGaming Comission to allow the proposal for illegal Revere Only csion to move foreard

Categories: Purple Category

To MGC members:

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Karen Maddalena
East Boston Resident
]

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Michalo <michalo1@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:17 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: No casino!

Categories: Purple Category

I am against any casino at suffolk downs!

Michael underwood
1052 bennington
E. Boston

Regards M.
Sent from my iPad

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anthony DeMarco <demarco380@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:14 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

Good Morning, I know tomorrow is the day to decide weather Revere should move forward with a proposed Casino. I would just like to add that my self and my family members have tried to reach out to the Mayor of Revere about the new proposed site of the casino, and we never hear back from him. He said in his letter to you that he only heard one person be on the opponent for this, this is not true, as I have said my family and I have tried to reach out to him and we did not get any response back from him.

The vote was for a mostly EB built casino and resort, not a Revere only one and this disturbs me as to how you can move forward on this with out a new vote solely on the Revere side. Zoning and everything else will affect the people who live around that area. The Mayor, is putting all his energy and people that work for him on this project, not to mention the money he is spending of the tax payers on this. While he says it will create jobs and boost our economy, I'm not really sold on this because the casinos are looking for experienced people to run them, and no one from Revere has any experience in Casinos.

If you had watched the Counsel meeting last week it was a disgrace to see the way the people who were not for the casino were treated, and the Mayor just sat there and let it happen. I was born in the city, raised my family in this city and I still live and own a home in this city and my voice was never heard by the Mayor, who claims he listened to all the people.

If this is to move forward without a new vote I will write congress of the way this whole Casino issue has been handled in an honest letter, with no lies.

Please listen to the people who deserve a new vote, isn't that the way we are supposed to unite here? If a new vote is still in favor, then let the city move to a proposal and then no one can complain.

Thank you

Anthony DeMarco

Revere resident for the past 55 years.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lenny Delorey <len_d@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 9:05 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: info@mgc.mass.gov; GOffice@state.ma.us; anthony.petrucelli@masenate.gov; robert.deleo@mahouse.gov
Subject: Suffolk casino
Categories: Purple Category

Leonard Delorey
111 Main St
Winthrop, MA 02152

Dec 9, 2013

By Email
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street
10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Dear Commission:

As a citizen of the Commonwealth, I am saddened to say I have lost all faith in the process and the commission.

Allowing Suffolk/Mohegan to move ahead on a casino at Suffolk Downs is a complete circumvention of the democratic process and disregard for the law. The no vote in East Boston put an end to any possible casino there. Both Revere and E. BOS had to vote yes.

Allowing a move to the Revere only portion of the land is in clear violation of the statute; a six month waiting period is required, along with a new host agreement and a new referendum vote by the host community.

The host community agreement with the city of Revere states " The Project would be constructed within the municipal boundaries of the City of Boston and no new significant construction is currently proposed on the portion of the Property located in the City (of Revere)."

How can the commission come to the conclusion that this is the same project? It could not be more clear to me, an average citizen, that even if the Commission can somehow find a way to disregard the people's vote in E. Boston, you can not claim this is what the people in Revere voted for.

Revere voted for a casino in "the municipal boundaries of the City of Boston."

What's proposed is an entirely new project, with new developers. Suffolk is not even applying for the gaming license. In the new proposal, Mohegan Sun is the entity applying for the license. Again, not what was proposed or voted on by the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Please, restore some integrity to the process you have been charged with.
Respect the vote of the People.

Citizen of the Commonwealth,

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: John Walkey <jawalkey@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 8:25 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

When the proponent of a resort casino at Suffolk Downs visited us with their proposal we heard about a casino that would be in both East Boston and Revere, run by Caesar's Entertainment, represented by a specific design that included specific improvements to the area around it and was connected to very specific Community Benefits Agreements. Our local elected officials, from the municipality and State Legislature told us in no uncertain terms that when the vote occurred a "yes" would be needed in both municipalities for this project to move forward. My understanding of the MGC is that you are charged with assuring a very ordered and unambiguous process is followed so that all residents of the Commonwealth can be assured that any gaming establishment that opens in Massachusetts is done so in a manner that best benefits the communities it will affect and in a process that is beyond reproach in its transparency and adherence to the law that you are sworn to uphold.

The current situation at Suffolk Downs is light years away from all of that. The operator is no longer Caesar's. The physical layout and design of the site is completely different. Adherence to the law in regards to the operations of the race track is unclear at best. The agreements signed with the municipalities are completely in question regardless of what the vote results may have been, as the people of these communities **voted on a different proposal than the one that is now before you**. In regards to the process, all statements that a "yes" vote would be required in both communities for this project to move forward is now revealed to be a complete blatant lie given the fact that you are entertaining this proposal. There is also the issue of violating the gaming law **which requires that residents vote on the proposal that is before the commission**, not past proposals that are now dead. The current proposal must be brought up to the people of Revere for another vote or you are in violation of the gaming law that you are responsible for enacting.

Finally the recent revelations of personal relationships between members of the Commission and parties that will benefit from the passage of one project or another throws this entire process into the kind of doubt and cynical questioning that the Commission was supposed to prevent. The Commission's Chairman should not only recuse himself from the Everett/Wynn vote due to his personal connection, but also from any vote in the eastern region as they are all connected. There can be only one facility in this region and if the chairman has a connection to one of these proposals he must recuse himself from the decision on the regional facility. Anything less results in a process as flawed and questionable in its motives as naysayers feared would be the case upon the passage of the original gambling bill.

Thank you for your consideration,
John Walkey
63 Putnam Street #1
Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: larrysmith87@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 8:14 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Blue, Catherine (MGC)
Cc: celeste myers
Subject: No Casino in Revere!!!
Categories: Purple Category

I am writing because I am appalled that there is still a chance that a casino could be built in Revere.

The vote in November had to have both Revere and East Boston vote in favor of a casino for it to be approved. East Boston voted it down and that should have been the end of it. Mayor Rizzo did not agree with the result of the vote and now wants to change the rules.

I have heard that the Gaming Commission has not heard from one person in Revere who is opposed to a casino. How can this be?! Weren't the commissioners paying attention to the vote in November?!

There were many Revere residents who made their views known in that vote who are opposed to the casino. They spoke with their vote and shouldn't need to speak again.

I am very much against a casino in Revere.

Sincerely,

Larry Smith
87 Sewall St.
Revere, MA 02151

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 7:59 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Brian Gannon

Email

briangannon@briangannonboston.com

Phone

(617)767-6046

Subject

Revere only proposal (12/10 meeting)

Questions or Comments

Mass Gaming Commission,

I am a resident of East Boston and have been following the MGC meetings closely and was shocked to hear that the MGC did not immediately throw out "the Revere only option" as soon as it was presented. I urge you to stand with democracy and officially recognize that the proposal is a farfetched stretch of the law and would undermine our commonwealth's democratic process. East Boston voted on 11/05 with a resounding no to a Casino at 525 William F McClellan Hwy, Boston, MA 02128. If the MGC is considering this vote null by allowing developers to build on this site a casino why did we vote? Additionally, this proposal and mitigation agreement does not look anything like what was presented to Revere. There is now no track component which was an integral part of the communication between the developers and the community and was included on the ballot question. If "Vote Yes for Suffolk Downs" equates to "Vote Yes to Mohegan Sun without a track in Revere" makes ! sense to this board is akin to putting Mitt Romney in office and saying that the community voted for him. I urge you to ask that a new vote be taken in the 180 day timeframe to determine if this new proposal is accepted by Revere voters. 4,281 East Boston voters (56%) and 4,232 (38.1%) Revere voters voted against the previous gambling proposal. Of the yes votes most if not all voted on the basis that Suffolk Downs was the benefactor not the landlord. Vote Yes for Suffolk Downs was the message that was heavily marketed to both communities they are not even involved in the latest incarnation.

Regards,

Brian Gannon
briangannon@briangannonboston.com
198 Everett Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jbeaudoin10 <jbeaudoin10@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 6:44 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: jbeaudoin10@hotmail.com; revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: Please proceed with caution and care

Categories: Purple Category

To Members of the Gaming Commission:

Please continue to honor the vital role entrusted to you to regulate wisely and cautiously the expansion of gaming in our state. Once introduced, casinos are here to stay- with serious negative impacts as independent studies have documented- (unlike elected officials who lose their seats if they don't measure up.)

I am very concerned with the attempt of Suffolk Downs to disregard the No Vote of East Boston and the regulations set forth by our legislators as cited by Petrocelli. Suffolk Downs LLC and Chip Tuttle showed poor choice in "trusting " Ceasars. How can this recently contrived arrangement with Mohegan Sun (very different by the way from what people thought they were voting on in Nov.) be trusted to be a good choice? It would seem very unwise to allow it to proceed without the time and process needed to evaluate the true negative and positive impacts- short and long term. But beyond all of this, please honor the No Casino referendum intent that both East Boston and Revere needed to vote yes for a casino to be built.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeannine Beaudoin
East Boston
Sent from my Samsung smartphone on AT&T

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 10:55 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Richard Borgatti

Email

reversbest@yahoo.com

Phone

(857)236-8613

Subject

Saying Yes to Revere Prosperity, Logan income, North-shore Growth, Traffic will never be as bad as the Everett Fiasco.

Questions or Comments

Conversation started Thursday

12/5, 12:52am
Richard Borgatti

We have come to understand that Revere has it's own Sovereign interest in seeking validity in this process. Controversy aside, made by a few media seeking self interests, We have the Peoples vote, commitment, and determination, to move forward in this matter.
We stand for the State's mandate of local input, local control, local communication, and local determination. We serve our own self interest, but acknowledge those that would bend the will, to their own self serving interests unfortunately serving no one, but their 15 minutes of infamy..

This is not except able to the people of Revere, or Their Friends in the surrounding communities, that we share livelihood, family, and interests with.

We do not appreciate others trying to undermine our dreams, hard work, integrity, elected officials perseverance, and total backing of our commitment to the past. present or future jobs, opportunities, and educational enhancement opportunities, presented and voted on in a referendum, and accepted as such.

We are not Stupid, intrepid people, as one Commissioner would have other's believe as "people that did not Know what we were voting for".

In Revere language, We speak for ourselves and none shall do us harm. (expletive)

If it is said and wanted, no one, nor outside influences, have the right to challenge us, after the fact, by double thinking our right to have that which is earned.

You (board members - with integrity) have no valid right to surmise Our integrity, and should not be "biased", and possibly "moving within outside personal influence".

Not forthwith,.... an intellectual person, of any merit, would not think within a discriminatory statement, unless there were an underlining reason, that would lead to conjecture and bedeviling results, that can and would be used in a court of law.

Shame!

We Share, Revere Roars!

And, I do not get that the councilman has "not heard from Revere". What, are they not with out those " investigators", that can read open source talks, held on various websites and Facebook? i.e. Revere Say's Yes

Examples...

Revere City Council voices support for casino (<http://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2013/12/02/revere-city-council-approves-resolution-supporting-casino-proposal/M6C2Qh1bwWryVHuGVMdVgK/story.html>)

Revere Say's YES

(https://www.facebook.com/groups/195404383078143/1998592268865992/?comment_id=199940200191228¬if_t=like)

Also the Commission is deliberately asking for opposition, even if it comes from outside non interest groups? WTF?
Once again, here is an unsettling quote from an observer....P Mike Maz "I see the NEC group has a new site. NRC. mostly the same players, some new faces, a whopping 111 members. they are crying out for Winthrop residents to take a negative. In my younger days, in Beachmont, nosy nellies usually got their big noses broken !! alas, now all they do is invite outside noses in". This is getting out of hand, with a few wannabe's stroking the bottom line. Nothing can come good out of this but a civil chaos. Please ignore the crazy's wanting to wrestle our future away for a few votes, down the line when "as rumor has it" they only want free media exposure to use, to warrant a future run at a council seat (EB)....at our expense.

I predict a bad time in the Commissions future if they do not look at this as a past 10 year run to get this thing done. I do not understand why many are side stepping our history. Americas First public beach, Wonderland Dog track (50 + years), Suffolk Downs (75+ years), Opportunities that We built and grew our family from. New construction on vacant parcels, new Revere MBTA growth (Blue Line), Our land, our schools, and our integrity and respect, along with our East Boston family and Chelsea, and Winthrop, and Malden, Lynn and Saugus, and beyond, getting a shot of sharing with us in the future! Outside interests have No place, No say, No influence, in this decision!
Bad News heard, that a Senator threw Revere under the bus? With a letter to the Commission, trying to curry favor with the EB scum?

Someone that does not want to share, that Family Value, can just Begone.
No one needs any disrespect.. If you are outside our community, stay outside.
We do not condone peer-ins, wannabe's or intrusions.

As I read all the content out there, in media land , one thing becomes clear, and said best by Commissioner Crosby, "The issue's are less an legal argument and more of a public policy debate", "I can not see a right reason, a compelling reason.....to deny the people of Revere the opportunity to play out the string on this."

We, the people of Revere, see it as much in the same way.

Leaning in favor of allowing the project to go forward, track officials pledging to to keep racing, and Revere continuing to move the city forward, is what keeps us on a great stride for our future growth , integrity, and honor and helping the State with their eyesight on the future, and revenue... as history shows, Revere Roars.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lj3Vgm7R-O8>

Revere City Council approves resolution supporting casino proposal - The Boston Globe
www.bostonglobe.com

REVERE -- The City Council Monday night unanimously approved a resolution reiterating its support for a casino to be built on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs. At the same time, the council also affirmed its support for the Nov. 5 referendum where Revere residents voted to support the plan, by a cou.....

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 10:42 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

richard borgatti

Email

reversbest@hotmail.com

Phone

(339)532-8190

Subject

posts for Revere say's Yes

Questions or Comments

John Gambardella

Over the last year and a half, I've done a lot of my own research into cities/towns with casinos. I've seen many cities and towns benefit greatly from the jobs and revenue the casinos provided. I've found that, many of these cities and towns have low or declining crime rates, have hundreds of successful businesses and restaurants and have home values that have gone up, all in spite of having a casino. The sky has not fallen on these cities as the 'Fear mongers' would have you believe.

With that said, I believe the casino will only benefit the surrounding community, should the project be allowed to go forward. I see the potential of what the millions of dollars in revenue from the casino can do for schools, parks, roads, police and fire depts., senior centers, libraries, youth programs, as well as, many other community projects. I also believe that, Suffolk Downs has a far greater chance of survival if the casino is built than if it is not. If you feel the same way as I do (as I certainly hope), then, please share these feelings with everyone you know...Spread the positivity.

James MacMillanJohn as you know I listed the 23 casino that are in SoCal alone and they are a huge part of that economy...they employ thousands, pay millions in taxes and have not destroyed their communities. They are an important part of the business base. Some even donate millions to charity...San Manuel Casino for instance hosts a couple of giant charity events..Ante Up For Africa and Put A Bad Beat On Cancer. Casinos are not evil.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 8:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Joseph Todesca

Email

joetodesca@yahoo.com

Phone

(617)877-2718

Subject

Revere only proposal

Questions or Comments

Dear Commissioner Crosby,

My name is Joe Todesca and I am a life long East Boston resident. I have written to you in the past and even testified in front of you on behalf of Suffolk Downs. I am writing you again to first off thank you and the Commission for the job that you do, I know that you folks are in a tough position and there are a lot of people that appreciate the work you put in. I also wanted to once again show my support for the Revere only proposal at Suffolk Downs. This is a great opportunity to create/preserve thousands or jobs and generate much needed revenue to the area. I know that you are aware of all the benefits that a resort casino could bring and I can only hope that on Tuesday you vote to allow Suffolk Downs to proceed in the application process. I'm looking forward to hearing your decision and hope to meet you all again in the future. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,
Joseph Todesca

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Mary Ellen Welch <maryellen225@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 6:59 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino For Revere

Categories: Purple Category

To Whom It May Concern,

Please do not approve a casino in Revere. After the voters in East Boston rejected a casino at Suffolk Downs it would be an insult to construct a casino just around the corner on Suffolk Downs in Revere. The impacts would be the same because it would be essentially in the same place.

Traffic on C-1 is horrendous now. A casino would create worse traffic right next to a dense residential neighborhood.

Do the right thing. Reject a casino on Suffolk Downs.

Thank you for your attention,

Charles Stafford Welch

212 Webster Street

East Boston, Massachusetts 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: marfourthbpos <mar4thbpos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 5:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Voters should have their say

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commissioners,

I agree with former Judge James McHugh that the Gaming Commission's consideration of the new Revere-only casino proposal based on Revere's favorable vote in the recent referendum raises serious legal issues. This new casino proposal is different in so many ways from that which was put before the voters, it's hard to imagine the Commission would even consider allowing it to move forward. Judge McHugh is correct that the idea that this new proposal has been "approved" by the voters of Revere stretches the concept of a "knowing community vote" well beyond recognition. There has never been a vote on this Revere-only proposal and the good people of Revere deserve an opportunity to be heard. The Gaming Commission should allow for a new vote even if it requires that the deadline be extended. *Any action by the Commission to approve this new proposal without a vote of the people of Revere flies in the face of the basic values of our democratic process.* And, any such action is likely to trigger an immediate legal challenge by those opposed to the proposal. A new vote is the right and only thing to do. Letting the new proposal move forward based on the earlier referendum is wrong and you should reject any such idea. **Allow the citizens of Revere to vote on the Suffolk Downs casino proposal as it is currently structured.** Thank you for your time and consideration.

Edward M. Phelan
287 Kelley Blvd
North Attleboro, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jordan Schulz <jordandschulz@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 3:57 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Casino Thoughts - please help!!

Categories: Purple Category

Here also is a note I wrote to our Governor, FYI:

Governor Patrick,

Great to meet you this week at the Mass Challenge event at Fan Pier. I deeply appreciate your interest and investment in entrepreneurship in Massachusetts, thank you.

I write you today because I am troubled by your lack of help to my neighbors and I here in East Boston. In short:

- Our elected officials, including yourself, have thought that a casino may be a helpful business to have in our state, and it very well may be, but when a community says no, it is your responsibility (and I would hope also your conviction!) to also tell the developer no - in this case Suffolk Downs
- At MassChallenge you spoke of so many positive things such as impacting our state and the world for our children and our children's children - PLEASE help us to do that by upholding the law and your constituents' wishes!!!

I hope your trip to Asia is going well. While you travel, please consider us here at home.

Thank you,
Jordan Schulz and family

Jordan Schulz
617-922-7691

On Sat, Dec 7, 2013 at 3:41 PM, MGCcomments (MGC) <mgccomments@state.ma.us> wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. The Commission welcomes your feedback as the state continues to prepare for the arrival of expanded gaming.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jordan Schulz <jordandschulz@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 3:41 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino Thoughts - please help!!

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I and my family are VERY outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Please help.
Jordan

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: oriana6368@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 1:10 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs
Attachments: Revere says Yes.doc

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Mr.Chairman

Earlier this week I sent a letter to the Mass Gaming commission but I don't know if I sent it to the correct address. I am resending it and I apologize in advance if I have already sent it.

Sincerely,
Matilda Bonfardeci

Date: 12/7/2013

Dear Mass Gaming Commission,

I have been a resident of Revere now for a very long time.. and I love my city!
On Tuesday, Nov 5th we the residents of Revere had a chance to express how we felt about putting a casino here in our backyard and I for one was one of those residents along with 6700 other residents whom voted 'Yes'. I totally understood what the ballot question was asking and when I attended the one of the many meetings that Suffolk Downs put together I asked the question ' What would happen if Eastie voted no?' and 'I was told that the 'Casino' could still be built on Revere land only and although it would be an uphill battle it could be possible. So, I was well aware that this was a possibility. So, therefore it was clear to me that our vote was very important! In addition with 'Ceasers' being out I still voted yes because I believed in Suffolk Downs and that they would find a suitable applicant. I attended our zoning hearing on Tuesday, Dec 2nd and if you could just see City Hall and the passion that the Revere residents had in that room it was overwhelming to say the least and we the citizens of Revere are still pulling for a 'Revere only Casino!

I also watched the Suffolk Downs hearing live and I have to say although I was disappointed that you need another week to make a decision whether Revere can go forward I also understand that the information of the applicant needs to be reviewed. So, with that being said I would like to address those commissioners who are still on the fence about voting in favor for our city. Think of this Please...

We the Residents of Revere voted in favor for this by almost 2 to 1. It is clear that we want this here! I for one am looking forward to what the flow of income will do for our city. I have two children who attend our public schools and I think of the beautiful things that can come to our city such as a new Recreation Center, New Stadiums, New Parks and more for our School System and not to mention how many people can be put back to work after the bad crash we had in 2008.

Please, Please, Please do not let our 'Yes' vote go to waste!!

When Gayle Cameron said that she hadn't heard from a lot of Revere residents who are in favor that this was an issue (the change) and I quote she said 'that this was a sign of support not an opposition' and you Stephen Crosby agreed and said that now you would probably get letters. I understood completely what Gayle Cameron meant but..unfortunately a lot of nay sayers took this as an oppurtunity to write against us. So, please keep this in mind when the letters come in and I am sure that they will they will be coming from the very same organization that is trying to repeal the law completely and people who don't even live in Revere. How do I know this? because of my social media pages!

In closing I just leave you with this please listen to the people of Revere and give us a chance!!

Sincerely,

Matilda Bonfardeci

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 12:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Dennis Bowen

Email

dwb482@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)284-3895

Subject

Revere casino

Questions or Comments

I would like to express my concern for a casino in Revere. I have lived in Revere for over 40 years and down the street from Suffolk Downs. When voting for the casino I was hoping for it to be built in Revere. I was always hoping for this along with many of my friends. Please consider Revere for the site of the casino. Thank You

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anthony DeMarco <demarco380@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 07, 2013 10:46 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Repel the States gambling law

Categories: Purple Category

Could the States casino licenses be in jeopardy if this goes to a vote in November of next year? Do you think it makes sense to hold off any licensing until the State knows for sure if it will be legal?

Secretary of State William Galvin says casino foes have collected enough certified signatures to put a question on the November 2014 ballot that would repeal the States 2011 gambling law.
I ask this because I'm from Revere and we are seeking a license in our city.

Tony DeMarco

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Debbie <debbied1116@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 10:53 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To The Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I live in East Boston and I was and am a supporter of a Casino being built at Suffolk Downs. I believe this could be a very big asset to the community because first and foremost Suffolk Downs has always been a great supporter and neighbor to our community and it will create jobs, economic development, road improvements and many more benefits. I am writing to ask that you allow this project to move forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah DiGirolamo

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Mary Ellen Welch <maryellen225@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:37 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Moving the Suffolk Downs Casino To Revere

Categories: Purple Category

Gentle People

When a Revere casino at Suffolk Downs comes before you for a vote, please vote "no". When the casino issue came up for a vote we in East Boston strongly voted against a casino. We voted against a casino at Suffolk Downs, not distinguishing on which piece of the Suffolk Downs site would be used.

The impacts of a casino on this community would be awful! The traffic impacts alone would be a disaster for the neighborhood and for all the commuters who use the C-1 highway on a daily basis. Chances are that the entrance in East Boston would be the major access, and egress point because the access point in Revere is a dangerous and narrow one.

Please think of all the people who are afraid of having a casino where they live. Vote down this proposal for a casino in Revere. If people want to visit a casino they could travel to a casino in a less dense part of our state.

Sincerely yours,
Mary Ellen Welch
225 Webster Street
East Boston, Massachusetts 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Robert Romig

Email

bobr2000@verizon.net

Subject

Casino License for Revere

Questions or Comments

I am against granting a casino license to Revere. In my opinion it tramples on the rights of citizens of East Boston and Winthrop. I believe it is disingenuous and possibly illegal to assume that because Revere citizens voted to approve a casino on Suffolk Downs property, a vote which included East Boston residents now excludes the wishes of East Boston citizens on a new deal just a few feet away. This is a cramming of the interests of a business entity on residents who overwhelmingly choose not to have a casino in their back yard.

There is much good that could be done with Suffolk Downs property. There are many other types of businesses that could build on that property which could have a better and more wholesome economic impact. There is too much downside to a casino which you are aware.

So I say NO to a revere casino license. Thank you.

Robert Romig
Winthrop

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Mary Ellen Welch <maryellen225@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:58 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commission Members,

This is a letter against the proposed Revere casino. As a resident of East Boston I fear the traffic impacts of a casino so close to my neighborhood. It is difficult to travel on Route C-1 now because of the gridlock.

In addition, the East Boston vote against a casino at Suffolk Downs WAS MAINLY FOR THE TRAFFIC IMPACTS IN MY OPINION. The mitigation measures proposed by the casino developer would not have relieved the traffic impacts. Moving the casino a short distance to Revere still brings the same problems. Voting to approve a casino in Revere disrespects the voters and residents of East Boston.

Put yourselves in our shoes: Would you like a casino where you live and raise your family ?

Sincerely,
Joanne J. Welch
212 Webster Street
East Boston, Massachusetts 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Peter Gill <pgill@town.winthrop.ma.us>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:41 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino at Suffolk Downs
Attachments: 2013 Suffolk(2).doc

Categories: Purple Category

Date: Friday, December 6 2013 03:59 PM

Subject: Casino at Suffolk Downs

Dear Commissioners

Please see attached letter regarding the proposed casino at Suffok Downs

Your comments via return email or phone at 617 846 3656 are welcome

Thank you

Peter T. Gill, President
Winthrop Town Council

IMPORTANT NOTICE. The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you received this communication in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error please send a return e-mail, and then delete this message, together with any attachments. Thank you.

Help make the earth a greener place. If at all possible resist printing this email and join us in saving paper.

125 Plummer Avenue
Winthrop, MA 02152
December 6, 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street Suite 720
Boston, MA 02109

As a lifelong resident of Winthrop, I am writing to express my opposition to a proposed Casino at Suffolk Downs.

Although I am in favor of the recently enacted Massachusetts casino law, I believe that the potential negative effects to Winthrop as a surrounding community to the proposed Casino at Suffolk Downs are not in the best interest of the Town of Winthrop or the citizens of Winthrop.

Pleased be advised that this is my personal opinion as a citizen of Winthrop, a recognized “surrounding community” in the proposal by Suffolk Downs of a Casino at Suffolk Downs.

At the present time my opinion on this matter does not necessarily represent the opinion(s) of the other members of the Winthrop Town Council either individually or collectively as a council.

I urge the commission to consider my concerns for the future of Winthrop and our citizens in any further deliberation on the Casino at Suffolk Downs.

Your consideration is appreciated.

Peter T. Gill, President
Winthrop Town Council

Via E-mail
CC: Winthrop Town Council

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Peter Gill <pgill@town.winthrop.ma.us>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:00 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Gayle.Cameron@ma.state.ma.us; McHugh, James (MGC); bruce.stebbins@.state.ma.us
Subject: Casino at Suffolk Downs
Attachments: 2013 Suffolk(2).doc
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commissioners

Please see attached letter regarding the proposed casino at Suffok Downs

Your comments via return email or phone at 617 846 3656 are welcome

Thank you

Peter T. Gill, President
Winthrop Town Council

IMPORTANT NOTICE. The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you received this communication in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error please send a return e-mail, and then delete this message, together with any attachments. Thank you.

Help make the earth a greener place. If at all possible resist printing this email and join us in saving paper.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matthew Neave <mdneave@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 9:27 AM
To: info@mgc.mass.gov; mgccomments (MGC)
Subject: Gaming Act Compliance by Suffolk Downs

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

Mass Gaming Commission,

I have a question about Section 15 of the Mass Gaming Act, which I've copied below. Could you please let me know when the host community agreement was published in a local newspaper with a full summary? The only information that I have seen published in the East Boston Times-Free Press (the most widely circulated periodical in East Boston) is from advertisements run by Suffolk Downs. Will Suffolk Downs be required to publish the same HCA summary that is on the Massgaming.com website (<http://massgaming.com/wp-content/uploads/Boston-Host-Agreement-Summary.pdf>)? It is very important that the residents of East Boston see the entire agreement summary since it explains that only 50% of the Community Impact Trust is dedicated to East Boston in contrast to the false advertisements by Suffolk Downs that the full \$20mil/yr is dedicated to East Boston.

The fact that not all of the community impact fee is actually for the host community also seems to directly conflict with point (14) below, which states that the community impact fee is for the host community.

I look forward to hearing from you about how this portion of the law is being fulfilled by Suffolk Downs. Please provide the periodical name and issue date when this required summary was published.

Thank you,
Matthew Neave

(13) have received a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community in favor of such license; provided, however that a request for an election shall take place after the signing of an agreement between the host community and the applicant; provided further, that upon receipt of a request for an election, the governing body of the municipality shall call for the election to be held not less than 60 days but not more than 90 days from the date that the request was received; **provided further, that the signed agreement between the host community and the applicant shall be made public with a concise summary, approved by the city solicitor or town counsel, in a periodical of general circulation and on the official website of the municipality not later than 7 days after the agreement was signed by the parties;** provided further, that the agreement and summary shall remain on the website until the election has been certified; provided further, that the municipality that holds an election shall be reimbursed for its expenses related to the election by the applicant within 30 days after the election; provided further, that the commission shall deny an application for a gaming license if the applicant has not fully reimbursed the community; provided further, that, for the purposes of this clause, unless a city opts out of this provision by a vote of the local governing body, if the gaming establishment is proposed to be located in a

city with a population of at least 125,000 residents as enumerated by the most recent enumerated federal census, "host community" shall mean the ward in which the gaming establishment is to be located for the purpose of receiving a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election; provided further, that, upon the signing of an agreement between the host community and the applicant and upon the request of the applicant, the city or town clerk shall set a date certain for an election on the ballot question in the host community; provided further, that at such election, the question submitted to the voters shall be worded as follows: "Shall the (city/town) of _____ permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located at ____ [description of site] ____? YES _____ NO _____"; provided further, that the ballot question shall be accompanied by a concise summary, as determined by the city solicitor or town counsel; provided further, that if a majority of the votes cast in a host community in answer to the ballot question is in the affirmative, the host community shall be taken to have voted in favor of the applicant's license; provided further, that, if the ballot question is voted in the negative, the applicant shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election; provided further, that if a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license;

(14) provide a community impact fee to the host community;

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: chudnathan@gmail.com on behalf of Nathan Chud <nchud@bu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 12:39 PM
To: mgccomments (MGC)
Subject: Opposing Item #5D, Boston Suitability Sequencing Variance at 10/3 MGC Public Meeting

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commissioners:

I am a resident of East Boston, and I am writing to oppose the granting of a variance from the Gaming Commission regulations to the City of Boston at tomorrow's public meeting (see [Item #5D, Boston Suitability Sequencing Variance](#)).

Your rules state that a host community may only vote on a proposed casino before the Gaming Commission's suitability determination *if* the governing body of the host community—Boston's City Council—first formally approves that timeline. (The relevant rules are 205 CMR 115.05(6) and 205 CMR 124.02(1).) The Gaming Commission designed this regulation to ensure that there would be an open public discussion of the fact that the people would be asked to vote on a casino project before all the facts regarding the suitability and responsibility of the applicant are known. ("Gaming commission approves emergency regulations," Samantha Lavien, [CBS3Springfield.com](#), April 18, 2013.)

In the case of the proposed casino at Suffolk Downs, the City of Boston and Suffolk Downs failed to follow the Gaming Commission's very simple procedural rule. Both the City of Boston and the Commission were on notice that the City Council was in violation of the Commission's rules when it allowed this vote regarding the November 5 East Boston election to go forward. There is no reason for the Commission to grant a variance now, after the fact.

The Gaming Commission exists to ensure transparency and accountability in the proposed casino industry. It is the Gaming Commission's responsibility to ensure that the City of Boston and Suffolk Downs follow the rules in scheduling a referendum on the casino. As resident of East Boston, I am extremely concerned that the Gaming Commission might waive or fail to enforce its own procedural rules after a clear violation has occurred.

Granting a variance to the City of Boston in this case is not in the public's interest. I urge you to require the City to delay the referendum until after the Gaming Commission's suitability determination.

Thank you,

Nathan

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Heather Engman <h.a.engman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 8:36 AM
To: mgccomments (MGC)
Subject: City of Boston Suitability Sequence Variance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission:

I am a resident of Winthrop, Massachusetts. **I am writing to oppose the granting of a variance from the Gaming Commission regulations to the City of Boston at tomorrow's public meeting.**

As you know, pursuant to 205 CMR 115.05(6), a host community may only vote on a proposed casino in advance of the Commission's suitability determination **IF prior to the request by the applicant for an election** in accordance with 205 CMR 124.02(1), the governing body of the community formally approves holding the election prior to a positive determination of suitability.

The Commission designed this regulation to ensure that there would be an open public discussion of the fact that the people would be asked to vote on a casino project before all the facts regarding the suitability and responsibility of the applicant are known.

In fact, Chairman Crosby informally explained the process as follows, "If you want to skip the suitability approval, then there has to be a decision by the town government or the city government to choose to skip the suitability approval then there has to be a host community agreement signed, then there has to be a result for the change of the date and then there has to be a referendum..." ("Gaming commission approves emergency regulations," Samantha Lavien, CBS3Springfield.com, April 18, 2013.")

In the case of the proposed casino at Suffolk Downs, the City of Boston and Suffolk Downs failed to follow the Gaming Commission's very simple procedural rule requiring a public determination to proceed without a suitability determination **before** the applicant requests an election.

The City of Boston and the Commission were both on notice and well aware that the City Council was in violation of the Commission's rules when it allowed this vote regarding the November 5 East Boston election to go forward. There is no reason for the Commission to grant a variance now, after the fact. The Gaming Commission exists to ensure transparency and accountability in the proposed casino industry. It is the Gaming Commission's responsibility to ensure that the City of Boston and Suffolk Downs to follow the rules in scheduling a referendum on the casino. It is extremely disconcerting that the Gaming Commission might waive or fail to enforce its own procedural rules after a clear violation has occurred.

Thank you for your time, and for your commitment to the rule of law.

Heather Engman
208 Grovers Avenue
Winthrop, MA 02152

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matthew Neave <mdneave@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:00 AM
To: info@mgc.mass.gov; mgccomments (MGC)
Subject: False Advertising by Suffolk Downs

Categories: Purple Category

Last week in the East Boston Times-Free Press (September 25,2013), Suffolk Downs ran the attached advertisement where they incorrectly claim that \$20 million per year will go to East Boston. Their HCA clearly states that only 50% of the \$20m annual Community Impact Trust payment is designated for East Boston. I would expect the gaming commission to discipline the developer and publicly clarify this error by publishing an ad in the next issue of this paper so the people of East Boston can receive accurate information before the vote on Nov. 5th.

Thank you,
Matthew Neave

Environmental group contends power plants are a major contributor to global warming

With the one-year anniversary of the Fukushima nuclear power plant disaster, a group of East Boston area residents gathered at a community meeting at a local park to talk about the impact of global warming on the region. The group, led by the Environmental Movement, discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming.



City Councilor LaLumina holds off a dissenting vote to support the East Boston area's plan to build a new power plant.



City Councilor LaLumina holds off a dissenting vote to support the East Boston area's plan to build a new power plant.

City Councilor LaLumina holds off a dissenting vote to support the East Boston area's plan to build a new power plant. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming.

The environmental and energy groups held their meeting at a local park in East Boston. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming.

City Councilor LaLumina holds off a dissenting vote to support the East Boston area's plan to build a new power plant. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming. The group also discussed the impact of global warming on the region and the impact of power plants on global warming.

BOSTON'S OLDEST ITALIAN RESTAURANT
Joe's Restaurant
 1000 Beacon St., East Boston
 Tel: 781-552-1234
 www.joesrestaurant.com

\$5.00 OFF
 with the purchase of **\$25.00** or more

REAL BENEFITS FOR EAST BOSTON

A resort casino at Suffolk Downs will mean good jobs and real benefits for East Boston residents.

- 4,000 permanent jobs with preferences to East Boston residents
- \$45 million in improvements to local roads and intersections
- \$5 million annually on goods and services from East Boston businesses
- \$20 million annually to East Boston
- State-of-the-art youth and senior community center
- Improvements to the Umana School, Noyes Park and LoPresti Park

FRIENDSOFSUFFOLKDOWN.COM/COMMUNITY

Black Opus Design

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2013 6:57 PM
To: mgccomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Ann Marie LoPresti

Email

aloprest@hotmail.com

Phone

(617)567-6363

Subject

Casino at Suffolk Downs

Questions or Comments

I just have a comment. I am completely in favor of the commission granting a license to Suffolk Down and Ceasar's to build a casino resort at Suffolk Downs Race Track in East Boston. I am a resident of Waldemar Avenue, East Boston and I am an abutter of the race tract and would welcome a fine establishment to be built there.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Wilcox, Deborah Ann <DWILCOX@PARTNERS.ORG>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:52 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: revere casino

Categories: Purple Category

My name is Deborah Wilcox and I am writing again to say how strongly I support a casino in Revere.

I also would like to voice my concerns about the opponent group No Eastie Casino. For almost 2 years have heard and read the lies, slander and just plain nonsense that this group puts out. Now they are spreading tales of Mr Crosby being unethical and threatening lawsuits, etc. I am frankly tired of these people and the dirty games that they play.

Thank you for your time and please allow Revere to move forward with their plan for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Patricia Clark <paclark117@me.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:44 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: NO CASINO IN REVERE

Categories: Purple Category

To the Gaming Commission:

> As a Massachusetts resident and most especially a Winthrop resident I am writing to to let you know I oppose the plans to move forward with a Revere-only casino and that the plan as it exists today is fundamentally different that what you decided on Nov. 5. If you do pass it, the State will ultimately be besieged with lawsuits and who makes money - the lawyers.

> The fact that Winthrop was not only given the right to have a voice is unimaginable as we are more impacted than parts of Revere. Winthrop is a beautiful seaside community and we want to maintain that - a casino at Suffolk Downs would hurt us - not help us! Any mitigation that may come from it is laughable - there is not any evidence that allowing casinos has helped the states and towns financially. In fact just the opposite - look at Nevada and California. Judging from the recent proposals with other towns in Mass - Massachusetts does not want casinos! Please don't try to jam it down our throats. The corruption, crime and prostitution will outweigh any mitigation benefits. Casinos don't make money on winners.

- Geographically, Winthrop is closer to the proposed site than parts of Revere, and our peninsular restrictions holds us uniquely captive to any development that will so greatly impact our daily travel.
- Quite recently, Winthrop's voters have decided to make a sizeable investment into the Town - the building of a new Middle/High School. We have an obligation to ensure that our new middle/high school is not overshadowed by circumstances that could possibly have a mitigating effect on our home values and quality of life.
- Our representatives, local and state, are not advocating for Winthrop's voice in this matter. To proceed with the Revere Mohegan Sun Casino plan without listening to Winthrop's voters would wrongly exclude, and thereby disrespect, the unique composition of our town.

Also please recall that a substantial number of voters in Revere voted "NO" to a casino. Could these numbers swell with a "new proposal, requiring a new vote?" Why not find out before rushing ahead with a decision. I urge you to please VOTE NO!

Patricia Clark
17 South Main St.
Winthrop MA 02152

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Michael Murphy <mcmdrummerboy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:25 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC)
Subject: Revere-only Casino proposal
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission:

I am writing to you as a resident of Winthrop, Massachusetts. **My home is located less than one mile away from the Suffolk Downs property.** I am writing to express my grave concern regarding the Suffolk Downs' "Revere-only" casino development.

The law regarding the East Boston and Revere referendums on the proposed Suffolk Downs casino is exceedingly clear: BOTH communities had to vote "yes" in order for the proposal to move forward. Following the East Boston "no" vote, Suffolk Downs is willfully and deliberately attempting to disenfranchise East Boston voters and to skirt the law by moving its proposed development a few yards to the north and *arguably* across the city line. This behavior is extremely disturbing for the residents of Winthrop. **If Suffolk Downs is willing to disregard the clear requirements for legal process as it competes for a license, it can similarly be expected to disregard any mitigation agreement or legal obligation it owes to Winthrop in the event it is awarded a license.**

The intent of the law on this matter is very clear; Suffolk Downs cannot move forward without a new Host Community Agreement and a vote on the new proposal.

I urge you to remove the Suffolk Downs / Mohegan Sun application from consideration, as it does not comport with the law.

Thank you for your attention to this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Michael Murphy, MD
208 Grovers Avenue
Winthrop, MA 20152

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matthew Clarke <clarkeracingstable@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:22 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Mohegan Sun, Suffolk Downs proposed application.
Attachments: commission letter final draft.doc

Categories: Purple Category

Please find the attached letter to Chairman Crosby, and Commissioners Cameron, Stebbins, McHugh, and Zuniga regarding casino development at Suffolk Downs.

Thank you,

Matthew Clarke

Matthew D Clarke

P.O Box 536, Revere, MA 02151

Telephone 352-875-4044 Email clarkeracingstable@gmail.com

December 5, 2013

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Gayle Cameron, Commissioner
Enrique Zuniga, Commissioner
James F. McHugh, Commissioner
Bruce Stebbins, Commissioner

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street
10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Commissioners,

My name is Matthew Clarke. I am a racehorse trainer who for the past six years has raced horses at Suffolk Downs. During that period the horses in my care have made approximately 646 starts, winning 66 races. I ended the 2013 meet as the fifth leading trainer. For the last six years, since moving to New England from Florida, my family and I have also been active in breeding thoroughbred racehorses to participate in the Massachusetts thoroughbred breeding incentive program. From 2009 – 2011, I also served as an elected board member of the Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders Association (MTBA).

From 2009 through to final passage of the Expanded Gaming Act in November 2011, I was intimately involved in speaking with lawmakers about the economic benefits which thoroughbred racing and breeding bring to the Commonwealth as they crafted the language of the law relating to my industry. I also gave testimony to the Joint Committee on expanded gaming specifically relating to economic impact studies which had been published by other States, who had incorporated horse racing into expanded gaming legislation.

Lawmakers clearly heard our voices and in crafting the final bill, gave my industry specific, important protections and benefits designed to protect and expand Thoroughbred racing and breeding. The bill also placed oversight and regulation of our industry under your authority.

I applaud your appointment of Dr. Jennifer Durenberger to the Horse Racing Division. The new medication guidelines and testing protocols which she introduced were for me a breath of fresh air. In an industry often criticized for overuse and misuse of medications, Massachusetts now leads the country in standards, something which all horsemen should welcome.

Given these circumstances, you will no doubt not be surprised that I have been a long term supporter of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC, and their ambition to bring a world class destination resort community to Boston. It was with great dismay that I learned of the necessity for SSR to sever their operator relationship with Caesar's, although I respect and understand

your concerns. Even greater disappointment came with the host community vote in East Boston. Again I fully respect the wishes of the residents and their vote.

Following the referendum on November 5th, 2013, SSR announced their intention to refocus their application on a gaming facility solely located in Revere. While I did not like the notion of giving up a stabling area located in Revere that is essential to the training of race horses and the operation of a viable major racetrack in order to construct a gaming facility, I was prepared to listen to their proposal and give it serious consideration.

Shortly thereafter, SSR announced that their new partner would be Mohegan Sun, a well-respected operator in the gaming industry and one which was acceptable to the Gaming Commission in terms of suitability.

Only days later, we are informed that the whole proposal has changed once again. Instead of Mohegan Sun being an operator partnering with SSR on this application, we are now told that Mohegan Sun will be the applicant, the developer and the license holder thus relegating SSR to the position of landlord for the project.

While I understand the need to restructure the application in light of the East Boston referendum, and the subsequent need to clearly separate the Gaming facility built solely on the Revere side of the property from the racing facility which occupies land in both communities, this substitution of applicant allows SSR to continue to operate the racetrack completely free of the obligations demanded of them previously as an applicant under the terms of the Expanded Gaming Act of 2011. **These obligations were clearly set out in the Act, specifically in terms of the number of days racing that would be required by an existing gaming licensee/applicant to host in order to obtain and thereafter retain a Casino license. These obligations set out by lawmakers in relation to existing gaming license applicants, were inserted to protect and enhance a valued industry that provides substantial financial and community benefits to the Commonwealth together with jobs to its citizenry.**

During the Commission hearings held on December 3rd, 2013 SSR, stated that if “gaming took place on their property, that they would maintain a commitment to operate the racetrack and continue to race” Commissioners, what does this mean? Will they voluntarily perform their obligations as set out in the Act that would have applied were they the applicant? Will they choose to offer a “boutique” meet with higher purses offered with far fewer racing days? My fellow trainers, owners and breeders need a guarantee that the protections and benefits afforded to them in in the Expanded Gaming Act will be met in order that we can create our business models, future plans and maintain much needed jobs in the rural and agricultural sectors.

In 2012 and 2013, the Horsemen’s Benevolent and Protection Association (HBPA) cooperated with SSR when they requested that the State reduce the number of racing days from 100 per year required by statute for SSR to maintain their simulcast license to 80 days. This reduced number of racing days is not sufficient to support a state breeding program as such a program is entirely dependent on having sufficient opportunities to race these State bred horses in order to earn breeder incentive rewards. The Expanded Gaming Act of 2011 mandated that SSR, if a successful applicant would have to race 105 days in the first year of casino operation, rising to

115 and ultimately 125 days in the third year of gaming operations. The newly proposed application currently before you, completely absolves SSR of any obligation to comply with the intent and spirit of the provisions specified in the act while enriching themselves in their new role as a simple “landlord”.

In addition to SSR’s stated nonspecific “commitment to racing”, there is also another area of great concern to me and my fellow horsemen. Our barn and stabling area in Revere will have to be demolished in order to allow gaming area construction. SSR have told the horsemen that the City of Boston will not allow the construction of a new stabling area on available land that SSR owns located in East Boston. Furthermore even though SSR has publicly stated that it owns 42 developable acres in Revere, (more that the Everett and Milford locations combined) it would not be possible to allocate any of that land to construct new stabling essential to the operation of a viable racetrack.

Their current proposal, although completely absent detail is that SSR will create a “remote” stabling and training location elsewhere in the Commonwealth. From that location EVERY horse will have to be transported to Suffolk Downs on race days and then return to the training location post-race. This proposal will pose a logistical and financial nightmare for horsemen and is quite frankly based upon by experience as a horseman not achievable. While there are several racetracks in the country that have limited stabling on site and use offsite training centers for overflow, there is not a single racetrack that has no stabling facilities on site, other than very short duration race meets such as The Meadowlands (8 race days per year spread over 4 weeks.)

Commissioners, SSR have made no secret of the fact that they have always disliked the obligatory race day schedule mandated in the Act. Their new non applicant status allows them to proceed with racing upon their own terms and conditions without regard to the needs of the horsemen and without regard to the conditions envisaged by our lawmakers. It is clear to me that the legislature felt that if a Casino be located anywhere on the SSR property it would only occur with the protections and benefits for horsemen as set forth by Statute.

In summary, I would humbly request that in reaching your determinations regarding the Mohegan Sun, SSR application you consider the clear intent of the legislature regarding any casino facility located on any part of the Suffolk Downs racetrack property and its direct effect on Thoroughbred racing and breeding in the Commonwealth. If you do make the determination that this current application should proceed, I would ask that you consider making it conditional on SSR fulfilling the live horse racing obligations that would exist for an existing gaming licensee applicant. To the extent that such conditions may be deemed inappropriate for any reason, perhaps Mohegan Sun will consider being a partner with Suffolk Downs in the racing operation so that the appropriate restrictions and protections of the racing industry can be then placed on any gaming license issued to Mohegan Sun.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Clarke

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jenny Reynolds <squirrelburrito@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:13 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino Proposal

Categories: Purple Category

Hello!

My name is Jenny Reynolds. I'm a 29 year old married mother of two great little girls. I've lived in Revere since 2006, and I love this city with all my heart. My older daughter attends one of the city elementary schools, and my family is actively involved in the community.

I am writing in support of a Revere-only casino. I feel that Suffolk Downs has our best interests at heart, and I believe that Mohegan Sun is a solid partner in this project. I believe that the benefits of this project coming here far outweigh the risks or negative effects.

Traffic is already a mess here. In my part of the city, you must deal with 1A to get anywhere, and at some times of day, it is honestly a nightmare. Casino traffic would add more cars at off peak times, but if the plan still includes helping to make the driving situation better, I'm ok with that. We deal with beach traffic in the summer, and when I first moved here, Revere street eastbound was closed for over a year for bridge work. It was a mess, but we got through it.

Both Revere and Suffolk Downs have great history as far as being entertainment and tourist destinations. As we've seen with several great rebuilding efforts along the beach in the last few years, our city is proud to welcome others and share in our natural resources and other opportunities and attractions.

These improvements cost money, and with never-ending, year after year budget cuts from state and federal authorities, the money our city would gain from this proposal would help us become an even better and stronger community. The jobs the casino would provide to our residents are much needed during these tough economic times.

Our public transportation in this city is great. We have the blue line, bus, and even the commuter rail passing through. I see no reason why we couldn't add a commuter rail stop at the old Wonderland property and invite even more people into our city and new world class casino. When compared to the other option in Everett, our public transportation is a huge boost for this proposed site.

In the past few years we have also created new public service facilities. Our police station and a fire station are within feet of the proposed building site. We've rebounded from our not-so-great reputation in the past few decades, and we are showing every day what a densely populated city can do to keep its citizens safe and informed.

I am involved with a community group that works with the city of Revere, and even in that regard, I believe a casino here would be a great thing for our residents. And as the commission has seen since East Boston voted against it, our city is ready and willing to fight for what we think is best.

Please consider us as the best host community for an urban casino. Let Revere delight visitors and locals alike once again. We are ready. Roll the dice on us, and I guarantee we will do everything in our power to make this project a success, and one to be proud of for generations to come.

Thank you for your time!

Jenny Reynolds
45 Woodland Rd.
Revere, MA 02151
squirrelburrito@gmail.com

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:06 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Edward Palladino Sr

Email

eddiepal@comcast.net

Phone

(617)567-6863

Subject

Revere/ Mohegan Sun Casino resort

Questions or Comments

As a lifelong resident of the Orient Heights section of East Boston I have seen the many changes that East Boston has endured for over 90 years. Unfortunately I was looking forward to the possibility of the next big change with the addition of a destination resort casino at Suffolk Downs, but the voters had their say and it won't come to be. The mitigation agreement that was proposed between East Boston and Suffolk Downs, I thought, was one of epic proportions and would have greatly enhanced the place I have called home for 90 years. Now with the proposed Revere only on the docket, I feel that it's a final opportunity to enhance the area for the future and I wholeheartedly support the current proposal by Mohegan Sun and the city of Revere. Looking forward to a better Revere/East Boston community.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: kam123@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 11:10 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: kmagno@macatholic.org
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

As a Revere resident I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then.

I for one attended the public forum that was held in Revere where Suffolk Downs and Ceasers outlined their proposal. There were many questions taken that night from the audience which was quite large. None of the answers to those questions taken at that public forum would apply to the new arrangement. In fact the new arrangement brings up a whole new set of questions that the citizens of Revere will not have an opportunity to ask.

In no way did the average citizen in Revere understand that there was always possible Revere only plan. This was totally a surprise to most who voted. I find this troubling in so many ways. Revere residents will be affected in ways that are unforeseen and there has been no discussion as to how a community that already suffers from too much traffic and high car insurance rates will deal with it. The impact on families in the community is also a strong concern. Revere up until recently had a 1:00 am closing time for all establishments serving liquor. That was recently changed to 2:00 am in anticipation of the Casino coming. This is already impacting motor vehicle safety and with drivers leaving the casino at late hours the danger of drunk driving increases further. There will also be an increase in prostitution and drugs. This scenario is what East Boston decided they didn't want for their community and will have to, in some part, deal with this anyway just by virtue of being such a close neighbor. I simply can't understand how this can stand.

Many in the community of Revere have been concerned about the closing of the Track due to those in our community that work there. Now it looks as though even that won't be saved if the new plan goes through. I don't think a jockey or a horse trainer would want a job working the card tables.

Please reconsider all the the points that I have made above when deciding if this proposal should go through without holding another election. It's just wrong!

Kathy Magno

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Heather Engman <h.a.engman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:47 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs casino development
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission:

I am writing to you as a resident of Winthrop, Massachusetts. **My home is located less than one mile away from the Suffolk Downs property.** I am writing to express my grave concern regarding the Suffolk Downs' "Revere-only" casino development.

The law regarding the East Boston and Revere referendums on the proposed Suffolk Downs casino is exceedingly clear: BOTH communities had to vote "yes" in order for the proposal to move forward. Following the East Boston "no" vote, Suffolk Downs is willfully and deliberately attempting to disenfranchise East Boston voters and to skirt the law by moving its proposed development a few yards to the north and *arguably* across the city line. This behavior is extremely disturbing for the residents of Winthrop. **If Suffolk Downs is willing to disregard the clear requirements for legal process as it competes for a license, it can similarly be expected to disregard any mitigation agreement or legal obligation it owes to Winthrop in the event it is awarded a license.**

The intent of the law on this matter is very clear; Suffolk Downs cannot move forward without a new Host Community Agreement and a vote on the new proposal.

I urge you to remove the Suffolk Downs / Mohegan Sun application from consideration, as it does not comport with the law.

Thank you for your attention to this very important issue.

Sincerely,
Heather Engman
208 Grovers Avenue
Winthrop, MA 20152

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: dianevd1@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 8:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-only Casino

Categories: Purple Category

December 05, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

The vote taken by East Boston and Revere regarding whether to build a casino at Suffolk Downs was to be the deciding and final factor regarding whether or not the plan to build a casino at Suffolk Downs would go forward. It was stated and understood that the vote would have to be passed by both cities for the casino to be built as both cities own the land. Now we are told, because Revere lost the election, we must do it another way, and skirt the original legal agreement because Revere's legislators are not happy with this result. In our country the vote is the vote and the result is the final result and should not be played with, no matter what the cost to those who are so intertwined in this process. It was written to be the final decision and anyone with any regard for democratic rule should absolutely be suspicious of this new plan.

I am against building a Revere-only casino for a number of reasons. I live in Winthrop, MA, a very small town of 18,000 people. Winthrop is landlocked by East Boston and Revere and would be severely impacted by this plan. To this point, Winthrop has not been involved in any level of the planning and never had and still currently does not have a vote regarding this issue. There has been no consideration of the cost to adjoining towns in regard to traffic, road building and maintenance. In addition, the effect of casino gambling on local housing values, crime, poverty, and the potential psychological, financial and socio-economic cost to individuals and families cannot be accurately measured when politically argued against the need for jobs and the want for money. This is an issue in which people measure only the short-term outcome and do not consider the long-term negative effects.

Please consider Everett, MA and any other locations, particularly those that have voted in favor for such a plan and have the much need space as well as a plan thoughtfully submitted in a timely fashion, when deciding where to grant casino licenses.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Diane E. Sands

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: dianevd1@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 7:34 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-only Casino - letters need to be in for tomorrow

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will*

East Boston's vote not be respected?

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Diane E. Sands

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: dianevd1@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 7:10 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-only Casino

Categories: Purple Category

December 05, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

The vote taken by East Boston and Revere regarding whether to build a casino at Suffolk Downs was to be the deciding and final factor regarding whether or not the plan to build a casino at Suffolk Downs would go forward. It was stated and understood that the vote would have to be passed by both cities for the casino to be built as both cities own the land. Now we are told, because Revere lost the election, we must do it another way, and skirt the original legal agreement because Revere's legislators are not happy with this result. In our country the vote is the vote and the result is the final result and should not be played with, no matter what the cost to those who are so intertwined in this process. It was written to be the final decision and anyone with any regard for democratic rule should absolutely be suspicious of this new plan.

I am against building a Revere-only casino for a number of reasons. I live in Winthrop, MA, a very small town of 18,000 people. Winthrop is landlocked by East Boston and Revere and would be severely impacted by this plan. To this point, Winthrop has not been involved in any level of the planning and never had and still currently does not have a vote regarding this issue. There has been no consideration of the cost to adjoining towns in regard to traffic, road building and maintenance. In addition, the effect of casino gambling on local housing values, crime, poverty, and the potential psychological, financial and socio-economic cost to individuals and families cannot be accurately measured when politically argued against the need for jobs and the want for money. This is an issue in which people measure only the short-term outcome and do not consider the long-term negative effects.

Please consider Everett, MA and any other locations, particularly those that have voted in favor for such a plan and have the much need space as well as a plan thoughtfully submitted in a timely fashion, when deciding where to grant casino licenses.

Thank you for your attention and consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Diane E. Sands

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Kerri Courtois <kerriago@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 4:34 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Applicant Suitability

Categories: Purple Category

Hello, Thank you for your efforts with this Gaming possibility.

As a life long resident of Revere, I did not vote for a Revere Only Casino. My ballot said the Majority of the casino would be in East Boston. Every Meeting I went to talked about both cities and traffic plans.

What are the new traffic plans now?

Did the original bill voted in Congress have a plan if one city said no and one city said yes?

If East Boston said yes and Revere said no, would Revere put up with East Boston having a Casino?

If these were countries this would Cause WAR.

It is rude to even let Revere Consider it.

There should have been two construction plans and two traffic plans or more.

Two Host agreements?

Now will East Boston get anything?

Will Revere receive MORE now that a Complete City Host agreement?

Can the Bridge on route 16 / route 145 even handle traffic for construction?

This bridge is following down now and trucks have to be diverted.

Will the fly over still be built?

Will the Route 1 Route 16 exit still be installed?

Everything Revere voted for Was a Lie.

My ballot did not discuss this possibility.

This Revere Only Casino should not even be considered.

My Vote should not have been counted.

My Ballot was NOT TRUE and the vote should have been cancelled.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Terri <tebraz@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 4:28 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: No Casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

December 5, 2013

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost

9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Theresa M. Brazil

The people have clearly spoken on this matter, but it's clear we must continue to speak to ensure that our voices are heard! Thank you your cooperation with these two simple tasks. Revere residents, your input to both the Commission and your Mayor are especially valuable. Finally, please remember that time is of the essence, and these letters should be sent this week. Please don't hesitate to contact us for any reason.

Thank you,

- No Eastie Casino

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: stiegails@aol.com <eastiegails@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 4:16 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Conflicts of Gaming Chairman

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and members of the Gaming Commission:

Reading in the Boston Globe today of your decision to recuse yourself from the Wynn's proposal in Everett regarding land issues only mirrors similar concerns involving your familiarity with principals in the Revere proposal at Suffolk Downs. I will not cite chapter and verse of the Gaming Commission's own standard of ethics which appear to be a higher threshold to meet than the state's own ethics standards, but suffice it to say that the same "appearance of impropriety" is evident in the Revere proposal as it is in the Everett proposal.

I don't know how one could argue that there is no "appearance" of impropriety when by your own admissions you revealed your relationships involving principals in both proposals at least a year ago. How can the public be reassured now that past decisions by this Gaming Commission under your chairmanship were not influenced by those relationships?

Then reading of Hopkinton's concerns about the Gaming Commissions' investigative bureau, it now appears that there are issues of transparency beyond just the locales of East Boston and Revere. Your authority over the investigative bureau failures to provide information to governing bodies satisfying concerns about a casino applicant causes speculation that your review and oversight might be less than what is mandated.

To avoid further appearances of impropriety in reviewing these proposals, at the very least in the Eastern region, it seems as though any action you take or propose will be subject to a magnifying glass causing distractions going forward in the review of these applications. Everything you say and do will be suspect as a result of these revelations.

I respectfully request that you recuse yourself from any and all consideration of gaming licenses in the Eastern region. Let the record speak for itself in determining your involvement in the two remaining regions.

Sincerely,

Gail C. Miller
232 Orient Avenue
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Ricci LaCentra <Ricci_LaCentra@emerson.edu>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 3:56 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: I am a Revere Resident Opposed to a Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission Chairman Crosby and commissioners of the board,

I am dismayed by your attempt to speak for Revere voters in the November 2013 election. The referendum put to us on November 5th was in regard to the establishment of a casino in East Boston and came with specific provisions in the form of a community agreement with Suffolk Downs. In the intervening month these specifics have changed dramatically. No longer will the casino be located in East Boston but entirely in Revere. Despite this, no updated community agreement has been made available for public consumption. The developments of the past month have been acknowledged by Mr. Crosby, "What [Revere] voted on is clearly not what's on the table now." However, from this premise Mr. Crosby reaches an absurd conclusion, "But what [Revere voters] didn't know [in November] wouldn't have changed their vote." Allow me to put this in perspective.

Let's say you are at an ice cream shop with your family. Your children want a vanilla ice cream sundae with hot fudge and jimmies. Now let's posit this ice cream shop, due to endless political wrangling and the influence of countless lawyers and moneyed men, changes its distributor. "Wait, Don't leave! Don't reach for the Brigham's!" exclaims owner 'Chocolate ' Chip Tuttle. "We've found a new distributor and they are going to give you mint chip, a whole gallon—no, two! Smothered in pineapple chunks!" Granted it isn't what you originally requested, but undeniably there is a ton of it. Further the Quality Control Board for Ice Cream says that all ice cream is the same, so not only is mint chip an appropriate substitute, but it is now what you must buy for your family. Did I mention, the man behind the counter is already scooping? It seems you have no choice in the matter.

On November 5th Revere residents voted on the following ballot question, "Shall the city of Revere permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located at Suffolk Downs in East Boston at 525 William F. McClellan Highway East Boston, Massachusetts?" The East Boston address in this ballot question is undeniable. Therefore to say voters approved a casino in Revere is to interpret the intent of over 10,000 people who voted in the election. This is beyond the Gaming Commission's mission.

The goal of a casino referendum was to enfranchise voters to make meaningful choices about the future of their communities. To have a voice in influencing your future: this is vital to the concept of democracy. Otherwise we might as well have tyrants dictate our lives to us. However, so far as choosing one's future, not all plans are created equal, this we know. Therefore it is necessary to be informed, to debate, to drive at the truth as best we can. Both East Boston and Revere printed their respective community agreements with Suffolk Downs on the November 2013 ballot. This was not a coincidence. Any savvy voter would factor this information into their decision about a casino in East Boston. Does the fact that these community agreements have become moot count for nothing? The city of Revere has taken sole responsibility for hosting a casino in Eastern Massachusetts and the citizens of Revere have not seen a community agreement which reflects this. If such a development does not merit public discourse and cooler heads, what does? A decision by your board to prematurely approve a casino when the community agreement is unknown to Revere residents would disenfranchise all parties, even those who would blindly approve—perhaps especially those who would blindly approve, then have ample time for regret. The details are vital to the democratic process—without them the process is a sham.

In closing I will remind you of your stated duty to properly vet casino applicants. So too the citizens of Revere must decide what is best for our community. We must be allowed the time necessary to debate and vote on this question. Indeed this is our future, do not supersede us and take that Responsibility upon yourself.

Sincerely,

Ricci LaCentra II
30 John Ave.
Revere, MA 02151

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Roussel, Steven J <Steven.Roussel@CITIZENSBANK.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 2:03 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Support Letter For Revere Casino Only From Steven Roussel
Attachments: Gaming Commission.doc

Categories: Purple Category

To whom it may concern at the Gaming Commission. My name is Steven Roussel. The above attachment is a letter of support for the Revere only Casino. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Use of email is inherently insecure. Confidential information, including account information, and personally identifiable information, should not be transmitted via email, or email attachment. In no event shall Citizens or any of its affiliates accept any responsibility for the loss, use or misuse of any information including confidential information, which is sent to Citizens or its affiliates via email, or email attachment. Citizens does not guarantee the accuracy of any email or email attachment, that an email will be received by Citizens or that Citizens will respond to any email. This email message is confidential and/or privileged. It is to be used by the intended recipient only. Use of the information contained in this email by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and promptly destroy any record of this email.

To The Gaming Commission
From Steven Roussel 238 River Road , Winthrop Ma 02152
Date 12/05/2013
Subject : Revere Casino

Thank you for your valuable time and consideration to read my opinion. I was born and raised in East Boston, MA. I lived at 128 Falcon Street for 39 years and now live in Winthrop with my wife for the last 11 years.

This letter is **in support** of the Revere only Casino. I understand and respect the wishes of the East Boston Community not to have a Casino in East Boston, I wonder, however, if the community understands the valuable resources provided by Suffolk Downs and its employees over the past 5 to 6 years. Suffolk Downs donated time, resources and money to non-profits and special organizations such as The YMCA, Salesians Boys and Girls Club, East Boston Social Center and others. I only wish the neighborhood knew how generous that Mr. Richard Fields, Chip Tuttle and the rest of the Suffolk Downs staff was to the community. I respect the voters of Revere and I completely understand the value this proposal would bring to Revere. This is an economic engine not only for their City but the entire Metro-Boston area. There are many people in the surrounding cities that would have an opportunity to get on the economic ladder. Here is why I believe that having this land development is important: I was a newspaper delivery boy during the Blizzard of 1978. I then worked at Jewel's Restaurant as a dishwasher, then busboy, then as a preparation cook. I made money to help my disabled father and was able to pay for a College Education at University of Massachusetts with a Degree in International Management that I otherwise would not have had the opportunity to. I later worked as a host, waiter, captain, Assistant Manager and Manager in the hospitality business. Today I work in the banking industry managing at least a 100,000,000 dollar a year operation for Citizens Bank Mortgage. My point is that not unlike when I was starting out in my career, there needs to be entry level jobs to have people to be able to provide for themselves, and have a respectable place to work. These employees once hired would be able to be trained, have health care benefits, and have a job that offers retirement benefits. This creates a trickle effect to spend money in the local area in which they live, and pay taxes to further stimulate the economy. This grows jobs, reduces crime, and stabilizes an area. We all have friends and families that have lost their jobs or do not have jobs at this time. Some are under employed just looking for a job. Some are part time workers looking for full time work and benefits. It be virtuous to have 3,500 to 4,000 jobs at the moment . I have a friend Stephen DeMarco who works at Suffolk Downs. He works 8 to 16 hours a week and wishes he was fully employed and is crossing his fingers his job will be a full time job with the new development. A second friend Paul Pelosi had to close his variety store and has been looking for a job for at least 5 years. My nephew John Paul does not drive due to the costs of car insurance and gas. He has a girl friend and 2 year old baby and must travel to Waltham to work as a Cook. It takes him 1 hour and 15 minutes to go back and forth to work. These people and hundreds, possibly thousands more would be able work locally and lead a balanced life between family and friends. This is what I believe in. Give someone the opportunity and let them run with it.

Revere has a history of running a gambling operation and their citizens voted overwhelmingly to embrace this opportunity. Wonderland day tracked closed not because Revere want it to be closed. It is my understanding that the voters in Massachusetts voted it to close. This is why I think the City of Revere supports this development. It understands the impact and benefits to their City and surrounding Cities. A second reason for the project is to bring development to a huge tract of land that is probably environmental hazardous and the area could bring in over 1 Billion dollars of investment income that would work through an economy that needs a shot in the arm. Many local businesses would be used and workers would be needed. Unemployment is over 7% in Massachusetts. The government sequester is beginning to hurt defense spending, research , and education dollars in Massachusetts. This would offset those declines and keep this areas unemployment figures from going higher.

At the moment many people in the area gamble a short automobile drive away. They go to Connecticut, Rhode Island and other near by casinos and spend their money. I lot of our Massachusetts tax revenues are going to other states. By having a Casino in Revere we would be able to keep more tax dollars locally, working to improve our areas. The other benefits would be to have moderate to upscale restaurants, shopping, and professional entertainment in the area. Since I live in Winthrop this could be a great day excursion without traveling. I would like to share that I went on a 5 day, 4 night vacation to Las Vegas. I had to pay for a hotel 5 days, needed to block off time at work, spend my hard earned money on dinners, shopping, and shows were expensive. I spent a lot of money compared to what I make because I only able to go there once every 7 to 8 years. The convenience of having the Casino and its facilities in my own back yard would be a better quality of life to just get away for a few hours without paying exorbitant flying fares.

I think it is important to have a high quality, green level development to lead us into revitalizing with an environmentally friendly project. This is important to off-set a large, local polluter in New England. The Airport would at least now bring in more tourists in to the area. The Casino project would be the gold standard for all new major development in New England. It would be a nice feature to have a close by Spa resort with all its amenities.

If you should have any questions please do not hesitate to call me . My direct number is 617-686-7988. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Steven Roussel

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 2:01 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Anne Bowen

Email

am22b@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)284-3895

Subject

Mohegan Sun Suffolk Downs Revere

Questions or Comments

During your Hearing on December 3rd, Revere's Community Host Agreement was debated.

A Casino at Suffolk Downs is not a new idea in Revere. We have talked about that possibility for years. In 1996, the Revere City Council voted to amend a Zoning Ordinance that would accommodate a Casino on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs.

When the Extended Gaming Act became law in 2011, people in Revere were elated. A Casino at Suffolk Downs could now be a reality.

On November 5th, educated and informed, Revere voters said YES to a Casino at Suffolk Downs off Winthrop Ave (at the time not knowing Suffolk Downs choice for an operator). Yes to a casino at Suffolk Downs like we have been talking about all these years.

Now Mohegan Sun , a New England Company, successful and respected nationally is partnering with Suffolk Downs to build and operate a casino in Revere. One of the best possible outcomes! Mayor Rizzo is right. People in Revere are excited. We hope that Suffolk Downs-Mohegan Sun will be allowed to apply for an extended gaming license. Let our YES votes count.

Revere has been the home of Wonderland Dog Track and Suffolk Downs Horse Track. We want to add to that list a world class Mohegan Sun Casino at Suffolk Downs in REVERE

Good luck with your decision

Anne Bowen

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Wilcox, Deborah Ann <DWILCOX@PARTNERS.ORG>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 1:17 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Hello Gaming Commission;

I am writing to express my favor for a casino on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs. I understand that the race track will only be the land lords of a casino owned and operated by Mohegan Sun. Although, it would have been my preference to have the original plan this plan is more than acceptable to me.

I now live in Winthrop, MA but I was born and raised in Beachmont and understand that traffic may be an issue as I have experienced it for many years. As I still have property in the Beachmont area I would hate to see The Race Track close. When it closed for three years in the early 90's; businesses in that area suffered and taxes raised at least 3%. It would be a huge blow to the local economy for it to close permanently. Not to mention the loss of jobs.

I implore you to except and approve a casino on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs.

Thank you
Deborah Wilcox

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Sandra <sauns@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 11:42 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: No Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan, on the Revere parcel, then a new vote should take place to give residents their right to vote on a new proposal.

A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Best Regards,

Sondra

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Patrick Ristino <patr06677@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 11:27 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk downs

Categories: Purple Category

Dear mass gaming commission,

I am writing to you to show my support for the casino project in revere at suffolk downs. I've lived in revere all my life and have two small children in revere public schools. The benefits of a revere only casino would be tremendous for our city and the greater boston area also. The job creation, improvements to public schools, tax relief and road reconstruction are a once in lifetime opportunity for us. Suffolk downs has been there for almost 80 years and would be a shame to see it shut down because a gaming facility wasn't allow to move forward. All the nay Sayers are coming up with silly reasons why it should'nt be built ,which gets me angry every time somebody from another city tries to tell us what to do. Revere as you know voted overwhelmingly in favor for this project with bigger numbers than the competition in Everett. The owner of suffolks downs land are well known highly regarded and legit, compared to Everett which has some shady activity going down which you are aware of. Suffolk downs and revere has and always will be the best place for a resort casino in the state. We voted a resounding YES for this project and should be allowed to proceed with this once in lifetime opportunity and ultimately be rewarded a gaming license when the time comes!!! Thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely Patrick Ristino

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: ajchianca@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 10:32 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs
Attachments: MGC Letter re Revere support Dec 4 2013.docx

Categories: Purple Category

Please see that the attached letter is delivered to Chairman Crosby

Thank you,
Anthony J. Chianca

4 December 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02109

RE: Casino License for Mohegan Sun/City of Revere

Dear Chairman Crosby,

I am writing this letter to voice my support for the City of Revere and its residents who, on November 5th of this year, overwhelmingly voted to support a measure to bring a world-class Resort Casino to Suffolk Downs.

As a resident of East Boston, I was very disappointed when many of my fellow East Bostonians voted against a measure that would bring a world-class Resort Casino to a parcel of land situated in East Boston and Revere. This would have brought many economic and social benefits to our community. While the measure was defeated in East Boston, it received a resounding "YES" in Revere.

During the many community meetings I've attended, one question was repeatedly raised "what would happen if East Boston voted NO and Revere voted YES?" On each occasion I heard Mr. Chip Tuttle openly state that while it would be very, very difficult to proceed, it was not impossible and that Sterling Suffolk Downs would keep all of its options open and look to find a way to do it. Well, in my opinion they have found an extremely reasonable way to do it and they have been very responsive to the community in the process.

I continue to support their application for the simple reason that this project will have an immediate and ongoing positive impact on the economy of our entire region. There will be infrastructure improvements in the area that are long overdue; good jobs, with good benefits, will be created and maintained; and, the regional economy will receive a tremendous boost.

I believe that the people of Revere have every right to have this resort casino built in their community and I applaud them for their vision and commitment.

I ask you and your fellow commissioners to follow the lead of the people of Revere and vote "YES" for them and for our entire region.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

Anthony J. Chianca
64 St Andrew Rd
East Boston, MA 02128
617-970-4285

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Robin Brister <fom.clarionwakefield@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 8:09 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs

Categories: Purple Category

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this email to voice my support of a Revere only casino on the suffolk downs property. I have been a homeowner in Revere for 4 years now. On Tuesday, Nov 5th we the residents of Revere had a chance to express how we felt about putting a casino here in our backyard and I for one was one of those residents along with 6700 other residents whom voted 'Yes'.

I totally understood what the ballot question was asking and when I attended the one of the many meetings that Suffolk downs put together I asked the question ' What would happen if Eastie voted no?' and 'I was told that the 'Casino' could still be built on Revere land only and although it would be an uphill it could be possible. So, I was well aware that this was a possibility. So, therefore it was clear to me that our vote was very important! In addition with 'Ceasers' being out I still voted yes because I believe in Suffolk Downs and that they would find a suitable applicant. I attended our zoning hearing on Tuesday Dec 2nd and if you could just see City Hall and the passion that the Revere residents had in that room it was overwhelming to say the least and we the citizens of Revere are still pulling for a 'Revere only Casino!

Robin Brister
18 wilson St.
Revere Ma 02151
781-284-6047

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: ELLA CONTI <ellaemc@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 7:57 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: NO CASINO IN REVERE

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,
I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.
The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Ella Conti

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Elaine Moschella <emoschella@revere.mec.edu>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 5:56 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To Whom it May Concern,

After watching the news Wednesday night I was shocked to learn a new vote is not required on the issue of the casino in Revere. The original vote was on a casino in Revere and East Boston. Putting the casino in Revere alone is an entirely different project. As a Revere resident and employee (third grade teacher) I am SHOCKED at the total disregard for the fact the casino would be a stones throw away from the Beachmont Elementary School, not to mention the Garfield Elementary School is a mere five minute walk!!!! A colleagues fifth grade daughter said it best, "Mommy why would anyone want to put a casino so close to a school?" What do you say to that? I know full well the perks casinos offer and why so many people are being swayed to believe this is fiscally solid and will benefit Revere residents. There are far too many residents who do not understand English in Revere who will not be voicing their opinions to you. Have you made this information available in Spanish, Arabic, French, etc,??? My question is this, "If your child or grandchild would be going to school across the street from a casino would you be approving this?"

Elaine Moschella

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please notify the sender immediately by email if you have received this email by mistake and delete this email from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. This email is the property of the Revere Public School Department.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: joelcoeb70 <joelcoeb70@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:18 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Mr Crosby,

I am a East Boston resident. Who live very close to the property that a Casino would be built on. I support it 100%. I voted for it and believe it will be a wonderful addition to our area. Suffolk downs is a historical sports venue. That deserve to be treated better. Casino and horse track are teaming up all of the country . They have been very successful. Please consider Revere for a Casino license.

Thank you in advance

Joseph A LoConte.

82 leyden st.

East Boston. Any other feed back you need feel free to call. 617-593-5252

From my Android phone on T-Mobile. The first nationwide 4G network.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Chris Andrade <cdsandrade@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 1:12 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: Regarding the Revere Casino Proposal

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor – NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time, if any, to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans – intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Chris Andrade,
East Boston Resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Joeloco70 <joelocoeb70@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 12:50 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Mr Crosby,

I am a life long resident of East Boston , and I live very close to Suffolk downs . I supported the first proposal of a East Boston Casino . I support a Revere Casino as well . I beleive the jobs and new tax revenue that this new proposal has to offer, is worth the chance . . The area has been a Gambling site for 78 years Suffolk Downs is a historical sports venue and should continue that way .This area is in need of some new venues to help those who need Jobs and save those who are working at the track . All around the Country , Casino and horse tracks have partner up to create some very successfull venues . It will add to the uniqueness of Boston . Giving those around the country one more reason to Visit our fine city . Please consider Revere as a strong Candidate for a Casino License .

Thank You in Advance

Joseph A LoConte

Joeloco70

joelocoeb70@aol.com

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matilda Bonfardeci <oriana0668@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Dear Mass Gaming Commission,

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Mass Gaming Commission,

I have been a resident of Revere now for a very long time.. and I love my city!
On Nov 5th we the residents of Revere had a chance to express how we felt about putting a casino here in our backyard and I for one was one of those residents along with 6700 other residents whom voted 'Yes'.
I totally understood what the ballot question was asking and when I attended the one of the many meetings that Suffolk Downs put together I asked the question ' What would happen if Eastie voted no?' and 'I was told that the 'Casino' could still be built on Revere land only and although it would be an uphill it could be possible. So, I was well aware that this was a possibility. So, therefore it was clear to me that our vote was very important! In addition with 'Ceasers' being out I still voted yes because I believe in Suffolk Downs and that they would find a suitable applicant. I attended our zoning hearing on Tuesday Dec 2nd and if you could just see City Hall and the the passion that Revere residents had in that room it was overwhelming and we the citizens of Revere are still pulling for a 'Revere only Casino!

I also watched the Suffolk Downs hearing yesterday live and I have to say although I was disappointed that you need another week to make a decision whether Revere can go forward I also understand that the information of the applicant needs to be reviewed. So, with that being said I would like to address those commissioners who are still on the fence about voting in favor for our city.

Think of this please..We the Residents of Revere voted in favor for this by almost 2 to 1. It is clear that we want this here! I for one am looking forward to what the flow of income will do for our city. I have two children who attend our public schools and I think of the beautiful things that can come to our city such as a new Recreation Center, New Stadiums, New Parks and more for our School System and not to mention how many people can be put back to work after the bad crash we had in 2008.

Please, Please, Please do not let our 'Yes' vote go to waste!!

When Gayle Cameron said that she hadn't heard from a lot of Revere residents who are in favor that this was an issue (the change) and I quote she said 'that this was a sign of support not an opposition' and you Stephen Crosby agreed and said now you would probably get letters.

I understood completely what Gayle Cameron meant but..unfortunately a lot of nay sayers took this as an opportunity to write against us. So, please keep this in mind when the letters come in and I am sure that they will they will be coming from the very same organization that is trying to repeal the law completely and people who dont even live in Revere. How do I know this? because of my social media pages!

In closing I just leave you with this please listen to the people of Revere and give us a chance!

Sincerely,
Matilda Bonfardeci

Sent from my iPad

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: George <mrmrsshern@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Categories: Purple Category

On Nov 5 13 there was election where both cities had to vote yes for a Suffolk Downs Casino. Suffolk Downs is mainly on the East Boston side holding more than 2/3 of the land, so therefore by them voting No majority should rule and should eliminate Suffolk Downs as a competitor.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: rettatic@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 9:50 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: I AM A REVERE RESIDENT AGAINST A REVERE CASINO

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Members of the Gaming Commission:

As a lifelong resident of Revere, I am utterly disgusted that the Commission would even think of entertaining the idea of allowing a Casino in Revere after the ballot question was soundly defeated in Boston!

The information below was taken from the ballot question both cities voted on. You will note it unequivocally states "Revere and Boston".

The Project

Suffolk Downs proposes a resort-style casino at the Suffolk Downs racetrack property, located partially in the City and partially in East Boston. Suffolk Downs proposes to invest approximately \$1 billion to develop the casino and make improvements to the regional transportation infrastructure, and expects to generate approximately \$1 billion in gaming revenue each year once the casino is fully constructed. The project is expected to create 2,500 construction jobs and 4,000 permanent jobs.

If approved by the voters of Revere and Boston, Suffolk Downs would need to win a casino license from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and various permits from state and local agencies in order to develop the project. The HCA would remain in effect for as long as Suffolk Downs has a casino license. All of Suffolk Downs' obligations under the HCA are contingent upon the Gaming Commission issuing a casino license to Suffolk Downs.

It is quite obvious that both Revere and Boston did not approve the ballot question.

In addition, the ballot question we voted on, shown below, states Suffolk Downs in East Boston, not Suffolk Downs in Revere.

"shall the city of revere permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located at Suffolk Downs in East *Boston* at 525 William F. McClellan Highway East Boston, Massachusetts"

Having said that, I have to ask how is it at all possible that a Suffolk Downs casino can go forward?

Where does the Commission have the Right and authority to supersede the voters and rewrite the ballot question after the fact?

As far as I am concerned Suffolk Downs had their chance at the polls and lost! Game Over!!!

Sincerely,

Ricci LaCentra
30 John Avenue
Revere, MA 02151

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Charlotte Burns <chlburns@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 6:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Revere Casino; Vineyard Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Not in my life time buddy. We're going to repeal the casino deal and send these con artists packing!!!!!!!!!!!!

On Dec 4, 2013, at 2:33 PM, MGCcomments (MGC) wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. The Commission welcomes your feedback as the state continues to prepare for the arrival of expanded gaming.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Ana <ailanzilli@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 5:26 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: regarding Revere only proposal

Categories: Purple Category

Dear MGC,

I am writing on behalf of both my parents who live at 22 Loring Road Revere, and also own a Condo at Bell Isle (directly behind Suffolk Downs) 145 Bennington Street Revere. On November 5th, my parents voted yes for a casino at Suffolk Downs. They are both in favor of jobs, and the development of the site for a Resort/Casino. When EB voted down the proposal, they continued to be very excited and positive that this would happen (obviously shifting everything to the Revere side). East Boston saying no should NOT be more important than Revere Saying YES..... Nothing has changed for my parents, and they continue to FULLY Support this project. We hope you will let Suffolk/Mohegan move forward so that the Citizens in Revere have a chance for what they VOTED for. Thank you for your time.

Ana Lanzilli (781-727-3863)

On Behalf of Jose and Prisila Rodriguez
(781-284-9148)

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Linda Rainville <rainy148@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 5:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: No way Revere should be allowed to just bid again!

Categories: Purple Category

Revere should vote again for new plan and also East Boston should be heard! Moving a casino over a few feet is not in the spirit of the vote. To allow this casino to go forward seems to make a mockery of the vote of East Boston residents and seem to corrupt the process and why a vote was held. Linda Rainville

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: antonia vangel <vangelv2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 5:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Antoinette Vangel

love,

Antoinette

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jamie Farrell <jamiemariefarrell@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:42 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere voter feedback

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Mass Gaming Commission: It is likely illegal that you are ignoring the "no" vote in East Boston, but it is arrogant to claim to know how Revere voters would react to a new proposal without giving us a chance to vote. I have read that you are basing a decision about moving forward partly on a lack of emails to you. The commission looks more and more foolish each day.

Jamie Farrell
A Revere Voter

Jamie Farrell
jamiemariefarrell@hotmail.com
781-289-7088

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: kent elliott <kentelliott819@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:19 PM
To: reve-re_mayor@reve-re.org; MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: stupid casino/illegal actions by Suffolk Downs and the gaming commission

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards, B. Kent Elliott 49 Read St. Winthrop, MA 02152

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Brown, Stephen Thomas <stbrown@bu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:10 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: Revere Casino Proposal

Categories: Purple Category

As an East Boston voter how voted "no" to the original casino proposal, I am appalled that consideration is being given to this secondary proposal. As stated below, it is illegal and both the intent and process of this revised proposal a sham and an insult to my fellow East Boston residents who did vote period. The new proposal is fundamentally different from the original in all applications. Both Revere and East Boston voters voted on a rendering, an agreement, a mitigation package, and the guarantee that the continuation of horse racing was the main focus. This recent proposal leaked in the news is not the same and should not be considered. To do so would make a mockery of the process and spit on the faces of the people who have worked so hard to raise awareness on both sides of the issue.

While I understand Mayor Rizzo's need to further the wishes of his constituency, I ask that you uphold the no vote and continue your attempts to maintain a clean and fair process. Suffolk Downs has put money over community despite claiming in their commercials that they "have represented the community for over 70 years." Will you do the same to both our community, the law, and the election process?

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's

Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,
Stephen Brown

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Carol Facella <cafcaf930@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Carol Facella
Subject: NO REVERE-ONLY CASINO AT SUFFOLK DOWNS
Attachments: No Casino - Mass Gaming Comm - caf letter 12-4-13.docx

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Chair Crosby and Members of the Mass Gaming Commission:

Please see the attached letter, expressing my opposition to a "Revere-Only Casino at Suffolk Downs.

Your consideration of this letter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Facella

December 4, 2013

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am extremely concerned and distressed that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission is seriously considering the current proposal for a Revere-Only Casino at Suffolk Downs. Are you willing to have your positive reputation tarnished and your principles compromised by proceeding with a new "illegal" casino proposal by Revere? Are you willing to discard the current Massachusetts Gaming Act and cast aside East Boston's Vote, which clearly said "No" to a Suffolk Downs Casino? If you approve a Revere-Only casino, all of the negative impacts from this Suffolk Downs site will be thrust upon East Boston – the very ill-effects that they voted to prevent. If you approve this "new proposal," respect for our laws and the democratic process will be DEAD in Massachusetts. PLEASE do not force this issue to the Mass Supreme Judicial Court – the time and money involved will drain our already empty State, aka Taxpayers, coffers! The Commission has the power to take a stand and do what is legally right. Is the State that desperate for a "quick" casino license that all will be compromised? If you do not honor and act according to the Mass Gaming Act, and its stated process; the long-term negative impact of an illegal, poorly designed and executed casino at Suffolk Downs, will have devastating effects on our local communities for generations to come. Please exercise your power and courage to do what is right, according to the Letter, as well as the Spirit, of the Law and its Process. Please vote "No" on a Revere-Only Casino at Suffolk Downs.

The plan for a Revere-Only Casino, as currently proposed, is significantly different than the proposal approved by Revere voters on November 5. These voters could not have foreseen the changes that are now being proposed: namely, the new location of the casino on the property; the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant, and the uncertain future of horse racing on this site. This current proposal is very different than the one placed on the original referendum for East Boston and Revere residents. Also please recall that a substantial number of voters in Revere voted "NO" to a casino. Could these numbers swell with a "new proposal, requiring a new vote?" Why not find out before rushing ahead with a decision.

Please note that Senator Anthony Petruccelli, an original casino proponent, who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project: The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act: [They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Again, I urge all of you to respect the Mass Gaming Act, and its process, and to honor the votes of nearly 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters. Please help us restore trust and confidence that the "system and process" can work and that the Gaming Commission can work independently in following the law and duly exercising their responsibilities. Our hope rests entirely with you.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Facella

Massachusetts Citizen and Winthrop Resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

richard norris

Email

virginn@msn.com

Phone

(781)284-4110

Subject

revere casino/horseracing

Questions or Comments

PLEASE,PLEASE,PLEASE, honorable commission, look closely at the request of Mohegan sun and Suffolk downs to open a casino in revere only. The vote that was held in nov. and passed was based on a casino with revitalized horse racing included. this current situation does not include racing as I understand. Please be advised that this is NOT what a majority of revere residents voted for.the voters voted for a different situation altogether.This new proposal ,if it does not include a firm and written agreement including horseracing should, in my opinion and the opinion of others,not be allowed to pass without a favorable vote from the HOST community. thank you very much. Virginia norris

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Dom. Amara <domamara@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 3:43 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: ?Revere Only Casino?

Categories: Purple Category

Gentlemen,

I am a lifelong resident of East Boston.

As a member of the State Gaming Commission I am sure you have heard all the arguments against putting a casino in Revere, after East Boston overwhelmingly voted against it.

The impact on East Boston will be dramatic, everyone agrees to that. We who opposed the Casino believed it would have been catastrophic, that is why we worked so hard to defeat the measure.

A Casino in Revere would be flying in the face of East Boston who rejected the idea. In our view if the Casino is placed in Revere we will get all of the problems we know will plague the neighborhood and none of the promised benefits - minimal t as they were.

It would be a travesty if the Gaming Commission circumvented the wishes of East Boston. It would certainly underscore the notion that government is itself is unable to govern intelligently. I hate to be so blunt, but the situation is a mess. To foist the effects of this Casino on East Boston would simply say that citizens can have a say, but that their say doesn't mean anything.

As you can tell, I am angry. We were never told that this was a splintered package. Even the legislature who helped construct the bill says that it was not the intent of the legislation for it to be considered piecemeal.

Well, I think I've made my point. Hopefully, you will agree with the arguments against the Revere only casino .

Sincerely,

Domenic G. Amara, Ph.D.
226 Orient Avenue
East Boston, MA 02128
Boston, MA
617-567-3045
617-913-6842
domamara@aol.com

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Nancy Ramey <nramey@anchorcapital.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 3:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC); 'Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov'
Subject: VOTE NO ON REVERE/SUFFOLK PROPSAL
Categories: Purple Category

To Whom it May Concern:

I am hoping that my voice will be heard as **both** a resident and property owner of Revere for over 30 years. I am deeply saddened by the way the leaders of my city and Suffolk Downs are trying to push this casino proposal through without a new proposal vote **from** their residents. I am against the casino for many reasons (crime, traffic, congestion, moral and addition issues) and I voted NO with the understanding that unless East Boston and Revere both voted in favor, the proposal would be dead and there would be no opportunity for a casino license at Suffolk Downs. It is a fact that this was a very important stipulation in the language of the proposal **and it should be upheld**.

If the legal teams involved are able to find a loophole to negate this stipulation, and without question, that's what it will take to have this move forward, at the very least, I strongly believe that another vote for **Revere residents only** should be taken, as this is an entirely different commitment and burden for the city's residents and they should have the opportunity to review and understand **the new plan and the new intrusions it will bring** to make a more educated choice at the ballot box. I believe that the people of East Boston have strongly voiced their NO vote and that the power of that vote needs to be upheld, disqualifying this REVERE ONLY PROPOSAL ENTIRELY.

I ask that the commission disallow this proposal on the basis of it being illegally restructured to obtain what the politicians and Suffolk Downs want to accomplish, and not in the spirit of the terms of the original proposal to the residents of either city. If this commission is unable to obtain a majority of its members to refuse to acknowledge this proposal, an extension to the deadline should be made to allow for a 2nd vote in Revere so that all Revere residents will be give the the opportunity to be informed of the new plan and know exactly what they are voting on. With a population of 50,000 plus, I believe only 10,000, a fraction actually voted on November 5th, clearly this is not a full city's vote in favor of something so large that it will redefine our neighborhoods and our city and most importantly, our quality of life.

You have not heard the true opposition that is on the streets. The mayor has not heard it either, perhaps he doesn't want to. All attention has been on East Boston. Our political leaders and Suffolk Downs were counting on East Boston to vote in favor...there wasn't an organized voice in Revere, but I assure you, the majority of the residents are NOT IN FAVOR and with only a week or two to rally support, we must turn our hope to the Gaming Commission to do what's ethical, legal and in the spirit of the residents who played by the rules and voted NO to a casino on the Suffolk Downs site. The Revere YES vote must be disallowed simply because the East Boston majority vote was NO...in accordance with the gaming law...Revere's vote is in INVALID.

I appreciate your consideration and hope that you disallow the proposal to move forward with a Revere only casino license.

Sincerely,

Mary Diana Russo

-

If you are not an intended party to this transmission, please notify the sender immediately and delete/destroy any and all copies. Unintended recipients shall not review, reproduce, disseminate nor disclose any information contained in this message. The Company reserves the right to monitor and retain all incoming and outgoing e-mails without further notice. E-mails may contain viruses or other defects. The Company does not accept liability for any errors, viruses or omissions arising as a result of transmission.

-

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Kirsten Swenson <kgsvenson44@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 3:14 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: A Revere-Only Casino is Illegal

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am **disgusted** that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law **you are bound to uphold**. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Kirsten Swenson
550 Mountain Ave
Revere, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Peter D <taxpro54@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 3:13 PM
To: revere_mayor@revere.org; MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-Only Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

--

Peter DeBilio

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Hyer, Marc <Marc.Hyer@takeda.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 3:07 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: revere casino is unfair and unacceptable

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and to the mayor of Revere,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East

Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Marc Hyer

Marc L. Hyer, Ph.D.
Cancer Pharmacology
Millennium: The Takeda Oncology Company
40 Landsdowne Street | Cambridge, MA | 02139
p 617.551.8947 | f 617.551.8906
marc.hyer@takeda.com | www.millennium.com

This e-mail, including any attachments, is a confidential business communication, and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary and/or privileged. This e-mail is intended only for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed, and may not be saved, copied, printed, disclosed or used by anyone else. If you are not the(an) intended recipient, please immediately delete this e-mail from your computer system and notify the sender. Thank you.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Richie Mercurio <devinc629@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 2:48 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere casino

Categories: Purple Category

Dear MGC,

I was born /raised and am raising my family in Revere. On November 5th, I voted yes for a casino at Suffolk Downs. I am in favor of economical growth, jobs and the development of the site for a Resort/Casino. East Boston voted down the idea of a casino and Revere did NOT. I continue to be very excited and positive that this will happen for the people in Revere. East Boston saying no should NOT be more important than Revere Saying YES.....I continue to fully support this project. I am looking forward to this new venture and hope the Gaming Commission fully supports and respects that Revere Said Yes. We hope you will let Suffolk/Mohegan move forward so that the Citizens in Revere have a chance for what they VOTED for. Thank you for your time.

Richard Mercurio
459 Malden Street
Revere, MA
781-844-5163

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Charlotte Burns <chlburns@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 2:33 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino; Vineyard Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Steve Crosby and Gaming Commission;

It looks like our fearless leaders opened a huge can of worms when they legalized casino gambling. The pristine Vineyard just may have a casino, and there are all kinds of legal questions with a Revere Casino. I'd say the Eastie councilor brought up a good point. On Nov.5 both towns voted on a specific, carefully worded ballot question. Now that the outcome isn't what you wanted, you are talking about changing the rules. Why isn't Deval sending the full force of his legal dept. after this one? But the Vineyard, home of perhaps many of his well healed friends is at stake, and he's using MY TAX MONEY TO FIGHT THIS!!!!!!!

I am a resident of Palmer. Many of my casino foes and I spent hundreds and even thousands of our own dollars to fight Mohegan Sun. I cannot begin to tell you how resentful I am that Patrick is going to use state money to go after the Aquinnah Wampanoags. You guys can change the rules any which way you want depending on circumstances. We've lost this democracy. Martha Coakley let us know when she shot down the Repeal the Casino Deal ballot question that we don't live in a democracy. This just confirms my belief that our governments at all levels are bought and paid for by very powerful special interests.

What ever the big shots want goes.

An indian tribe that has every right to have a casino is going to have the courts unleashed on it, my tax money going to this. A community like Eastie which did not want a casino in its midst is going to have the gaming commission change the rules midstream to accommodate the casino industry. I guess only the affluent have any control over this process.

Yours truly,
Charlotte Burns
1021 Chestnut St.
Palmer, MA 01069

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: renee.maclean@nechv.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 2:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: REVERE CASINO IS ILLEGAL!

Importance: High

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I AM OUTRAGED that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward!

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough! I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Ms. Renée MacLean

Life Long East Boston Resident

Member of "No Eastie Casino"

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: david.margossian@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 2:03 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: David Margossian
Subject: Support of Revere Casino at Suffolk Downs

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Mr. Crosby, Ms. Cameron, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Zuniga, and Mr. Stebbins,

As a life long resident of Revere I would ask that you continue to support the Revere-Suffolk Downs-Mohegan Sun proposal moving forward.

As a homeowner in Revere I continue to support this and hope you do as well. Our Mayor, City Council and citizens voted in support in November and continue with a renewed vote of confidence this past Monday night with a strong showing of "proponents" at city hall.

With our Public Transportation, proximity to Logan Airport and major highway access, Revere is well suited to be an excellent choice to host a casino if the wisdom of this commission chooses to make it so. As the proud caretakers of our Nations First Public Beach, we are accustomed to some of the nuances that any successful endeavor would bring to the community and unlike others who have voted negatively, we as a community are able to look beyond look forward to the benefits.

Thank you for your time and opportunity to share.
David B. Margossian

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: McCloy, Nicole V <nicole.mccloy@baml.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:56 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino Opposition

Categories: Purple Category

To Whom it May Concern:

I am hoping that my voice will be heard as a resident and property owner of Revere for over 30 years. I am deeply saddened by the way the leaders of my city are trying to push this casino proposal through without another vote from its people. I am against the casino for many reasons however, I believe that everyone's voice should be heard and that the power of the vote needs to be upheld. This is especially true, in this case, as the plan/host arrangement has changed so much and the playing rules have changed. The initial vote was for a whole other plan/arrangement. Do the residents even know what their "yes" vote was for? How can we use that "yes" vote for this new proposal? How is that fair to anyone?

I am pleading that the commission extend the deadline and have a call for another vote in where the Revere Residents can be informed of the new plan and know exactly what they are voting on.

I think everyone would feel a lot better-residents and developers if a clear and accurate proposal was voted upon . If I were a developer, I would want to know that the host community's residents were with my plan especially as it takes form. It would cause less headaches for all parties in the long run, ie less protesters interrupting your job site and other major factors causing construction delays for my project. Also, if there were commercial spaces slated for that project, local boycotts wouldn't help attract tenants.

I appreciate your consideration for my opinion.

Nicole V. McCloy

VP-Tax Credit Equity Investments
Bank of America, N.A.
225 Franklin Street
MA1-225-02-02
Boston, MA 02110
617.346.5779 (office)
617.346.2724 (fax)
617.834.9242 (cell)

nicole.mccloy@baml.com

This message, and any attachments, is for the intended recipient(s) only, may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or proprietary and subject to important terms and conditions available at <http://www.bankofamerica.com/emaildisclaimer>. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this message.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:40 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Mary Berninger

Email

sail58@hotmail.com

Phone

(617)569-3643

Subject

Suffolk Downs/Mohegan Sun proposal

Questions or Comments

To: Commissioners of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission
From: Mary Berninger, 156 Saint Andrew Road, East Boston, MA 02128
Date: December 4, 2013
Re: Public Comments pertaining to the Suffolk Downs/Mohegan Sun Proposal

Dear Sirs and Madam,

In the interest of public commentary, I would like to add my voice to those who are in support of the application for a casino license from the Suffolk Downs/Mohegan Sun proponents.

As a resident of East Boston, I was voted in favor of the referendum that was put before the voters on November 5, 2013. The outcome of the vote in East Boston was a big disappointment to me and I feel it was a lost opportunity for East Boston, in particular, and for the region as a whole. For me, the real and tangible benefits far outweighed the negatives that were attached to the development proposal. However, the vote in my community is done and we move forward.

In moving forward, it is my opinion that a regional development plan as proposed in Revere would benefit greatly the Greater Boston area. It would help to secure the jobs at the racetrack, while creating additional employment opportunities for so many more people. The benefits for the tourism industry would be bountiful. Hotel room nights, restaurants, the convention business and the connection to a marketing scheme for Boston and Revere would seem to be natural partners to a world-class destination resort-style casino in the region. The promised improvements to the transportation infrastructure also would benefit the greater region. Having waited for so many years and through so many state budgets without seeing line items to address the many deficiencies in that infrastructure, it would appear that this proponent is the only hope the region has to bring to fruition true highway and secondary roadway improvements.

It is my hope that the Commission will arrive at a determination that will allow for the proponents in Revere to proceed with their application.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Mary C. Berninger

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Emily Martin <emilyhyman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: No Revere-only casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Emily Hyman

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:03 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere.mayor@revere.org
Subject: Re: Revere only Casino

Categories: Purple Category

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
To: "mgc coments" <mgc.coments@state.ma.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2013 9:17:05 PM
Subject: Re: Revere only Casino

I'm sending this letter to you by post, because it keeps coming back undeliverable

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
To: "mgc coments" <mgc.coments@state.ma.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2013 9:11:32 PM
Subject: Fwd: Revere only Casino

From: maxwellchance@comcast.net
To: "mgc comments" <mgc.comments@state.ma.us>
Cc: "Facebook" <notification+pihk5vv_@facebookmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2013 9:02:53 PM
Subject: Revere only Casino

I am writing regarding the Revere only Casino. I won't waste your time going over all the bad points of a casino in the middle of a busy city and even more destructive of a casino in the middle of neighborhoods, and forcing it down our throats when we voted NO on Nov 5th which should have ended it. To put matters worse the plans that were shown have changed dramatically, because there are no plans and if there are plans in the making they cannot reflect what was agreed on since you are moving the casino and racetrack to another location not agreed upon. You have only heard from the Revere citizens who want a casino, many do not.

The casino sooner not later will lessen and even go under since the US is now saturated with casinos not doing well, leaving destruction in there path, expressly the neighborhoods, families and the economy that only the top dogs, politicians and the casino backers will profit from "the house always wins". We are a diverse community and have witnessed the melting pot and survived happily, now that could all be destroyed, leaving our new citizens homeless, foreclosed on and in dyer blithe.

For all these reasons and more that I can't even participate, please make your decision with wisdom in mind and not the greed that always pops up its ugly head with politician's that work only for themselves and not the people who put them there to protect our environment and then of course the backers who know they will win every pot or they wouldn't invest.

We have been plagued here on the north side of the tunnel with the airport, horse tracks, dog tracks and whatever downtown Boston wants to hide trash. There are many other venues that could be put at Suffolk Downs that our children can get real jobs from and not cleaning toilets and serving drinks, making beds and the such. If a vision of this land was used for technology or ecology we could be proud to live north of the city. It seems downtown Boston gets the convention halls, viable offices and good paying jobs.

Please look deep and try to see a real economic growth industry on that land for the future of our neighbors and their children. This should be our chance to shine.

Sincerely,
Diane Cataldo
Native East Bostonian and proud of it.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:55 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

William Perry

Email

billy@eastienow.com

Phone

(857)246-0134

Subject

Revere Only Casino Proposal

Questions or Comments

Greetings,

Thank You for your attention to the matter of the Revere Only Casino Proposal of Mohegan Sun and Suffolk Downs.

As an East Boston resident, I am very disappointing at the notion that this proposal may move forward. We were promised that a no-vote meant no!

I believe that the Revere-only development should be allowed only if East Boston voters say Yes, which we have not. Revere got a say in the East Boston Casino because Suffolk's property overlapped into Revere. Why then, does East Boston not get a say in the Revere Casino under the SAME circumstance. This is unfair and in my opinion illegal should the MGC allow this to go through. There is no difference between the two scenarios.

In the words of Revere's, Senator Petrucelli, if this proposal is allowed to go through, I have to question the integrity of the MGC.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matthew Morano <mfmorano@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-Only Casino is Illegal

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lauren Wilson <lwrhinestone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:42 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere-only casino proposal

Categories: Purple Category

Members of the Mass Gaming Commission:

I am profoundly disappointed to learn that you are apparently leaning towards accepting the Revere-only casino application from Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun. This proposal has fundamentally changed from what either one of our communities voted on last month, and it frankly disregards the election results.

I was very surprised to read Mr. Crosby's assertion that, despite significant changes to the proposal, we should assume that residents of Revere would vote the same way. Aside from the fact that you cannot assume that you know how other people will vote in the future, it is quite clear that many people voted in November to save the race track at Suffolk Downs, which is now no longer guaranteed.

This proposal is pitting two close communities against one another; leaving voters feeling disillusioned with the process and angry that profits apparently trump our votes; and is legally questionable in any case. I understand that there are significant financial implications to these decisions, but we have invested in these neighborhoods with our lives and families and businesses, and our right to have a say in what happens here is being ignored. I urge you to reject this proposal for a Revere-only casino, as it has not been approved by the host community. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Lauren Wilson

617-953-6287

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:31 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Elizabeth Nowak

Email

elizabeth.nowak@gmail.com

Phone

(617)817-2778

Subject

My Right to Vote

Questions or Comments

As an East Boston resident, I exercised my right to vote and rejected the idea of a casino in my neighborhood. Why isn't that vote being upheld? A casino at Suffolk Downs was rejected by voters and should not be allowed, even if it is "only" on the Revere side of the line. The implications of having a casino in Revere affect East Boston as well. Please support the residents of my neighborhood and find a new location for this casino.

Thank you!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Blair Piersall <blair.piersall@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:30 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an

agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Blair Piersall
841 Saratoga St East Boston, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Phil Gutowski <phil@liveeastie.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,
Phil Gutowski

--

Phil Gutowski

Owner



Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anthony DeMarco <demarco380@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:06 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs Casino

Categories: Purple Category

The gaming commission should watch the revere city council meeting that took place on Monday Dec 2nd and see how the people were treated that were opposed to the casino! It's an American disgrace to see these people embarrassed in front of a live audience and on tv.

But the people that were for the casino were allowed to talk and speak freely!

The casino does not belong in that area and it should be shut off. Many people live close to there and there lives will change unless they move out.

What a great neighbor Revere is to East Boston, they voted it out and Revere stills wants it in that area!

We voted for it in a specific area of the track and now it's all moved, with no re-vote.

Thank you for reading this and please watch the council meeting.

I'm a resident who was born in Revere and raised my family and I still own a home there.

Sincerely

Anthony DeMarco.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Carla Ceruzzi <ceruzzi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:58 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Opposition to the Revere-only casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,
I am writing to express my frustration and anger that a Revere-only casino is being proposed for the Suffolk Downs site. My family and I voted against the casino that was proposed for the dual-city site. The new proposed site would have all of the same impacts on the neighborhood as a whole (Revere, East Boston, and Winthrop), and yet the vote we took is being ignored. I feel as though the election was a sham and it really undermines my trust that this process is actually taking public opinion into account.

Moreover, the design has changed from the one we voted on. I know nothing about the design and what kind of neighbor it would be. It's simply too late to make all of these changes, and I urge you to oppose this half-baked plan.

Sincerely,

Carla Ceruzzi
East Boston resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: moartnow@juno.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:52 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Immediate Action Needed to Stop a Revere-Only Casino!

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, §15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted

in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Maureen O'Connor

[Forward this email](#)



This email was sent to moartnow@juno.com by noeastiecasino@gmail.com
[Update Profile/Email Address](#) Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) [Privacy Policy](#).
No Eastie Casino 256 Marginal Street East Boston MA 02128



Do THIS before eating carbs (every time)

1 EASY tip to increase fat-burning, lower blood sugar & decrease fat storage
info.fixyourbloodsugar.com

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Ben Hammer <benhammer85@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:45 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: The electorate has spoken, respect their decision!

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in [Suffolk Downs](#), Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Ben Hammer
Proud resident of East Boston, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lisa Paulson <lisa02152@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:42 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; robert.deleo@mahouse.gov
Subject: Illegal Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. The voters of Revere approved a casino in East Boston that included horse racing at Suffolk Downs. They did not approve a casino in Revere. The question was not a "Land Use" question. The vote was not on a gaming operation in Revere. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petruccelli, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Lisa M. Paulson

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Alice Dampman Humel <alicedh@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:36 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,
I know I've already written to you, but apparently, the fact that I opposed the casino from the very beginning somewhat "watered down" my objections to this new plan in your view.

This communication is only about what I, and many others, see as reasons this new proposal is unacceptable on its own merits, or lack of them.

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted

in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

continue to speak to ensure that our voices are heard! Thank you your cooperation with these two simple tasks. Revere residents, your input to both the Commission and your Mayor are especially valuable. Finally, please remember that time is of the essence, and these letters should be sent this week. Please don't hesitate to contact us for any reason.

Thank you,
Yours truly,
Alice Dampman Humel
29 Overlook Avenue
Revere, MA
02151
email: alicedh@vewrizon.net

Yo

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Giordana Mecagni <gmecagni@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:07 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: Illegal Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

In yesterday's meeting, you called it a 'reasonable deduction' that Revere voters would have supported the current proposal that doesn't attempt to save the track or have any of the environmental or traffic mitigations promised to our communities. How do you know that Revere this Chairman Crosby? Are you clairvoyant? Isn't that what the vote was supposed to determine?

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. Will East Boston's vote not be respected?

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Giordana Mecagni

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Liat Bird <liat.bird@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:05 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: "Revere-only" Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. We voted against a casino at this location; moving it a few hundred yards over the town line is clearly a violation of the spirit of the law as well as its letter. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Liat Bird

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: frarael30@gmail.com on behalf of Franz Israel <fisrael@turnoverweb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:03 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Massachusetts Gaming Commission - Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Franz Israel
East Boston Resident and Entrepreneur

The people have clearly spoken on this matter, but it's clear we must continue to speak to ensure that our voices are heard! Thank you your cooperation with these two simple tasks. Revere residents, your input to both the Commission and your Mayor are especially valuable. Finally, please remember that time is of the essence, and these letters should be sent this week. Please don't hesitate to contact us for any reason.

Thank you,

- No Eastie Casino

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Meg Stanton <meg.stanton@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:01 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Meg Stanton
East Boston resident
Director of Harbor City School
196 Putnam
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:00 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Matilda Bofardecì

Email

oriana6368@comcast.net

Phone

(781)629-1818

Subject

Revere says Yes!

Questions or Comments

Dear Mass Gaming Commission,

I have been a resident of Revere now for a very long time.. and I love my city!
On Nov 5th we the residents of Revere had a chance to express how we felt about putting a casino here in our backyard and I for one was one of those residents along with 6700 other residents whom voted 'Yes'.
I totally understood what the ballot question was asking and when I attended the one of the many meetings that Suffolk downs put together I asked the question 'What would happen if Eastie voted no?' and 'I was told that the 'Casino' could still be built on Revere land only and although it would be an uphill it could be possible. So, I was well aware that this was a possibility. So, therefore it was clear to me that our vote was very important! In addition with 'Ceasers' being out I still voted yes because I believe in Suffolk Downs and that they would find a suitable applicant. I attended our zoning hearing on Tuesday Dec 2nd and if you could just see City Hall and the the passion that Revere residents had in that room it was overwhelming and we the citizens of Revere are still pulling for a 'Revere only Casino!

I also watched the Suffolk Downs hearing yesterday live and I have to say although I was disappointed that you need another week to make a decision whether Revere can go forward I also understand that the information of the applicant needs to be reviewed. So, with that being said I would like to address those commissioners who are still on the fence about voting in favor for our city.

Think of this please..We the Residents of Revere voted in favor for this by almost 2 to 1. It is clear that we want this here! I for one am looking forward to what the flow of income will do for our city. I have two children who attend our public schools and I think of the beautiful things that can come to our city such as a new Recreation Center, New Stadiums, New Parks and more for our School System and not to mention how many people can be put back to work after the bad crash we had in 2008. Please, Please, Please do not let our 'Yes' vote go to waste!!

When Gayle Cameron said that she hadn't heard from a lot of Revere residents who are in favor that this was an issue (the change) and I quote she said 'that this was a sign of support not an opposition' and you Stephen Crosby agreed and said now you would probably get letters.

I understood completely what Gayle Cameron meant but..unfortunately a lot of nay sayers took this as an oppurtunity to write against us. So, please keep this in mind when the letters come in and I am sure that they will they will be coming from the very same organization that is trying to repeal the law completely and people who dont even live in Revere. How do I know this? because of my social media pages!

In closing I just leave you with this please listen to the people of Revere and give us a chance!

Sincerely,
Matilda Bonfardecì

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Kali Anna Lombardo <kalilombardo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 11:00 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: To whom it may concern at mass gaming commission I hope this letter reaches you well ...as a first time home buyer of a couple of days ago my dream was to be able to live near the beach and the city revere just fit that description I finally found the ...

Categories: Purple Category

To whom it may concern at mass gaming commission I hope this letter reaches you well ...as a first time home buyer of a couple of days ago my dream was to be able to live near the beach and the city revere just fit that description I finally found the place for me I am pleased to hear discussion on building a casino in my new town I think it would give revere the shine it once had a long time ago, please consider putting the casino here and making what I believe would be a Turing point for our city bringing more jobs money improvements that our city needs to prosper again hope you all had a great holiday. -Kali lombardo

Sent from my iPhone

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: g <rhlwool@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:59 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: No Revere site. End running intent of law

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to add my voice to those against any casino proposal on the Suffolk Downs site, especially the current end run proposal of a Revere only site.

There's no way siting it in Revere won't impact the neighbors of East Boston who clearly voted against the site. That is unfair and it violates my understanding of the intent of the casino law and it's clear and deliberate community process.

Please send Revere and Suffolk Downs back to the drawing board as their proposal is a hasty last second proposal in the obvious face of local opposition.

Thanks
Phil Lindsay
10 Barrington Road
Dorchester, MA 02124
rhlwool@aol.com

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Susanna Starrett <starrett@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:58 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Susanna Starrett

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Carlos Brown <carloslbrown@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:54 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Opposed to Casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am disappointed beyond measure that my vote, and the vote of the East Boston community has been weighed as less important than that of the residents of Revere. It is frustrating that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward.

The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I ask the the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 10:34 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Andrew Pike

Email

andrewpike78@outlook.com

Phone

(617)285-0727

Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino Project

Questions or Comments

I am writing to express my extreme outrage regarding the possibility of this commission to allow a casino project at Suffolk Downs to continue despite a negative vote from the citizens of the neighborhood of East Boston. Believe it or not, I'm one of the East Boston residents who voted YES for the casino and I still think what is happening here is 100% wrong. East Boston will clearly be affected by this casino and will now receive none of the mitigation due to what I truly believe to be considered a "loop hole" in the law allowing Suffolk Downs to move it's project into "Revere". I feel that a casino in this area will be good for the economy, however East Boston should be given the opportunity to re-vote for the new casino project as it will directly impact our community. Mitigation for East Boston MUST be considered despite the location physically in Revere. Much has changed, including the casino management company and the project is no longer what we were voting for. Please take this into consideration when making your decision.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 9:25 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

John Antonellis

Email

john_antonellis@harvard.edu

Phone

(617)561-8843

Subject

Respecting our vote

Questions or Comments

I am writing to you because I am outraged that you are even considering allowing Suffolk Downs to proceed with its plans for a Revere only casino. I attended several meetings where it was made clear to me that they required support from both communities or the plan was dead. If Suffolk Downs wants to build a casino on the Revere side of their property they should be held to the law and begin again with a new host agreement and a new vote. It is shameful that you haven't made that clear to them. It speaks of great corruption and collusion. Shame on you!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: gferragamo@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 8:35 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs Resort Casino. Revere says YES.

Categories: Purple Category

December 4, 2013.

To the Massachusetts Gaming Commission.

Hello and good day.

My name is Gary Ferragamo and I would like to state my opinion on the possibility of a Suffolk Downs-Mohegan Suns Resort Casino in Revere. However, before I do, I would like to give you some background on me, so you have some knowledge about me to base your opinions on.

To begin, I am 53 years old, married with one son, a life-long Revere resident and businessman. My parents were both born in Revere, have always been life-long residents, and raised their four children right here in Revere. Although I lived in California for about 18 years, I moved back to my home city, Revere, back in 2002 and have lived in Revere ever since. In 2009 I proposed to my wife right on Revere Beach, and the picture of me on my knee holding up the ring to her was on the front page of our local Revere Journal newspaper. We got married in St. Anthony's Church in Revere, and nine months later my wife gave birth to our son Anthony who lives in our home in Revere and will be attending Revere Schools soon.

From about 2005 through 2009, I was the Sales Manager in charge of a \$170MM new, high-end, residential condominium development on Revere Beach called; "The Ocean Club." During our first two years, myself and my sales team sold about 100 condominiums PRE-CONSTRUCTION, shattering most real estate records along the way. I personally shattered the existing price record for the sale of a condominium and sold one for \$1.5MM, which shattered the previous price record of \$750K, doubling that price record. Normally when you break a sales price record, it is by 5%, 10%, maybe ever 15%. The fact that we completely shattered the highest price sales record by 100%, simply does not happen. Once again, a picture of me with the Buyer of that \$1.5MM condominium was on the front page of our local Revere Journal newspaper.

With the success of our sales at The Ocean Club, we proved without a doubt what I always knew when I moved back to Revere, that Revere was an amazing city with unlimited possibilities and unlimited potential. It is a city that is home to the First Public Beach in the United States, and was once the jewel of New England. However, in the past couple of decades, it has been hit with very tough and very challenging times. What was once a thriving ocean-front city with amusements parks and rollercoasters, has become a sleepy beach community, with very little growth, and undervalued, underrated and underdeveloped real estate. This city is begging for something to revive it and with the success of the sales of The Ocean Club, that proved that this city is ready for the future and the next level of progress and development.

With the proposal of the Suffolk Downs-Mohegan Suns Resort Casino, I firmly believe this can and will be the most exciting and financially beneficial new development in the history of Revere. I believe beyond a question of a doubt that this Resort Casino will indeed provide our city with much needed economic 'turbo' boost, for so many reason, but first of all, by infusing \$45MM to our aging roads with much needed roads improvements, as well as creating over 4000 jobs.

This "Billion Dollar" Resort Casino development can also lead to dozens of other development possibilities, from new hotels being built close to this development, to new restaurants, new entertainments facilities, new convention halls, new amusements, new car rentals, etc. Thus the ripple effect of this Resort Casino development can revive our local economy and produce millions of dollars of much needed income for the City of Revere and it's residents, and bring this city back to it's former grandeur and glory and even raise it to the next level. This is what the overwhelming majority of the life-long Revere residents like myself have voted for and are pleading for.

One thing I would like to briefly touch upon is the traffic. I truly believe that most people who do not support this development do not support it because they feel the traffic will be twice as bad as it is now. However, I also truly believe that they have not considered the alternatives to this development. First of all, they should understand that the overwhelming majority of the traffic for this resort Casino will 'not' be on 'peak rush-hour traffic.' You simply do not find people heading to a Casino at 8am.

Secondly, it is so important that everyone understand that if this Resort Casino development does not happen, the next possible development for this land could be as many as 5,000 condominiums, apartments and low income housing. That type of development can produce as many as 8,000-10,000 more cars on the road 'during' peak rush-hour traffic. Or another possible development for this land is a new Shopping Mall. Again, probably the same number of cars on our old, beat-up roads with no assistance from anyone to fix them. Either of these other development options will indeed double or triple, or more, the amount of traffic that is on our roads 'during' peak rush hour traffic, and could create the worst bottle neck of congestion taking residents hours to get into Boston. This is not the answer and these other options could completely suffocate and destroy future possibilities of growth and development that can negatively effect our city for several future decades.

With all that said, let me state clearly for the record, and I know I speak the overwhelming majority of the residents of Revere when I say that; I am 100% in favor and completely support this One Billion Dollar, Suffolk Downs-Mohegan Suns Resort Casino! Revere says YES! Revere Strong!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Gary Ferragamo
Revere, MA 02151

Gary A. Ferragamo
Partner
Antonia's At The Beach, Restaurant & Bar
Director
VizConnect / Mobile Marketing & Social Media
Cell. 781-223-7771

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 8:08 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

arthur orlandino

Email

acehole31@yahoo.com

Subject

casino

Questions or Comments

Karin Theodoros Zaroulis Vickie- perhaps a large number of people can attend the hearing next week with signs NoRevere Casino; or do other visibilty like picket outside MGC; also write letters to the editor, get a petition going signed by Revere residents, get a Revere FB page going and issue a press release; Talk radio is another option. Aside- I was cringing today when the mayor said the City Council voted "Unanimously" despite the fact two members were missing. Hope they weren't pressured to stay away. It might be helpful to determine if they stayed away because they were not casino supporters. once again another no eastie casino personim just going to keep telling you revere is all for this!!! ty

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 7:02 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

James MacMillan

Email

mbta305@aol.com

Phone

(781)286-9468

Subject

Revere casino

Questions or Comments

I am fully in favor of a casino in Revere..if you combined both votes in both communities than it was clearly a yes vote. How a small group of people (NEC) many of whom have just arrived in EB were able to sway a slight no vote in thier community and have it prevent a casino project being built in Revere where it is clearly desired is beyond me. The yes vote in Revere needs to be respected and the wishes of its citizens realized. I respectfully request that the MGC give Revere its chance to bear the fruit of its YES vote and allow a casino be built within the City of Revere. Thank you. JM

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Gamby <jgamby@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 4:24 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: The casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and Commissioners,

I'm writing to you, in support of the casino in Revere. The people of Revere overwhelmingly approved the building of a casino in their city on November 5th and, since then, their support has only grown. I ask that, you please allow this project to go forward. Thank you.

John Gambardella

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:10 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Claudia Sierra

Email

sierraclaudia617@hotmail.com

Questions or Comments

To The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I strongly oppose the plans to move forward with a Revere-only casino and that the plan as it exists today is fundamentally different that what you decided on Nov. 5.

STOP THIS ILEGAL PLAN ALREADY!

Doesn't our vote mean anything to you? What was the vote for? Just to have a "pretend voting process" and then regardless of the outcome you will do whatever you want with out city?

Enough of this nonsense! I've never seen so much consideration to accommodate something that the public has already decided in a vote it is not what we want.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 12:01 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Lilian Salazar

Email

luisabedoya@msn.com

Phone

(339)226-0401

Subject

I against the casino .

Questions or Comments

Not casino for Revere

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 11:59 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Luisa Bedoya

Email

lbedoya@msamortgage.com

Phone

(617)921-3177

Subject

No Casinos in Revere

Questions or Comments

Please do not need a casino in Revere this will only make the city to go down we don't want to live like in Atlantic City. We kids and this is not a good future for them.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 11:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Charlie Barrile

Email

vtgsmom@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)286-1973

Subject

Revere Only Casino

Questions or Comments

I am ten year resident of Revere who spent the other 38 years of my life in East Boston. I have family still in East Boston as I raise a family of five in Revere. I also have family and friends in Revere, NONE of which are for the casino. I write to you now to tell you NOT all Revere residents are pro casino. We did our job, we voted against the casino, as did my family in East Boston. Unfortunately we're in the minority in Revere but our family in East Boston was not, they were in the majority. It is YOUR job to uphold the law and see that the voters spoke up and UNDER THE LAW THE WAY YOU WROTE IT THE CASINO DEAL IS NULL AND VOID. They did NOT obtain a yes vote from East Boston. The casino that Revere voted yes for is no longer possible and that should null and void that vote as well. Mayor Rizzo and Suffolk Downs are asking you to change the rules, to break the law. The mayor speaks as if he speaks on the behalf of all residents, I'd like you to know he does not. There are those of us who do not feel comfortable vocally and literally fighting city hall. There are those of us who feel we shouldn't have to. The laws were laid, the vote was conducted and the results are in, end of story.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 11:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Vickie Barrile

Email

vickiebarrile@yahoo.com

Phone

(617)270-1122

Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino

Questions or Comments

It was brought to my attention today that 3 of the gaming commissioners are in favor of proceeding with the "Revere only" proposed Suffolk Downs Casino. I would like to put in my two cents and let you know that NOT ALL REVERE RESIDENTS ARE SUPPORTING THE CASINO. Some never supported it, some originally supported it but are well aware THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL VOTED ON IS NO LONGER AN OPTION. THE AMENDED PLANS ARE NOT WHAT WAS VOTED ON. Isn't it true the license permitted for the casino was to include Suffolk Downs race track and it can longer do so? Wasn't it made clear that both East Boston and Revere had to pass a yes vote to proceed with a casino on that property? How is it fair to impose the casino on East Boston? It seems Suffolk Downs and their "friends" including our newly elected mayor are asking the gaming commission to bend several laws.

Speculation is after Revere spent \$1.5 million dollars of tax payers money to prepare for a casino (that was not even voted in) the mayor feels pressure to push for the casino. Who approved that spending anyway?

I for one did not feel the need to advocate loudly against the casino because I can not believe the idea is even being entertained for these reasons. I speak on behalf of two other registered voters in my home and many friends against the casino (either from the beginning or with the Revere only proposal), friends and family reluctant to speak up.

Let me ask you with a Mayor that is all over the news insisting that Revere supports and wants the casino, speaking so loud and adamantly on "our" behalf how are we to feel comfortable speaking out? His handling of the situation gives the pro casino advocates the confidence to speak up and leaves the anti casino and concerned citizens intimidated. I am not an easily intimidated person and I can tell you I DO NOT FEEL COMFORTABLE ATTENDING THE CITY MEETINGS AND RAISING MY HAND TO SPEAK AGAINST THE CASINO OR EVEN QUESTIONING IT. There is ABSOLUTELY an intimidation factor and tension in the air in Revere. One can only imagine the pressure and tension the gaming commission is under. That being said you need to stand up for what's right and not compromise the laws and agreements under which the license was granted. It seems a clear cut case that East Boston vote stops the casino. Do not let the aggressive pro casino advocates fool you into thinking that all of Revere is for the ! casino including those who originally voted yes. Unfortunately not everyone is comfortable speaking up against the mayor and "Friends of Suffolk Downs".

Thank you.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: McDonough, Kevin <Kevin.McDonough@nuance.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 10:28 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Support Revere

Categories: Purple Category

Hello Sir-

Just want to let you know that I am in support of Revere's right to have a Casino in their City. The residents overwhelmingly endorsed it and they should be able to proceed. It's amazing to me that other Cities want to dictate what another City does.

I was the City Council President in Woburn and certainly we couldn't tell our neighbors in Burlington what they could do.

Thank you for allowing me to present my personal opinion on this. Happy Holidays.

Sincerely,

Kevin McDonough

Kevin R. McDonough
Clinical Documentation Solution Sales

NUANCE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Nuance Healthcare
295 Salem St., Unit 86
Woburn, MA 01801

781.879.6594 Mobile
877.502.9716 Fax

NUANCE.COM
The experience speaks for itself™

Additional numbers:
Depot Repair Service: 800-677-7928
Customer Service: 800-339-7683
Technical Support: 800-833-7776
Service Contracts: 800-228-1210
Account Receivables: 866-383-9031

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 9:47 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

eugene mckenna

Email

local22gene@verizon.net

Phone

(781)284-6517

Subject

revere vote

Questions or Comments

I truly believe ,more residents would vote yes. this is a better deal for revere. same traffic,more money. Casino would be much nicer. thank you ,Eugene McKenna

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:53 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Michael Jacob

Email

Michaeljacob99@yahoo.com

Phone

(617)312-5380

Subject

Revere only Casino

Questions or Comments

Dear Mass Gaming Commission,
I watched the hearing today and found that I am one of the individuals that you wanted to hear from earlier. I'm sorry for the late response but from what I understood is this battle was over with because of the East Boston Vote.
I asked myself today, whether or not I would not I would tell Mayor Rizzo who how I felt about the Revere only Casino. I would not say anything because I find him to be very intimidating. This may be the case of many. I read about the meeting in Revere last night and also learned the people who opposed the casino were not able to speak because of the crowd attending.
I voted yes on the Casino and I am learning everyday that that was not the right dissension only because of how much that has changed. I do not believe it will be a good thing to move the casino to Revere. Now I'm learning that the conservation of the track may be in danger. That saddens me. I as well as others who I've talked to feel as though there is a lot of corruption already involved in this process. What is being done is not legal. I now would oppose the casino, but I will not be able to because the Ma gaming commission has guessed that we would vote no anyway. I find that today's decisions of the mass Gaming commission were very troubling and I suggest rethinking what is being done. Suffolk Downs has had too many chances and many of us are very curious as to why.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:36 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

peggy pratt calle

Email

prattnoel1@aol.com

Phone

(617)438-5355

Subject

revere casino

Questions or Comments

Good evening

Please do not allow a casino in our city. It would be a disaster for our community, our roads and the welfare of our children. The families of Revere are completely against this, please don't allow our Mayor to get richer and our properties to fall back into recession just when they are stabilizing.

NO CASINO in this busy, small city

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: marfourthbpos <mar4thbpos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

In recent emails to the Gaming Commission, I have argued that any proposed casino to be located in Revere-only should require a new vote by the citizens of Revere. I wish to add that the specific language of the ballot question put before Revere voters in the recent referendum supports this contention. The ballot question put before the voters in Revere stated as follows:

Shall the City of Revere permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located at Suffolk Downs in East Boston ...?"
[underline added]

Based on this explicit language of the referendum question, the favorable vote by the Revere electorate cannot possibly be interpreted as the voters' approval of a casino *in Revere*. Clearly, the ballot question only asked the Revere electorate to vote on a casino proposal "to be located at Suffolk Downs in East Boston." The citizens of Revere have *never* had the opportunity to vote on whether to permit the operation of a gaming establishment licensed by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to be located "at Suffolk Downs *in Revere*".

The fatal flaw in the Revere ballot question was its very precise description of the site of the proposed casino as "Suffolk Downs in East Boston" with no mention of a Revere

site as even a possibility. In fact, the entire thrust of Suffolk Downs' campaign rested upon the proposed casino being sited in East Boston. And that is what was presented to Revere voters in the referendum.

I would contend that the specificity of the ballot question precludes the Gaming Commission from further consideration of licensing a gaming establishment at Suffolk Downs *in Revere* unless and until Revere voters are given the opportunity to vote on a properly worded ballot question relative to the proposed Revere-only casino. It could be that the voters of Revere will approve a casino to be located entirely in Revere but they must be given an opportunity to express their opinion in a properly worded referendum.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Edward M. Phelan
287 Kelley Blvd
North Attleboro, MA 02760

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 7:25 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Patty DiBattista

Email

Dibattista2@aol.com

Subject

Revere casino

Questions or Comments

Please do not put a casino in Revere, MA. I have been against this proposal from the beginning and still stand strong that this is a BAD idea and will ruin the city.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anthony Guarino <anthonyg75@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 7:07 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere casino

Categories: Purple Category

----- Original Message -----

From: Anthony Guarino
Sent: Tue, 03/12/2013 06:58 PM
To: Comments@state.ma.us
CC:
Subject: Revere casino

To the gaming commission,

I am a long time East Boston resident who apposed a Suffolk Downs casino and am very concerned that yards away we will be getting a casino in Revere. I am very disappointed in the system as to why this is giving the legs to continue as it has? The vote was if either East Boston or Revere voted no then it was a Dead deal! This is just not right to have this right next door when we voted NO! This was never about keeping the track afloat but getting a casino at any cost as the track will still have to operate as a separate entity and is doomed to fail as such. We will still see the same negative impacts as if it were in East Boston. Please, I beg of you to not allow this to continue any further than it has. Thank you for your time.

Anthony Guarino

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:48 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

JOSEPH MAGGIORE

Email

joem443@verizon.net

Subject

Casino

Questions or Comments

As a registered voter in Revere, am I to understand that you have designated yourself as my proxy and will decide on the altered casino plan for me.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:48 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Susanna Starrett

Email

starrett@hotmail.com

Phone

(617)874-2821

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

Dear Gaming Commission,
When I voted on November 5th, I voted against a casino at Suffolk Downs. I did not vote for an East Boston or Revere casino, but a casino at Suffolk Downs. How can the Gaming Commission allow a casino at Suffolk Downs to move forward? How can this new proposal be legal?

Best regards,
Susanna Starrett, East Boston resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Thomas Todisco <tomtodisco@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:35 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino in Revere

Categories: Purple Category

I have been a lifelong resident of Revere and recently voted yes on Nov 5th ballot regarding the East Boston / Revere casino. If I were to vote again on the recent changes I would still vote yes. I believe now the benefits to Revere are more than they would have been if the Casino were shared between Revere and East Boston. My yes vote was cast with the idea of a casino located on that piece of property, the recent changes only makes me support the project that much more. I don't see why the recent changes would turn a yes vote into a no vote. I voted on a casino close to my home that hasn't changed and I still support it.

Tom Todisco

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: robyn dapolito <rdapolito37@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:18 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Categories: Purple Category

I am an employee of the school department in Revere and most of my family live there as well. I truly believe the City of Revere should have the opportunity that the voters of Revere want....a casino at Suffolk Downs. It is unfortunate that the residents of East Boston did not feel the same way. Gambling at Suffolk Downs has been a way of life for many years and it is evidently important to Revere to keep that livelihood. I am an educated professional and without a casino surely the track will not continue and we will be left with uncertainty of the use of the land, primarily housing which will surely strain the present education system. The voters of Revere have spoken, now they should be heard!

Sincerely,

Robyn D'Apolito

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Minchello, John UTAS <John.Minchello@utas.utc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:18 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: CASINO IN REVERE

Categories: Purple Category

I AM ALL FOR THE CASINO IN REVERE. LET ME ASK YOU THIS? WHEN STEVE WYNN, LOST THE VOTES FOR FOXBORO, WHAT DID HE DO? JUMPED OVER TO EVERETT. THAT WAS ALLOWED, RIGHT?
SO LETS BE FAIR, AND ALLOW REVERE TO GO AHEAD AND HAVE A FAIR CHANCE AT GETTING THE CASINO. LET'S BE HONEST, ABOUT A FEW THINGS, WITH THIS EVERETT CASINO SIGHT. THE SIGHT IS BEING BUILT ON A CHEMICAL PLANT. DO YOU KNOW HOW MUCH TIME AND MONEY WILL BE NEEDED TO CLEAN UP THAT PLACE? TRUST ME I KNOW, A LOT. ALSO, WHAT ABOUT HIS TIES WITH THE MOB, AND ONE OF HIS INVESTERS, WHO IS UNDER INVESTIGATION, WITH THE GRAND JURY? IT ALMOST LOOKS LIKE HE IS GETTING AWAY WITH A LOT. THE SHADY STUFF HE IS INVOLVED WITH SHOULD OPEN UP A LOT OF TROUBLE FOR MR. WYNN & MA.
SINCEARLY
JOHN M.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 6:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

George Kougeas

Email

georgekougeas@comcast.net

Phone

(617)569-9317

Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino

Questions or Comments

When I voted NO in East Boston I believed the vote was for ALL OR NOTHING not Hey, how about in Revere? Considering this proposal is SHAMEFUL ! The House always wins right? Vote this proposal down!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Donna Brady <hadathata@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 5:43 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs Race Track

Categories: Purple Category

Professor Crosby,

I have been in the thoroughbred race horse business for over 40 years (trainer, owner and farm owner). My investment is not only financial but a lifetime for me and my family. I have held signs at rallies, been to the offices on Beacon Hill and even walked the streets of East Boston and Revere because I know this is thoroughbred racing last shot in New England. Many of my fellow horsemen have done the same and have invested more than 10 years in the dream that a casino at Suffolk Downs will save racing. Although I believe and trust both Richard Fields and Chip Tuttle, I feel it is important that any combination of Mohegan Sun and Sterling Suffolk Downs be subject to what the Legislature had in mind when they enacted the Gaming Legislation; **to try and resurrect horse racing in Massachusetts**. Sterling Suffolk Downs has not always had the best interests of horse racing and much of what they have done was in preparation to gain a casino license. Now that they have used the horsemen to approach that goal, the Gaming Commission and Suffolk Downs must not be allowed to throw our efforts aside with a "slight of hand". I am asking that any agreement with Suffolk Downs be subject to the oversight that the Legislature intended in the original bill.

Please feel free to share my concerns but I must request anonymity at this time.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 4:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Andres Henao

Email

andy_henao@me.com

Phone

(617)806-6414

Subject

No To Revere Casinos.

Questions or Comments

If you care about the well being of children, cutting down on illegal drugs, home values dropping, and prostitution in the corners of Revere. STOP WITH THIS CASINO IDEA!...NO AGAINST CASINO

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 4:00 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Eylen Arbelaez

Email

Eylenjohanna@msn.com

Phone

(617)501-6132

Subject

Casino in Revere

Questions or Comments

We don't need a casino in Revere,we want our city to to continue a nice city and casino is not the option ,

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 3:39 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Maxine Teixeira

Email

MiaNonna@aol.com

Phone

(617)569-2668

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

as a resident of East Boston, I voted Yes for the Casino. I am still in favor or a casino in Revere. this area has always been a place people came to have fun. there was Wonderland Park, the nation's first theme park. then it moved to Revere Beach. the problem is we got so mad at the way we lost Wood Island Park that we started saying no to everything. hence we have crap along Route 1. It is time to bring the fun back to the area.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Michael G.Tucker <michaelgtucker@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 3:08 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Please concider Casino in Revere.

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Members,

As a home owner in Revere I took the time to review the host community agreement before voting on November 5. I was very happy to see that Mayor Rizzo had the foresight to protect this city in the event that East Boston voted no. I was also very happy to see that the entire city council have endorsed the current project that was presented today and ask that you please vote yes so that this project can move forward.

I strongly feel that the host agreement that was put on the ballot is very clear and that as a registered voter I was confident in my vote on November 5th.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Michael G. Tucker
9 Ellerton Street
Revere, MA 02151
Tel: 781-289-5296

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:30 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

ANA LANZILLI

Email

AILANZILLI@HOTMAIL.COM

Phone

(781)727-3863

Subject

Revere proposal

Questions or Comments

Dear MGC,
I am writing on behalf of both my parents who live at 22 Loring Road Revere, and also own a Condo at Bell Isle (directly behind Suffolk Downs) 145 Bennington Street Revere. On November 5th, my parents voted yes for a casino at Suffolk Downs. They are both in favor of jobs, and the development of the site for a Resort/Casino. When EB voted down the proposal, they continued to be very excited and positive that this would happen (obviously shifting everything to the Revere side). East Boston saying no should NOT be more important than Revere Saying YES..... Nothing has changed for my parents, and they continue to FULLY Support this project. We hope you will let Suffolk/Mohegan move forward so that the Citizens in Revere have a chance for what they VOTED for. Thank you for your time.
Ana Lanzilli (781-727-3863)
On Behalf of Jose and Prisila Rodriguez
(781-284-9148)

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:27 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

arthur orlandino

Email

acehole31@yahoo.com

Subject

casino in revere

Questions or Comments

Steve Holt

PLEASE SHARE: The Massachusetts Gaming Commission will rule at next week's meeting whether to let Suffolk Downs/Mohegan Sun proceed with plans for a casino in Revere only. **As it stands today, it appears that 3 commissioners are in favor of allowing the application to proceed, and 2 are opposed.** THEY NEED TO HEAR FROM YOU, REVERE RESIDENTS! At today's meeting, commissioners said they haven't heard from that many Revere residents who oppose the plans to move forward with a Revere-only casino. Additionally, Mayor Rizzo said (again) that he "has not heard from one person" with concerns about the casino plans moving forward. Here are two things you can do NOW to stop this ILLEGAL casino from being built in Revere:

1) Call / write to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to let them know you .. that all from no eastie casino, revere wants this so much!!!! ty

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:25 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

arthur orlandino

Email

acehole31@yahoo.com

Subject

revere casino

Questions or Comments

Matt Cameron Extension was on surrounding community deadline. Did everyone catch McHugh making our case back there? 2 hours ago....this as soon as meeting got over, revere wants this and only people against it are from no eastie casino.....ty

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: knealon21@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:18 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Hello, My name is Kathleen Orlando and I am a lifelong resident of East Boston. I was a supporter of a casino in East Boston. I listened very carefully to both sides of the issue before making my decision because I live a few blocks from Suffolk Downs. Suffolk Downs has always been a wonderful friend and neighbor to our community and I think the Casino plan was great for East Boston. Unfortunately, we fell shy of the support we needed and I think many things played a role in that. I applaud the residents of Revere for coming together as a community and making informed decisions and voting overwhelmingly to bring a Casino to Revere. I support this plan. I feel that the residents of Revere spoke loud and clear on election day and together with their Mayor should be heard by the gaming commission. I have a great deal of respect for the MGC and I know you will approve the best plan for the area. It is my opinion that the Revere location is the best plan. I feel it will boost the local economy tremendously including businesses in East Boston. Thank you!

Respectfully,

Kathleen Nealon Orlando

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:15 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

lina ashby

Email

antifaz@msn.com

Subject

no revere casino

Questions or Comments

No amount of money is enough to pay for the negative impacts in the community. a casino is very lucrative, but is not worth it. In the long run, the negative impacts will affect drastically. Is not about money, is about a better future. Please No Revere casino...

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

jon santeusanio

Email

jonsanteusanio@gmail.com

Phone

(781)558-8734

Subject

revere

Questions or Comments

Dear sir/madam,
Thank you for your efforts in the licensing for a casino in Revere. As a registered voter I know I'm only a single vote, however i ask any consideration you can give to Revere. As a life long resident, I feel that the casino will impact Revere in the most positive of ways.
Thank you for your time,

Jon Santeusanio
Concerned Voter

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Frank ambrosino

Email

ambro.fa@gmail.com

Phone

(781)244-2919

Subject

revere casino

Questions or Comments

I'm a revere resident and I am totally in favor of the proposed mohegan sun casino placed in revere , I think it would be a great opportunity for our great city and I'm looking forward to revere moving on with this process, thank you

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Rob O'Dwyer

Email

odwyro@gmail.com

Phone

(617)513-5848

Subject

Please Review 'Revere Only' Carefully

Questions or Comments

I am a parent and resident of Winthrop who is concerned about both the negative impact of a Revere casino and the laws and ethics of moving to a 'Revere only' casino at this point. When you vote next week, ask yourself if you would vote a project like this into your neighborhood under similar circumstances. There must be a better way to proceed for the impacted communities and for job creation. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Rob O'Dwyer

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Donna Mahoney

Email

donnamahoney652@comcast.net

Phone

(781)534-1024

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

Dear Council,

I reach out to you today after the meeting with Revere Mayor Dan Rizzo and colleagues, in full support of a casino in this city. I have lived in Revere my entire life of 47 years. I have brought up 3 successful young adults, to whom I would love to see our World class city become the home of a World class casino. I would love to witness the beautification and revenue that this would entail. Mayor Dan Rizzo has our full support along with thousands of other Revere residents who trust in this journey.

In hope of allowing my children and I to witness and be part of this wonderment, I thank you for your time and attention.

Thank You,
Sincerely,
Donna Potito Mahoney

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 1:14 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Yureidy Medina

Email

myureidy@hotmail.com

Phone

(781)632-0056

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

Good afternoon,

I am a resident at 77 Pitcairn Street Revere, Ma. and would like to express my opposition to a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Please do not accept the proposal from Mayor Russo to obtain a gambling license for the City of Revere.

Thank you,

Yureidy Medina

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 12:45 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Maria Pineda

Email

Lucy21173@gmail.com

Phone

(617)416-1064

Subject

No to casinos

Questions or Comments

We care our city we care our community our newbornhood a , we donk wan casinos in revere, we wan to live safe, no trafic, no polition, no drogus, no Prostitucion, No to casinos no it's only one word NO

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 12:11 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

richard norris

Email

shuem@msn.com

Phone

(781)284-4110

Subject

revere casino

Questions or Comments

I am writing this comment and questions to the gaming commission today as I am a citizen of revere and a pro casino in revere person. that being said I still favor a revere Suffolk downs casino venue but to be honest, I am concerned about the racing aspect of this new agreement where as the new applicant has recently stated that horse racing is really not on the agenda for them and to be honest my vote and a lot of peoples votes that I know of were with Suffolk downs continuing to conduct a racing meet. to my understanding the original project was to expand and upgrade both the facility and quality of horse racing in this city. Now to my question, will the gaming commission grant their okay in this manner without a concrete agreement from the new applicant or Suffolk downs? This is a very important issue that was on the original ballot and carried a lot of weight with the voters of this city!! Now if I may be so bold as to say if they will not agree to this then I for one would like there to be another vote before this goes any further, and I am not alone in this feeling! thank you very much and look forward to your findings. Richard Norris.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 12:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

George Rotondo

Email

georgejrotondo@gmail.com

Phone

(781)248-6972

Subject

Revere

Questions or Comments

It is patently false that the Mayor of Revere had not heard from anti-casino people in Revere. As I am pro-casino I want to be able to see the new applicant, the new package and I want to know what will happen to horse racing before I vote yes alone. Also I am not alone on this issue.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 9:43 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Lawrence Mason

Email

Lmason2121@aol.com

Phone

(781)799-3783

Subject

Suffolk Downs

Questions or Comments

For a year I have seen the proposed site of Suffolk Casino (grandstand) all located in East Boston! What happens to barns and lifelong horsemen born and raised in this State! I don't believe the votes cast was for these new plans!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:20 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

John Ribeiro Jr.

Email

johnribeiro@gmail.com

Phone

(857)246-3179

Subject

Sterling Suffolk Application Changes

Questions or Comments

Dear Commissioners Crosby, Cameron, McHugh, Stebbins and Zuniga,

My name is John Ribeiro Jr. and I am a lifelong resident of East Boston, a father of 6, grandfather of 9 and have worked in criminal justice and mental health fighting addictions for 47 years. I am writing today to voice my concerns over the consideration of the proposed application changes being presented by Sterling Suffolk – on an application that has already been deemed by the residents of East Boston, in accordance with the Massachusetts Expanded Gaming legislation – as unsuitable for their community by a majority vote of 56%.

The owners of Sterling Suffolk Race Course with a business at 525 McClellan Highway East Boston, MA have entered into cohost agreements with both the City of Revere and the City of Boston to build a casino on its 161 acre property; 45 acres located in Revere and the balance located in East Boston. In its application the owner also stated that it would maintain its existing racing facility on the property.

This is a site specific plan and proposal which was determined to be suitable by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. This is one location within the jurisdiction of two municipalities it was not either or. This is one entity. The owners asked for binding votes from both cities.

This application for the gaming license submitted by owners is in accordance with C14r 116 as of 10/12/13.

This was the legal proposal and nature of the development and still is, however the owners want to change it semantically. They want you to believe that by changing the address although it's the same location it will be essentially different. This is an extremely different argument.

The negative impacts will be the same in Boston as they were before the address change. It is an unashamed attempt at qualifying the wishes of the electorate in Boston.

It is contrary to the written agreement and spirit of the agreement and spirit of the agreement.

It makes a sham out of our democratic process.

And it is an outrage to the families in Boston who are working to protect our quality of life and fight the exploitation that is being forced on us.

Respectfully,
John Ribeiro Jr.
370 Meridian St.
East Boston, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lee <ayah519@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 7:47 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Lee
Subject: My support for the Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

I lived in Revere for 30 years before moving to East Boston 14 years ago. My children were born and raised in Revere, so I truly believe that my opinion is worth considering. Revere is clearly capable of deciding its own future and has voted as such. I do not believe that a very small group of newly transplanted crusaders from East Boston should have the power to nix a project that is obviously important to Revere and its future.

I cannot attend today's meeting as I am at work.

I voted YES from East Boston for the Casino.

Lee McKenney
617-567-3009.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MBTA305@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 7:22 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino

Categories: Purple Category

To Whom It May Concern...

I would hope that Revere's overwhelming YES vote and last night's unanimous city council vote to approve casino in Revere does not fall on deaf ears. Revere has a much right to have a casino as does EB right not to have one. Eastie voted no and as a result they will not have a casino built in Eastie and I respect that. Revere voted yes and that vote is as legitimate as their vote and should be respected.

If you combined both cities' votes, then it was a clear YES vote, how can a small group of people, many of whom are very new to this area, dictate what happens in our city?

I would respectfully request every consideration on this matter, keeping in mind Revere and its citizens have spoken in the most democratic way, by voting and by voting YES to a casino.

Sincerely

James MacMillan
107 Cummings Ave
Revere, Ma
02151
781-286-9468

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: vickie barrile <vickiebarrile@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 9:05 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC); kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gove
Subject: Proposed Casino In Revere - NO Thank you
Categories: Purple Category

Dear Mass Gaming Commission & Elected Officials,

My husband and I moved to the city of Revere almost ten years ago. We are raising three children in the Revere Public School System and have our planted our roots here, invested in a home. We have a lot "riding" on the future of this city, an invested interest in the decision you have a head of you.

We went to the "Friends of Suffolk Downs" meetings, we saw their plans, we heard what they had to say on changes to local roads to "relieve traffic" implications, we were not sold on the idea. We voted against the casino. The plans for the resort were impressive. They were well thought out, seemed environmentally conscious and as "family friendly" as one would want to consider a casino. We still were NOT sold on the concept of having a casino 3 miles from where we are raising our children, on the route we take to and from work and in between our home and the home of our loved ones in East Boston.

Now that East Boston has voted against the casino and the plans have to change the casino is even less appealing and more frightening. We do not understand how the recent votes could be counted towards such a drastically different plan. **It does not seem fair to have citizens vote on one plan and then implement another.** It seems only fair to present the new plan to ALL Revere citizens and redo the vote, if there isn't enough time for this, so be it. Better safe than sorry. **It also seems unjust (if not illegal) to impose a casino on the border of a city (East Boston) that clearly voted against it.**

Is it not true that the gaming license was granted with the stipulation that Suffolk Downs race track had to be kept in business and included in the plans? Even Chip Tuttle admits this difficult if not impossible to do on Revere property. **Another legality Suffolk Downs is trying to overlook or over rule.**

People in the community of Revere are reluctant to speak out about their concerns and speak against the proposed casino not knowing how the people around them feel. It is an emotional and heated discussion. However, I can tell you **there is concern even amongst those who voted for the casino. They may not have known who the partner would be when they voted but they knew the proposed development and the agreement.** They trusted that with the gaming commission finding fault in Caesars, there would be a suitable replacement found. **It was not "part of the deal", quite literally, to change the infrastructure and the agreement. What is being proposed is NOT what was voted upon.**

The frustration the residents of East Boston must feel on this issue seems unimaginable. Their city voted no and yet the Mayor of Revere feels he can impose the casino abutting their property. Plain and simple, it just doesn't seem legal.

Please realize NOT all Revere residents backed this casino to begin with and even among those who did vote for it, NOT ALL REVERE RESIDENTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE SUFFOLK DOWNS CASINO.

Thank you!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 5:35 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

HELEN HEGARTY

Email

hhegarty@verizon.net

Phone

(781)286-0828

Subject

new plan

Questions or Comments

I urge you to require a new vote for a casino in Revere only. When we voted the plan was considerable different than it appears now. It is only fair that the citizens of the city can vote on the new proposal.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Nancy Ramey <nramey@anchorcapital.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 4:16 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC); 'Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov'
Subject: Very much opposed to the Revere Only Casino Plan
Categories: Purple Category

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to have the State Gaming Commission know that I am very much opposed to the Revere only casino proposal. I do not see this as a good faith or legal result of a clearly defined Nov 5th vote that stated both communities (East Boston and Revere) had to have a majority of resident votes in favor of a casino project at Suffolk Downs to be able to move forward to qualify for one of the licenses to be granted. I have spoken with many YES Revere voters who now feel differently and would vote NO, knowing the project will be entirely on the Revere side, as it will be much more intrusive to their neighborhoods. Some have said that voting YES was meant as an effort to save the horse racing at Suffolk Downs, but that now seems in jeopardy and those votes would also now vote NO. The East Boston residents who were very clear to show a strong NO VOTE will be poorly served with this sidestep change in the proposal. Revere and Suffolk Downs are breaking the 2011 gaming law by moving the plans a few hundred feet over the town line and skipping the necessary re-drawing of a new host community agreement. A new vote and a 6 month waiting period is required by law...how can this occur before the 12/31 deadline unless this deadline is changed.

There has always been a condition of positive neighborhood approval for the Suffolk Downs proposal, as well as other casino site proposals...the state and commission already have strong support in Everett, a higher percentage in favor than Revere. In the spirit of how this was to be addressed, Everett would be the more welcoming community for the casino license.

One final note is that Sen. Anthony Petrucelli, who represents part of Revere, helped write the 2011 gaming law and has condemned the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. He was an ardent supporter of the casino plans prior to the attempt to have Suffolk Downs change the proposal to suit its own interests and intent of obtaining the casino license from your commission.

I greatly appreciate your attention and consideration to doing what is respectful and fair for the communities which would be so negatively impacted by the plan if it were to move forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Ramey



NANCY D. RAMEY
VICE PRESIDENT

ANCHOR/RUSSELL
WEALTH ADVISORS

Division of Anchor Capital Advisors LLC

1 Post Office Square, 38th Floor

Boston, MA 02109

Office: (617) 338-2722

Fax: (617) 368-3768

If you are not an intended party to this transmission, please notify the sender immediately and delete/destroy any and all copies. Unintended recipients shall not review, reproduce, disseminate nor disclose any information contained in this message. The Company reserves the right to monitor and retain all incoming and outgoing e-mails without further notice. E-mails may contain viruses or other defects. The Company does not accept liability for any errors, viruses or omissions arising as a result of transmission.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 3:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Dottie Donofrio

Email

donofrio35@aol.com

Phone

(617)539-3092

Subject

Casino in Revere MA

Questions or Comments

I sincerely hope you will give full consideration for Revere Mass/Suffolk Downs as a viable site for a casino.....
A handful of folks lead by clergy created the upset for East Boston.
Both land sites could have been developed in a favorable manner if it were not for the \$ backing \$ to defeat.
Should we stop Bingo, 50/50 chances, raffle tickets and all the 'gambling' that presently helps to support community endeavors?
Presently the Revere parcel being presented is in dire need of uplifting.
A costly undertaking that the city cannot afford.
I honestly feel that revitalizing this area that sits just outside our poorest setting down town Boston and the Seaport district would enhance in many more jobs, an attractive offering for those choosing to participate, more affordable lodging and a meaningful ongoing infrastructure planning.
When one looks at a promising future for this land area it is bleak at best.
Now we have an opportunity to develop and create a 'win-win' setting in communities that sorely need help.
From a Winthrop resident I appreciate your allowing me to register my feelings.
Dottie D.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Gail Miller <gailmiller48@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 2:40 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Fwd: Mohegan casino proposal, Revere

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and gaming commissioners,

Sorry my previous email was sent (below) before I finished my comments.

I would like to point out that you have before you what is, in essence, an entirely new application because you have a new applicant, new venue, no host agreement, no surrounding communities agreements, no vote... all proposed for your Dec. 31st deadline. How is this possible?...Simply because you have what appears to be two "suitable" applicants, no details are in place to review this application according to the legislation as we understand it. The parties to this new proposal both lost their casino bids in the East Boston/Revere and Palmer communities.

Before the November 5th vote in East Boston and Revere, it was certainly communicated by Senator Anthony Petrucci that BOTH municipalities would need a dual YES to be granted a license.

Regardless of Revere's host community agreement, the legislation determines the rules of the game. To act like the rules do not apply to Revere now makes a mockery of process despite how Revere wants to spin this new application. For your commission to allow their application to go forward is an affront to all those that did play by the rules and participated in this recent campaign. Because Suffolk Downs was inept in their presentation despite throwing a sizable sum of money into the community, hopefully capturing a vote to win a casino license, this commission should not grant special favoritism to them. All parties involved should not even be having this discussion.

Our legislative delegation is on record basically making the same arguments. We request that you exercise fairness in this process and direct Mohegan Sun and partners to go back to their drawing board and submit their application six months after the November 5th vote. They then can clearly state the new details of their proposals instead of allowing this bait and switch approach.

Regards,

GailC. Miller
232 Orient Avenue
East Boston, Ma 02128

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gail Miller <gailmiller48@icloud.com>
Date: December 2, 2013, 1:40:16 PM EST

To: "mgccomments@state.ma.us" <mgccomments@state.ma.us>
Subject: Mohegan casino proposal, Revere

Chairman Crosby and gaming commissioners:

On Tuesday, December 3rd you will be taking up the matter of a brand new application for a casino proposal in Revere.
from my iPhone

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 10:38 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

anthony butler

Email

butlertony2000@yahoo.com

Phone

(978)270-0913

Subject

suffolk downs / racing

Questions or Comments

I was very distressed but not surprised to read in Saturdays Herald that should Mohegan and Suffolk win a deal for Eastern Mass that racing was not guaranteed to continue. Chip Tuttle and Suffolk's ownership from day one has told employees and everyone involved in the thoroughbred industry that continuing racing was their number one priority. More to the point is the FACT that many, many of the voters who turned out and gave their approval for the Casino did so with the understanding that it would " save " Suffolk Downs, that is fact! I have been in meetings at the facility where Chip Tuttle has made it very clear to the employees this was the case. If Suffolk's ownership and Chip Tuttle now backtrack away from their promise I say their words ring hollow at best and at worse the people were used to push forward ownerships agenda. I urge the commission to view any deal that does not guarantee Suffolk's survival as a slap in the face to everyone who's been promised otherwise..... Snake salesman or honest business people? I don't know if the commission has the authority but my message to Chip Tuttle is no Suffolk Downs, no Casino

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 01, 2013 5:03 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Anne Bowen

Email

am22b@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)284-3895

Subject

Mohegan Sun suffolk downs casino proposal

Questions or Comments

I'm unable to attend the Revere City Council Meeting on Monday December 2nd.

I am in favor of this proposal moving forward and support a Casino being built solely in Revere

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: marfourthbpos <mar4thbpos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 28, 2013 11:55 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: REVERE-ONLY PROPOSAL REQUIRES NEW VOTE

Categories: Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission members

As I see it, the proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs involved a *specifically delineated site location*. Suffolk Downs went to great lengths to show voters where the casino facilities would be located on the site. Under the original Suffolk Downs proposal, it was clear that the buildings housing the gaming activities were *all* to be located in East Boston. So, voters in East Boston and Revere had a specific vision of what they were voting on when they cast their ballots. Clearly, East Boston voters did not want the project in their neighborhood and rejected it. On the other hand, Revere voters, *voting on a proposal in which all the gaming buildings were sited in East Boston*, voted in favor. [See map in attached Boston Globe article (dated 11/28/13).

Now, here comes Suffolk Downs with a *materially different* proposal; one that involves squeezing a casino project onto 52 acres of land located entirely in Revere. *This is not the proposal the people of Revere voted on*. In fact, given the chance to express their opinion in a referendum, the voters of Revere might well reject this new casino proposal to be located entirely in their city. *The only fair way to determine how Revere voters feel about Suffolk Downs' Revere-only casino proposal is to hold another referendum for Revere citizens only*. To extrapolate Revere voters' favorable vote on the original proposal as somehow representing their approval for the new Revere-only casino is wrong. From the perspective of Revere residents, this new Revere-only proposal is substantially different from the original Suffolk Downs venture and it should get the approval of Revere voters before moving forward. Anything less would be unfair to Revere residents.

The people of Revere deserve a separate vote on this new Suffolk Downs proposal. To move ahead without it would likely lead to legal action which is certain to delay the project, inject uncertainty into the process and undermine the credibility of the Gaming Commission. *I urge the Commission to do the right thing and allow the voters of Revere to voice their opinion in a referendum on this new Revere-only casino proposal before taking further action*. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Ed Phelan
287 Kelley Blvd

North Attleboro, MA 02760

LINK TO 11-28 GLOBE (w/MAP):

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2013/11/28/mohegan-sun-suffolk-downs-announce-deal-bring-casino-revere/ZkZkYmX9Xxyz10vQ4hJSJI/igraphic.html>

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 5:03 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Kenneth Posco

Email

kenposco@gmail.com

Phone

(978)345-1860

Subject

Thoroughbred horse racing

Questions or Comments

I am a thoroughbred horse breeder in Fitchburg with approximately 30 horses at my farm. It scares me to think what will happen if Suffolk Downs closes. No only will I have to sell the farm, but I think about all the thoroughbred horses that race at Suffolk Downs that will need a home. In this market you cannot give away a horse, and it is well known that, at this point, horses that race at Suffolk will not be competitive at any tracks in the east.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 3:06 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Purple Category

Name

Trent Mutchler

Email

trent@bostonbusinessprinting.com

Phone

(617)482-7955

Subject

Casino in Revere

Questions or Comments

I would like to say that I believe that Revere voted in favor of a casino and that the casino should now be in Revere. It will not be in Boston. To ignore the voters of Revere because a very small # of voters in Boston voted against it is just wrong. We (the voters of Revere) would have been in the same position if the situation was reversed.

Trent Mutchler
25 Aiden Ave
Revere, Ma 02151

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 2:19 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Anthony DeMarco

Email

Demarco380@gmail.com

Phone

(617)838-5928

Subject

Suffolk downs casino

Questions or Comments

To whom it may concern;

I am a home owner and resident of Revere, I grew up here and raised a family here and was born right in this city as well. When we went to vote on a casino for Suffolk downs, I was under the impression it was going to be mostly built on EastBoston land, and now that EastBoston voted it down and Revere wants to build it solely on Revere land I think a new vote should be in order and I think the outcome will be a lot different than the last one was for Revere. This changes the complexity of a Casino in Revere a lot.

Please take this into consideration when deciding on Suffolk Downs for a casino.

Thank You

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Reilly, Janice (MGC)
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Sharlow, Albert (MGC)
Subject: FW: Regarding Suffolk Downs' Revere-only Plans

Categories: Revere

Can you please start a file for comments on Suffolk Downs and include this? Thanks.

Janice Reilly
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
Tel: 617.979.8400

From: smh00a@gmail.com [mailto:smh00a@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Steve Holt
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 11:20 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC)
Cc: Anthony Petruccelli; LaMattina, Salvatore; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov
Subject: Regarding Suffolk Downs' Revere-only Plans

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Gaming Commission,

When voters in Revere and East Boston went to the polls on Nov. 5, they were voting on a casino plan that had been formulated and vetted over "not weeks ago, not months ago, but literally years ago." (watch Suffolk Downs Chief Operating Officer Chip Tuttle say these words on Aug. 27 in Revere: <http://youtu.be/qDy2wb2gMUM?t=10m11s>) Time and time again, from the earliest conversations about a proposed casino at Suffolk Downs right up to the Nov. 5 vote, voters were told they would get the last say on whether a casino is placed in their communities. Sen. Anthony Petruccelli and Kathi Reinstein continually affirmed the clear intent in the 2011 legislation for *communities* to have the last say. This interview with both Senators aired on RevereTV in the month leading up to the vote: <http://youtu.be/g06Z7Nql3qo?t=4m5s>

When it was announced that Caesars Entertainment would be found unsuitable to proceed as Suffolk Downs' operations partner, members of the community [called on the track to withdraw gracefully from the process](#), believing then that the revised plan was fundamentally different from that which was laid forth in the host community agreements and even on each city's ballots. This was not just a "land use" vote in either community, despite what you might hear from some proponents (and even Sen. Petruccelli in his letter); all the voters I know took into consideration every facet of Suffolk Downs' application, including its partners or lack thereof, so as to determine whether this development would be a worthy neighbor for at least the next 15 years. On Nov. 5, East Boston unequivocally stated that a casino and its developers would not be a good neighbor.

Today, I struggle to find the words to express my bafflement that a "Revere-only" continuation of the Suffolk Downs application would even be considered by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission within the confines of the current procedural timeline. (to hear Chairman Crosby say on WGBH that he is exploring whether "there's room in the law" for such a move is especially troubling) I attended countless meetings and watched dozens of presentations about this proposal by both elected officials and Suffolk Downs, and not once was the idea publicly aired that a casino could be built in one of the communities despite a "no" vote in the other. Everyone's

understanding (and anyone who tells you otherwise isn't being honest) leading up to the vote was that if a double "yes" was not achieved at the polls, the project application would be dead.

Indeed, even Sen. Petruccelli, an architect of the 2011 gaming law and ardent supporter of a casino at Suffolk Downs, now stands with the nearly 9,000 voters in both communities who voted "no" (and undoubtedly, now, many who voted "yes") in asserting that the legislation prohibits Suffolk Downs from moving forward with a Revere-only casino in the manner in which it is doing so. An excerpt from his letter to the Commission last week:

When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

I realize that the Commission has been tasked with the construction of casinos that financially benefit the Commonwealth, and to do so in a manner that is full of integrity. I stand with Sen. Petruccelli, State Representative Carlo Basile, East Boston City Councilor Sal LaMattina and others to ask that you respect the integrity of the process set forth by the legislature -- in both letter and the spirit -- and thus respect the binding vote that was taken on Nov. 5. To allow Suffolk Downs to move forward with a plan that impacts East Boston every bit as much -- without first drafting a new host community agreement and putting the **new plan** to another vote in Revere -- is to mock both the process and the voters of Boston's Ward 1 who unambiguously rejected a casino **anywhere on the Suffolk Downs property**.

Thank you, as always, for your continued work on behalf of the residents of the Commonwealth.

Best Regards,

--

Steve Holt
68 D Marginal St.
East Boston, MA 02128
617-447-6519

CC: Sen. Anthony Petruccelli, Rep. Carlo Basile, and Councilor Sal LaMattina

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: smh00a@gmail.com on behalf of Steve Holt <steve@thebostonwriter.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 11:20 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC)
Cc: Anthony Petruccelli; LaMattina, Salvatore; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov
Subject: Regarding Suffolk Downs' Revere-only Plans

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Gaming Commission,

When voters in Revere and East Boston went to the polls on Nov. 5, they were voting on a casino plan that had been formulated and vetted over "not weeks ago, not months ago, but literally years ago." (watch Suffolk Downs Chief Operating Officer Chip Tuttle say these words on Aug. 27 in Revere: <http://youtu.be/qDy2wb2gMUM?t=10m11s>) Time and time again, from the earliest conversations about a proposed casino at Suffolk Downs right up to the Nov. 5 vote, voters were told they would get the last say on whether a casino is placed in their communities. Sen. Anthony Petruccelli and Kathi Reinstein continually affirmed the clear intent in the 2011 legislation for *communities* to have the last say. This interview with both Senators aired on RevereTV in the month leading up to the vote: <http://youtu.be/g06Z7Nql3qo?t=4m5s>

When it was announced that Caesars Entertainment would be found unsuitable to proceed as Suffolk Downs' operations partner, members of the community [called on the track to withdraw gracefully from the process](#), believing then that the revised plan was fundamentally different from that which was laid forth in the host community agreements and even on each city's ballots. This was not just a "land use" vote in either community, despite what you might hear from some proponents (and even Sen. Petruccelli in his letter); all the voters I know took into consideration every facet of Suffolk Downs' application, including its partners or lack thereof, so as to determine whether this development would be a worthy neighbor for at least the next 15 years. On Nov. 5, East Boston unequivocally stated that a casino and its developers would not be a good neighbor.

Today, I struggle to find the words to express my bafflement that a "Revere-only" continuation of the Suffolk Downs application would even be considered by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission within the confines of the current procedural timeline. (to hear Chairman Crosby say on WGBH that he is exploring whether "there's room in the law" for such a move is especially troubling) I attended countless meetings and watched dozens of presentation about this proposal by both elected officials and Suffolk Downs, and not once was the idea publicly aired that a casino could be built in one of the communities despite a "no" vote in the other. Everyone's understanding (and anyone who tells you otherwise isn't being honest) leading up to the vote was that if a double "yes" was not achieved at the polls, the project application would be dead.

Indeed, even Sen. Petruccelli, an architect of the 2011 gaming law and ardent supporter of a casino at Suffolk Downs, now stands with the nearly 9,000 voters in both communities who voted "no" (and undoubtedly, now, many who voted "yes") in asserting that the legislation prohibits Suffolk Downs from moving forward with a Revere-only casino in the manner in which it is doing so. An excerpt from his letter to the Commission last week:

When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more

than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

I realize that the Commission has been tasked with the construction of casinos that financially benefit the Commonwealth, and to do so in a manner that is full of integrity. I stand with Sen. Petruccelli, State Representative Carlo Basile, East Boston City Councilor Sal LaMattina and others to ask that you respect the integrity of the process set forth by the legislature -- in both letter and the spirit -- and thus respect the binding vote that was taken on Nov. 5. To allow Suffolk Downs to move forward with a plan that impacts East Boston every bit as much -- without first drafting a new host community agreement and putting the **new plan** to another vote in Revere -- is to mock both the process and the voters of Boston's Ward 1 who unambiguously rejected a casino **anywhere on the Suffolk Downs property**.

Thank you, as always, for your continued work on behalf of the residents of the Commonwealth.

Best Regards,

--

Steve Holt

68 D Marginal St.

East Boston, MA 02128

617-447-6519

CC: Sen. Anthony Petruccelli, Rep. Carlo Basile, and Councilor Sal LaMattina

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 9:45 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Anne Bowen

Email

am22b@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)284-3885

Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino revere

Questions or Comments

At the November 21st Massachusetts Gaming Commission's Hearing on the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal discussion , a question arose that Revere voters may not have understood the language of the Host Community Agreement Referendum that was printed on the November 5th ballot.

Revere citizens are very informed voters and I cannot think if a time when our City was more focused and educated about an issue than when we voted on November 5, 2013, YES for the City of Revere to be a HOST community (meaning a casino will be built within our City limits) and YES to a referendum for Suffolk Downs Casino off Winthrop Avenue , Revere.

While watching the Hearing on Thursday, Ms Myers stated that if she knew a Revere only Casino was an option, she would have expanded her "no Eastie casino" campaign into Revere. I can assure Ms Myers and you that the NO vote campaign in Revere was covered. Our city was inundated with people being paid to influence Revere voters to vote NO on the casino question. Mr Charles Lightbody, who was interviewed on several news stations, spent thousands of dollars in advertising, hiring people and busing them into our City to vigorously campaign a NO CASINO vote. A businessman with an extensive criminal record, Mr. Lightbody was trying to influence the Revere vote for his own personal gain of millions of dollars if the Wynn Resort in Everett is awarded a gaming license. Revere voted YES!

You may have a difficult task with your decision on this issue but please do not make our vote in Revere part of that discussion. The voters of Revere, educated and informed, voted a definite YES. Our votes need to be recorded and counted the same as those votes in Milford, Everett and East Boston.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: marfourthbpos <mar4thbpos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 24, 2013 12:06 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Citizens of Revere deserve a vote on new Revere-only casino

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I write to urge the Gaming Commission to refuse to allow a new Revere-only casino proposal to move forward without a new Revere-only referendum on the issue. The recent referendum placed before the voters of East Boston and Revere was based on a very specific proposal whose situs was mostly in East Boston. That being the case, many Revere voters may likely have voted in favor of the plan thinking that most of the construction, and later the traffic congestion, would be mainly contained in East Boston with a relatively minor impact in and on Revere itself.

The plan now being proposed for a full-blown casino sited entirely within Revere is far different than that which Revere voters had in mind when they cast their ballots in the referendum. In fact, one might reasonably surmise that some Revere voters may well have voted differently in the initial referendum if the proposed casino was to be *primarily sited in Revere*. The question is 'how many' such voters? And the only way to determine how many Revere voters are in favor of a casino sited *entirely in their own town* is to hold another referendum on the prospect of a Revere-only casino project. To do otherwise, the gaming commission would be giving the go-ahead to a project that the citizens of Revere did not envision and was not what was put before them at the time they voted in the referendum. The proposed Revere project is a *substantially different* project and the voters of Revere deserve a chance to vote on the prospect of a full-blown casino to be located entirely in their town. They may or may not feel differently but they should have the chance to vote on the new Revere-only project. For the Gaming Commission to allow the Revere-only project to proceed at this juncture would be the equivalent of a "bait & switch" tactic played on the good citizens of Revere.

I urge the Gaming Commission to reject the proposed Revere-only casino without giving the citizens of Revere the opportunity to vote in a new referendum on the specifics of the project. It's the only fair thing to do. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Edward Phelan
287 Kelley Blvd
North Attleboro, MA 02760

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 23, 2013 12:33 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Phil Turland

Email

turland@gmail.com

Phone

(978)662-1651

Subject

CMR 124.04 & Revere HCA Sect. 1 A 5

Questions or Comments

Greetings Commisioners;

A new vote in Revere is required based on 124.04 and the Revere HCA Section 1 A 5. The impact statement clearly states that the project would be constructed entirely in Boston and no significant new construction would take place in Revere. Any change to the host agreement would violate 124.04.

Thanks

-Phil Turland

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 1:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

ARTHUIR ORLANDINO

Email

ACEHOLE31@YAHOO.COM

Subject

NEC

Questions or Comments

WHY ARE NO EASTIE CASINO INVOLVED IN REVERE CASINO TALKS WHEN THEY ALREADY VOTED NO AND THEY DONT HAVE ANY SAY TO WHAT HAPPENS IN REVERE...IT SEEMS TO ME THEY TRYING TO TELL YOU HOW TO DO YOUR JOB WHEN IT SEEMS YOU DOING GREAT ON YOU OWN,IT INSULTING THAT THEY DO THIS IT SEEMS AND KEEP SAYING THEY GOING TO TELL YOU THIS AND THAT...TY

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Matthew Neave <mdneave@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 1:18 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs Suitability Deadline

Mass Gaming Commission,

I am writing to inquire about the status of Suffolk Downs suitability to hold a gaming license. Suffolk Downs was given a November 8 deadline to provide a plan for Caesar's divestment or to complete the divestment. During the open meeting yesterday it was stated the Suffolk Downs did not meet this requirement. Does this mean that they have proved themselves unsuitable to hold a gaming license?

I find it troubling that the gaming commission has continually bent rules to favor the Suffolk Downs proposal. It is common knowledge that the gaming law was written with Suffolk Downs in mind and the gaming commission is giving the impression that the rules do not apply to this applicant. Suffolk Downs was allowed to place 19% of their ownership into a blind trust to avoid background checks of Vornado Realty, which apparently still has not been taken over by a new investor. The city of Boston was allowed to schedule the referendum before the suitability checks were complete without following the required procedure of obtaining permission from the commission in a timely manner. Most recently, the commission is keeping their proposal alive even though both ballots and the law state that affirmative votes were needed in both communities for this proposal to continue. Is the commission planning on giving Suffolk Downs another free pass for failing to complete this requirement to plan out Caesar's divestment?

I am also curious if anyone actually reads these letters. It was shocking to hear during the open meeting that Commissioner Crosby didn't even know that Sen. Petrucelli had sent a letter to the commission. I have not received a response to the many letters I've written to the commission. Is this email address just a formality to give the impression that you are listening to the public or are you really listening?

Thank you,
Matthew Neave

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 10:23 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

ALICE CATALDO

Email

accataldo@comcast.net

Phone

(781)629-1320

Subject

REVERE CASINO

Questions or Comments

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE IDEA OF ANOTHER VOTE IN OUR CITY. WE OVERWHELMINGLY SAID YES TO A CASINO IN REVERE, WHETHER IT'S ALL IN OUR CITY OR NOT, WE STILL NEED THE JOBS & REVENUE!! WHAT WILL THE QUESTION BE-DO YOU WANT A CASINO IN REVERE-I THINK THAT WAS ASKED AND THE ANSWER GIVEN!! IF REVERE IS GIVEN THE LICENSE IT WILL ACCOMPLISH TWO THINGS, IT WILL SAVE OUR BELOVED RACE TRACK AND GIVE US A ONCE IN A LIFE TIME CHANCE AT GOOD JOBS & MUCH NEEDED REVENUE. WE ARE USE TO GAMBING IN OUR CITY, AS WELL AS THE TRAFFIC AND OTHER PROBLEMS IT MIGHT BRING. WE HAVE HAD 2 RACE TRACKS HERE FOR MANY YEARS, IT'S PART OF THE FABRIC OF OUR CITY!! BY SAYING WE NEED TO HAVE ANOTHER VOTE ,YOU ARE ESSENCIALLY NEGATING OUR YES VOTE-
A SMALL NO VOTE IN EAST BOSTON SHOULD NOT MEAN MORE THAN AN OVERWHEILMING YES IN REVERE!!
PLEASE BE FAIR TO OUR CITY!!

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 4:37 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Anne Bowen

Email

am22b@yahoo.com

Phone

(781)284-2895

Subject

REVERE Suffolk Downs Casino Project

Questions or Comments

I voted YES to a Suffolk Downs Casino off Winthrop Avenue REVERE
I voted YES for gaming in Massachusetts and I expected both of my votes to be registered and counted
It was so frustrating to watch the Commission today and know that our votes in Revere were being questioned that we may not have understood the language. We are well informed voters. We want a CASINO in our City
Our votes deserve to be counted as was those voters in Everett and those voters in East Boston.
Your every possible consideration on this matter is appreciated. Suffolk Downs has been a great neighbor and deserve every possible opportunity to continue their pursuit to obtain a gaming license
Thank you

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 4:15 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

dennis bowen

Email

dwb482@yahoo.com

Phone

(617)378-8894

Subject

gaming in revere

Questions or Comments

I voted for a casino in Revere. Please consider Revere site.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Donald <donjmelnik@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 2:58 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: junemelnik@gmail.com; revere_mayor@revere.org
Subject: A Casino for Revere

Dear Commission members,

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my concern over the location of a resort casino in Massachusetts.

My wife and I own our home in Revere and reside in this home.

We are in favor of a Revere only casino, with the thought that our taxes and water bill will be reduced.

We frequent many visits to the casinos south of Revere, primarily CT and RI.

Seeing the number of Mass and New Hampshire plates, including some from Vt and Maine that frequent these southern casinos is an indication of the monies, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is missing, for our wonderful state. Our state needs more alternatives of getting funds to help us through the work that needs to be funded by our tax dollars.

We plead with you, to look at the Revere cite to be accepted as the Eastern Casino.

Thank you,
June and Donald Melnik
43 Elm St
Revere MA

Sent from my iPad

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 1:30 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Susan Horn

Email

susanmariehorn@yahoo.com

Phone

(617)610-4030

Subject

Live Stream meeting regarding Suffolk Downs November 21

Questions or Comments

As a resident of East Boston, I went to countless meetings regarding the Casino-- These meetings had Chip Tuttle, Sen Petrucelli, Councillor LaMattina and Rep Basile-- when asked what happens if there is a split vote it was said that there would be a no go to the Suffolk Down Casino. There was never any suggestion of a Revere only or East Boston only based Casino. Please respect our vote that was voted on November 5.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 10:50 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Julia Howington

Email

Juliacoll@gmail.com

Subject

Reject Revere-only proposal

Questions or Comments

Dear Gaming Commission,

Please reject Suffolk Downs' proposal to revise its application. Allowing them to move forward at this point allows them circumvent state law and the decision made by the voters of East Boston.

Just because Suffolk Downs is disappointed by the results doesn't mean they should be able to rewrite the rules to suit their ambitions.

I have been impressed with the integrity of the process and decisions made by the Gaming Commission to date even though I am personally opposed to casinos for Massachusetts.

By rejecting the Revere-only proposal you will be sending a clear message that to Massachusetts that the process is fair.

Sincerely,

Julia Howington
Winthrop , MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 11:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Philip Cataldo

Email

PhilipCataldo@Hotmail.com

Phone

(781)284-6856

Subject

Revere Casino

Questions or Comments

I have heard the rumors of a Revere only Suffolk Downs casino. So I wanted to pass on some thoughts.

The Mass Gaming Commission should rule that a casino along the East Boston corridor to Revere should be eliminated as a site. That site has been voted on by the rules set out by the Commission, and the collective decision was NO. Any gerrymandering of the land/buildings along the East Boston corridor would be a breach of faith and a loss of faith in the honesty of the Gaming Commission. If the Gaming Commission doesn't rule out a casino in the East Boston corridor the Commission board should be recalled.

However, I think a casino can be put in Revere. If Revere wants to try and put a casino on it's border with Lynn or Chelsea or Saugus, as long as it is not along the East Boston corridor then the people of Revere should have the right to examine and determine if this is what they want. Of course it would require another vote and whatever city is abutted by the casino should also be included in the vote, Lynn, Chelsea, Saugus, etc. But the next referendum must include a plan and resort manager. The people of Revere shouldn't be asked to vote on an undefined plan and give the city politicians a blank check to do whatever they wish. I think the last vote should have been cancelled because once Caesar's was eliminated we were basically voting on an undefined plan and giving the local politicians too much power to make any deal no matter how bad. I think the Gaming Commission was wrong in not stepping in to delay the vote.

In any event I think the reputation of the Gaming Commission is in question if they don't eliminate any possibility of a Revere casino along the East Boston corridor.

Sincerely,

Phil Cataldo
Revere, MA.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 6:45 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Leonard Leone

Email

leone1@hotmail.com

Phone

(617)803-8546

Subject

Revere Beach Casino

Questions or Comments

It would be a great idea putting casino in Revere, it has ocean ,5 minutes to airport, 5 -10 minutes to Boston on Blue Line, jobs, jobs. Fall you have foliage up North,skiing etc. and its only a day trip and back to your hotels.
Respectfully submitte
LeonardrLeonene

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: mattcameron@gmail.com on behalf of Matt Cameron <matt@mattcameronlaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 4:23 PM
To: Blue, Catherine (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); MGCcomments (MGC); Grossman, Todd (MGC)
Subject: No Eastie Casino's formal comments in re: Sterling Suffolk for 11.21 open meeting
Attachments: NEC Comments re Sterling Suffolk LLC, 11.21.13 MGC Open Meeting.pdf

Chairman Crosby & Attorney Blue--

Attached please find No Eastie Casino's formal written comments to be filed in advance of tomorrow morning's open meeting. I have done my best to address the Commission's questions, and will be prepared to briefly speak in support of our position on them and to discuss them with the Commission.

Thank you again for your consideration of our position, as well as the opportunity to participate in tomorrow's meeting. I look forward to it.

Best,

Matt Cameron
General Counsel, No Eastie Casino

NO EASTIE CASINO

November 20, 2013

BY EMAIL

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
84 State Street
10th Floor
Boston, Mass. 02109



RE: Status of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC's Category 1 Application

Dear Gaming Commission:

On November 5th, 2013, 4,281 East Boston residents decisively registered their opinion against a casino at Suffolk Downs. As the only organized opposition to this proposal, we are now writing on behalf of these voters to provide our comments on the current status of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse ("SSR") LLC's application for a Category 1 gaming license in the wake of this split vote with Revere.

Senator Anthony Petrucelli,¹ Representative Carlo Basile,² City Councilor Sal LaMattina,³ and the editors of the *Boston Globe*⁴ and the *Boston Herald*⁵ have all taken strong positions against SSR's stated intention to proceed with a Revere-only casino following its defeat in East Boston. We commend our elected representatives and the media for their commitment to the rule of law, and request that the Commission give appropriate weight to their comments as it continues to consider the issues raised by SSR's continued pursuit of a gaming license in the wake of East Boston's rejection of its proposal.

In support of our position that SSR's application for a Category 1 gaming license should now be pretermitted, No Eastie Casino submits the following points of fact and law:

I. CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT REMAINS A SHAREHOLDER IN THIS APPLICATION DESPITE THE COMMISSION'S CLEAR MANDATE THAT ITS INTEREST BE DIVESTED BY NOVEMBER 8, 2013.

As a preliminary matter, SSR appears to have blatantly disregarded this Commission's order dated October 30, 2013⁶ that it divest (or establish a cognizable plan to divest) the ownership interest presently held by Caesars Entertainment on or before November 8, 2013. As of the date of this letter, SSR has missed this critical deadline by nearly two weeks. Per the terms of this Commission's order, this applicant has no right to proceed with its application unless and until this mandate has been clearly met.

¹ "The proposed resort casino at Suffolk Downs is dead... if Suffolk Downs has a new proposal, there needs to be a new process. Anything less would bring into question the integrity of the Massachusetts Gaming Law and the whole process." "Casino In Revere Being Considered," Seth Daniel, *Revere Journal* (Nov. 13, 2013)

² "I'm going to stand by the vote... the law was written specifically so that both communities had to say yes." "Suffolk Downs, Revere set to reopen casino talks," Mark Arsenaunt, *Boston Globe* (Nov. 12, 2013)

³ "Councilor Sal LaMattina... said Monday that he will oppose a Revere-only Suffolk Downs casino. "The neighborhood was always told if one community voted against it, they would not be able to go forward," LaMattina said." "Milford vote could change the game in casino quest," Mark Arsenaunt, *Boston Globe* (Nov. 19, 2013)

⁴ "...[b]ringing in a new partner in a new location, in defiance of the Revere agreement and against the spirit of the East Boston vote, stretches flexibility to the point of absurdity. Suffolk Downs has been offered every courtesy up to this point. But now it's just asking for too much." "Suffolk Downs asks too much in seeking Revere-only casino," *Boston Globe* (Nov. 11, 2013)

⁵ "The integrity of the casino licensing process demands that the Gaming Commission not bend the rules for Suffolk Downs..." "Editorial: Time to fold 'em," *Boston Herald* (Nov. 8, 2013)

⁶ *In Re: Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC*, "Phase I Suitability Determination," at 6 (Oct. 30, 2013).

II. NEITHER HOST COMMUNITY VOTED IN FAVOR OF A GAMING ESTABLISHMENT TO BE SOLELY SITUATED IN REVERE, AND ANY FUTURE REVERE-ONLY PROPOSAL WILL REQUIRE A NEW HOST COMMUNITY AGREEMENT AND A NEW VOTE.

"...[i]f a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license."
MGL c. 23K § 15(13)

This language could not be more clear: a gaming establishment to be situated at a location such as Suffolk Downs which spans two host communities must earn the approval of the residents of both host communities. This was the stated purpose of the referendum held in both communities on November 5, 2013, and no provision has ever been made (legally or otherwise) for the possibility of proceeding in one community alone following a split vote in the manner that SSR now proposes.

Ballot questions in both communities clearly stated that both East Boston and Revere were voting on a gaming establishment to be located at Suffolk Downs, an entity which any resident of either community would reasonably understand to include the entire 161-acre parcel. All of the plans and proposals presented to the public in the years preceding this vote were for a destination resort casino which would make use of all of the land available to Suffolk Downs. Furthermore, the Revere ballot⁷ plainly stated that an affirmative vote would be required in both communities, and, as detailed further below, its mitigation agreement with SSR was plainly predicated upon an understanding that the majority of the proposed gaming establishment would be located in East Boston.

As Chairman Crosby noted on the record⁸ one week prior to the November 5th vote during a special meeting convened to evaluate the state of the Suffolk Downs proposal: "There will be another public hearing during the evaluation process if the vote is successful. **If it isn't successful, it's over.**"

We agree. This opinion—which clearly did not distinguish between the two host communities, but merely referenced "the vote" that would be held on November 5th in connection with SSR's proposal—is generally what proponents, stakeholders, and the Commission itself appear to have believed immediately prior to the November 5th election. We see no reason that this plain reading of MGL c. 23K § 15(13) should change in the wake of East Boston's vote.

Revere clearly negotiated its host community agreement with the expectation that the majority of the development would be on the East Boston side and that Suffolk Downs was reserving the right only to "expand" its gaming facility into Revere. The following pertinent excerpts unmistakably confirm this:

As planned, the Project would be constructed within the municipal boundaries of the city of Boston and no new significant construction is currently proposed on the portion of the Property located in [Revere]...
Revere HCA, Sec. 1(A)(5), p. 3

⁷ Available at <http://www.revere.org/docs/election/revere-city-common-back-1-3-col-19-in-nov-5-2013.pdf>

⁸ See transcript of October 29, 2013 meeting, p. 61:21-24 available at <http://massgaming.com/wp-content/uploads/Transcript-10-29-13-3PM.pdf>

NO EASTIE CASINO

The Owner and the City anticipate that the Owner will construct on the Revere Property certain improvements to existing racing-related structures (such as barns, maintenance buildings, and the like) and surface parking improvements...

Revere HCA, Sec. 2(C)(2), p. 13

If the Owner seeks to expand its gaming establishment onto the Revere Property or beyond the Property onto property located within or outside the City, the Owner shall promptly notify the City...

Revere HCA, Sec. 2(N), p. 19

While Suffolk Downs would likely be within its rights to propose a *new* Revere-only plan in the future, this would require SSR and Revere to restart the entire process with a new Revere-only proposal, a new Revere-only host community agreement, and a new Revere-only referendum. It would fly in the face of the statute, the regulations, public policy, and basic democratic principles for this Commission to permit the applicant to effectively retrofit the outcome of this referendum to meet its needs.

SSR has made much⁹ of the fact that Chief Operating Officer Chip Tuttle responded to a hypothetical question posed at a public meeting in September regarding the possibility of a split vote as follows:

"It would be really, really, really hard. If East Boston votes it down, I don't think it gets built in East Boston—but it would be almost impossible for us, but if we have a great deal of support in Revere, I don't think we'd rule out any options..."¹⁰

This was not an affirmative confirmation that SSR had prepared a Revere-only contingency plan. This was merely an acknowledgment of the practical and legal reality that it would be "almost impossible" for SSR to proceed without affirmative votes from both communities.

We agree with this assessment, and do not intend to recognize any Revere-only RFA-2 application filed by SSR as lawful or legitimate unless and until a new Revere-only vote is held. If SSR does not now voluntarily withdraw its application, it should now be pretermitted.

III. THE EXISTING RACE TRACK AT SUFFOLK DOWNS MUST LEGALLY REMAIN AS PART OF ANY FUTURE GAMING ESTABLISHMENT

A "gaming establishment" in Massachusetts includes "a gaming area and any other nongaming structure related to the gaming area and may include, but shall not be limited to, hotels, restaurants or other amenities." MGL c. 23K §24. We read this language to include *all* amenities required for the operation of a casino—including, but not limited to, parking facilities, means of ingress/egress, all landscaping and curtilage, and any other supporting physical plant structures. For reasons outlined below, this definition must also include the existing race track, almost all of which is presently located in East Boston.

One of the few things that is certain about this application as of the date of this letter is that Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC **must** maintain active racing at its track on the premises of any future gaming establishment as an ongoing condition of any license it may be awarded. SSR may not legally be awarded or maintain a gaming license without also operating its race track as a condition of the license, and this track may not be

⁹ See "The Split Decision Question," at <http://friendsofsuffolkdowns.com/2013/11/split-decision-question> (Nov. 11, 2013)

¹⁰ *Id.*

NO EASTIE CASINO

located in East Boston as part of a gaming establishment following our community's rejection of the casino proposal at Suffolk Downs.

Any applicant for a gaming license holding a racing license at the time of its application must maintain its annual live racing season; failure to do so will result in suspension of the gaming license. M.G.L. c. 23K §19(e). Such racing meetings must be held "on the premises" of the applicant's gaming establishment. M.G.L. c. 23K §24. Although these essential mandates are plain from the face of the statute, Revere's HCA further cites these provisions in support of its contractual requirement that that SSR "shall maintain the existing racing facility on the Property, subject to the permitted changes in the number of live racing days." Revere HCA Sec. 2(I), p. 17.

The language and context of this provision suggest a clear legislative intent that applicants with existing racing licenses be required to maintain their support for the thoroughbred racing industry—no matter how economically detrimental the continued existence of a track on the premises might become—rather than pursuing the more obviously profitable strategy of pivoting to a casino-only business model, as SSR is now apparently willing to do. This is consistent with the intent of other states which have permitted "racinos" around the country, all of which have determined that casinos should be profitable enough in and of themselves to maintain horse racing as a loss leader.¹¹ (We believe it worth noting that this gamble has not always paid out.¹²)

In the months prior to the referendum, Suffolk Downs encouraged residents of both host communities to support its casino bid through a promotional campaign in which it encouraged voters to "Vote Yes For Suffolk Downs." This was an obvious effort to benefit from the significant goodwill historically shared by many residents of East Boston for its 78-year-old "Hometown Favorite." Throughout this campaign, SSR representatives publicly stated that a casino was the track's only chance for survival, and that the livelihoods of its workers and the preservation of the entire Massachusetts thoroughbred racing industry¹³ hung upon this vote. We aver that it is beyond question that a desire to save the track was a powerful deciding factor for many of our neighbors who voted in favor of the casino at Suffolk Downs.

Yet, as the *Revere Journal* recently noted: **"At one point, the casino was touted as being necessary to save the track. Now, it appears the track is going to have to be separated in some fashion to save the casino."**¹⁴ We do not believe that any reasonable voter in either host community could have possibly anticipated this outcome.

We have taken the position since the date of the referendum that any new Revere-only casino plan must either move the entire 78-year-old historic race track entirely into Revere's city limits or somehow find a way

¹¹ "Money from slots has done nothing to improve horse racing," Andrew Beyer, *The Washington Post*, (March 19, 2012)

¹² *Id.*

¹³ SSR's claims on this point are directly contradicted by its own recent study of the likely effects of funds which will become available to the thoroughbred racing industry once casinos begin to open in Massachusetts. Per the terms of the Expanded Gaming Act (MGL c. 194 §§59-60), 2.5 percent of *all* state revenue generated from the gaming industry throughout the Commonwealth will be reinvested in the Massachusetts Race Horse Development Fund. According to an exhaustive study commissioned by SSR, the higher purses and benefits to the thoroughbred racing industry statewide from this fund should be sufficient to preserve the industry no matter where casinos are ultimately located. While the study's calculations were predicated upon the assumption that Suffolk Downs would ultimately obtain a Category 1 license, the funds will be available as soon as casinos begin operations in the Commonwealth no matter the locations. See "The Economic Impact of the Massachusetts Thoroughbred Equine Industry," Christiansen Capital Partners (Oct. 22, 2013) (available at <http://www.suffolkdowns.com/pdf/economicimpactofmathoroughbredIndustrystudy.pdf>)

¹⁴ "Casino In Revere Being Considered," Seth Daniel, *Revere Journal* (Nov. 13, 2013)

NO EASTIE CASINO

to proceed with its gaming license application without maintaining SSR's racing license.¹⁵ SSR COO Chip Tuttle has publicly agreed with this analysis in interviews with both the *Revere Journal*¹⁶ and the *East Boston Times-Free Press*¹⁷ since the referendum,¹⁸ and we concur with his assessment. (We do not believe that any of these options are lawful or advisable, but agree that they would be all that is left for Suffolk Downs to explore if they continue to pursue a racing license at this point.)

COO Tuttle has further likened SSR's current relationship with the track so long as it remains in East Boston to the familiar separation of church and state within American government, acknowledging that "we hope to keep the racetrack, but it can't be part of our gaming development" and suggesting that it would have to be reborn as a completely new legal entity with no connection to the Suffolk Downs casino development for the casino plan to move forward.¹⁹ We respectfully suggest that any divestiture of the race track is completely unacceptable at this late stage in the process. The Commission has recently awarded SSR a 2014 racing license in a decision dated November 14, 2013. Any attempt to transfer this license to a completely new entity solely responsible for the operation of racing meetings at Suffolk Downs would constitute an overt attempt to subvert the letter, spirit, and legislative intent of M.G.L. c. 23K §19(e).

CONCLUSION


"Ensuring public confidence in the integrity of the gaming licensing process... is the paramount objective of [the Expanded Gaming Act]." M.G.L. c. 23K §1(1). This Commission's continued review of a license application which bears no cognizable resemblance to the proposal upon which Revere and East Boston residents were called to vote on November 5th, 2013 is nothing less than a direct threat to this objective.

In light of the above, we see no lawful grounds for Sterling Suffolk Racecourse to proceed with a Revere-only gaming establishment at this time. If SSR does not voluntarily withdraw its application for a Category 1 license, we join our elected representatives in urging the Commission to pretermitt this application.

Thank you as always for your time and consideration. We look forward to personally addressing these issues at tomorrow's open meeting.

Very truly yours,

NO EASTIE CASINO


Matt Cameron, General Counsel
Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

¹⁵ See, e.g., "Foes: Revere casino would nix track," Marie Szaniszlo, *Boston Herald* (Nov. 15, 2013)

¹⁶ "Tuttle said there is a very good possibility that the track could close, or that it would operate as a separate entity with no common access points. He even said it could possibly be moved to another location." "Casino In Revere Being Considered," Seth Daniel, *Revere Journal* (Nov. 13, 2013)

¹⁷ "Suffolk Downs COO Chip Tuttle said Monday that the ownership would have to divest the racetrack as an 'amenity' in order to move forward with a Revere-only development." "Revere Being Considered for Suffolk Casino Project," John Lynds, *East Boston Times-Free Press* (Nov. 13, 2013)

¹⁸ However, in a message posted to the Friends of Suffolk Downs website on November 15th, Tuttle referenced claims that the track would likely have to be moved or closed for the casino licensing process to move forward as "distortions." friendsofsuffolkdowns.com/2013/11/future-racing

¹⁹ "Casino In Revere Being Considered," Seth Daniel, *Revere Journal* (Nov. 13, 2013)

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 3:27 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Richard Powers

Email

papered@comcast.net

Phone

(781)289-5343

Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino

Questions or Comments

Nov. 20, 2013

76 Sewall St.
Revere, MA 02151

Mr. Stephen Crosby
Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission

Dear Chairman Crosby,

It is my hope that if your board allows Suffolk Downs to move forward in the application process for a casino in Revere that all original requirements and deadlines be maintained.

For instance, while Revere voters approved a recent casino referendum, it was for a plan whose structures were predominantly in East Boston. If a new plan is to be exclusively in Revere, another vote in Revere should be required.

I personally have little faith in the ability of Suffolk Downs to operate a casino of which we can all be proud. I distinctly recall my first visit to Las Vegas in 1978. In one of the major casinos, I inquired about making a bet on a race at Suffolk Downs. After the sports book employee stopped chuckling, he explained they did not accept any action from Suffolk Downs. My point is the fact that they have operated one of the worst horse tracks in the country for decades should give public officials great pause when it comes to issuing them a casino license.

And as one who lives within a mile of all three entrances to Suffolk Downs and has resided in this community for 55 years, I do not believe that the traffic recommendations they are making go nearly far enough to protect our neighborhoods. I see problems only getting worse.

Finally, Suffolk Downs has been billing themselves as a good neighbor throughout this process. I personally never saw much of that in my 22 years as a reporter, associate editor and editor at The Revere Journal nor did I witness it while serving as director of communications for several state agencies between 1994 and my retirement in 2012.

I personally believe that the revenues generated by gaming in Massachusetts will be of great benefit to the Commonwealth and taxpayers. I just don't think Suffolk Downs is the proper steward of that trust.

Good luck to you and your colleagues as you try to reach the best decision for the most people.

Sincerely,

Richard R. Powers

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: No Eastie Casino <noeastiecasino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 8:39 PM
To: Crosby, Steve (MGC)
Cc: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC)
Subject: Re: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

One more thing ... we will be prepared to comment on the questions given, and we will provide you with a written summary of our comments by tomorrow afternoon. Thanks again.

Steve

On Tue, Nov 19, 2013 at 8:36 PM, No Eastie Casino <noeastiecasino@gmail.com> wrote:

Commissioner Crosby, et al,

Thank you for your quick reply and for making space on the agenda for us. We truly appreciate it! Matt Cameron received the questions from general counsel, and we'll look for an email tomorrow with further instructions. Please keep us posted on anything else you might need from us.

Best Regards,

Steve Holt
Communications Director
No Eastie Casino

On Tue, Nov 19, 2013 at 5:25 PM, Crosby, Steve (MGC) <steve.crosby@state.ma.us> wrote:

Representatives of No Eastie Casino—

You would be welcome to appear at our public hearing Thursday, when we expect to be discussing issues concerning the so-called "Revere only" proposal. Our general counsel will forward you the specific questions that we are looking into. Your comments should be limited to those questions.

And we will be in touch about schedule tomorrow, when we will give you our best estimate of when you might be called upon to testify.

Thank you.

Steve Crosby

From: No Eastie Casino [mailto:noeastiecasino@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 2:12 PM

To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)

Subject: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission,

Given the decisive results of the referendum in East Boston and Revere on November 5 surrounding the Suffolk Downs casino proposal, the track's apparent 11th hour attempt to "move the goalposts" across the line into Revere is desperate and in direct violation of the licensing process set forth in the gaming legislation. No Eastie Casino respectfully requests an opportunity to represent the 4,281 East Boston residents (and the 4,232 Revere residents) who voted "no" in stating our case before the Commission. Attached, please find No Eastie Casino's signed, formal request for a No Eastie Casino representative to provide a brief, narrowly tailored public comment at the Open Meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on November 21, 2013.

Please let us know if you have any questions about this request. We can be reached at this email or by phone: [857-574-0224](tel:857-574-0224). Thank you for the important work you do upholding the integrity of the licensing process you and the Legislature set forth.

Best Regards,

Matt Cameron, General Counsel

Jessica Curtis, Policy Director

Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Crosby, Steve (MGC)
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 5:26 PM
To: No Eastie Casino; MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Day, Rick (MGC)
Subject: RE: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

Representatives of No Eastie Casino—

You would be welcome to appear at our public hearing Thursday, when we expect to be discussing issues concerning the so-called "Revere only" proposal. Our general counsel will forward you the specific questions that we are looking into. Your comments should be limited to those questions.

And we will be in touch about schedule tomorrow, when we will give you our best estimate of when you might be called upon to testify.

Thank you.

Steve Crosby

From: No Eastie Casino [mailto:noeastiecasino@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 2:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)
Subject: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission,

Given the decisive results of the referendum in East Boston and Revere on November 5 surrounding the Suffolk Downs casino proposal, the track's apparent 11th hour attempt to "move the goalposts" across the line into Revere is desperate and in direct violation of the licensing process set forth in the gaming legislation. No Eastie Casino respectfully requests an opportunity to represent the 4,281 East Boston residents (and the 4,232 Revere residents) who voted "no" in stating our case before the Commission. Attached, please find No Eastie Casino's signed, formal request for a No Eastie Casino representative to provide a brief, narrowly tailored public comment at the Open Meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on November 21, 2013.

Please let us know if you have any questions about this request. We can be reached at this email or by phone: [857-574-0224](tel:857-574-0224). Thank you for the important work you do upholding the integrity of the licensing process you and the Legislature set forth.

Best Regards,

Matt Cameron, General Counsel

Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Crosby, Steve (MGC)
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 2:25 PM
To: No Eastie Casino; MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Grossman, Todd (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Subject: RE: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category

I have to deal with this to finalize agenda. Not unreasonable request, given that we are thinking about this issue. But maybe premature; would be better after we have heard what Suffolk has to say?

Thoughts?

From: No Eastie Casino [mailto:noeastiecasino@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 2:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)
Subject: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission,

Given the decisive results of the referendum in East Boston and Revere on November 5 surrounding the Suffolk Downs casino proposal, the track's apparent 11th hour attempt to "move the goalposts" across the line into Revere is desperate and in direct violation of the licensing process set forth in the gaming legislation. No Eastie Casino respectfully requests an opportunity to represent the 4,281 East Boston residents (and the 4,232 Revere residents) who voted "no" in stating our case before the Commission. Attached, please find No Eastie Casino's signed, formal request for a No Eastie Casino representative to provide a brief, narrowly tailored public comment at the Open Meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on November 21, 2013.

Please let us know if you have any questions about this request. We can be reached at this email or by phone: [857-574-0224](tel:857-574-0224). Thank you for the important work you do upholding the integrity of the licensing process you and the Legislature set forth.

Best Regards,

Matt Cameron, General Counsel
Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: No Eastie Casino <noeastiecasino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 2:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)
Subject: Request for Public Comment / Participation in 11/21 Open Meeting
Attachments: NEC Request for Public Comment at 11.21 Open Meeting.pdf

Dear Chairman Crosby and Members of the Commission,

Given the decisive results of the referendum in East Boston and Revere on November 5 surrounding the Suffolk Downs casino proposal, the track's apparent 11th hour attempt to "move the goalposts" across the line into Revere is desperate and in direct violation of the licensing process set forth in the gaming legislation. No Eastie Casino respectfully requests an opportunity to represent the 4,281 East Boston residents (and the 4,232 Revere residents) who voted "no" in stating our case before the Commission. Attached, please find No Eastie Casino's signed, formal request for a No Eastie Casino representative to provide a brief, narrowly tailored public comment at the Open Meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on November 21, 2013.

Please let us know if you have any questions about this request. We can be reached at this email or by phone: [857-574-0224](tel:857-574-0224). Thank you for the important work you do upholding the integrity of the licensing process you and the Legislature set forth.

Best Regards,

Matt Cameron, General Counsel
Jessica Curtis, Policy Director
Celeste Ribeiro Myers, Co-Chair

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 8:23 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Bob McKenzie

Email

bobmckenzie33@gmail.com

Phone

(617)501-4812

Subject

No Eastie Casino Ulterior Motive

Questions or Comments

As a Revere resident, I was shocked at the tactics used by the "no casino" crowd in East Boston. The media gave them a free pass, and nobody bothered to see their ties with efforts to repeal the statewide gaming legislation. Now that their true motives have been revealed, I hope that you are open to Revere's stand-alone application. The "No Eastie Casino" crowd used shameless fear-mongering tactics, and bullied their neighbors into a "no" vote. Please consider Revere and the Suffolk Downs bid in a fair and thoughtful manner to help us save jobs and improve our community. Thank you.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Flora Tella <floragtella@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 10:44 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs

First off I Don't perceive Suffolk Downs as an ideal location for a Casino! that said! many feel they are getting handled with kid gloves! It 's high -time for the MGC to lower the boom on Suffolk Downs they arent deservant of another bite of the Apple!

Sent from my iPad

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Carol Facella <cafcaf930@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 6:37 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Carol Facella
Subject: No License for "Revere-Only" Casino at Suffolk Downs
Attachments: No Casino - CAF letter to MA Gaming Commission.docx

Dear Chairman Stephen Crosby and Committee Members,

Please see the attached letter, regarding a request not to approve a license for a "Revere-Only" Casino at Suffolk Downs.

Thank you,

Carol A. Facella
Winthrop Resident

November 18, 2013

RE: Revere-Only Casino at Suffolk Downs

Dear Stephen Crosby, Chair of Mass Gaming Commission, and Committee Members:

The purpose of my correspondence is to share with you my concerns about a "REVERE ONLY" Casino at Suffolk Downs, and the negative impact it will have on the host and surrounding communities.

I URGE YOU NOT TO LICENSE a Suffolk Downs Casino in Revere. Please consider the serious consequences that this proposed casino will inflict on its host and adjacent communities: increased traffic, in an already congested area; greater violence, especially domestic violence and suicides; higher crime rates in prostitution, theft and fraud; increased addictions to gambling, alcohol and drugs, and all of their attendant consequences; economic, social and physical deterioration of areas and small businesses surrounding casinos; overstress on an infrastructure already overburdened; limited menial and low-paying jobs; and the devastating financial impact on many families, who can least afford to lose their paychecks and savings! Please do not subject East Boston and Winthrop residents to live with these well-documented negative consequences from a "Revere-Only" Casino. This License Approval would be especially egregious, given that East Boston voted resoundingly "No Casino at Suffolk Downs," and Winthrop had NO VOTE NOR VOICE at all, even though Suffolk Downs is within very close proximity to both entrances of our community. It is also highly questionable what, if any, benefits or revenues Winthrop will receive, since we are not defined as a "host" community! We are, however, guaranteed all of the "ILL" effects of a local casino. We want Winthrop to flourish, not become an "impact area" for a casino complex, for which we had NO VOTE NOR VOICE, and one that is geographically closer to us than it is to many other areas of Revere.

As Chair and Members of the Gaming Commission, our Community's Future and Quality of Life are in your hands. I URGE you to weigh heavily the following important concerns:

- East Boston has strongly spoken with their "No Casino" Vote. Please honor their Vote and not allow Revere to be pitted against East Boston – neighbor against neighbor. This will be truly tragic for these communities, as well as for their neighbor, Winthrop. With a "Revere-Only" Casino, East Boston will suffer all of the the "ILLS" of a casino complex, without any "perceived" benefits – this is what they VOTED AGAINST. Licensing a Revere-Only Casino will undermine the legal voting process, by "voiding" East Boston's vote. To do so would greatly compromise the principles of our valued democratic process.
- Presently, East Boston and Revere have a tremendous opportunity to unite, build consensus, and develop an economic and social vision, other than a casino complex, for this urban area. A project that will contribute to the rejuvenation and growth of these communities, not one that will lead to division and deterioration. Suffolk Downs' location, and its great access to world-class educational and research institutions, and high tech businesses, can pursue viable alternatives in partnering with businesses and industries for sustainable economic growth and

revenues. With a creative and sustainable long-term economic vision, “additional revenues” can be raised through the development of industries and businesses, not through “addictional revenues” from gamblers paying a “regenerative tax.” When gamblers and their families face financial ruin and bankruptcy, as often happens, who will be there to save them financially? Certainly not the Casino Owners, it will be us – the Tax Payers – who will bear the financial responsibility for families impoverished by gambling losses. Please help our communities not to be blinded by greed and by the illusion of “quick revenue fixes,” from casinos, when in reality, the costs will be too great for our communities of East Boston, Revere and Winthrop to bear: division, deterioration and degradation.

- Elected officials and citizens in our respective communities have espoused the top priority of education for our children, in an effort to prepare them for future entry into a competitive and potentially thriving economy, with the hope of a better quality of life. This is evidenced by Winthrop voting for a new middle-high school and by Boston’s newly-elected Mayor Walsh supporting a strong educational plan for the city. The communities of East Boston, Revere, and Winthrop are not affluent ones. Please give us the opportunity to capitalize on our children’s education, talents, skills and knowledge. Let us hold out to them a VISION for a better future with the possibility of diverse, well-paying and upwardly-mobile jobs and career opportunities. Please let us not give them the message that the best for which they can hope in their communities are menial and low-paying jobs at a casino complex at Suffolk Downs!

I would, therefore, respectfully ask that you consider these stated concerns and not license a “Revere-Only” casino at Suffolk Downs.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Yours truly,

Carol A. Facella, Winthrop Resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: JoanneNuzzo@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2013 1:52 PM
To: robert.deleo@mahouse.gov; anthony.petrucci@masenate.gov; MGCcomments (MGC);
pgill@town.winthrop.ma.us; pvarone@town.winthrop.ma.us;
pboncore@town.winthrop.ma.us; jletterie@town.winthrop.ma.us;
ndelvento@town.winthrop.ma.us; cmael@town.winthrop.ma.us;
rsanford@town.winthrop.ma.us; lcalla@town.winthrop.ma.us
Cc: cafcaf930@gmail.com
Subject: The Casino Myth

Dear State and Town Officials and the Mass Gaming Board:

After weeks of pro casino publicity, I feel compelled to urge my elected officials to consider the negative impact a casino will have on Winthrop and, in particular, on the quality of life of its residents.

My specific concerns in this regard include the following: Traffic congestion, delaying commuting times and causing increased costs from taxes and environmental pollution. Also, there is the issue of increased police requirements as evidenced by the quadrupling for crime related calls in neighboring towns to Foxwoods. Additionally, there is the potential of decreased home valuations and resulting loss of tax revenues as has happened in Ledyard, Ct., home to Foxwoods.

I feel it is morally questionable to defend casino development because of its revenue generation and job creation without offsetting against these the increased crime, environmental degradations and constriction of alternative developments. Casinos across the country are losing money, obviating the possibility of alternative development strategies. Consider the model of Assembly Square Mall in Somerville, a combination of housing and retail development resulting in almost 10,000 permanent jobs.

Absent casino development, town planners should be considering how the Suffolk Downs area could be playing to the strengths of our region, namely Education, Health Sciences, and Technology. These are the areas of expertise which have fueled and should continue to fuel the region's economic and cultural development and provide for a secure future for the next generation.

No one has yet demonstrated that the residents of Winthrop will profit either from the casino revenues or from significant full time employment. Even if this were to be true, it would not offset the negative consequences of a casino abutting our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.
Joanne E. Nuzzo, Winthrop Resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anjie <sunshynjr@juno.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 4:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: suffolk downs...
Attachments: ltr2mgc 11'15'13 rev'casino.docx

dear gaming commission, please include my comments below [also attached] to your process considering suffolk downs for a gaming license, thank U. signed, anjie preston

November 14, 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, Tenth Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

After reading about Suffolk Downs/Suffolk Sterling Racetrack's ("SD/SSR") official notification to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission ("the Commission") on a Revere-only casino plan, I'm wondering how is it possible that SD/SSR or the Commission can even consider this new plan.

The host community agreements for East Boston and Revere were based upon a partnership between SD/SSR and Caesar's Entertainment to build a Caesar's brand and styled \$1 billion resort-destination casino. Caesar's did not pass the background check and the dissolution of that partnership between SD/SSR and Caesar's should have caused the Commission to deem SD/SSR unsuitable, but it didn't. SD/SSR (barely) passed the adjudicatory hearing with a decision of suitability, albeit conditional, even though the commissioners and the Investigations & Enforcement Bureau appeared to have grave reservations on their plan.

There was the referendum vote that, according to the expanded gaming law establishing gaming in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, i.e., Mass. Gen. laws, c.194 of the Acts of 2011, specifically, [from page 28] chapter 23K, section 15(13) provided, in part:

[...] that, if the ballot question is voted in the negative, the applicant shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election; provided further, that if a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license....

The vote happened and the result was East Boston's negative vote. That means this plan is no more. There are millions at stake for the host community so it is easy to understand why Revere mayor Rizzo is salivating and wants to proceed with a new plan, but he does not and should not speak for the city of Revere's residents.

November 14, 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, Tenth Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

After reading about Suffolk Downs/Suffolk Sterling Racetrack's ("SD/SSR") official notification to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission ("the Commission") on a Revere-only casino plan, I'm wondering how is it possible that SD/SSR or the Commission can even consider this new plan.

The host community agreements for East Boston and Revere were based upon a partnership between SD/SSR and Caesar's Entertainment to build a Caesar's brand and styled \$1 billion resort-destination casino. Caesar's did not pass the background check and the dissolution of that partnership between SD/SSR and Caesar's should have caused the Commission to deem SD/SSR unsuitable, but it didn't. SD/SSR (barely) passed the adjudicatory hearing with a decision of suitability, albeit conditional, even though the commissioners and the Investigations & Enforcement Bureau appeared to have grave reservations on their plan.

There was the referendum vote that, according to the expanded gaming law establishing gaming in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, i.e., Mass. Gen. laws, c.194 of the Acts of 2011, specifically, [from page 28] chapter 23K, section 15(13) provided, in part:

[...] that, if the ballot question is voted in the negative, the applicant shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election; provided further, that if a proposed gaming establishment is situated in 2 or more cities or towns, the applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license....

The vote happened and the result was East Boston's negative vote. That means this plan is no more. There are millions at stake for the host community so it is easy to understand why Revere mayor Rizzo is salivating and wants to proceed with a new plan, but he does not and should not speak for the city of Revere's residents.

According to the gaming law, the process must begin anew for SD/SSR to be reconsidered for a gaming license and that can not happen before the December 31, 2013 deadline established – unless laws are broken and/or rules bent.

East Boston residents fought long and hard to win a "no casino" vote. It is in bad faith that SD/SSR is trying to work around the referendum, gaming law and host community agreements in order to have their way. This is not fair and I hope the Commission will see SD/SSR's new effort for what it is... sour grapes. Further, I hope the Commission disqualifies SD/SSR as an applicant in issuance of this

round of gaming licenses. SD/SSR should not be allowed to reapply for a gaming license until it lawfully satisfies the established process. Please follow the law in doing your job!

Sincerely,

Anjie Preston, East Boston resident

:dp

According to the gaming law, the process must begin anew for SD/SSR to be reconsidered for a gaming license and that can not happen before the December 31, 2013 deadline established – unless laws are broken and/or rules bent.

East Boston residents fought long and hard to win a “no casino” vote. It is in bad faith that SD/SSR is trying to work around the referendum, gaming law and host community agreements in order to have their way. This is not fair and I hope the Commission will see SD/SSR’s new effort for what it is... sour grapes. Further, I hope the Commission disqualifies SD/SSR as an applicant in issuance of this round of gaming licenses. SD/SSR should not be allowed to reapply for a gaming license until it lawfully satisfies the established process. Please follow the law in doing your job!

Sincerely,
Anjie Preston, Long-time East Boston resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Sara Sprinkhuizen <sara.sprinkhuizen@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:39 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston residents who defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at a NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Sara Sprinkhuizen
Everett street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Claudia S <sierraclaudia617@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Mayor's Office ; carlo.basile@masenate.gov ; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov ;
nthonny.Petruccelli@masenate.gov ; MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

As a 22 year resident of East Boston who wants to stay in East Boston with her 13 year old daughter, I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities. East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Claudia Sierra

Sent via BlackBerry from T-Mobile

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Alyssa Vangeli <avangeli@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 9:31 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere casino comments

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Alyssa Vangeli
198 Everett Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Miles Lang-Kennedy <mlang-kennedy@revere.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 4:43 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Dan Rizzo
Subject: Letter from Mayor Rizzo to the Mass Gaming Commission
Attachments: Mayor Rizzo Letter MGC 11.13.2013.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached to this email a letter from Mayor Rizzo from the City of Revere.

Thanks,

Miles Kennedy
Chief of Staff
Office of Mayor Daniel Rizzo
781-286-8111
mlang-kennedy@revere.org

The City of Revere Massachusetts



City Hall

281 Broadway
Revere, MA 02151
(781) 286-8110
(781) 286-8199 Fax

Daniel Rizzo
Mayor

Office of the Mayor

November 13, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Chairman Stephen Crosby
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street, Suite 720
Boston, MA 02109

RE: Suffolk Downs

Dear Chairman Crosby:

For nearly 80 years, the City of Revere has been a host community to Suffolk Downs. When asked last week to continue that relationship, the voters of Revere overwhelmingly supported the siting of a gaming establishment at the Suffolk Downs property. More than 11,000 voters turned out for the November 5, 2013 City Election, with over 60% voting "yes" on the casino ballot question.

I submit this letter to express Revere's ongoing, enthusiastic support for the Suffolk Downs project. Since the evening of November 5th, my administration has been working closely with Suffolk Downs on a plan to locate a resort gaming establishment on the Revere side of the Suffolk Downs property, consistent with the affirmative land use referendum in Revere.

Please note that the City's ballot question asked if voters would permit a gaming establishment at the Suffolk Downs property off of Winthrop Avenue in Revere. In addition, the published summary of the City's Host Community Agreement, which was printed on every ballot, clearly stated that the Agreement would be re-opened if the casino was developed on the Revere side of the Suffolk Downs property. Finally, Revere's ballot was silent with respect to Suffolk Downs' gaming operator.

As a result, Suffolk Downs may proceed with a new version of its project without having to ask Revere citizens to approve it a second time. My administration is currently considering


what amendments to the City's Host Community Agreement will be appropriate to accommodate Suffolk Downs' project in Revere.

A first class gaming establishment at Suffolk Downs will bring needed economic development opportunities, municipal revenue and employment to thousands of local families. With 4,000 permanent jobs and 2,500 construction jobs at stake, I have been proud to support this project, both before and after November 5th.

I appreciate the Gaming Commission's independence and integrity as applied to the casino licensing process. I respectfully request that you keep the voice of our City's voters in mind when considering Suffolk Downs' plans for Revere.

I thank the Gaming Commission for its consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Daniel Rizzo
Mayor

cc: Speaker Robert DeLeo
Senator Anthony Petruccelli
Representative Kathi-Anne Reinstein
Revere City Council
Brian Falk, Esq.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: stiegails@aol.com <eastiegails@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 11:12 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs Revere casino proposal

Chairman Crosby and members of the Gaming Commission:

The voters have made their voices loud and clear in voting down a casino while Revere did not. People knew that it was do or die when two communities voted the same day. The No's were recorded loud and clear in East Boston which brought the end to the game of a casino in Revere at Suffolk Downs. Those were the rules.

We expect your commission and our elected officials to stand by those rules and hold firm as legislation mandated. To end run this process would not be good for your commission's integrity and those of our elected officials.

Senator Anthony Petrucci, Representative Carlo Basile and City Councillor Salvatore Lamattina have issued statements stating that they will stand with the results of the vote and the people in their districts, especially Senator Petrucci who also represents Revere and Winthrop.

We expect no less from all of you and appreciate the strong support of our electeds in East Boston.

The outgoing Mayor of the City of Boston is considered a lame duck mayor at this point, I would gather, so we will look to Mayor Elect Marty Walsh to also stand with the people's vote.

Gail C. Miller
232 Orient Avenue
East Boston, MA

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Phil Gutowski <phil@liveeastie.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 10:42 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

--

Phil Gutowski

Owner



Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Kougeas George <georgekougeas@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 5:57 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: suffolk downs casino is dead

Commissioners,

The Suffolk Downs bid failed on many levels. Enough has been done to help them succeed. No more! They lost, it is over. They are not above the law.

Sincerely,
George Kougeas

George Kougeas
88 White Street
Boston, MA 02128
617-569-9317
georgekougeas@comcast.net

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Steve Anthony <steven.m.anthony@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 10:56 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: HEDGING THEIR BETS (and reputation also)

I am writing as one of many East Bostonians that spoke loudly and clearly on Nov.5th. Your commission laid out clear rules in accordance with the bill that spelled out how a license might be considered or rejected. The folks from Suffolk Downs lost in a landslide. I say landslide because, as I'm sure you have surmised, if we can win by 4% having been outspent by aprox. 40 to 1, then with a real budget it would have been a massacre for the pro casino folks. "MOVING THE GOAL POSTS" is a perfect analogy. I would imagine that you folks would also be insulted that Suffolk Downs dismisses the intent of the law and waves you off saying...." yeah, yeah, yeah.." Please tell me the letter and intent of the law that would consider a proposal to operate a casino in our state,.....or not...was not a joke. Tell me you are thoughtful, serious people that would be as incensed if someone pulled this b.s. in your community. Please issue a statement that puts this nonsense to rest. What am I to conclude if this applicant is given further consideration having lost already fair and square? The speaker of the house does not live in Eastie. I am sure he means well in an attempt to keep the track alive. The people have spoken. What about you?

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Jason Burrell <r.jason.burrell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 10:16 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Jason Burrell
187 Everett Street

East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lauren Wilson <lwilson1256@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 9:36 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: mayor@cityofboston.gov; Anthony.Petruccelli@masenate.gov;
Carlo.Basile@mahouse.gov; Martin.Walsh@mahouse.gov;
Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov
Subject: New Suffolk Downs proposal

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am appalled that Suffolk Downs' new proposal for a casino technically restricting gaming activities to just over the town line in Revere is being considered by the gaming commission. A revised plan would apparently still be located on the site of Suffolk Downs, and so it would not have any less of an impact on our community. To welcome this as a valid proposal is to insult all the residents of East Boston who turned out to vote last Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs may be able to pull together a hasty proposal by the deadline, but there is not enough time to create a thoughtful and careful plan that is mindful of its host and surrounding communities. East Boston will be heavily impacted and does not welcome a casino at Suffolk Downs.

I find it hard to understand how a business with so much of their property in East Boston, with an East Boston address, and whose buildings would be at least partly located in East Boston can get away with ignoring our vote simply by moving the gaming tables into another room. Frankly, I feel we've been tricked and it is a slap in the face to our community. (A community that just a few weeks ago Suffolk Downs proudly claimed to be a member of.) If anyone is wondering why Massachusetts communities are rejecting casinos in many parts of the state, it is in part because of shady moves such as this one.

I very much appreciate the fairness and thoughtfulness with which the gaming commission has assumed its responsibility to implement the new gaming law to date. However, with this move from Suffolk Downs, we are losing trust in this process. I strongly and respectfully urge you to reject any revised casino proposal from Suffolk Downs. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lauren Wilson
841 Saratoga Street #1
East Boston, MA 02128
617-953-6287

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Nick Moulaison <nickmoulaison@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 8:54 PM
To: revere_mayor@revere.org
Cc: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs

Mayor Daniel Rizzo

Revere City Hall

281 Broadway

Revere, MA 02125

Dear Mr. Mayor,

As a concerned citizen of Revere who voted for the development of a casino/resort, I am writing to you to re-echo that I advocate moving forward to a Revere based casino/resort project. 6,700 residents in Revere voted with a “YES” vote and we want our votes to count.

We want more jobs, opportunities and revenue that will benefit our community. Suffolk Downs has been an excellent and very generous neighbor during the 78 years it has been hosting legalized gambling in the form of horse racing in Revere and East Boston, Massachusetts.

Many of the citizens of Revere work for/at Suffolk Downs and would like to preserve their jobs. Revere has passed a “land use” referendum, the city of Revere signed a host community agreement with Suffolk Downs, and Suffolk Downs has been found suitable by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. We eagerly await to discover who will be the new managing partner, as well as the designs for the Casino in Revere.

In closing we enthusiastically support Suffolk Downs Casino project to move forward in Revere. Yes for Suffolk Downs !

Sincerely,

Nick Moulaison Sr

57 Milano Avenue #2

Revere, Ma. 02151

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Bethany Platt <bethany.platt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 8:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Bethany Platt
412 Sumner Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: oriana6368@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:39 PM
To: revere mayor
Cc: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Yes for Suffolk Downs!
Attachments: suffolk downs revere.doc

Dear Mr.Mayor Rizzo,

I have attached a letter to voice my stand on going forward with the possibility to bring a Casino plan at Suffolk Downs for Revere. I already voiced my opinion when I voted 'Yes' on Tuesday, Nov 5th as well as 6700 other voters in Revere. We are behind Suffolk Downs for Revere all the way!!!

Sincerely,
Matilda Bonfardeci

Mayor Daniel Rizzo

Revere City Hall

281 Broadway

Revere, MA 02125

Dear Mr. Mayor,

As a concerned citizen of Revere who voted for the development of a casino/resort, I am writing to you to re-echo that I advocate moving forward to a Revere based casino/resort project. 6,700 residents in Revere voted with a “YES” vote and we want our votes to count.

We want more jobs, opportunities and revenue that will benefit our community. Suffolk Downs has been an excellent and very generous neighbor during the 78 years it has been hosting legalized gambling in the form of horse racing in Revere and East Boston, Massachusetts.

Many of the citizens of Revere work for/at Suffolk Downs and would like to preserve their jobs. Revere has passed a “land use” referendum, the city of Revere signed a host community agreement with Suffolk Downs, and Suffolk Downs has been found suitable by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. We eagerly await to discover who will be the new managing partner, as well as the designs for the Casino in Revere.

In closing we enthusiastically support Suffolk Downs Casino project to move forward in Revere. Yes to more Jobs! Yes to more Revenue for the City of Revere! Yes to Suffolk Downs!

Yes! Yes! Yes!!!

Sincerely,

Matilda Bonfardeci

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Tom Clackett <tomclackett@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Fwd: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Thomas Clackett

--

Tom's Home Renovations, Inc.

418 Sumner St
East Boston, MA 02128
Cell: 857.829.0702

The greatest compliment you can give us is a referral.

For Tom's Home Renovations' news and photos, check us out on:

Our Website: www.tomshomerenovations.com

or

Facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/TomsHomeRenovations>

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: John Rogers <johnrogers4321@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Personal Letter of Concern

To Whom it may Concern,

My name is John Rogers. I am a resident of East Boston as well as a teacher here. I wanted to take the time to write you a personal letter to express my concern.

I support the people's decision from the November 5th vote. Now with the news that Suffolk Downs may push through with a Revere only proposal I can't help but be overwhelmed with feelings of alarm. If the people of East Boston cast their vote 56% "NO" to 44% "YES" why continue to entertain the idea of a Casino on their property?

I did some research and found this law: *if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13)*. Therefore why is there still any discussion whatsoever? Please deny any future proposals finagled by the Suffolk Downs administration.

The decision of us East Bostonian (despite \$ 2,000,000 invented by Suffolk Downs) clearly voices our opinion on the Casino issue. I am vehemently encouraging you to honor and uphold our democratic decision against the Suffolk Downs casino.

Thank you for taking the time to read this heartfelt letter,
John Rogers M.Ed.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Nancy Burns <nancyburns@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 6:23 PM
To: revere_mayor@revere.org
Cc: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Mayor Daniel Rizzo
Revere City Hall
281 Broadway
Revere, MA 02125

Dear Mr. Mayor,

As a citizen of Revere who voted for the development of a casino/resort, I am writing to you to say that I advocate moving forward to a Revere based casino/resort project. the majority in Revere voted with a "YES" vote and we want our votes to count.

We want more jobs, opportunities and revenue that will benefit our community. Suffolk Downs has been an excellent and very generous neighbor during the 78 years it has been hosting legalized gambling in the form of horse racing in Revere and East Boston, Massachusetts.

Many of the citizens of Revere work for/at Suffolk Downs and would like to preserve their jobs. Revere has passed a "land use" referendum, the city of Revere signed a host community agreement with Suffolk Downs, and Suffolk Downs has been found suitable by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. We eagerly await to discover who will be the new managing partner, as well as the designs for the Casino in Revere.

In closing we enthusiastically support Suffolk Downs Casino project to move forward in Revere. Yes for Suffolk Downs !

Sincerely
Nancy Burns

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Loretta <rettaric@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 6:01 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere casino

Dear Mass Gaming Commission:

As a resident of Revere, I wish to express my displeasure at the attempts by Suffolk Downs to try and change the location of the proposed casino. When I voted last Tuesday, the proposal on the ballot indicated the casino would be built in East Boston. The new proposal sounds nothing like the ballot proposal--rather it sounds like a bait and switch or perhaps, just a desperate measure. Either way, it was not what I was lead to believe when I voted.

My understanding was that unless both Revere and East Boston approved the casino, then there would be no further pursuit of it.

The fact that Suffolk Downs doesn't have a casino partner at this time, and the resounding East Boston defeat of the referendum, I respectfully ask you to turn down any request by Suffolk Downs to attempt to build a casino.

Thank you
Loretta LaCentra
30 John Ave
Revere MA 02151

Sent from my iPad

From: Jane O'Reilly <oreillyjane05@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 3:50 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is illegal.

From: Jane O'Reilly <oreillyjane05@gmail.com>
Subject: **Revere Casino is illegal.**
Date: November 12, 2013 3:15:31 PM EST
To: mgcomments@state.ma.us

Subject line: Revere Casino is Illegal

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5. I am one of those voters.

And I am a member of No Eastie Casino.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

I find it both astonishing and frightening that discussions about a Suffolk Downs casino, in or near East Boston, continue. the law is clear,

sincerely,

jane o'reilly
150 orleans st Apt 407
east boston, ma 02128

Contact Info for the Mass. Gaming Commission:

--

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: JOHN BOYCE <rockportdesign@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 3:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Subject: The Suffolk Downs move to establish a casino in Revere

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere-only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Thanks,

Jack Boyce

Jack Boyce
156 Porter Street, Unit #410
East Boston, MA 02128

PLEASE NOTE NEW ADDRESS:
156 Porter Street, Unit #425
East Boston, MA 02128

617.568.2501 W
617.510.0667 C

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Julia Burrell <julia.c.burrell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:48 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Tanya Hahnel
Subject: Re: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am also one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted **NO** and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Please allow me to echo my neighbor Tanya Hahnel's sentiments by stating:

"Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license."

Now, in my own words...

If our clear and resounding "NO" vote has absolutely no bearing, what is the point of democracy? I implore you to end this game of semantics and cease your consideration of Suffolk Downs for a gaming license. The people of East Boston AND Revere deserve better than a casino.

Sincerely,
Julia Burrell
187 Everett Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: BOM <bom@bracque.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:47 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Revere Casino

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the East Boston residents that is against building a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Imramsjah M.J. van der Bom, PhD
257 Everett street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: littlesnowfly@gmail.com on behalf of Carolyn Little <carolyn@livethrive.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Little
410 Sumner St.
East Boston, MA 02128

--

Carolyn Little, MA,RYT,HHC

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Emily Martin <emilyhyman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:30 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Emily Hyman
273 Webster Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Tanya Hahnel <thahnel1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:16 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Elected Officials and Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am one of the 4,281 East Boston voters who voted NO and defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Hours and hours of my time, and my neighbors' time, went into attending meetings about the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal and helping to ensure that everyone in our community understood what was going on so that our entire community could be a part of the process and understand the major impacts of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Through this process, which was long and drawn out and exhausting for our community, East Boston arrived at NO vote on November 5th for a casino at Suffolk Downs.

Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal at the Suffolk Downs site is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. I am outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

We also call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

Sincerely,
Tanya Hahnel
551 Sumner Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: tkmaddal@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:14 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Revere Casino is Illegal

-----Original Message-----

From: tkmaddal <tkmaddal@aol.com>
To: mgcomments <mgcomments@state.ma.us>
Sent: Tue, Nov 12, 2013 2:10 pm
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Subject line: Revere Casino is Illegal

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Karen M Maddalena

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Bonnie Rachel Lutz <bonnierachel.lutz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: Revere casino is illegal

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Bonnie Lutz

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: liz nofziger <nofzilla@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 1:55 PM
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

Dear Gaming Commission and my elected officials,

I am writing on behalf of myself and the 4,280 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

I, along with No Eastie Casino, call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Thank you for upholding the law as you have written and allowing a neighborhood a voice in its future.

My best regards,

Mary Elizabeth (Liz) Nofziger
109 Lexington Street
East Boston, MA 02128
617.504.1237

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: tkmaddal@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 1:53 PM
To: MGCComments (MGC)
Subject: Fwd: ATT:Mass Gaming Commission

-----Original Message-----

From: tkmaddal <tkmaddal@aol.com>
To: constituent.services <constituent.services@state.ma.us>; mgccomments <mgccomments@state.ma.us>; enrique.zuniga <enrique.zuniga@state.ma.us>; stephen.crosby <stephen.crosby@state.ma.us>; Gayle.Cameron <Gayle.Cameron@state.ma.us>; james.mchugh <james.mchugh@state.ma.us>; bruce.stebbins <bruce.stebbins@state.ma.us>; john.ziembra <john.ziembra@state.ma.us>; Robert.DeLeo <Robert.DeLeo@mahouse.gov>; Therese.Murray <Therese.Murray@masenate.gov>; elections <elections@sec.state.ma.us>; cis <cis@sec.state.ma.us>; ago <ago@state.ma.us>; mayor <mayor@cityofboston.gov>; revere_mayor <revere_mayor@revere.org>; Anthony.Petrucelli <Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov>; Carlo.Basile <Carlo.Basile@mahouse.gov>; Martin.Walsh <Martin.Walsh@mahouse.gov>; HCAC <HCAC@cityofboston.gov>; elizabeth.dellorusso <elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov>; Stephen.Murphy <Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov>; info <info@michelleforboston.com>; mflaherty <mflaherty@apslaw.com>; Salvatore.LaMattina <Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov>; Bill.Linehan <Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov>; Frank.Baker <Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov>; Charles.Yancey <Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov>; Rob.Consalvo <Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov>; matthew.omalley <matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov>; Tito.Jackson <Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov>; Michael.Ross <Michael.Ross@cityofboston.gov>; John.R.Connolly <John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov>; Ayanna.Pressley <Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov>; elizabeth.dellorusso <elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov>
Sent: Fri, Nov 8, 2013 3:09 pm
Subject: ATT:Mass Gaming Commission

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 4,180. of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino. By voting "no" on Tuesday, I and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community registered on Tuesday. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,
Karen M Maddalena

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Evelyn Jimenez <ejimenez0507@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 1:51 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere-only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Evelyn M. Jimenez

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MacLean, Renee <renee.maclea@nechv.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 1:14 PM
To: Crosby, Steve (MGC); MGCcomments (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: Revere Casino IS ILLEGAL!!

Importance: High

We have Commissioner Crosby's own words recorded & televised...

*Chairman Crosby @MassGamingComm said **"if (the vote) isn't successful, it's over."***

An Open Letter To Our Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission:

I am writing on behalf of the **4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.**

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Ms. Renée MacLean

Member of "No Eastie Casino"
Life Long Resident of East Boston

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Elizabeth Schulz <easchulz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 12:37 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC)
Subject: Revere Casino is Illegal!

To: My Elected Officials and The Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am writing on behalf of the 4,281 East Boston voters who soundly defeated the ill-conceived proposal for a casino at Suffolk Downs on November 5.

Suffolk Downs' casino proposal failed. The developer was unable to choose or properly vet a casino operator. Unambiguously located in both East Boston and Revere, the developer failed to win the East Boston vote. Massachusetts law clearly states that if a proposed casino is located in more than one city or town, it must win a referendum vote in both communities, M.G.L. c. 23K, § 15(13). East Boston said NO; Suffolk Downs' casino application is dead.

Suffolk Downs is now trying to circumvent the law by suggesting it can simply "move the goalposts" to the Revere side, but a Revere-only casino is not what residents of East Boston or Revere were called to vote for. East Boston voters said "no" to the impacts that a Suffolk Downs casino would bring, and a Revere-only casino will create the same impacts. Enough is enough - Suffolk Downs is no longer a legitimate contender. Any attempt to move forward with a Revere- only casino proposal is a deliberate effort to disenfranchise East Boston voters and circumvent the clear intent of the law. No Eastie Casino is outraged this idea could even be entertained.

East Boston residents expect and demand our elected officials to uphold and enforce the law, stand for the will of the people, and reject Suffolk Downs' last ditch effort to install a casino in our community.

No Eastie Casino calls on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to adhere to the proper licensing procedures, M.G.L. c. 23K, 205 CMR, and application deadlines previously set forth.

The law is clear and the voters have spoken. We insist that Suffolk Downs be immediately removed from consideration for a gaming license.

We will not tolerate any breach of the law or the public process. We will continue to fight to keep East Boston safe for families and small businesses. We will not stop until this threat to our community has been removed once and for all.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Schulz

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Claudia Correa <claudiaycorrea@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 8:44 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Please listen to Revere and its votes.

Members of the gaming commission,

My name is Claudia Yaneth and I am writing you to please consider Revere as one of the best, if not the best location to have the casino. My entire family lives in Revere, we love it, but it is just sad to see so many empty lofts, pieces of land, stores and even the beach itself is very sad during most days of the year. We need the jobs and the benefits and we would love to be part of generating profit to our families, city and the state. We understand and respect EB's position, probably they don't need the jobs and revenues as much as we do, but they should also consider and respect our vote, when I first became able to vote I was very happy because my voice could be heard through the democracy, but now I'm sad to hear that another city could want to stop many others who want in their own city. Please consider also saving the track, where my friend Estefania has worked for many years with some elderly folks. Thank you so very much for taking the time to read and consider mine and my family's message.

Regards,

Claudia Yaneth C.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Lee <ayah519@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:45 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Suffolk Downs & Revere Casino

I am an East Boston Resident and I write to give my support to Suffolk Downs and the City of Revere to have the race track continue and the Casino built in Revere. I voted YES for an Eastie casino, it did not happen so I am giving my support to the City of Revere. I lived in Revere for 30 years, been in East Boston for the past 15 years. My husband was born and raised in Eastie. The horse track has been a fixture in Eastie for as long as I can remember. I love hearing him talk about Suffolk Downs from when he was a kid. I would love to see a higher class of horses be able to race at SD, I remember when the great Cigar and Skip Away came to race, it was so exciting. I am not a gambler on the horses, just love the thrill of horse racing and the horses. I do however love to play the slot machines. Please given consideration to Suffolk Downs to continue racing and do whatever they need to do to build the casino on Revere only property.

Lee McKenney

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Michaelann Bewsee <michaelannb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 12:24 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)
Subject: No Western Mass Casino

Dear Gaming Commissioners:

I'm writing to let you know I strongly oppose placing a casino in Springfield, or anywhere in Western Mass. A casino will do far more harm than good for Springfield, Longmeadow and other surrounding communities. Recent votes have proven that the residents of Western Mass do not want a casino here.

Putting development time and resources into casinos stultifies the imagination for other, more community-centered solutions to underemployment.

Thank you for your time,

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Bonnie Rachel Lutz <bonnierachel.lutz@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Constituent Services (GOV); MGCComments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); robert.deleo@mahouse.gov; therese.murray@masenate.gov; elections@sec.state.ma.us; Williams, Jeff; Email Correspondence (AGO); mayor@cityofboston.gov; revere_mayor@revere.org; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; martin.walsh@mahouse.gov; HCAC@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov; Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov; info@michelleforboston.com; mflaherty@apslaw.com; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov; Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov; Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov; Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov; matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov; Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov; Ross, Michael (City Council); Mark.Ciommo@cityofboston.gov; Arroyo, Felix; John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov; Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: No Revere Casino!

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 1,480 of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino. By voting "no" on Tuesday, I and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community registered on Tuesday. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

Bonnie Rachel Lutz

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Cheryl Sullivan <cheryls23@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 2:25 PM
To: Constituent Services (GOV); MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Robert.DeLeo@mahouse.gov; Therese.Murray@masenate.gov; elections@sec.state.ma.us; Williams, Jeff; Email Correspondence (AGO); mayor@cityofboston.gov; revere_mayor@revere.org; Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov; Carlo.Basile@mahouse.gov; Martin.Walsh@mahouse.gov; HCAC@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov; Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov; info@michelleforboston.com; mflaherty@apslaw.com; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov; Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov; Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov; Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov; matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov; Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov; Michael.Ross@cityofboston.gov; Mark.Ciommo@cityofboston.gov; Felix.Arroyo@cityofboston.gov; John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov; Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: No Casino at Suffolk Downs
Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials:

I am a resident of East Boston. I was proud to cast my vote against allowing a casino at Suffolk Downs. I feel strongly that a casino at Suffolk Downs would be a detriment to my community.

I am disappointed that my elected officials have not stood up and congratulated the efforts of the grassroots campaign that led the community to reject casino plans at Suffolk Downs.

I am outraged that my vote is being ignored and that Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with me, your constituent, instead of the wealthy casino developers to RESPECT THE VOTE MY COMMUNITY REGISTERED on November 5th. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

Cheryl Sullivan
150 Orleans Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Anna Kondratenok <anna.kondra@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 1:26 PM
To: Constituent Services (GOV); MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); robert.deleo@mahouse.gov; therese.murray@masenate.gov; elections@sec.state.ma.us; Williams, Jeff; Email Correspondence (AGO); mayor@cityofboston.gov; revere_mayor@revere.org; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; martin.walsh@mahouse.gov; HCAC@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov; Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov; info@michelleforboston.com; mflaherty@apslaw.com; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov; Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov; Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov; Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov; matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov; Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov; Ross, Michael (City Council); Mark.Ciommo@cityofboston.gov; Arroyo, Felix; John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov; Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Casino in Revere or East Boston
Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 1,480 of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino.

I voted "no" on Tuesday, myself, my husband, and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community and myself registered on Tuesday.

I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

Anna Kondratenok

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: John Casamassima <john.casamassima@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 1:15 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Fwd: Casino

Categories: Purple Category

Please excuse any typos, this was sent from my iPhone.

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Casamassima <john.casamassima@gmail.com>
Date: November 8, 2013 at 1:13:22 PM EST
To: "michael.ross@cityofboston.gov" <michael.ross@cityofboston.gov>
Cc: "noeastiecasino@gmail.com" <noeastiecasino@gmail.com>
Subject: Casino

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 4,180 of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino. By voting "no" on Tuesday, I and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community registered on Tuesday. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

John Casamassima
East Boston

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: db <beckerand@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Constituent Services (GOV); MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Robert.DeLeo@mahouse.gov; Therese.Murray@masenate.gov; elections@sec.state.ma.us; Williams, Jeff; Email Correspondence (AGO); mayor@cityofboston.gov; revere_mayor@reverer.org; Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov; Carlo.Basile@mahouse.gov; Martin.Walsh@mahouse.gov; HCAC@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov; Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov; info@michelleforboston.com; mflaherty@apslaw.com; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov; Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov; Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov; Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov; matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov; Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov; "Ross, Michael (City Council)"; Mark.Ciommo@cityofboston.gov; "Arroyo, Felix"; John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov; Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: New Suffolk Downs Revere Only Casino Development
Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 4,180 of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino. By voting "no" on Tuesday, I and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community registered on Tuesday. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

David Becker

156 Porter St.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Peter D <taxpro54@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Constituent Services (GOV); MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); stephen.crosby@state.ma.us; Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); robert.deleo@mahouse.gov; therese.murray@masenate.gov; elections@sec.state.ma.us; Williams, Jeff; Email Correspondence (AGO); mayor@cityofboston.gov; revere_mayor@revere.org; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; martin.walsh@mahouse.gov; HCAC@cityofboston.gov; elizabeth.dellorusso@cityofboston.gov; Stephen.Murphy@cityofboston.gov; info@michelleforboston.com; mflaherty@apslaw.com; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; Bill.Linehan@cityofboston.gov; Frank.Baker@cityofboston.gov; Charles.Yancey@cityofboston.gov; Rob.Consalvo@cityofboston.gov; matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov; Tito.Jackson@cityofboston.gov; Ross, Michael (City Council); Mark.Ciommo@cityofboston.gov; Arroyo, Felix; John.R.Connolly@cityofboston.gov; Ayanna.Pressley@cityofboston.gov
Cc: noeastiecasino@gmail.com
Subject: NO EASTIE CASINO
Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and my Boston Elected Officials,

As an East Boston resident, I am outraged that my vote -- and the votes of 4,180 of my neighbors -- is being ignored and Suffolk Downs is apparently moving forward with a proposal for a Revere-only casino. By voting "no" on Tuesday, I and the majority of my neighbors were emphatically rejecting the false promises of a casino and the negative impacts it would bring to our way of life. A Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts to my roads, East Boston families, and small businesses as the proposal we voted down on Tuesday.

Suffolk Downs needed to have received the support of both East Boston and Revere to move forward with its gaming application. East Boston registered a convincing "no" to the ill-conceived casino idea. Suffolk Downs' gaming application is effectively moot, and to suggest otherwise makes a mockery of the gaming law and my vote.

I call on you, a servant of the citizens of the Commonwealth, to stand with their constituents over wealthy casino developers and respect the vote my community registered on Tuesday. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop entertaining any discussion by Suffolk Downs for a Revere-only casino. At stake is not only the rule of law and credibility of our elected officials and the Gaming Commission, but the very future of the neighborhood my neighbors and I voted on Tuesday to protect.

Best Regards,

Peter DeBilio
Longtime Resident and Voter of Boston

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:25 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Jean Sigourney

Email

jamod3m@aol.com

Phone

(781)581-0609

Subject

Casino

Questions or Comments

Please consider the possible disruption to the Blue Line and access to the Airport in weighing the pros and cons of a casino at or near Suffolk Downs or Wonderland.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 8:31 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Scott Sagan

Email

ssagan@lgallp.com

Phone

(781)249-5258

Subject

Revere

Questions or Comments

I was under the impression that to proceed with the Suffolk Downs casino project required that both Revere and East Boston vote favorably for the project. The vote was held and while it prevailed in Revere it was defeated in East Boston. Please do not allow the project to continue. The Revere mayor knew of the parameters in advance of the election and the outcome did not go in his favor. It is time to move on to Everett or Milford.

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: pjfj@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 4:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Re: Revere MA needs and wants the Casino

Dear Sir/Madam:

As the votes indicated, Revere, wants a Casino in its city and looks forward to the revenue it will generate to build schools and roads and give us the opportunity for our city and Revere Beach to thrive and grow into a world famous vacation destination. Mass Gaming Commission should consider a Casino solely in the city of Revere and work toward effectuating same. Suffolk Downs has been an excellent neighbor and resident in our city for over 78 years and should not be denied a license just because East Boston does not want a Casino in its city. Many of our residents are employed by Suffolk Down Race Track. The Track can not continue without the revenue from the Casino. Thus hundreds of jobs would be lost.

Thank you for your consideration
Paula M. Jeffrey
a concerned citizen and resident of Revere

From: "Mass Gaming Commission" <mgccomments@state.ma.us>
To: pjfj@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2013 4:25:27 PM
Subject: Meeting Notification and Agenda: November 7, 2013



November 5, 2013

Our Mission

The mission of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission is to create a fair, transparent, and participatory process for

Greetings,

MassGaming would like to thank you for your ongoing participation and interest in our efforts to successfully implement the expanded gaming law.

[Latest MassGaming Updates](#)

implementing the expanded gaming law passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in November, 2011.

[Join Our Mailing List!](#)

[Forward to a Friend](#)

[Meeting Notification and Agenda 11.7.13](#)

For your convenience, MassGaming provides a LIVE STREAM of every meeting on the homepage of its website at [MassGaming.com](#).

In addition, MassGaming invites you to follow along and participate with live meeting updates via Twitter at @MassGamingComm.

Mass Gaming Commission | (617) 979-8400 | mgcomments@state.ma.us |

[Forward this email](#)



This email was sent to pjfi@comcast.net by mgcomments@state.ma.us | [Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).
Mass Gaming Commission | 84 State Street | 10th Floor | Boston | MA | 02109



Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 9:23 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Stephen Brown

Email

twisted041@gmail.com

Phone

(617)302-7161

Subject

Revere

Questions or Comments

In light of the recent vote by East Boston residents to reject the casino proposal put forward by Suffolk Downs (SD). The management of the horsetrack has decided to explore a Revere-only option to work around the processes outlined by the Commission. It would be a mistake and an unfair slap in the face to the residents of Boston to allow this to continue.

When SD sought to build the majority of their development in Boston, input was still taken from Revere as a host community. They entered into an agreement with Revere as a host community as well. Now that the vote has shifted to a Revere-dominated suggestion, the will of the people in East Boston should be ignored and not treated as a host community?

Also, at the very least, given how the SD proposal has fallen apart, it seems imprudent for the Commission to consider SD as a viable candidate with viable approval. The residents of Revere voted on a package that will no longer exist, a development/site plan that will need to change, and a currently unidentified developer. What exactly did they vote on that will still be true when or if SD can scrounge another plan in the upcoming two months.

Your mission statement says that collectively, you are tasked with "creat[ing] a fair, transparent, and participatory process" with regards to future gambling developments. The process has spoken, will you let SD skirt the rules and act in bad faith to the community they have claimed to represent for 78 years?

AT WHAT COST(S)?

BY

JOHN RIBEIRO JR.

Gambling is not a Fruit of Our Labor. It is the hope to gain from someone else's loss. That loss will be our own.

There are many ways that we will lose; first our money. The Casino is in the business of influence and seduction. The Casino will be an attractive and mesmerizing environment where it will encourage us to stay until we lose our money and the equity in our homes. The Casino will provide delicious buffets and happy hours, with great entertainment options—it will be a spectacular destination. Their goal is for us to remain there as long as possible, so we can spend our money (or use “borrowed” money). We will chase this elusive hope of winning while someone else is losing.

The Casino exists to make money without producing any commodity or product of intrinsic value—*The slot machines are preprogrammed to pay off on a schedule that will benefit the house*. We cannot win. The slot machine works for the House: it doles out rewards like we do to rats in a maze. Those most deprived will work harder and spend more money to get less, and they eventually lose everything. The Casino exists to feed itself.

The Casino will cannibalize the small family owned businesses here in East Boston. These businesses were built and grown at a tremendous cost and labor; so that families can pass a legacy onto their children. These existing businesses employ workers who earn a livelihood and pay taxes. How many jobs will be lost, if The Casino is built in our neighborhood? We have not factored this into the jobs equation; but we must. The Casino will not just cost us jobs, but our health too.

We already suffer from a higher than normal rate of respiratory infections and/or diseases. Because of the pollution that comes from our airport, the pollution will increase exponentially—including our risk to these respiratory infections and diseases—if we prescribe a Casino into our midst. This is not a legacy we want to leave for our children; our parents; and our future generation. These medical costs have not been factored in at all. What will, the increase medical costs and the cost on the quality of life be?

Also because of the increased traffic, our insurance rates will be higher—
East Boston drivers will pay more!

In addition to, there will also be many low paying jobs; attracting more people to move to our neighborhood. There will be competition for our housing, which will drive up our rents, and will place higher burdens on our schools; our police force; and our other services. All of this will be a financial cost to us all.

Once The Casino is set in place, the high paying jobs will be advertised nationwide and it will become its own authority; it cannot be abolished or be denied of its existence. It will hire whomever it wants and do whatever it wants. It will exist to make money for itself; not for The Commonwealth. *It becomes an un-killable pig!*

The Casino is banking and earning on the ancient human vice of greed and its weakness: addiction.

Along with other negative depravities that will harm our community's health, Human Trafficking will become encouraged. As young girls will be persuaded to enter a life of prostitution, many will be swindled with drugs. This has happened before in our neighborhood and many girls have died.

Pawn shops will start opening and there will be many house break-ins. This provides robbers "seed money" for that elusive jackpot.

The cost of these losses will be much more than the 32 pieces of silver that Boston will get from thrashing our historical and beloved East Boston. East Boston is a destination with its own intrinsic value. A Casino will tarnish its historical value.

Then lastly, the traffic flow and highway configuration that was proposed to service The Casino is totally inadequate. Even without a Casino being in the equation, the highway needs are not adequate of its existing needs. The proposed plan does not address the need to correct the present traffic flow along McClellan Highway, and Route 1 through Danvers. The present rotary pattern of lights causes gridlocks and backups that are inconvenient and dangerous. The prior cost estimate, when the third harbor was built was up to hundreds of millions of dollars to effectively rectify this problem. *The proposed plan addresses the immediate traffic flow around The Casino*—the increased gridlock would be oppressive and dangerous for our neighborhood.

For more information go to: www.johnribeiroforcitycouncil.com
www.facebook.com/johnribeiroforcitycouncil
electjohnribeirojr@gmail.com
857-746-2179

Protecting our Dignity by Voting "No" to the Casino
by

John Ribeiro Jr.

Dignity is our self-respect, and with it we will all have equal dignity.

Dignity is the ability to understand reality. We make decisions according to reality or truth and reflect on those decisions as to whether they are right or wrong--that is self-respect. The more clearly we see the reality in the world, the better equipped we are to deal with the world. However, the less clearly we see reality in the world, the more we will be confused by falsehoods, misperceptions, and illusions, which will make us less able to determine the correct course of action and make wise decisions.

Casino Gambling is an insidious lifestyle which causes gradual harm and is not immediately noticed--the end game of slot machines is to take all of our money. The machines dispense money on a random (reinforced) schedule which is programmed to cause addictive behavior and the program is always in favor of the house.

The Gambling behavior is self-reinforcing and addictive. It activates the brain to secrete dopamine and serotonin which causes pleasure and excitement. This addiction is very difficult to extinguish, hence the origins of pathological Gambling. Multiple neurotransmitter systems are involved in the pathophysiology of pathological gambling (Potenza 2001)

The cost of Gambling is the heaviest on the poor--"Players with household incomes under \$10,000 bet nearly THREE TIMES as much as those with incomes over \$50,000." (National Gambling Impact Study Commission Final Report, U.S. Senate 6/23/99 p.119) Those who were kept deprived and needy were those that became more easily addicted.

The National Gambling Impact Study (NGIS) was mandated by Congress in 1996. This was a two year study on the social and economic impacts of Gambling in the U.S. It was founded through research (not opinion) that pathological gamblers cannot control their impulses to gamble; hence, bringing ruin on themselves and their families; their jobs; their savings; their relationships; and their dignity.

Pathological gamblers hurt not only themselves and their families but society as a whole, i.e.: unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, physical and mental health problems, theft, embezzlement, bankruptcy, suicide, violence, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect. It has also been associated with alcohol and drug abuse. This pathology is not only exhibited in adults but in adolescents as well—over one million adolescents.

In 1999, the National Gambling Impact Study (NGIS) asserted in their study (on page 114), that Gambling establishments' coercive behavior amounts to exploitation. And that

pathological Gambling is now recognized by the AMA (American Medical Association) as a medical disorder.

Now one might say that each person has a free choice. However, the Casino establishment relies not only on the addictive behavior that comes from gambling alone, but the use of advertising establishments to allure us in their view of life: promises of glamour and excitement, titillation of sensual desires, and the yearning for wealth. Their advertising methods are used to confuse us; and to create misperceptions and illusions. Their objective is to blur our perception of reality to their misperceptions, hence stealing us our dignity.

We have a responsibility to examine our perceptions closely so that our decisions rely on the reality in the world; and not to their lies and emotional coercions.

We must protect our dignity!

John Ribeiro Jr. is a Retired Probation Officer and a proud Eastie Bostonian. He has worked and intervened in the comorbid effects of gambling for 47 years, as a Probation Officer, and has worked side by side with Mental Health workers in the fight to stop addictions.

For more information go to: www.johnribeiroforcitycouncil.com

Massachusetts Gaming Commission
84 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Dear Commissioners,

My name is John Ribeiro Jr. I have previously shared some concerns with you over the consideration of the proposed changes in the proposal being presented by Sterling Suffolk. - Since attending public meeting #92, I have had additional concerns.

- The first is that Mohegan Sun and not Sterling Suffolk becomes the applicant. Sterling Suffolk is relinquished to becoming a landlord.
- There are no guarantees that the horse track will remain open.
- In the referendum the voters were asked to vote on the good will and confidence they had shared with Sterling Suffolk.
- The electorate did not know they were voting for Mohegan Sun as an autonomous authority; with the legal permanency that comes with.
- The electorate have a right to have full disclosure and know that it is voting for an outside legal entity that becomes a local authority which cannot be dissolved.

- You cannot assume that the Electorate would agree with the present proposal without giving the voters the option to respond by means of the sanctity of voting booth.

- Now some on the Commission have voiced the opinion that they have not received any letters opposing the new proposal. This is firstly, because information has not been adequately disseminated, also voters become fearful of being vilified if they publically oppose the new proposal. - There is no replacement for the sanctity and privacy of the ballot box.

please do not take this right away.

I am also including additional information I have previously shared with the voters of Boston

Respectfully Yours
John Ambrose Jr.
370 Meridian Street
2. Boston, Mass. 02128

P.S.
I also respectfully request to address the Commission at the next hearing. Te 857-246-3178

Thank you.

December 3, 2013

Dear Commissioners Crosby, Cameron, McHugh, Stebbins and Zuniga,

My name is John Ribeiro Jr. and I am a lifelong resident of East Boston, a father of 6, grandfather of 9 and have worked in criminal justice and mental health fighting addictions for 47 years. I am writing today to voice my concerns over the consideration of the proposed application changes being presented by Sterling Suffolk – on an application that has already been deemed by the residents of East Boston, in accordance with the Massachusetts Expanded Gaming legislation – as unsuitable for their community by a majority vote of 56%.

The owners of Sterling Suffolk Race Course with a business at 525 McClellan Highway East Boston, MA have entered into cohost agreements with both the City of Revere and the city of Boston to build a casino on its 161 acre property; 45 acres located in Revere and the balance located in East Boston. In its application the owner also stated that it would maintain its existing racing facility on the property.

This is a site specific plan and proposal which was determined to be suitable by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. This is one location within the jurisdiction of two municipalities; it was not either or. This is one entity. The owners asked for binding votes from both cities.

This application for the gaming license submitted by owners is in accordance with C14r 116 as of 10/12/13.

This was the legal proposal and nature of the development and still is, however the owners want to change it semantically. They want you to believe that by changing the address, although it's the same location, it will be essentially different. This is an extremely different argument.

The negative impacts will be the same in Boston as they were before the address change. It is an unashamed attempt at manipulating the wishes of the electorate in Boston.

It is contrary to the written agreement and spirit of the agreement.

It makes a sham out of our democratic process.

And it is an outrage to the families in Boston who are working to protect our quality of life and fight the exploitation that is being forced on us.

Respectfully,
John Ribeiro Jr.
370 Meridian St.
East Boston, MA

John Ribeiro, Jr.
Criminal Justice and
Drug Addiction Specialist
Education • Prevention • Treatment
Recovery • Consulting
Cell: 857-246-3179
Vote John Ribeiro, Jr. for City Council
www.electjohnribeiroforcitycouncil.com

The Gaming ^{Law} requires a favorable referendum results in both communities; Boston and Revere. Please see below.

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. **Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2.** That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Vanessa Fazio <vanessafazio@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 12:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov;
Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; mayor@cityofboston.gov
Subject: Respect the 11/5 Vote

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petruccelli, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. Will East Boston's vote not be respected?

Enough is enough! I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Sincerely,
Vanessa Fazio – East Boston Resident

Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

From: Madeleine Steczynski <msteczynski@zumix.org>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 12:07 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Got democracy?

Categories: Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

As a business owner, home owner, landlord, educator, and active member of the East Boston community, I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. This is no longer only about the proposed casino, but it's an attack on democracy itself!

I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,
Madeleine Steczynski

--

Madeleine Steczynski
Founder/Executive Director
ZUMIX
260 Sumner St.
East Boston, MA 02128

Tel: (617) 568-9777 x104

Fax: (617) 568-9797

msteczynski@zumix.org

www.zumix.org



~~~~~

***Thanks for all your support! Click [here](#) to make an online end-of-year gift!***

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Murphy, Francine L <FMURPHY@mgh.harvard.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 12:23 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** casino

**Categories:** Purple Category

Hello,

Not sure why we have to go through this again. It was a YES or NO question on the ballot. Typical - if you do not get the answer you want then just do what you want. I guess our new mayor has a job ahead of him.

Francine Murphy  
East Boston Resident

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Julien Geiser <julien.geiser@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 12:24 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Cc:** revere\_mayor@revere.org; kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov;  
anthony.petruccecelli@masenate.gov  
**Subject:** No Still Means No in Revere, Like in EB  
**Categories:** Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

*The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot*



*question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).*

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

*[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."*

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Julien Geiser

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Tom Ostrowski <toostrowski7@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 12:27 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Please reject Revere Casino proposal!

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Mass Gaming Commission,

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year on the way!

I am writing to request that you deny the proposal to build a Casino on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs.

The original vote was to establish if East Boston and Revere *together* would accept a Casino on the Suffolk Downs site. To build a Casino on the Revere side on the basis of votes obtained during a *combined* vote rather than holding a Revere only vote would be irresponsible. The results of the combined vote could very well be different from results of a Revere only vote and to be fair Revere citizens should be given the opportunity to voice their wishes on the new proposal in a separate vote.

Considering that we are close neighbors I also object to the placement of a Casino on the Revere side of Suffolk Downs both because of the haste that this project is taking on and the impact that it will have on East Boston where I have been a resident for the past 5 years.

Putting a Casino on the Revere side only would have the same negative impact on the community that we fought in East Boston to reject. Crime would increase, traffic would increase, gambling addictions would rise and the community would be worse off in the end because a Casino is not a grass roots extension of the community and ultimately is not a sustainable or desireable local source of income.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Tom Ostrowski  
96 Bennington St. Apt #3  
East Boston, MA 02128

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** gary myers <rainbowpntopine@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 12:57 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Casino

**Categories:** Purple Category

Please vote No on Revere proposal

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Michael Jacob <michaeldjacob@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 12:59 PM  
**To:** revere\_mayor; kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov; anthony.petruccelli; MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Say no to the Revere only Casino  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am a resident of East Boston and on Nov. 5th voted no against the casino. As you know the no vote won. I, as well as many others were told that we only need one no vote. You have made it clear that because there is no proof, other than the Boston Globe, that you are still open to the idea of a casino at Suffolk Downs. Many of us were told by Chip Tuttle. To move forward with the Casino in Revere would require the process to start all over again. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

The vote on Nov. 5th had nothing to do with what Suffolk Downs and Revere are talking about now. A poll has been taken which showed Ma. does not mind a casino as long as it is not in their back yard. It is now being considered to be in Revere's back yard and they have not been able to express their opinion as to how they feel about it. That is totally against the Mass Gaming Law. Tomorrow there will be another meeting. Please consider that there is a gaming bill which was passed and it must be followed.

Consider the following;

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petruccelli, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15

specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

*The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).*

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

*[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."*

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Michael Jacob

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** J Archer O'reilly <archo3@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:11 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** No Revere Casino

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Sirs

By what elastic stretch of imagination can you conclude that a positive vote of BOTH communities was NOT required to authorize the permitting of a Casino at Suffolk Downs which would and will have an enormous impact on the residents of both East Boston and Revere?

Is it not obvious that cramming the casino into Suffolk's "back lot" without access and without even the pretense of a traffic study or plan presents a greater, not lesser, impact on the people and businesses of East Boston?

The rationale for a Suffolk Downs Casino was ALWAYS based on the race track, the history of gaming there, and preservation of racing industry jobs. Any fool can see that the demolition of the barns and support buildings on the Revere portion of their property means, inevitably, the end of racing at Suffolk Downs. You may say that some employees will get jobs as cocktail waitresses and dealers at the casino but that is both unlikely and NO help to all the ancillary jobs in the horse business the casino supporters have talked about for decades.

There was absolutely NO discussion or debate about **this** proposal prior to the vote and therefore no consideration of the certain death of horse racing in Massachusetts. Can you say how many residents of Revere voted yes to save their, or their neighbor's, current jobs at the track? is there any rationale at all for your Commission to divine what the voters may, or may not, have thought about this radically different proposal had it been on the ballot?

This proposed location may look the same as what was voted when seen from Springfield or even Brockton but certainly not when viewed from East Boston or Revere. Different players, different location, different impact on racing and jobs, different traffic problems, this is not even close to what the people voted on. This is akin to swearing in Dan Patrick as Governor after the people voted for Duval Patrick. After all they have the same initials.

Well, I submit that is what this is, Suffolk Downs, East Boston and Suffolk Downs, Revere have no more in common. To say they do is to violate the reputation and endanger the trust in your commission.

J Archer O'Reilly III  
[archo3@aol.com](mailto:archo3@aol.com)

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:13 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Cresta Richard

### Email

[ricksr5@hotmail.com](mailto:ricksr5@hotmail.com)

### Phone

(617)567-1918

### Subject

Suffolk Downs

### Questions or Comments

I am very disappointed that the commission is allowing the Revere only casino project to go forward. This seems to be in direct conflict with the intent of the community approval clause in the law. I live in East Boston. The fact that Revere had a vote when the project was almost exclusively in East Boston supports this. What if the vote were reversed? If Revere voted no, we would have had to honor that. Why else would there have been votes in both communities?

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Lysa Corso <lcorso721@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:17 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); revere\_mayor@revere.org; kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov  
**Subject:** Revere Resident, I voted for a completely different casino layout  
**Categories:** Purple Category

To whom it may Concern,

My name is Lysa Corso,

I am a resident of Revere and voted yes on the casino. I voted yes for the location, the layout of the casino, the track and jobs. At the time I believed in what I was hearing. Now that Nov. 5th has gone by, if I had another chance I would vote no.

I did not vote for a casino in Revere, nor did I vote for Mohegan Sun, whom which we have little time to even learn about. Why don't we get a chance to even learn what has even changed.

I grew up around the track and before I vote for a casino I want to know for sure that it will still be there and that the new proposed casino will not destroy my memories.

This is not fair, and I deserve the chance to vote on what is currently being proposed.

Why must this be so rushed that we are not able to even get to vote on what is currently be proposed. Please give Revere a chance. Plus, our neighbors in East Boston seemed to have known what they were getting into but we were not given the same opportunity.

Thank you for you time,

Lysa Corso



## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** jlr6042@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:47 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and Commissioners,

My name is Joseph Ruggiero. I am a resident, local business owner and community activist in East Boston. I am writing to you today to extend my support for Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun in their venture to build a world class destination resort that not just Revere, but surrounding communities around them can be proud of.

As the past president of the East Boston Chamber of Commerce and as a small business owner, I know of the troubles we face within unemployment and a slow economy. This is a chance for Revere and neighboring communities to capitalize on a major opportunity that will transform Greater Boston in the best way.

On November 5th, I was disappointed to see East Boston vote down the proposal by Suffolk Downs. However, I am optimistic that there are still lucrative benefits for many people and communities if the new Revere proposal is successful. Please allow Suffolk Downs to move forward in applying for a resort casino. Thank you for your diligent efforts that you folks have provided through this process. Best of luck.

Sincerely,  
Joseph Ruggiero

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Matthew Neave <mdneave@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:40 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Petruccelli, Anthony (SEN); Basile, Carlo - Rep. (HOU); LaMattina, Salvatore; mayor@cityofboston.gov  
**Subject:** Mohegan Sun Casino at Suffolk Downs  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am writing to respectfully ask that you follow through with the state gaming law and put an end to the Suffolk Downs proposal that was voted down on November 5. The law (and the ballot language) was very clear that a gaming facility at Suffolk Downs would require affirmative votes from both Revere and East Boston. Suffolk Downs took a chance in pursuing a casino in two communities and they failed in that bid. It is disappointing to see the gaming commission following Suffolk Downs and not leading with integrity on this issue.

Since the current proposal has been voted down it is impossible for Mohegan Sun to take it over in the way that Penn National did in Plainville. I cannot see any way that the current Revere Host Community Agreement applies to what is currently being proposed by Mohegan Sun and Suffolk Downs. Those who did vote yes, voted "Yes for Suffolk Downs," just as all advertisements used before the referendum pleaded. Now we are being told that the Phase 2 applicant is actually Mohegan Sun with a new parcel of land, which should require a new HCA and referendum. Unfortunately, details of the relationship between Suffolk Downs and Mohegan Sun aren't clear since their lease agreement has not been made public and Suffolk Downs is still in the news reporting on Surrounding Community Agreements, which shouldn't be their responsibility if they are not an applicant.

The affirmative vote from Revere cannot be seen as merely a land use vote. If that were the case, why would the referendum be required to be at least 60 days after the HCA was signed with a summary printed on the ballot? It is unjust for the gaming commission to assume to know the will of the people on such a different proposal. Listening to Mayor Rizzo, you would think that 99% of his constituents support a casino in Revere, but in the last referendum 40% of residents voted "NO" even without any organized opposition to offer an alternative view to what Suffolk Downs was peddling. There is a large, silent group in Revere that can only be heard at the ballot box.

It is also troubling that the gaming commission has never even acknowledged the desires of East Boston. Residents of East Boston were told that this was the one time that they would actually get to vote on whether they wanted to bear another burden for the state. East Boston didn't get to vote on hosting an international airport that would wipe out an Olmsted designed park. They didn't get to vote on whether they wanted to pay a toll to access their own city hall. But given the chance, East Boston made it clear that it does not want to host a casino and the impacts it would bring on their little island.

Please respect the law of the Commonwealth and the will of the people and stop the Suffolk Downs gaming proposal tomorrow.

Sincerely,  
Matthew Neave

Engineer  
East Boston Resident  
Father of 3 Young Children

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Lynda O'neil <lindooneil1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 1:51 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); revere\_mayor@revere.org; kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov  
**Subject:** Revere Resident begging you to stop the Revere only Casino  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission,

Please reconsider going forward with the Revere only Casino. The current Suffolk Downs plan is nothing like it was on Nov. 5th. I believe the outcome would be totally different if the city of Revere were to vote on it.

Also, I read the Mayor Rizzo claims no one has approached him and expressed that they do not approve of the Casino plans in Revere. That was simply not true. I have and he said thank you for your opinion and walked away. I felt it was rude and it only got worse when he claimed no one has talked to him about this. It was hard, reading that my Mayor would say such a thing in front of many people.

This feel as though this casino is being pushed on us now, with no say from the people who will be impacted. The law was design to give a voice to the people of the surrounding communities. I'm afraid the law has failed and left us all in the dark.

Please think twice before you make your decision,  
This is in our packyard,  
We have to live with it, isn't it only fair that we have a chance to know what it is and get to vote on it,  
Thanks,

Lynda O'neil

## **Sharlow, Albert (MGC)**

---

**From:** Lydia Edwards <lydia.m.edwards@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:00 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** BRING PROGRESS AND JOBS!!! BRING THE CASINO  
  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission

I am writing to you in **SUPPORT** of the CASINO. Please stand with the Revere residents.

**THE MAJORITY OF VOTES BETWEEN EAST BOSTON AND REVERE WERE FOR THE CASINO**

--

Lydia Edwards

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:05 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Christopher J Trakas

### Email

[ctrakas@aol.com](mailto:ctrakas@aol.com)

### Phone

(617)697-5555

### Subject

Please allow Revere to proceed

### Questions or Comments

Hello,

I am a horse owner at Suffolk and I sincerely urge you to let the Mohegan Revere proposal to proceed. Even though my horses might eventually have to be stabled off site I am in favor of the Mohegan proposal. The property is surrounded on three sides by Revere and on one side by the Suffolk track, part of which is also in Revere. It is not in East Boston and is at the furthest corner of East Boston away from the population centers of East Boston. Revere welcomes this proposal and will look at it with a sense of neighborhood pride. I also feel that Suffolk will accommodate the horsemen/women and the horses in an acceptable fashion even though they are no longer required to by the casino law, I have faith in and trust them. Yes I will miss the current Suffolk barn area and the good memories I have there but Mohegan will build a good place and Suffolk will find a way to accommodate us.

Please contact me should you wish further information.

Thank You,  
Chris Trakas

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** andrew fenno <andrewfenno@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:27 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** No Casino Revere

**Categories:** Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

*The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).*

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

*[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."*

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Andrew H Fenno  
255 Walnut Ave  
Revere Ma 02151



## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Susan Ward <susan.ann.ward@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:31 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); anthony.petrucelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; mayor@cityofboston.gov  
**Subject:** Suffolk Downs Revere Only Casino Proposal  
**Categories:** Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am an East Boston resident and I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for a Revere-only casino to move forward. I urge you to **honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5th vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs** and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

The law states that only favorable referendum results in both host communities should allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs should be dead.

*The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).*

If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

*[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."*

Where is our rule of law here? Will the vote from East Boston not be respected?

I ask the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to stop these rushed and illegal casino plans. If you proceed to allow the Revere-only casino proposal, you are gutting your institutional integrity and that of the voting process for host communities.

Best Regards,

Susan Ward  
East Boston

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:48 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Vincent Prezioso

### Email

[vincent.prezioso@hotmail.com](mailto:vincent.prezioso@hotmail.com)

### Phone

(781)244-0068

### Subject

Suffolk Downs Casino

### Questions or Comments

Dear Commission,

As a resident of Revere for all 34 years of my life, I truly hope you vote to keep the Mohegan Sun Casino project at Suffolk Downs alive for the residents of Revere to get what we voted for . Please consider the jobs at Suffolk Downs and the history of the race track, the casino will keep it alive. Mayor Dan Rizzo has been great during this whole process and Mohegan Sun is a great local partner for a local casino. I wish you the best and give my 100% support for the casino as a lifelong resident of Revere, Massachusetts.

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** carmellasmarket@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 2:59 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** no subject

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Sterling Suffolk LLC moving forward in their effort the process of developing a resort style casino in Revere Massachusetts.

I am a local business owner in East Boston and a member of the East Boston Chamber of Commerce. The opportunity to create a significant amount of regional economic activity as well as long overdue public improvements are

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 3:02 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Howard M Brown

### Email

[HMBrownMSW@aol.com](mailto:HMBrownMSW@aol.com)

### Phone

(617)620-2131

### Subject

Casion

### Questions or Comments

12/9/13

To the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

In a recent article, Commission Chair Stephen Crosby was quoted as stating "I am flabbergasted that we haven't heard from anyone" regarding their opposition to the idea of Revere and Suffolk down getting approval over building a Casino. Well I am flabbergasted to think that the Commission would consider such an idea after the recent November vote to turn a Casino / Suffolk down proposal down.

I and my family call East Boston home; we fought against the Suffolk Downs Casino. I sat in hearings listening to Chip Tuttle state several times that Suffolk Downs was part of the East Boston Community and was looking to help the community. "Trust us" was said and implied over and over. Yet, in a recent Fox article it was stated that Suffolk Downs had been working a deal, agreement, and or pact with the city of Revere in case the vote turned against them Trust Suffolk Downs? This is the same company that had been illegally dumping manure into the water less than two years ago. Dumping manure on the community seems like a theme with Suffolk Downs.

We were elated when the vote came in against the Casio proposal. We understood that both communities had to agree or it would not go through. Yet, it appears that another set of rules existed that we were not familiar with. I am reminded of a line from Casablanca: Captain Renault: I'm shocked, shocked to find that gambling is going on in here!  
(At the same time a croupier hands Renault a pile of money from the roulette table).

We have tried to raise our children with simple values "play fair, treat others with respect, and if you lose accept it, learn from it and move on." I don't know what disturbs me more: the idea that having lost a proposition the opposition ignores the voice to the community and goes with the project, or the idea that a State Gaming Commission would even consider allowing this to happen.

Commissioner Cosby, you're flabbergasted; well that makes two of us. The Commission should not, cannot override the results of the November 5th Casino Proposal vote. There is no room for interpretation. No means no for both East Boston and Revere.  
Respectfully,  
Howard M. Brown  
150 Orleans St  
Apt 204  
Boston, Ma. 02128

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** hmbrownmsw@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 3:03 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); revere\_mayor@revere.org; kathianne.reinstein@mahouse.gov; anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; MGCcomments (MGC); anthony.petruccelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; mayor@cityofboston.gov; oreillyjane05@gmail.com; vera.schneider1@gmail.com; DCEMSA1@aol.com  
**Subject:** Letter to the Commission  
**Categories:** Purple Category

12/9/13

To the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

In a recent article, Commission Chair Stephen Crosby was quoted as stating “I am flabbergasted that we haven’t heard from anyone” regarding their opposition to the idea of Revere and Suffolk down getting approval over building a Casino. Well I am flabbergasted to think that the Commission would consider such an idea after the recent November vote to turn a Casino / Suffolk down proposal down.

I and my family call East Boston home; we fought against the Suffolk Downs Casino. I sat in hearings listening to Chip Tuttle state several times that Suffolk Downs was part of the East Boston Community and was looking to help the community. “Trust us” was said and implied over and over. Yet, in a recent Fox article it was stated that Suffolk Downs had been working a deal, agreement, and or pact with the city of Revere in case the vote turned against them Trust Suffolk Downs? This is the same company that had been illegally dumping manure into the water less than two years ago. Dumping manure on the community seems like a theme with Suffolk Downs.

We were elated when the vote came in against the Casio proposal. We understood that both communities had to agree or it would not go through. Yet, it appears that another set of rules existed that we were not familiar with. I am reminded of a line from Casablanca: Captain Renault: I'm shocked, shocked to find that gambling is going on in here!

(At the same time a croupier hands Renault a pile of money from the roulette table).

We have tried to raise our children with simple values “play fair, treat others with respect, and if you lose accept it, learn from it and move on. “ I don’t know what disturbs me more: the idea that having lost a proposition the opposition ignores the voice to the community and goes with the project, or the idea that a State Gaming Commission would even consider allowing this to happen.

Commissioner Cosby, you’re flabbergasted; well that makes two of us. The Commission should not, cannot override the results of the November 5th Casino Proposal vote. There is no room for interpretation. No means no for both East Boston and Revere.

Respectfully,

Howard M. Brown  
150 Orleans St  
Apt 204  
Boston, Ma. 02128

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** jamoos@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 3:34 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Cost Assessment

**Categories:** Purple Category

Please do not allow a slots casino - or any other casino - in Leominster. The location chosen will cause a traffic crises in Bolton with no comensatory benefits.

Bolton already suffers from too many auto and truck trips along a 2 lane road (Rt. 117) thru the center of town. It lies between Rt. 495 and Rt. 190 and so will be severely impacted by a casino in this location (Rt. 117 and Rt. 190).

thank you,  
Jane Moosbruker, Ph.D.

[jamoos@earthlink.net](mailto:jamoos@earthlink.net)  
Jane Moosbruker, Ph.D.  
72 Coventry Wood Road  
Bolton MA 01740  
978-779-5423

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** carmellasmarket@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 3:35 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Re: Sterling Suffolk LLC

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Sterling Suffolk LLC effort to continue in the process of developing a resort style casino in Revere Massachusetts.

I am a local business owner in East Boston and a member of the East Boston Chamber of Commerce. The economic activity generated by this development will have a regional affect which will create jobs. Most business owners like myself regard our market area local and includes surrounding communities like Revere. The proposed public improvements in infrastructure and new business generated will provide a short term boost as well as a long term increase in new business to the region. Lastly, I feel it is important to consider that a casino will help preserve and improve one of East Bostons oldest Businesses at the Suffolk Downs race track.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Clark J. Moulaison  
Owner  
Carmella's Market  
86 Cottage Street  
East Boston Ma. 02128

Dec 9, 2013 02:58:58 PM, [mgccomments@state.ma.us](mailto:mgccomments@state.ma.us) wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. The Commission welcomes your feedback as the state continues to prepare for the arrival of expanded gaming.



## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Philip Cataldo <philipcataldo@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 3:53 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); revere\_mayor@revere.org; KathiAnne.Reinstein@mahouse.gov; Anthony.Petruccelli@masenate.gov  
**Subject:** Letter against Revere only casino vote  
**Categories:** Purple Category

### A letter to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission against the Revere only casino

The Massachusetts Gaming Commission is a new agency without history. So every decision is setting the standard for future actions and the precedent for future Commission members to follow. The announcement by the Commission to hold a vote to possibly gerrymander the referendum ballots to ignore the vote in East Boston and focus on the Revere vote will set a terrible precedent. A precedent that should chill any of the other cities or towns who have or are about to vote on a casino referendum. What is to say that loopholes in those referendums won't overturn the vote as it was presented to the people? And by voting to allow a Revere only casino project based on a totally different project, a different location, a new casino partner, puts the Commission in a position of guessing what was in the minds of the voters at the time of the ballot. Who know if the reason people voted yes was because of the old location or the fact they liked the Caesar Corporation. Maybe the public doesn't hold a potential new casino partner in the same esteem. But by allowing a Revere only casino based on a previous vote gives Mayor Rizzo a blank check to do whatever he likes. Now as nice a fellow as Mayor Rizzo is, I doubt most people would have voted a yes to giving the Mayor a blank check to create a casino as he sees fit. If there is a materially different deal then it should be announced and published, rolled out so the public can examine it and a new vote taken. At the very minimum if the Commission believes it has the right to overturn the referendum vote it should set a high standard. The Commission should hold a Town Hall meeting, before the Commission holds a vote, in both East Boston and Revere at a place and time that is easy for local residents to attend. There the Commission should lay out the reasons why they are considering overturning a binding referendum as it was explained to us by the politicians like Governor Patrick, Mayor Menino and the various Commission members who were interviewed by the

press prior to the original November vote. Nothing in the tens of thousands of dollars in advertizing, mailers, letters and emails sent by the Suffolk Downs people gave a material representation that a Revere only casino would be possible based on a yes vote in Revere. Neither did any politician I saw on many media interviews. If the Commission members believed that a Revere only casino based on the referendum was possible they had an obligation to correct the record, to correct interviews to give the people a clear picture of what they were voting on. I saw no Commission member explain that the referendum could be split and a yes vote by either city could result in a casino project in the East Boston/Revere corridor.

Lastly, Commission members have been quoted in the press as having said one reason they are considering a vote on a Revere only casino is they haven't received much opposition or letters against such a proposal. I submit that is the wrong standard. The referendum was the place for the people to show their support or opposition. For most people they heard the casino proposal was defeated and have stopped paying attention to the issue. I doubt many even know about today's meeting and the vote. By saying that we all have to pay attention to each meeting of the Gaming Commission you are saying that only the rich and the corporations who can afford to sit in these meetings during a work week or even watch the web archives on a regular basis have the power to decide these issues. The people look to the Commission to protect it from the legal loopholes and backdoors that would overturn their vote. It shouldn't matter whether the Commission received one letter or 1000 letters. The Commission needs to protect the people by judging what was advertized, what did the people expect from their vote and is the Commission vote to overturn the referendum consistent with the people's will?

Sincerely,

Philip Cataldo

Revere, MA

cc: [Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov](mailto:Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov)

[KathiAnne.Reinstein@mahouse.gov](mailto:KathiAnne.Reinstein@mahouse.gov),

[revere\\_mayor@revere.org](mailto:revere_mayor@revere.org),

09 December 2013

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

My name is Trent Sheppard and my family and I live in East Boston. I am a local minister and I serve as Alpha New England's Collegiate Chaplain, helping to guide college students through some of life's most difficult questions.

On November 5, voters won a hard-fought, democracy-based battle to keep our community free of a casino. I am profoundly concerned the Massachusetts Gaming Commission (MGC) appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward and I strongly urge the commissioners to reconsider on the basis of these five reasons:

1. For months the streets of East Boston and Revere were plastered with this unmistakable message: "Vote YES for Suffolk Downs." In the Revere-only proposal, however, Suffolk Downs has now become a landlord to Mohegan Sun, a developer that voters have had no time whatsoever to vet. It is plainly dishonest to act as if that is not a fundamental change from what we voted on.
2. Both communities voted on a casino that would be situated on Suffolk Downs' property *in East Boston*. While the Host Community Agreement (HCA) briefly referenced the potential of *expanding into Revere*, it never made mention of the potential of actually *establishing the casino in Revere*. Again, that is a fundamental change to the HCA that accompanied the ballot question.
3. Throughout the rigorous campaign leading up to the vote, Suffolk Downs repeatedly claimed a casino was *the only way to save horseracing at the site*. With the Revere-only proposal, however, Suffolk Downs is now claiming that the horseracing track will have to be separated from the casino – and its future therefore potentially jeopardized – because that is *the only way to save the casino*. That significant shift is clearly disingenuous and is an obvious sign of the faulty and untrustworthy planning that has undergirded Suffolk Downs' casino plans from the start.
4. Should Suffolk Downs' Revere-only proposal be approved, East Boston will still bear the brunt of all the negative impacts – increased crime, increased traffic, increased insurance rates, harm to small business, addictive behaviors, etc. – even though we decidedly voted against the casino on the stated basis that it had to be approved in both communities for the proposal to advance.
5. Senator Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and who helped write the law, clearly agrees with this assessment. He recently stated in a letter to the MGC that: "Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen

with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead."

Incredibly, it was recently stated by the Mayor of Revere and by a member of the MGC that they had not heard from many Revere residents who oppose the plans to move forward with the casino in Revere; **what about the 4,232 residents of Revere who voted NO on November 5?** It is an outrage to suggest that you have not heard from Revere residents on this issue.

Leading up to the November 5 referendum, we as ministers were tasked with the responsibility to urge our congregations and communities of faith that they have a voice in our democracy; that their vote actually matters; that we have a choice about what happens in our community.

If you fail in your responsibility to create "a fair, transparent, and participatory process" by permitting Suffolk Downs to illegally proceed with a Revere-only proposal, then we will be tasked with the much more challenging responsibility of guiding our congregations and communities of faith through what to do when laws are not followed, when leaders listen to powerful interest groups instead of listening to the people, when the politics of greed trump the ideals of democracy.

**Enough is enough.** I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Along with many others in the faith community, I urge you to do what is right.

Sincerely,

Trent Sheppard, Alpha New England Collegiate Chaplain and resident of East Boston

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:01 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Maria Betancur

### Email

[mariabetancur0@gmail.com](mailto:mariabetancur0@gmail.com)

### Phone

(781)289-5199

### Subject

Revere Vote for the Casino,

## **Sharlow, Albert (MGC)**

---

**From:** Katy <katehurley23@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:05 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Anthony.Petrucelli@masenate.gov; carlo.basile@mahouse.gov; Salvatore.LaMattina@cityofboston.gov; mayor@cityofboston.gov  
**Subject:** Please Say NO to the Suffolk Downs Casino Proposal  
**Categories:** Purple Category

### **To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,**

**As someone who lives a 4-minute drive down the street from Suffolk Downs (and a 2-minute ride on the T), I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.**

**Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.**

**But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucelli, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:**

**"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:**

**The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).**

**Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:**

**[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."**

**Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. Will East Boston's vote not be respected?**

**Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost 9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.**

**Best Regards,**

**Katy Hurley  
Bennington St, 02128**



## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Anjie <sunshynjr@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:08 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** no revere-only casino...  
**Attachments:** 2013 Why Casinos Matter FINAL lesB 12'05'13.pdf

**Categories:** Purple Category

December 19, 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission  
84 State Street, Tenth Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission (“the commission”),

For the 21,000+ documents reviewed during this process, here is another. My previous correspondence cited specifics of the expanded gaming law (“the law”) in an effort to illustrate how clean-cut your decision is. Apparently, excepting the former jurist on the panel, that fell mostly on deaf ears. This time, bulleted items will highlight my points.

- Mr. Chairman, you have a background in American democracy & public policy, how can you disregard or nullify the democratic process? The referendum vote is binding, albeit flawed due to summary references to former partner and proposed operator, Caesar’s Massachusetts Mgmt. Co., LLC (“Caesar’s”).

- Based upon the law, an affirmative vote is required for an East Boston and/or Revere project to move forward; East Boston voted the project down. Even Wynn Resorts understands the law well enough as they abandoned a casino proposal for Foxborough last year after anti-casino candidates won a local election.

- Both Host Community Agmts. (“HCA”) list the owner, Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC/Suffolk Downs (“the owner”), as applicant, not Mohegan Sun. If the commission allows the owner to move forward, under the law a new HCA needs to be negotiated and new application submitted after 180 days of the November 5<sup>th</sup> election.

- On page 25 of the Revere HCA, i.e., section 3, subsection C entitled “exclusivity” says [in part]: During the term of this agmt., the city [i.e., Revere] shall not sign another HCA with any other gaming license applicant {e.g., Mohegun Sun}, gaming licensee or owner of a gaming establishment other than the owner and will only enter into a surrounding community agmt. relating to another applicant if required by the commission. To the extent permissible by law, the city [i.e., Revere] (i) shall support the owner’s application for a category I license for the project as the sole application within the city [i.e., Revere] for a license to operate any gaming establishment, and (ii) shall not support the application or proposal of any other person to obtain a license to operate any gaming establishment.

- On page 2 of Revere’s HCA, recital #13 says [in part]: The operation of the racetrack requires approximately 63 acres to operate a one-mile oval racing surface and related open space, all in an urban environment. The maintenance of this open space and related view corridor is an important community amenity. Please note there is no condition for removing that important community amenity in the law and/or either HCA.

- Section 1 of Revere’s HCA, “impacts of the project”, subsection a “stipulations of known impacts” #5 says: As planned, the project would be constructed within the municipal boundaries of the city of Boston and no new significant construction is currently proposed on the portion of the property located in the city [i.e., Revere].

- Casino proponents refer to a triggering event as grounds for changing this project. In Section 1, subsection B “additional impacts” #2 says: Consistent with the gaming commission’s regulations, set forth at 205 CMR 127, which are designed to protect host communities from significant and material adverse impacts occurring after the execution of the HCA, owner and the city [i.e., Revere] shall, if reasonably necessary under the circumstances, negotiate in good faith an amendment to this agmt. if a **triggering event**, as provided in 205 CMR 127.02, occurs.

- Provision 205 CMR 127.02, reasons for reopening a mitigation agmt. has three sects:

1. refers to... secty of EOEEA’s [i.e., Exec. Ofc. of Energy & Environmental Aff.] certificate & conditions of licensure;
2. refers to... federal, state or local permit or approval; and,
3. says: An occurrence that is likely to cause a significant and material adverse impact.

- If the alleged triggering event proponents are referring is the split decision, it is unclear how that classifies as a significant and material adverse impact. The split decision only disallows a casino to be build; there are other viable developments possible. Under this provision, a split decision does not give the owners a reason to reopen the HCA [aka mitigation agmt.]. Again, the legislators drafted and passed the law saying both communities had to affirm the vote.

- If the casino proponents think the split vote is a triggering event, 205 CMR 127.03 (negotiations to reopen a mitigation agmt.) stipulates a process the owners must follow. Specifically, [paraphrased]: (1) Request that the other party voluntarily enter into discussions to supplement or amend the mitigation agmt., or (2) Petition the commission to mandate the reopening of the mitigation agreement. The owners have done neither and should not be allowed to overlook or disregard the process and proceed without following the rules, or nullifying the referendum vote.

- The proposed Revere-only project is not an expansion as illustrated in Revere’s HCA, section 2 (responsibilities and undertakings by the owner), subsection n, expansion of the gaming establishment, that states: If the owner seeks to expand its gaming establishment onto the Revere property or beyond the property onto property located within or outside the city [i.e., Revere], the owner shall promptly notify the city [i.e., Revere] and the parties shall negotiate in good faith an amendment to this agmt. to mitigate any negative impacts, if any, upon the city [i.e., Revere] of such expansion.

- The owners propose to: change the applicant, remove the important community amenity, i.e., racing surface, facility and related open space, exclude one of the two communities that encompass the 161-acre property [i.e., not change the status of East Boston from host community to surrounding community], without redrafting the HCA and/or allowing Revere residents a democratically-derived referendum vote as the expanded gaming law requires.

- In your own words, Mr. Chairman, at a Suffolk University forum you asserted that before the commission grants a casino license, local government and citizens will have the opportunity to decide whether they want a casino in their city or town, through the agreement and the referendum. **“This is up to the locals,” Crosby said....**

- In a MassLive article, dated December 3, 2013, notes that Mohegan Sun was vetted by the commission as a potential operator in Palmer not Revere. Supporters of the Palmer casino in attendance today [i.e., last week’s commission meeting] were miffed by what they feel was a strategic maneuver by Mohegan Sun to block a casino from their region in order to protect their establishment nearby in Connecticut. Will Mohegan Sun be vetted for a Revere-only casino project?

Lastly, The Institute of American Values has produced an in-depth report [attached] from the Council on Casinos, an independent, nonpartisan group of scholars and leaders who come together to examine the role of casinos in American life and to foster informed citizen debate on gambling as a public policy. Please read this valuable research to better understand the impact of casinos on communities and allow the information to complement your decision. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anjie Preston, East Boston resident activist

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:10 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

**Categories:** Purple Category

### Name

Maria Betancur

### Email

[mariabetancur0@gmail.com](mailto:mariabetancur0@gmail.com)

### Phone

(781)289-5199

### Subject

Revere Vote for the Casino.

### Questions or Comments

Hi Members of the Commission,  
My name is Maria Betancur and I am just writing to you to express my concern in regards to mine and my family's vote. My daughter and son just became citizens last year after living on the states for many years. They both were very exited about their citizenship specially my daughter because now she became ellegible to vote, but sadly now she and I are very disappointed that it seems our vote and hers to support the casino in our neighborhood might not be vailid and ignore. It is very sad to know that after 10 years we waited to have the right to vote and now it seems is not such a great thing since it might be ignored by you. We would love to keep participating in civic envents and participating in democracy but it seems that now it looks like some latin america countries where your vote doesn't count any more. Please consider our vote YES for the casino in Revere, we have heard on the news that many of our neighbors voted yes for it. Also, both my daughter and son are yo! ung and have many friends who need the jobs, I don't want to see many of friends of their friends doing things they aren't suppost to for the lack of local jobs. Thank you so very much for your consideration and I hope you make our vote valid and let the people of the track continue with their project of bringing the jobs to the area.  
P.S. We live next to the beach and it is very sad to see that there is not much economic movement (except for the 3moths of the summer). We need the investment and tourism to see the beach more alive.

Maria Betancur.

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Maureen White <maureenclairewhite@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:17 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)  
**Cc:** Reilly, Janice (MGC); Blue, Catherine (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Grossman, Todd (MGC)  
**Subject:** Illegality of a Revere Casino  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Members of the Gaming Commission,

I am writing to ask that you vote against further consideration of Mohegan Sun's gaming application for a casino at Suffolk Downs. I am gravely concerned about the prospect of this proposal being entertained when **no one has voted on it**. On November 5th, voters went to the polls and defeated a proposal for Suffolk Downs to build a casino in East Boston. Not a single ballot contained a question about Mohegan Sun building a casino in Revere. Should this application be allowed to proceed, it will mean that the Gaming Commission is willingly disenfranchising thousands of voters and violating the very statutes you are employed to uphold. I urge you to stand up for the voters and the laws of the Commonwealth and vote to end this illegal application immediately.

Sincerely,  
Maureen White  
410 Sumner Street  
East Boston

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Gail Miller <gailmiller48@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:33 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Cc:** eastiegails@aol.com  
**Subject:** Revere casino proposal

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby and members of the Gaming Commission,

Tomorrow, December 10th you are scheduled to take up the matter of Mohegan Sun and company's proposal for a casino license in Revere at Suffolk Downs.

This would be fine if a vote was taken on THIS proposal, based on a host agreement and clearly stating who the proponents were. That has not happened. I don't need to reiterate why we are at this juncture but suffice it to say that a vote was already taken with regard to a Revere proposal, it failed and according to legislation that dictated the procedures to obtain a casino license, any proposal cannot be supplanted for the original one. EVERYTHING about the current proposal is entirely different from the original. As a matter of fact, as you know, Suffolk Downs is ONLY a landlord in the current proposal. NO live racing is any part of this proposal.

To vote on anything in this regard before 180 days from November 5th is an utter disregard for the legislation drafted by one of its authors who is the state senator for Revere and East Boston. As a matter of fact, you must know all of our elected officials who strongly supported the proposal that both communities voted on.. East Boston and Revere....are now solidly against this current maneuver by Revere and Mohegan Sun.

Your commission will be tainted should you seek a vote of Revere's proposal in defiance of legally binding legislation. While the legislation gives your commission wide berth on matters, the public does not agree that you can disregard the format for obtaining a casino license that would have anything to do with voting rights.

Your commission should be instructing Revere and Mohegan Sun to properly follow the rules that you are asking all other applicants to do. This proposal is illegal in every way and members of your commission are so much as saying so because of their legal background.

A NO vote is urged by your commission.

Regards,

Gail Miller  
232 Orient Avenue  
East Boston, MA  
Sent from my iPhone

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Friends of East Boston <friendsofeastboston@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:42 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Crosby, Steve (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT)  
**Cc:** Blue, Catherine (MGC); Grossman, Todd (MGC); Driscoll, Elaine (MGC); Reilly, Janice (MGC); rever\_e\_mayor@rever\_e.org; mayor@cityofboston.gov  
**Subject:** Re: Suffolk Downs' Proposal for Casino in Revere  
**Attachments:** Clergy-MGC-Letter.docx  
  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

Fr. George Szal, Pastor of Immaculate Conception Catholic Church in Revere, has requested his name be added to the letter we submitted on behalf of numerous ministers in East Boston and Revere. It is important to note that Fr. Szal's parish serves approximately 2,000 families in Revere.

The attached letter is now updated with Fr. Szal's name included and we request for this addition to be noted in the official record of this submission to the Mass Gaming Commission.

Respectfully yours on behalf of Friends of East Boston,

Trent Sheppard  
Alpha New England Collegiate Chaplain and East Boston resident

On Mon, Dec 9, 2013 at 2:19 PM, Friends of East Boston <[friendsofeastboston@gmail.com](mailto:friendsofeastboston@gmail.com)> wrote:

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

We are writing on behalf of the Friends of East Boston, a network of more than thirty local ministers who believe our community deserves better than a casino, and on behalf of other individuals and communities of faith in Revere who share that same vision.

On November 5 the people of East Boston exercised their rights as citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by voting on a host community agreement between the city of Boston and Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC, which is the owner of 161 acre parcel located in **both East Boston and Revere**. The East Boston (Ward 1) ballot question said that "A NO VOTE from a majority of votes cast in this Ward referendum would prevent Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC, from proceeding with its application to obtain a gaming license from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to operate a gaming establishment at the specified location." That specified location includes the property in both East Boston and Revere. On November 5, a total of 7,637 East Boston citizens voted, and of those, 4,283 voted "no" to that ballot question.

Senator Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents East Boston and Revere and who helped write the law regarding the host community agreement, clearly agrees with this assessment. He recently stated in a letter to the MGC that: "Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host

community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead.”

Elected officials from Revere and officials from Suffolk Racecourse, LLC are attempting to deny the clear intent of the Boston Host Community Agreement and the East Boston ballot question and ultimately subvert the very democratic process that has been foundational for our Commonwealth. We call upon the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to recognize the truth that this proposal was never about a casino in East Boston or Revere. To accept the premise that this process includes an option of a casino in Revere only is to pretend that the Boston Host Community Agreement did not exist, that the East Boston ballot did not exist, and ultimately that the East Boston vote did not exist. We call upon the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to do the right thing and deny the post November 5 proposal for a casino on the Revere only property of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC.

Sincerely,

Rev. Dr. David Searles, Central Assembly of God, East Boston

Rabbi Joseph Berman, Temple B'nai Israel, Revere

Father Wayne Belschner, Sacred Heart Catholic Church, East Boston

Rev. Miguel Bravo, Iglesia Arca de Salvacion, East Boston

Rev. Alicia Climaco, Iglesia Profetica Internacional Ciudad de Sion, East Boston

Rev. Dr. James Collins, Eagle Heights Church, Revere

Fr. Thomas Domurat, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston

Deacon Frank McHugh, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston

Deacon Victor Rivero, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston

Rev. Nick Granitsas, First Congregational Church, Revere

Rev. Tim Bogertman, First Congregational Church, Revere

Pastors Ivan and Raquel Henriquez, Ministerios el Mover del Espíritu, Revere

Fr. George Szal, Immaculate Conception Catholic Church, Revere

Rev. Dr. David Martinez, Tabernaculo Evangelico de las Asambleas de Dios, Revere

Fr. Brian Morelli, Anglican Priest, Anglican Diocese in New England, East Boston

Rev. Don Nanstad, Our Savior's Lutheran Church, East Boston

Rev. Jaime Perdomo, Pastor of Iglesia Cristiana Nueva Vida, East Boston

Rev. Jeremias Rosa, from Iglesia Apostoles y Profetas, East Boston

Pastor Kevin Scott, Church at the Well, East Boston

Sherif Shabaka, Leader of Egyptian Association, East Boston

Trent Sheppard, Collegiate Chaplain, Alpha New England, East Boston

Rev. Matt Whelan, Freedom Mission, East Boston

Rev. Claudio Yeme, Iglesia Palabras de Vida, East Boston



09 December 2013

Massachusetts Gaming Commission  
84 State Street  
10th Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

We are writing on behalf of the Friends of East Boston, a network of more than thirty local ministers who believe our community deserves better than a casino, and on behalf of other individuals and communities of faith in Revere who share that same vision.

On November 5 the people of East Boston exercised their rights as citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by voting on a host community agreement between the city of Boston and Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC, which is the owner of 161 acre parcel located in **both East Boston and Revere**. The East Boston (Ward 1) ballot question said that "A NO VOTE from a majority of votes cast in this Ward referendum would prevent Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC, from proceeding with its application to obtain a gaming license from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to operate a gaming establishment at the specified location." That specified location includes the property in both East Boston and Revere. On November 5, a total of 7,637 East Boston citizens voted, and of those, 4,283 voted "no" to that ballot question.

Senator Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents East Boston and Revere and who helped write the law regarding the host community agreement, clearly agrees with this assessment. He recently stated in a letter to the MGC that: "Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead."

Elected officials from Revere and officials from Suffolk Racecourse, LLC are attempting to deny the clear intent of the Boston Host Community Agreement and the East Boston ballot question and ultimately subvert the very democratic process that has been foundational for our Commonwealth. We call upon the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to recognize the truth that this proposal was never about a casino in East Boston **or** Revere. To accept the premise that this process includes an option of a casino in Revere only is to pretend that the Boston Host Community Agreement did not exist, that the East Boston ballot did not exist, and ultimately that the East Boston vote did not exist. We call upon the Massachusetts Gaming

Commission to do the right thing and deny the post November 5 proposal for a casino on the Revere only property of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC.

Sincerely,

Rev. Dr. David Searles, Central Assembly of God, East Boston  
Rabbi Joseph Berman, Temple B'nai Israel, Revere  
Father Wayne Belschner, Sacred Heart Catholic Church, East Boston  
Rev. Miguel Bravo, Iglesia Arca de Salvacion, East Boston  
Rev. Alicia Climaco, Iglesia Profetica Internacional Ciudad de Sion, East Boston  
Rev. Dr. James Collins, Eagle Heights Church, Revere  
Fr. Thomas Domurat, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston  
Deacon Frank McHugh, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston  
Deacon Victor Rivero, Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, East Boston  
Rev. Nick Granitsas, First Congregational Church, Revere  
Rev. Tim Bogertman, First Congregational Church, Revere  
Pastors Ivan and Raquel Henriquez, Ministerios el Mover del Espiritu, Revere  
Fr. George Szal, Immaculate Conception Catholic Church, Revere  
Rev. Dr. David Martinez, Tabernaculo Evangelico de las Asambleas de Dios, Revere  
Fr. Brian Morelli, Anglican Priest, Anglican Diocese in New England, East Boston  
Rev. Don Nanstad, Our Savior's Lutheran Church, East Boston  
Rev. Jaime Perdomo, Pastor of Iglesia Cristiana Nueva Vida, East Boston  
Rev. Jeremias Rosa, from Iglesia Apostoles y Profetas, East Boston  
Pastor Kevin Scott, Church at the Well, East Boston  
Sherif Shabaka, Leader of Egyptian Association, East Boston  
Trent Sheppard, Collegiate Chaplain, Alpha New England, East Boston  
Rev. Matt Whelan, Freedom Mission, East Boston  
Rev. Claudio Yeme, Iglesia Palabras de Vida, East Boston

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** P. Messina <pmessina@alumni.umass.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 4:51 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Opposition to Casino in Revere, Mass.  
  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Commissioners:

I am a resident of Revere, and I am writing to voice my opposition to the casino plan currently under consideration by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. This is a new plan that no one -- not residents of Revere, not residents of East Boston, not residents of any city or town in Massachusetts -- voted on. At the very least, this new plan should be presented to voters on another ballot. Anything less would be an end run around the will of the people.

Please vote "no" on this new casino plan. Allow the voters to speak.

Yours truly,

Paula

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Ash <ashb1422@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 6:46 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Mohegan Sun Casino supporter

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Chairman Crosby,

I write to express my overwhelming support of the proposed Mohegan Sun resort casino located at Suffolk Downs. As a lifelong Revere resident, an attorney and an abutter to this development, I believe this proposal will generate much needed revenue for the City of Revere. It will lead to the creation of thousands of jobs for local residents and will serve as a catalyst for regional economic growth. I ask that you to allow Mohegan Sun and Suffolk Downs to proceed with their application. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Best regards,

Ashley Bostrom

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Steve Anthony <steven.m.anthony@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 6:56 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY

**Categories:** Purple Category

You nice folks seem to at least be trying to do the right thing amidst some public and private pressure, to say the least. You have correctly bandied the affirmation that it is not only confirmed impropriety but the appearance of impropriety that you would be wary of and seek to steer clear of in the name of the public interest. In the same vein, to say that a Revere only casino doesn't just legally fly in the face of all of us who stand (read: " live in" ) the path of the Casino, but outwardly violate the spirit and intent of the vote that was taken. A community of tens of thousands has spoken loudly and clearly. If the advertising budgets of either pro/con side were closer to even, those of us who do not want this in our community would have numbered far more than 52% to 48% .The agreement for the dual vote was clear. It did not state its validity was contingent on Suffolk Downs wanting two bites at the apple. If you feel there is not adequate competition for the gaming license, PLEASE, don't hold an extremely poor community on the rise hostage to this.

If you choose to support a Revere only site, you obviously never gave much of a shit for your integrity on the first vote. Do the right thing!!!! Please.

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Neenah Estrella-Luna <neenah@starluna.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 7:52 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Cc:** Marcos Luna; Gail Miller; Tina St. Gelais; magdalena ayed; Steve Holt  
**Subject:** Mohegan Sun/ Revere Casino Proposal

**Categories:** Purple Category

Dear Gaming Commission,

I am a homeowner resident in East Boston and professor of law and policy at Northeastern University.

I am writing to urge you to reject any consideration of a proposal for a "Revere-only" casino at the Suffolk Downs site without having gone through the proper process as outlined in MGL c.23K§15(13). The current plan is so different than the original proposal that has been described by Suffolk Downs for the past two years that it can only reasonably be considered a new proposal. The current plan has a different applicant, a different location, a different partner, and a different business model. As such, MGL c.23K§15(13) clearly states that this new proposal requires a new host community agreement and a new vote at least 180 days after November 5, 2013. The plain reading of the law is quite clear on this point. As your legal counsel undoubtedly has made you aware, Massachusetts courts pay very close attention to the plain language in state statutes.

To entertain a so-called Revere-only casino proposal at Suffolk Downs without having gone through the process as outlined in Expanded Game Act and your regulations is to render the concept of the rule of law meaningless. It is not the place of the Commission to *divine* the intent of the voters in Revere. This is not an academic exercise in epistemology or logic; it is a practical a legal matter with material implications. MGL c.23K§15(13) explicitly describes the process by which voters are to make their choices clear. The Commission needs to ensure that the proponents of this new proposal follow the letter of law and the process described therein.

I also urge Chairman Steve Crosby to recuse himself from all decisions related to Region A casino license applications. The recent revelations of personal and professional relationships between Chairman Crosby and casino proponents in both Everett and Suffolk Downs reinforce the concern that casinos will corrupt our public officials and public processes. It is simply implausible that Chairman Crosby could be considered impartial if he were to recuse himself from evaluating one applicant but not the other. Indeed, the insistence on finding some way, even if contrary to the unambiguous language in state law, to allow Suffolk Downs to submit a proposal suggests that the Commission is trying to create the appearance of competition in order to create a distorted semblance of impartiality.

The decisions and actions taken by this Commission to date have already reduced the public trust in the ability of the Gaming Commission to provide meaningful oversight of any casino licensed to operate in Massachusetts. As I stated in my comments to you dated 2 October 2013, the rule of law is first and foremost rooted in the commitment to following procedure. Procedure in and of itself does not automatically result in fair outcomes. But without fair procedure, even desirable outcomes are tainted with the appearance of corruption, further reducing trust in our government. If the Commission allows the proposed "Revere-only" proposal to go forward, and if Chairman Crosby refuses to recuses himself from evaluating any Region A applicants, the Commission's decisions can only be interpreted as stating that laws do not apply to some people and that the government cannot be trusted to look after the public's interest.

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** neptowers@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 7:57 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC)  
**Subject:** Revere Resident AGAINST a Revere Casino  
  
**Categories:** Purple Category

To the Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am outraged that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission appears poised to allow the proposal for an illegal Revere-only casino to move forward. I, along with thousands in both Revere and East Boston, urge you to honor the gaming law and the Nov. 5 vote by stopping the application for a casino at Suffolk Downs and requiring any new proposal to go through the legally mandated process.

Firstly, no one has voted on the current casino proposal, which makes it illegal. The plan for a Revere-only casino is a fundamentally different proposal than the one voters in Revere approved on Nov. 5, and voters could not have foreseen the changes that have occurred since then. From the location of the casino on the property to the naming of Mohegan Sun as the applicant to the uncertain future of horse racing on the site, the current proposal couldn't be more different than the one Revere residents voted on. "Yes" voters on Nov. 5 put their trust in Suffolk Downs, Revere's 78-year-old neighbor -- NOT in Mohegan Sun, a developer residents have had little time to vet.

But even still, the bullishness of developers to build a casino at Suffolk Downs is a violation of both the spirit and letter of the 2011 gaming law you are bound to uphold. Even Sen. Anthony Petrucci, a casino proponent who represents Revere and helped write the law, condemns the new plan, saying it is unlawful for Revere to move forward without a new agreement and vote. In a letter to the Gaming Commission a few weeks ago, he wrote:

"When the State Legislature crafted and passed the Gaming Act, my colleagues and I carefully drafted provisions pertaining to host community agreements and the conduct of an election. M.G.L. c.23K, §15 specifically requires an applicant, as a prerequisite to filing an RFA-2 application ("Phase 2"), to receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election in the host community. (See also 205 CMR 124.00.) Also, where a proposed gaming establishment is situated in more than one community, as is the case with the Project:

*The applicant shall execute an agreement with each host community, or a joint agreement with both communities, and receive a certified and binding vote on a ballot question at an election held in each host community in favor of such a license. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13).*

Taken together, the intent of these provisions is clear. Only favorable referendum results in both host communities allow the applicant to proceed to Phase 2. That did not happen with Sterling Suffolk's Project. Because one host community voted in the negative, the Project proposed for Suffolk Downs is dead. If Sterling Suffolk wishes to proceed with an alternative development plan on the Revere parcel, then under the terms of the Gaming Act:

*[They] shall not submit a new request to the governing body within 180 days of the last election; and provided further, that a new request shall be accompanied by an agreement between the applicant and host community signed after the previous election. M.G.L. c.23K, § 15(13)."*

Furthermore, a Revere-only casino at the Suffolk Downs site would create the same negative impacts on the roads, families, and small businesses of East Boston, whose voters rejected a casino on Nov. 5. *Will East Boston's vote not be respected?*

Enough is enough. I call on the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to respect the law and the votes of almost

9,000 East Boston and Revere voters by stopping these rushed and illegal plans -- intended to circumvent the law you are bound to follow.

Best Regards,

Ricci A. LaCentra  
30 John Avenue  
Revere, MA 02151



**Sharlow, Albert (MGC)**

---

**From:** Teresa Bonasoro <tbonasoro@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 8:09 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Blue, Catherine (MGC)  
**Subject:** No casino in Revere  
**Categories:** Purple Category

Many Revere residents have already made their views known in a vote.

I am against a casino in Revere.

Sincerely,  
Vincent Bonasoro  
5 Bateman Road  
Revere, MA 02151

## Sharlow, Albert (MGC)

---

**From:** Danielle Smith <daniellesmith636@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 09, 2013 9:01 PM  
**To:** MGCcomments (MGC); Zuniga, Enrique (MGC); Cameron, Gayle (MGC); McHugh, James (MGC); Stebbins, Bruce (MGC); Ziemba, John (DOT); Blue, Catherine (MGC)  
**Cc:** celeste myers  
**Subject:** No casino in Revere!  
**Categories:** Purple Category

I am writing because I am appalled that there is still a chance that a casino could be built in Revere.

The vote in November had to have both Revere and East Boston vote in favor of a casino for it to be approved. East Boston voted it down and that should have been the end of it. Mayor Rizzo did not agree with the result of the vote and now wants to change the rules.

I have heard that the Gaming Commission has not heard from one person in Revere who is opposed to a casino. How can this be?! Weren't the commissioners paying attention to the vote in November?!

There were many Revere residents who made their views known in that vote who are opposed to the casino. They spoke with their vote and shouldn't need to speak again.

I am very much AGAINST a casino in Revere.

Sincerely,

Danielle Smith  
87 Sewall St.  
Revere, MA 02151