

annual energy production from the podium PV system at 246.54 MWh per year and the parking structure PV system at 807.91 MWh per year. Total CO₂ offsets from these potential systems are estimated at 379.1 tons per year (tpy);

- 28.● Roof areas not significantly shaded and not designated for other uses will be constructed “solar-ready” such that they can support the live loads and include space for conduit runs and electrical gear such as inverters and meters;
- 29.● Use refrigerants with lower global warming potentials for freezer and refrigerator spaces.
- 30.● Conduct annual energy use surveys using information collected by the energy management system.
- 31.● Include energy efficiency standards as criterion in the selection and purchase of electronic gaming machines.
- 32.● Review in the final project design costs and benefits of the following project elements and consider inclusion:

33.● Chillers with improved full-load efficiency;

34.● Oversized cooling towers that can supply condenser water to the chiller condensers at a temperature ≤ 75 degrees F for 95 percent of the operating hours per year;

35.● Advanced elevators (machine room-less, permanent magnet gearless with efficient drives) and advanced escalators;

36.● Improvements to the building envelope and lighting power densities;

37.● Electronically commutated motors for terminal units; and

38.● Solar hot water to support specific end uses.

39.● Implement traffic-related strategies to reduce emissions from vehicles as outlined in the traffic mitigation section, including providing electric vehicle charging stations and designated parking spaces for alternatively fueled vehicles within the parking garage consistent with patron demand.

40.● Provide a self-certification document to the MEPA Office that is signed by an appropriate professional (e.g., engineer, architect, transportation planner, general contractor) and indicates that all of the required mitigation measures, or their equivalent, have been completed for each phase. The certification will be supported by plans that clearly illustrate what type of GHG mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project. For those measures that are operational in nature, the Proponent will provide an updated plan identifying the measures, the schedule for implementation, and a description of how progress towards achieving the measures will be obtained.

41.● Implement roadway and intersection improvements to improve traffic operations, reduce idling times for study area vehicle trips, and promote mode shifts away from SOVs;

42.● Fund and implement the TDM program outlined above.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Historic Resources

- 1. Develop a Memorandum of Agreement among the MHC, MGC and the Proponent to specify measures to minimize and mitigate impacts. These measures may include, but are not limited to:
 - 1. Photographic documentation of the buildings prior to demolition;
 - 2. Salvage and reuse of architectural elements within the Project; and
 - 3. Interpretive signage and displays providing information about the history of the Project area.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Water and Wastewater

- 1. Replacement of the twin 12-inch water mains in Main Street with one 16-inch water main;
- 2. Replacement of a 10-inch sewer main within Union Street with a 12-inch sewer main;
- 3. Replacement of a 24-inch water main in Union Street;
- 4. Replacement of a 12-inch vitrified clay sewer main and upgrade hot water mains in Howard and Bliss Streets where the roadway ROW will remain;
- 5. Work with the SWSC and the City of Springfield to identify and mitigate potential impacts on abutting properties. This may include the installation of backflow preventers on service laterals to prevent a surcharge condition during heavy rainfall events;
- 6. Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the SWSC to memorialize water and sewer infrastructure commitments including maintenance, inspections, monitoring, reporting, and continued communication;
- 7. Implementation of the following water conservation and reuse measures (overseen by a designated Water Conservation Manager):
 - 1. Rainwater reuse for irrigation;
 - 2. Consider rainwater reuse for HVAC cooling tower.
 - 3. Weather-based irrigation controllers;
 - 4. Installation of drip irrigation systems;
 - 5. Drought-tolerant plants/groundcover;
 - 6. Installation of low-flow urinals;
 - 7. Installation of dual-flush water closets (1.1/1.6 gallons per flush (gpf));
 - 8. Installation of metering faucets with 0.5 gallons per minute (gpm) aerators with 15 seconds run time) and;
 - 9. Education and training programs.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1", Tab stops: Not at 1"

Stormwater

- 1. The project will be designed and constructed consistent with MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards. The stormwater management system will reduce peak rates of runoff at each design point and provide treatment to improve water quality of discharge, compared to existing conditions.
- 2. Implementation of stormwater BMPs and LID techniques, including, but not limited to: deep sump catch basins, infiltration systems, hydro-dynamic (proprietary) separators,

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

rainwater capture, 2.2 acres of green roofs, and adherence to a specific maintenance schedule;

- 3. Elimination of 1.3 acres of impervious areas on-site;
- 4. Registration of the stormwater system's infiltration system in accordance with the MassDEP Underground Injection Control (UIC) program.
- 5. The Proponent will draft and execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the SWSC to memorialize their stormwater management agreements and commitments including maintenance, inspections, monitoring, reporting and continued communication.

Hazardous Materials

- 1. Prior to building demolition or renovation, hazardous building materials will be abated or removed in accordance with applicable regulations.
- 2. Consistent with the requirements of the Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) (RTN 1-12379), located at 38-50 Howard Street, this portion of the project site has been designed to accommodate the development of the main floor and basement offices of the casino building.
- 3. Construction activities within identified Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) disposal sites will include an environmental monitoring plan to monitor potential impacts to neighboring properties. The environmental monitoring plan will set dust action levels and VOC ambient air monitoring requirements for the Project. Air monitoring with dust meters and a photoionization detector will be a key component of the environmental monitoring plan included within the Release Abatement Measure (RAM).
- 4. A Licensed Site Professional (LSP) will be engaged to manage the MCP-submittal process and manage potential construction-period waste, soil and groundwater remediation in accordance with the MCP.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Construction Period

- 1. Coordinate with MassDOT and its construction contractor on a regular basis throughout the entire construction process to minimize impacts on the surrounding transportation infrastructure due to the simultaneous construction of the project and the I-91 Viaduct Deck Replacement project. The Proponent and MassDOT will incorporate language into each respective construction contract to define a need for bi-weekly construction coordination meetings to evaluate traffic detours, parking demands, major trucking needs, and other related items;
- 2. Develop and implement a construction period traffic management plan, subject to review and approval by the City and State. Prepared and implement Temporary Traffic Control Plans (TTCP) for construction of improvements near the MGM Project site including signage, traffic cones, drums, and other traffic control measures to facilitate vehicle traffic near the work zone. These plans will be refined as the project advances to the 25% design stage and will require review and approval by the City of Springfield DPW and MassDOT District 2 staff.
- 3. Establish truck traffic routes, with consideration for road closures or detours as part of the I-91 viaduct project, in collaboration with MassDOT, the City of Springfield, and PVPC.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

4. Implement a construction period parking plan for the City of Springfield's review and approval, which shall include the general contractor's plans and protocols for enforcing the prohibition on construction personnel parking personal vehicles on streets in the adjacent neighborhood. Terms and conditions to maximize protection of the neighborhoods related to workforce parking will be written into each subcontract and reviewed with each worker during a mandatory orientation. Terms and conditions encouraging public transportation use will be included in each subcontract.
5. Coordinate with the Springfield Parking Authority, City of Springfield, and owners of private parking facilities throughout downtown Springfield to identify locations to accommodate construction employee parking, as well as parking for uses displaced from the site during construction.
6. Publish an updated schedule of upcoming work every two weeks and disseminate to affected parties in local neighborhoods. In addition, the general contractor will publish monthly schedule updates describing progress as well as projected activity for the next month. This information will be available on a Project website which will allow neighbors real-time access to the most up-to-date construction information;
7. Comply with the City of Springfield Noise Ordinance;
8. Conduct activities such as excavation, pile-driving, and steel erection only during permitted hours;
9. Use appropriate mufflers on all equipment and provide ongoing maintenance of intake and exhaust mufflers;
10. Replace specific construction operations and techniques with less noisy ones, where feasible;
11. Select the quietest of alternative items of equipment, where feasible;
12. Locate noisy equipment at locations that protect sensitive receptors (by shielding or distance);
13. Conduct precondition surveys and vibration monitoring to document initial site conditions followed by vibration monitoring throughout the construction period;
14. Establish vibration limits and performance criteria in the Construction Management Plan and require mitigation measures by contractor if adverse impacts occur during construction.
15. Conduct below-grade work under the supervision of a geotechnical engineer to observe and document construction procedures, monitor vibration, and anticipate or facilitate mitigation measures, as necessary.
16. Comply with MassDEP's anti-idling regulations;
17. Establish a goal of 100 percent diversion of construction waste.

Conclusion

The NPC has sufficiently defined the nature and general elements of the project for the purposes of MEPA review. I am satisfied that any outstanding issues can be addressed by the Proponent during the State and local permitting. If consultations with MHC, or local or State permitting approvals result in changes to the project design, the Proponent should consult with the MEPA Office to determine whether additional MEPA review would be warranted. The Proponent and State Agencies should forward copies of the final Section 61 Findings to the MEPA Office for publication in accordance with 301 CMR 11.12.

November 25, 2015
Date

Matthew A. Beaton

Comments received:

- 10/23/2015 Springfield Historical Commission
- 11/4/2015 Pride Stores, LLC
- 11/6/2015 Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
- 11/9/2015 Beals Associates Inc., on behalf of Red Rose Pizzeria
- 11/9/2015 Beals Associates Inc., on behalf of Courthouse Park Associates, Inc.
- 11/9/2015 Beals Associates Inc., on behalf of Briarwood Thirteen, LLC
- 11/9/2015 Beals Associates Inc., on behalf of Covest/Columbus Spfld, LLC
- 11/9/2015 Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection – Western Regional Office (MassDEP-WERO)
- 11/9/2015 Jeffrey A. Burstein
- 11/9/2015 TEC on behalf of Blue Tarp reDevelopment, LLC
- 11/9/2015 Edward M. Pikula, Esq., City Solicitor, City of Springfield
- 11/13/2015 Massachusetts Historical Commission
- 11/18/2015 Ted Steger
- 11/18/2015 Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)
- 11/18/2015 Law Offices of Eric I. Michelman on behalf of Owners of Parcel #14

MAB/HSJ/hsj

Office of the City Council

36 Court Street, Room 200
Springfield, MA 01103
Office: (413) 787-6170



THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

November 2, 2015

Stephen Crosby, Chairman
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
101 Federal Street, 12th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

RE: MGM Springfield HCA Amendments and Design Changes

Dear Chairman Crosby:

Blue Tarp Development, LLC ("MGM Springfield") has recently announced its plans to request permission from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission ("MGC") and the City of Springfield to amend its design plans and Host Community Agreement ("HCA"). People in my community on all sides of this issue have expressed an interest in addressing the MGC on this subject. In light of this, the Springfield City Council would like to respectfully request that you hold one of your upcoming hearings in the City of Springfield so that residents and elected leaders can address you on the subject of MGM Springfield and the contemplated changes to its design.

Please let me know if/when you are available to schedule a hearing in Springfield. Please contact me via e-mail at mfenton@springfieldcityhall.com or by phone at 413-523-3223.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this very important matter.

Sincerely,


Michael A. Fenton
Springfield City Council, President

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: John Scagliarini <JS@aquadro.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 7:48 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Question

To whom it may concern,

As a 28 year old, lifelong citizen of Springfield, I have seen this city go through many changes both good and bad. I am a proud resident of Springfield and could not be more grateful for the diversity of cultures found here. When I originally heard the proposal for a casino I was skeptical. I know that they can bring a lot of crime and drugs into an area. But I also know that it could be one of Springfield's last shots to pull its self up from a downward spiral. So when the time came I voted yes to the casino and for MGM. As an architecture and design student I found their proposal to be the most compelling both plan wise and visually. The 25-story hotel was a very big part of why I voted for MGM. I believe this building would add to the cities sky line and change the whole aesthetic of downtown Springfield. When MGM proposed this reduction in size I was both disappointed and upset. I felt like MGM had played a trick on me and the other Springfield residence. If their new design was the original design I don't think I would have voted for them. I would have voted no or possibly for the other casino in the running. I feel like MGM is playing a game with all of the Springfield residence and I am not happy about that at all.

Sincerely,

John Scagliarini

John Scagliarini
Construction Engineer

150 Springfield St
Springfield, MA 01107

413-478-0040

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Gennaro Daniele 413-314-1938 <gnapoli2004@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 8:32 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM SPRINGFIELD DESIGN

To the Gaming Commission,

I am a life long resident of Springfield, and look forward to the updated design of MGM.

The new design actually blends in with our Cities historical culture and look. The change from a glass tower to a low rise hotel is most practice to blend in with current surrounding building of downtown Springfield.

In reference to the internal down sizing, it has zero impact to the consumers, as the y are back of the house impacting staff and operation. These chamber are practice.

The elimination of bowling 5 lanes, from 15 to 10, are nominal. Additionally to be noted the movie theater and bowling alley are high end, which relates to the experience. The bowling alley wasn't intended for leagues, it is a recreational spot while one visits downtown in the Casino as part of the whole experience. Alone with higher retail, and dinning. Coupled with Local Entertainment, Sponsored by MGM.

The decision to relocate there rate apartments makes sense. With the redesign of the casino, MGM can keep business in a certain area and have housing just minutes away. The apartments are still withing a convenient walking distance from all downtown Springfield will have to offer.

The down sizing of the parking was based on a formula that deemed it to be slightly smaller than proposed, however this is good as not to negatively impact the Springfield Parking Authority, and other surrounding pay parking lots.

I cunclusion the MGM new design is a design I feel will work best for the city and MGM.

It should also be notes that MGM has now updated its total investment cost to \$950 Million.

Thank you for you time,

Gennaro Daniele
413-314-1938
Springfield, MA
RESIDENT

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Thomas Beauregard <beasuetom@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 6:05 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Let's get going and get that Casino up. I am sick of driving to Ct.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: karenelfterakis@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 5:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Presentation

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you in support of the proposed redesign of MGM Springfield. While like most, I was initially disappointed that the initial design was no longer being considered, I am looking at the bigger picture of what MGM Resorts International is bringing to our state and the city of Springfield. They are bringing a value proposition of great entertainment that includes partnering with existing venues, great dining establishments (not to mention the draw to existing dining establishments) a five star hotel and gambling that will bring revenue into Springfield and Massachusetts. I have been a guest at MGM's establishments many times and even chose to get married there. They treat each and every guest like they are special and I am certain that MGM will bring the same amenities to their Springfield location. I can tell you that my friends from CT are also excited about MGM building here. Given that the Indian casinos are not regulated by the state, they are looking forward to similar gaming regulations in Massachusetts that the state of Nevada has enforced. After all gambling is about luck, not reduced profitability of the Indian casinos.

I invite the gaming commission to approve the design and allow MGM to proceed with what they do best; building quality establishments that will benefit a community that sorely needs a face lift and bring the jobs that they have guaranteed to a city that needs help. This process has taken far too long and I want MGM to make good on their promises but they can only do that with obstacles removed.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Karen Elefterakis
West Springfield MA

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Clifford Dufault <cld4210@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 4:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Comments on new design

I do not like the new hotel concept.

The 25 story hotel was the thing that made me vote for casino gambling in MA.

Like you orginally said It was the crowning jewel in the complex.

Now where is the crowning jewel???????

The new CT casino will have a six story hotel.

You are going to have to come up with something spectacular to made me want to support this venture anymore!!!!

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Carol Kerr <cgkerr4512@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 9:43 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: 'Amanda Gagnon'
Subject: MGC comments

To the MGC:

As a resident of Springfield, I'd like to share my brief comments on the MGM changes.

1. the layout of the hotel complex is much more in keeping with the feel of the downtown area. It integrates, not dominates.
2. It doesn't steal the thunder of the existing skyscrapers. They still hold pride of place. MGM doesn't dominate the skyline of downtown. I like that. It doesn't become " MGM " city. We still get to keep our unique personality.
3. Guests are less isolationist in a lower hotel than a big tower. People are more likely to walk an attractive surrounding area, people watch at an outdoor cafe, shop, walk to go to shows and such, rather than hole up in a glass tower.
4. I love the idea of the offsite building being used as apartments. Great building, great location, near to our museums, library, entertainments, Mattoon Street, other art venues, and the casino (but not part of it). The people who live there will feel a part of the community, not part of an entertainment complex.
5. Every big project has changes that need to be made along the way. There is nothing nefarious about it. It's just how large scale building projects work. Sometimes change is necessitated by legal issues, environmental or financial issues, space constraints, material or structural problems, efficiencies, and any manor of unforeseen issues. For the most part, the general public sees only the finished product. This is not MGM's first rodeo. They are spending a lot of money and will ensure that they will build an entertainment complex that is the best it can be. That would be true wherever they build. It isn't in their best interest to build something less than spectacular. They want to draw as many people as possible for as long as possible. I think it is counterproductive to micromanage something they do very well all over the world already. Hold them to their commitment to the city overall in terms of jobs, financials and such, but don't examine everything that changes every time under a microscope. These guys are the experts. let them build a world class complex. The people of Springfield want the council members to make sure they meet their commitments, not approve what color marble is used in the foyer.

Thank you,

Carol Kerr

107 Maplewood Terrace

Springfield, MA 01108

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Cynthia LANDERS <landers00@prodigy.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 1:27 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Springfield Casino

This company MGM has bent over backwards to comply with the needs of this city and the citizens of it. They should be given the go ahead to do what they wish to do here. Without any further restrictions or hurdle's to jump over.

The new design of lowering the Hotel will add to the greatness of this project.

It will add by bringing more foot traffic to the entire area.

It will add by keeping within the architectural style of this once great city.

It will add by giving us jobs and a Destination Casino.

With all the other attractions they plan to make as well as the now existing attractions here already.

This Casino will once and for all put this City, Our City, Springfield, Massachusetts back on the map once again.

As it was in the Industrial boom of the 1930's and 1950's.

With the Eastern States Exposition, Six Flagg's, the National Historic site of Americas first Armory, Commissioned personal in 1776 by George Washington and General Knox. Who together stood on the Armory grounds and selected the hill the Armory is on. Because the Conn. River would "provide transit needed" and also to "protect it from the Indians" of the time. Also we have here in Western mass. more Golf courses per acre than any place in the world. So the convention sector of America and the World will wish to come here to take part in the History of this great Nation. That got its start right here. History is not something you can buy or invent. You either have it or you don't. We have it here.

Along with our great people, who will be a definite asset to this Corporation.

Travelers who never knew these attractions and many more to numerous to mention here existed, will come to visit.

For too long this City has been hidden by lack of real leadership.

Some here wish to keep it a secret.

This Multinational Corporation has been in the entertainment business for 100 years.

They know how to promote a project. We here in Springfield will benefit greatly from that.

As will the entire state of Massachusetts and our people.

So it is with great enthusiasm that I support their plans as they have been presented to you.

Help us to get this Casino started.

Thank you,

James & Cynthia Landers

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: mary dandro <robertamaryrose@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 12:04 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: new changes

What is this commission waiting for???? Pass the changes before the Indians to the south of us get here. You all have stalled enough! Lets go.

Mary,
From west side.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: bocce54@aol.com
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2015 11:14 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: mgm new design

DEAR GAMING COMMISSION : The new building design is a lot lot better then before, it will provide more walking traffic. This is what main street needs. Like the old days in 50's and 60's... THIS MGM COMPANY the people running it THE MIKE MATHIS, THE HORNBUCKLES ARE BEAUTIFUL PEOPLE with A BIG BIG BIG HEART... THEY WANT TO MAKE THIS CITY OF SRINGFIELD,MA. A BETTER PLACE FOR THE KIDS AND FAMILIES... PLEASE SUPPORT MGM...THANK YOU rico daniele 413-374-5718... thank you.

Rico Daniele

Visit BocceBella.com for info on Bocce or Mom & Rico's Specialty Market.
Rico.Unfranchise.com 413-732-8941

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: benoit_christopher@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2015 10:15 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Good afternoon Commission Members,

My name is Christopher Benoit and I have been a long time supporter of this project since its inception in 2012. I have followed this project through all of the work that has gone in to it and I believe it is time for the politics to end and the construction to begin. MGM Springfield has been very transparent in its handling of this and frankly more open than expected.

The design changes that have been made by MGM Springfield do not take away from what is being created. These changes merely recreate the look of what is going to be built. While the size change is a behind the scenes adjustment, it needs to be remembered, that the guests and visitors to this location will not lose out on what will be offered. Offerings of great food and beverage vendors, excellent retailers, and high class gaming will still be there. The quality of the resort style rooms that will be provided will not be of any less quality just because the building size is changing.

I believe that all the red taping needs to stop, and that progress needs to be allowed to move forward. The time for fear of change has come and gone, and now is the time to move forward and not step back, otherwise this will be for nothing. Please let MGM Springfield do what it has been promising to the City of Springfield and the region and let them build this resort and it is now designed.

Thank you for your time and allowing me to express my thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely

Christopher Benoit

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Scott Burns <sburns9960@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2015 11:02 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design Changes

November 30th, 2015

I am writing this email to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to express my concerns with the proposed design changes by MGM Springfield to its' proposed casino project.

- 1.) The elimination of the 25 story hotel fundamentally alters the project. Additionally it misrepresents what was shown and offered to residents and voters of Springfield prior to the casino vote. The project is supposed to be billed as a rebirth of Springfield and the new hotel was a critical part of that look and feel.
- 2.) The reduction of space also signals to the voters that they are getting less than what was originally proposed.

I think that the Commission should, if necessary open up the Western Mass casino process to new casino companies, new host community agreements, and if need be new public votes.

Scott Burns
15 Blotz Road
Washington, MA 01223

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brendan Healy <brendanhealy15@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2015 9:13 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design Changes

What, if any, are the commitments MGM has to redeveloping the Court Square building?

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brendan Healy <brendanhealy15@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2015 8:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design Changes

As an urban casino with anticipated economic spin-off, what does the future of the South End look like and will MGM have any role in the redevelopment of the surrounding area?

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brendan Healy <brendanhealy15@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2015 7:57 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design Changes

With \$1 million devoted to Riverfront Park, what improvements can we expect to see and will they increase the accessibility, safety, and overall appearance of the city from the riverfront?

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brendan Healy <brendanhealy15@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2015 7:48 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design Changes

The corner of Howard and Main is the new hotel lobby entrance and needs to be accessible and appealing to visitors. Has there been any talks with Red Rose or surrounding businesses involving renovation and/or becoming part of the casino footprint as a whole in order to incorporate current structures into the overall design?

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Eric I. Michelman, Esq. <ericmichelman@lawfirmofbusiness.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 4:34 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design (Comments on behalf of Abutter - Parcel #14)
Attachments: Comments From Owners of Parcel #14 re MGM Springfield ReDesign.pdf

To: Massachusetts Gaming Commission

Please accept the attached comment letter of this office, dated November 18, 2015, on behalf of an abutter (known as Parcel #14) to the proposed redesign of the MGM Springfield casino and destination resort development. Parcel #14 is located on East Columbus Avenue between Howard Street and Bliss Street.

Although the letter is addressed to the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, the comments included therein address the Notice of Project Change, and are applicable to the review of the proposed redesign by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission.

Please note: the attached letter supersedes the letter of this office, dated November 9, 2015, which was sent directly to Ombudsman John Ziemba.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC I. MICHELMAN, Esq.

LAW OFFICES OF ERIC I. MICHELMAN
2301 Dupont Dr., Ste. 530
Irvine, CA 92612
949-553-1800
949-553-1880 (fax)
ericmichelman@lawfirmofbusiness.com

ALSO ADMITTED IN
NEW YORK AND
MASSACHUSETTS

LAW OFFICES OF
ERIC I. MICHELMAN
2301 DUPONT DRIVE, SUITE 530
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612
(949) 553-1800
FACSIMILE (949) 553-1880

November 18, 2015

VIA E-MAIL (holly.s.johnson@state.ma.us)

Secretary Matthew A. Beaton
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs
Attn: Holly Johnson, MEPA Office
100 Cambridge St., Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Re: Comments To Notice of Project Change - MGM Springfield, EEA #15033

Dear Secretary Beaton:

The undersigned hereby submits the following comments to the Notice of Project Change dated October 15, 2015 (the "NPC") of Blue Tarp Redevelopment, LLC (the "Proponent") on behalf of the owners of Parcel #14 (as designated and depicted in Exhibit "H" to the Host Community Agreement, by and among the City of Springfield, the Proponent and MGM Springfield Redevelopment LLC dated May 14, 2013).

Parcel #14 is located in Springfield, Massachusetts, on East Columbus Avenue between Howard St. and Bliss St. The common address is 1317-1343 East Columbus Ave. and 90 Howard Street. Parcel #14 contains a two-story building which covers the entire parcel. The building's uses include both residential dwellings and commercial offices.

The north end of the building on Parcel #14 is within an extremely small, but undisclosed, number of feet from the Proponent's newly proposed roadway connecting East Columbus Avenue to the Bliss Street entrance to the Project Site and the proposed sole entrance to the 3,375 space, self-parking garage structure.

As represented in the Host Community Agreement, the Proponent contracted to purchase Parcel #14, presumably to fulfill the Proponent's obligation to mitigate the expected traffic hazard between Howard Street and Bliss Street (i.e. the main ingress point to the Project)

Secretary Matthew A. Beaton
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs
Attn: Holly Johnson, MEPA Office
November 18, 2015
Page 2

that will be created by the Project. This hazard was recognized by the Proponent's traffic expert as set forth in the HCA (Exhibit E thereto), and as described in the Proponent's RFA-2 Gaming Application (Attachment 4-24-01 thereto), and the Proponent's Draft Environmental Impact Report (the "DEIR"). The Proponent did not consummate its agreement to purchase Parcel #14.¹

In light of the foregoing, the NPC is deficient, vague and misleading in a number of respects, including but not limited to the following:

1. The Proponent states the proposed changes are "minor" (p.1, p.2). This statement is an incorrect conclusion and misleading.
2. The Proponent states that "the changes do not create any new environmental impacts..." (p.1). This statement is an incorrect conclusion and misleading.
3. The Proponent states that it is "committed to complete the mitigation measures previously proposed in the Draft and Final EIR's" (p.1.). This statement is misleading because the changes proposed in the NPC create new environmental impacts which require new mitigation obligations.
4. The Proponent states in Footnote 1 (p.1) that the proposed design changes must only be approved by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission and the City of Springfield. This statement is misleading. Springfield Zoning Ordinance Section 8.5.80 requires amendments to site plans and elevations specified in the Host Community Agreement (which were deemed pre-approved by virtue of Springfield Zoning Ordinance Section 8.5.33) must be approved "pursuant to the same procedure and subject to the same limitations and requirements by which said plans and proposals were initially approved." The original site plans and elevations were approved by the voters of the City of Springfield in a city-wide referendum on July 16, 2013 (the ballot sought "approval for the City of Springfield to Host the MGM

¹ The owners of Parcel #14 did not submit comments to the DEIR because, at that time, they were under contract to sell Parcel #14 to the Proponent. However, the undersigned, on behalf of the owners of Parcel #14, did submit comments to the Proponent's Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") in December, 2014, but the Proponent failed to include the undersigned in its Circulation List (See NPC Attachment 1, p.50; and see NPC Attachment 5). As such, with respect to the NPC, the Proponent failed to comply with 301 CMR 11.10(7). It should also be noted that the Proponent also failed to include Springfield Mayor Dominic J. Sarno on the Circulation List.

Springfield Casino *pursuant to the terms of the signed Host Community Agreement*). Therefore, any material design changes must be approved by the voters of City of Springfield.

5. The Proponent states under "Description of Project Changes – Reduction in parking garage size:" that "The parking garage has been reduced by one level to a seven story parking garage. This results in a reduction of 387 parking spaces." This statement is materially misleading.

The statement fails to disclose the elimination of all bus parking from the parking structure, the elimination of Union Street as the location of the entrance and exit for the buses, and the elimination of the parking structure as the site for bus passenger arrivals and departures.

It also fails to disclose that a new element of bus vehicular traffic will be introduced onto the one-way, northbound, un-widened, two lane, East Columbus Avenue traveling immediately alongside, under and past Parcel #14, which will then turn into the Project Site at the corner of Parcel #14 on the Proponent's unlicensed property.² The purpose of this new bus traffic will be to both drop-off and pick-up passengers at the newly proposed "bus depot" to be located at the newly termed "South-end Market". (The location of the proposed "bus depot" is the same location as the originally proposed "porte-cochere" / valet entrance servicing the casino and the 25 story glass hotel, all of which is eliminated in the NPC.) (See NPC p.7 - Truck and Bus Access/Egress).

Buses dropping off passengers at the "bus depot" will then egress the Project Site presumably on State Street requiring the buses to travel throughout the City streets in search for parking at undisclosed off-site locations. The buses will then later return to the South-end Market "bus depot" a second time via a repeat trip on the sole access route of East Columbus Avenue passing alongside, under and past Parcel #14, for the purpose of picking up the passengers that were dropped-off earlier.

² Substantially all of the Proponent's parcel immediately abutting Parcel #14 to the north (over which the Proponent proposes to construct a curved roadway connecting East Columbus Avenue to Bliss Street, and over which all bus and vehicular traffic will access the Project Site to either enter the parking structure, or continue to the bus depot's "sawtooth bays") is not included in the "Gaming Establishment" as defined in Proponent's Gaming License.

Secretary Matthew A. Beaton
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs
Attn: Holly Johnson, MEPA Office
November 18, 2015
Page 4

In addition, the NPC proposes three bus drop-off/pick-up bays (i.e. the “sawtooth” bays). The NPC provides no information regarding any volumes or timing of bus arrivals for drop-offs and/or pick-ups. To the extent that the three “sawtooth” bays are inadequate, then buses will either be idling on Bliss St., backed up on East Columbus Avenue next to Parcel #14, or circling the City streets. In either event, there will be environmental impacts from traffic, noise, vibration and exhaust fumes.

There is absolutely no mention in the NPC of the scope or breadth of the impact from the buses, or any related mitigation whatsoever. Please note that the TEC Traffic Study incorporated into the Host Community Agreement referenced in both the DEIR and the FEIR, and included in the Proponent’s RFA-2 Gaming Application (as referenced in Attachment 4-24-01) made the material representation that East Columbus Avenue would be widened between Howard St. and Bliss St. to mitigate traffic volumes and provide for a deceleration lane for MGM Springfield traffic entering at Bliss St (to access the sole entrance to the then 3,762 spaces in the Parking Structure). At the time the representations were made to widen East Columbus Avenue, there was no plan for a “bus depot” on Bliss Street. With the introduction of the unquantified double daily trips for each bus, and the purposeful failure to provide any data, or mitigation related to such bus trips (each of which will pass alongside, under and past Parcel #14 and its residences), the Proponent has failed to introduce such impact, or any proposed mitigation measure to such impact. This bus impact is clearly contrary to the Proponents statements that “the changes do not create any new environmental impacts” (See Paragraph 2 above). Under the original design, buses were to enter and exit the parking structure on Union St. As originally proposed, Project related bus travel on East Columbus Avenue between Howard St. and Bliss Street was on a widened East Columbus Avenue and limited to only those egressing buses which were heading northbound to access I-91.

6. Attachment 3 (the “Currently Proposed Site Plan”) is NOT TO SCALE, and is grossly misleading with respect to the location of Parcel #14. Attachment 3 depicts Parcel #14 to be further away from Bliss St. than actual. This appears to be an attempt by the Proponent to mislead the Commonwealth and the City as to the proximity of Parcel #14 to the proposed curved roadway connecting East Columbus Avenue to Bliss St. which will be used by all vehicles, including the undisclosed double bus trips.

This combination of a failure to disclose the bus traffic, and to incorrectly diagram the location of Parcel #14, demonstrates that the Proponent's disclosures are not in good faith, and lack integrity.

7. The Proponent states in Footnote 2 that the construction of the residential units will not require any further State action by the Commission. This is an invalid conclusion of law. The Massachusetts Gaming Commission has the authority and responsibility to approve all design changes.
8. The Proponent states that it is implementing a comprehensive program of measures to mitigate traffic impacts. (NPC, p.6). In light of the comments set forth above, this statement is false.
9. The Proponents states "The proposed changes will not result in changes in transportation impacts". (NPC, p. 6 – Transportation). In light of the comments set forth above, this statement is false.
10. Table 2 – "Trip Generation Comparison" fails to reflect the introduction of the new double bus trips to access the Project Site for drop-off, and return trips for pick-up, (as discussed above), and as such, is insufficient and misleading.
11. The Proponent's statement on page 7 of the NPC with respect to residential parking that "There is also sufficient parking supply on the MGM Springfield site to provide alternative arrangements for parking." is inconsistent with the newly reduced number of parking spaces in the parking garage, and is misleading. First, the parking structure capacity before the proposed change was 3,762 (NPC p. 2.). The reduction in parking spaces is 352 (NPC p. 3). The NPC lacks specificity whether the reduction relates to buses or automobiles. Second, the reduced number of parking spaces is proposed to be 3,375. Projected peak demand (assuming the number provided is trustworthy) is 3,127 (NPC Table 3). Thus, there is a projected excess capacity of only 248 parking spaces spread throughout the proposed seven story parking structure (each floor to cover approximately two to three football fields). Third, the Proponent's statement that "drivers typically perceive a "parking lot" to be full when approximately 90% of the park spaces are full." (NPC p. 13). This statement may be misleading as there is a distinction between a "multi-level parking structure" and a

“parking lot”. As such, contrary to Proponent’s statement at NPC p. 13, there is little doubt that the consequence of the proposed design changes will result in “excess recirculation of vehicles to find open parking spaces”, and insufficient parking at any given time.

12. The Proponent makes the conclusory statement that the design changes will result in “...minor traffic distribution changes associated with these modifications on traffic volumes along Bliss Street, Howard Street and Union Street...” (NPC p.7), but omits to describe the substantial traffic distribution changes on East Columbus Avenue between Howard Street and Bliss Street and at Parcel #14, due to the “shift” of the bus drop off area from the Union St. parking structure entrance to the new “bus depot” on Bliss St. (MGM Way) at the “South-end Market”.
13. The Proponent is making a zero margin bet that no more than two trucks (presumably tractor trailers, box trucks, sanitation trucks, and other supply vehicles for the entire Casino Block and Retail Block) will be entering the site at the same time. If the Proponent is incorrect, it does not provide any basis for mitigation of truck traffic waiting to enter the reduced sized, shipping and receiving dock on the ground floor level in the parking structure at Union Street. (NOTE: the previous design included an underground level of the parking structure for shipping and receiving). This lack of capacity for waiting trucks will greatly impact the environment and traffic, and could impede egressing traffic from the parking structure’s proposed second floor exit ramp which empties onto Union Street at the location of the left hand turn lane into the parking structure’s truck entrance. (NOTE: the NPC states the truck driveway on Union Street is proposed to be shifted approximately 65 feet closer to East Columbus Avenue). This will have the effect of diverting egressing vehicles to the Howard Street exit of the parking structure and merging and accelerating onto East Columbus Avenue at Parcel #14.
14. The NPC at p.3 states “the parking garage has been reduced by one level to a seven-story parking garage” fails to disclose the elimination of the underground level of the Parking Structure. As such, the proposed changes include the elimination of at least two levels to the Parking Structure. The elimination of the basement level (as disclosed on NPC p.9) creates substantial environmental impacts due to the

Secretary Matthew A. Beaton
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs
Attn: Holly Johnson, MEPA Office
November 18, 2015
Page 7

relocation and rerouting of buses, passenger vans, limousines, and truck staging on Union Street.

15. The proposed Passenger Van Parking and Limousine Staging has been shifted to immediately behind Parcel #14 and its five (5) residential apartments. The area proposed for this staging of livery vehicles was previously used as a church rectory. In light of the fact that Springfield Zoning Ordinance Section 8.5.10 provides that the Proponent is obligated to contribute positively to the built environment and ensure a high quality of life for nearby businesses and residents, and the fact that the Proponent promised the City, and the City voters, and the Commonwealth and the Mass. Gaming Commission, and the owners of Parcel #14 that the Proponent would widen East Columbus Avenue at Parcel #14, the proposed redesign is punitive, unlawful and without integrity. The impact of air and noise pollution immediately adjacent to the residences is anticipated to be 24 hours a day, 7 days per week, and is unacceptable. The Proponent makes no mention whatsoever of any mitigation for this impact. Staging of livery vehicles next to residences creates an unsustainable impact to the built environment. The only mitigation is to eliminate this proposed use at the site abutting Parcel #14.
16. The only entrance to the proposed parking structure containing 3,375 parking spaces (claimed to be filled to approximately 89% capacity) is on Bliss Street, 200 feet from East Columbus Avenue. As stated in the NPC, the proposed redesign of the location of the entrance eliminates traffic to flow freely into the garage from either direction on Bliss Street. (NPC, p. 9). As such, all traffic entering the parking structure will be sourced exclusively from the one-way, northbound, East Columbus Avenue which will be required and directed to turn onto Bliss Street at the northern border of Parcel #14. The Proponent fails to disclose the exact distance between the northern border of Parcel #14 and the proposed new access roadway connecting East Columbus Avenue and Bliss St. But, as disclosed above, the "Currently Proposed Site Plan" which is Attachment 3 to the NPC, is not to scale and deceptively overstates the distance between Parcel #14 and the proposed roadway connecting East Columbus Avenue and Bliss St.
17. Attachment #3 depicts a staircase/stairwell in the Parking Structure at the location of Howard St. and the central plant. It is not clear whether there is a pedestrian

Secretary Matthew A. Beaton
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs
Attn: Holly Johnson, MEPA Office
November 18, 2015
Page 8

access door from such staircase/stairwell at the ground level to Howard Street. It is also not clear if there is a pedestrian sidewalk for access to such staircase/stairwell. Such access door and sidewalk is imperative for public safety. Also, to mitigate impacts to the handicapped and seniors, an elevator should be installed at the location of the staircase/stairwell at this location, as the only other elevator appears to be a distance of more than a football field away.

18. No mitigation plan is disclosed to eliminate the impact on Parcel #14 with respect to road closures of Bliss Street and Howard Street, the elimination of street parking at those locations, and the elimination of emergency access and public service access to Parcel #14, including sanitation, fire and rescue, mail, and public utilities. The health, safety and welfare of the occupants, residents, guests, patrons, vendors, and service personnel are at an extreme risk based upon the proposed changes in the NPC.

In closing, notwithstanding the violations and breaches by the Proponent with respect to the voter approved Host Community Agreement, and the terms of its Gaming License, the proposed redesign severely and substantially impacts and burdens Parcel #14 and the surrounding area without mitigation. The NPC is wholly inadequate and the Proponent must be required to provide specific mitigation measures including a different redesign of the Project.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric I. Michelman

Eric I. Michelman

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Paul Peter Nicolai <paul.nicolai@niclawgrp.com>
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2015 12:10 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

I am writing in response to the Commission's for public comments regarding the proposed changes to the MGM Springfield project.

While I understand that changing economics and business circumstances require flexibility in the design and construction of major projects like this one, there are two aspects to the proposed changes that cause concern:

Elimination of Tower – The structural change of the project from a 25 story tower to a six-story building is, based upon the criteria set forth by the Commission in the initial requirements for all resort casino applications, a major problem. The Commission made it clear in the initial requirements that the resort casino structure needed to be “transformative” of the physical environment in which it was set. What is now proposed is not transformative at all. In fact, a recent newspaper headline read that the new MGM proposal made “Springfield look like... Springfield” thereby highlighting the fact that there was nothing transformative at all about the revised proposal architecturally.

Given the amount of effort and the size of these resort casino projects, the requirement that the project be transformative of the physical environment is valid and should be maintained. This project should not be allowed to become the architectural equivalent of a Massachusetts middle school; what the new facade looks like.

Parking Garage – My understanding is that the revision includes removing one floor from the parking garage and reducing the number of parking spaces by 250. The effect of this project on parking in downtown Springfield has always been an issue and the Commission should inquire strongly before allowing the number of parking spaces in this project to be reduced.

Paul Peter Nicolai
Life Fellow, American Bar Foundation
President
Nicolai Law Group, P.C.
MONARCH PLACE
1 Monarch Pl., Ste 1230
Springfield, MA 01144-4006
v: 413-272-2000, ext. 222
f: 413-272-2010
e-mail: paul.nicolai@niclawgrp.com
visit us at: www.niclawgrp.com

U.S. Treasury Regulations require Nicolai Law Group, P.C. to inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice in this communication (including attachments) is not intended or written by the author to be used, and cannot be used, to (1) avoid penalties that may be imposed on a taxpayer or (2) promote, market, or recommend to another party any transaction or other matter addressed in this message.

ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS: If this communication relates to the negotiation of a contract, any electronic transaction or electronic signature statutes shall not apply; contract formation shall occur only on the mutual delivery of manually signed original documents unless otherwise specifically stated.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: DDayvid@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2015 8:27 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am a lifelong resident and tax payer in Springfield. I voted in favor of the MGM Proposal, as marketed and presented to the residents of Springfield, but DO NOT approve of their proposed changes.

The reasons that I voted in favor of the casino was that they positioned their vision of not just a casino, but a development of Residential Units, Retail Shops, World Class Entertainment and a beautiful high rise hotel tower. At the time MGM officials said this development was like no other, providing a mix of all these elements, making it more than just a "slot parlor".

The changes and recent announcements are very disheartening, as this was not the vision I voted for. They have proposed eliminating the hotel tower, moving the residential units off-site, and also reduced their retail and other non-casino elements. If you look at their reductions, the actual casino floor of gaming, was reduced by less than 500 SqFt. This tells a lot! They are focusing their strategy on casino slots and tables, and not much else.

PLEASE consider the wishes of the residents of Springfield, when making a decision on these changes.

I for one, DO NOT support these changes and would deny them.

Thank you for providing this forum to solicit public input on the proposed changes. MGM should have to build what they promised. No bait and switch!

Thank you!
David DaMolin
198 Emerson Street
Springfield, MA 01118

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: diane woodruff <dianewoodruff06002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 12:59 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Revised Casino Plans

Categories: Green Category

I think that with the planned changes, the casino will be a shadow of what was originally planned and no longer a show piece for the city of Springfield. This is truly *not* setting the project up for success. Have to say, though, that I'm glad. I never thought the casino should be built in the first place.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Marcus Baker <marcusedwardbaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 7:59 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Hello Members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

I am responding to your plea for public input on the MGM Springfield case, a project I care very much about and that it feel can be a kick-starter to bring Springfield from what it is today to being a premier New England destination for not only tourist but for businesses and families as well. Revitalization of Springfield's Metro Center is essential to not only the economy of the city but of the entirety of Western Massachusetts. It is one of the most densely built up downtowns outside of Metro Boston (which is why Springfield needs to build UP and not build OUT leading to urban sprawl), and more well connected and 'alive' then even Worcester's downtown (fingers crossed that the City Square development can change that!).

I have grave concerns about MGM Springfield's proposed changes. MGM says costs are going up regarding construction and is forced to cut the size of its Massachusetts Casino but, can still throw over a billion dollars on a Maryland Casino along a highway (and not in the center of a great historic city). So, when I first heard of the cutting out of the Hotel Tower from the plan I was appalled. The tower is what so many Springfield and even Commonwealth residents voted on when they went to the polls. The tower was seen by many as a physical representation of a 'city on the rise,' a city with a skyline that will continue to change. The tower was a physical representation that will be seen for miles and miles and say, "Come visit our fine city" and it would certainly attract more people than without it. It will also set a precedent for more tall buildings in the metro center, spurring economic development and bringing more people to live and work downtown.

When they say their costs are going up I feel like there are a few things at play here. MGM no doubt has the money and the extra costs of keeping the original plan are extremely small in the long run despite high inflation in the construction industry. I feel it may have more to do with Connecticut's possible Casinos that have MGM shaking in its boot and the Commonwealth should try to assure them against that fear, within reason (like maybe shaving 2% off their tax rate or by extending the time their license is valid). Nonetheless, MGM should be held accountable for the agreements it choose to make.

Further, the even more recent proposal to reduce the overall size of the resort is puzzling. This reduced size cannot possible save so much costs as the hit that will be taken by a 5-8% reducing in projected visitors (according to the recent MassLive article). That means 5-8% less people using the new Union Station, going to museums, walking along the riverfront, eating at restaurants, and shopping at area stores. 5-8% less people residents can count on to raise their long struggling economy. And to me that is just wrong, when this company could easily afford it and even benefit from it down the road.

Thank you for requesting comments and taking the time to read my thoughts. I urge you to please make MGM stick with its original plans for the sake of Springfield and the Commonwealth. The tower and original size resort should stay intact if you ask me and the majority of other stakeholders in this matter.

Regards,
Marcus Baker

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Sarann Ton <sarannt77@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 12:18 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Dear MGC,

I have been a resident of Springfield for more than 20 years and Springfield has gone through a lot of changes and a lot of turmoil. The crime rate in Springfield is appalling and frankly there is not much that really makes Springfield stand out. The Big E is a big attraction but only through the fall. Once that is gone, it seems like Springfield and the surrounding communities don't have much to offer for entertainment. I travel to Mohegan and Foxwoods when I want something to do and sometimes even to Boston. When I heard that we could have a casino in our city, I immediately thought, ok we finally have something that we can do. MGM Springfield's design was what I voted for because it really gave the city the wow factor with the size of the casino. The glass tower was a landmark piece for the skyline. I mean, people would be able to see it from enfield ct and even when you came from Holyoke on I-91. Having the tower removed and seeing the new design really didn't capture the wow factor that I voted for and even some of the people I conversate with about the casino have all said the same thing. Without the wow factor, how will anyone realize that there is a five star casino in the city. I understand why MGM wants to downsize the project, but I wish they would keep it or come up with another design that would give us the same wow factor that we once saw with the old design. As a long time Springfield resident, I want more for my city and I do want MGM to succeed. But I also want Springfield to stand out when it comes to entertainment and economic viability.

Thank you for giving me this time to voice my opinion about MGM Springfield.

Sarann Ton

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Re-Anagen <reanagen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 10:50 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

If the new design MGM presented was the one they originally presented I would have never voted for a casino in this city. It's a blatant bait & switch and Im disgusted and embarrassed that we the residents of the state of Massachusetts have been fooled like this.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brett Elmore <sfctrekie@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 9:04 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Springfield casino

Categories: Green Category

As a resident of Springfield my opinion is DO NOT let MGM change the plan.

Sent from my iPhone

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Brian Perks <constantbee@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 5:35 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Casino in Springfield MA

Categories: Green Category

To whom it may concern,

Please do not allow MGM to redesign the casino. It is not in the best interest of the city and is showing a lack of commitment to the community that was willing to let them in, but also a lack of care with regards to their ability to uphold their other obligations concerning the casino. Thank you for your time and consideration.

-Brian Perks
45 Willow St
Springfield MA, 01103

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: SHARON PILACHOWSKI <slp7306@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 4:29 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM SPFLD. REVISIONS

Categories: Green Category

I want to see the casino built the way it was originally planned. This includes the glass tower hotel. MGM is trying to cut corners to save money probably to invest in another casino in Bridgeport CT. I feel that building a casino in Bridgeport is a way of punishing Foxwoods and Mohican for wanting to build near Spfld. line. A casino in that location will take many of their customers that come from NY City.(Mainly large number of Asian patrons.) So please say no to MGM's revisions and keep them to their original plans that were agreed upon. Thank You, Sharon from Chicopee

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Remo Pizzichemi <remo@welcomegroupinc.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 2:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: esullivan@west-springfield.ma.us; Jeff Ciuffreda-ACCGS;
chuck.flowersbywebster@verizon.net;
president@massachusettschamberofcommerce.com; Wydra, Mary Kay (contact,SEA);
Amar Shokeen
Subject: Redesign to include funding assistance for skywalk to Mass Mutual Center
Categories: Green Category

My name is Remo Pizzichemi. I operate the Hampton Inn in West Springfield Massachusetts. I, along with many other competing hotel operators am disappointed that the 25 story iconic hotel will not be built as part of the MGM casino project. That said, I am more concerned that MGM may actually pull out of the project altogether because of all of the unexpected construction costs. I hope a compromise can be reached on the design to satisfy MGM. As a hotelier, we have not seen any new demand generator come to the market, enough to compensate for businesses leaving, downsizing or closing. The casino will create this very welcome new demand.

In the spirit of increasing demand, I also consider it vital for the MGM Casino to be connected to the Mass Mutual Convention Center. This will help assure that the convention center will be used more often affecting hotel occupancy in Springfield and surrounding towns. The performance of the convention center has always been on the radar since it was expanded. This is especially so with the hotels in Chicopee, Springfield and West Springfield where an additional 2.75% occupancy tax is collected to pay down the bond that funded the expansion of the convention center. Additionally, having the Massachusetts Convention Center Authority take over the convention center was to yield more conventions than when it was the former Springfield Civic Center. The reality is that the convention center sits largely empty especially during the colder months.

You can imagine the excitement in learning that the original casino design was to have minimal meeting space while connecting to the convention center with a pedestrian sky bridge. The convention center would effectively become the function space for the casino itself by installing a four season pedestrian sky bridge. This would help create demand for the convention center and finally give much-needed occupancy to surrounding hotels especially during the bad weather months. We could finally believe that we would see a return on our investment in funding the expansion of convention center.

With this forever changing landscape of seemingly increasing construction costs for the casino, I suggest we should accept compromises in designs by MGM, but to again include the pedestrian sky bridge to connect the convention center to the casino. The pedestrian sky bridge will actually assist in growing convention business and increase tax revenues. Worst case, if it is beyond the reach of MGM to construct this pedestrian sky bridge, I suggest we look at assisting MGM build it by appropriating some of the 2.75% occupancy tax that is currently being collected by hotels in Chicopee, Springfield and West Springfield.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Remo Pizzichemi
Vice President
Welcome Group Inc
www.welcomegroupinc.com

413-348-7097

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: acialek@charter.net
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 2:14 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: casino

Categories: Green Category

NO MORE CHANGES.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Nicholas Lapointe <nlapointe86@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 2:09 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield - Comment on change of hotel/14% reduction

Categories: Green Category

MGC,

I will first start by saying that I think you are doing a good job regulating all permitting for all 3 casino locations. I support the mass gaming legislation and the three pending licenses. I also thought the MGM proposal was by far the best one received when first voted upon. The hotel, parking, restaurants, and layout were amazing benefits to the city as originally proposed. I hope you continue to protect the interest of the city of Springfield.

I do not however, support the SIGNIFICANT change in scope of the MGM casino hotel. this site plan review process is unique, as it typically is up to the developer to build what they deem financial feasible for the site. Mass Gaming is a very special instance where the VOTERS approved the MGM application based on their proposed alternative

The MGM "concept" was NOT a concept, but a preferred alternative/selection. It is understood that they have the right to make minor changes for financial reasons but they should not be changing at a scale this large where it is clearly NOT what people voted on. The 25 story tower was the wow factor for me and thousands of others. MGM has committed 800 million for this project. They should be required to look into cutting other less essential aspects of the project (material changes/finishes engineering costs, vendors, casino equipment, ect) before removing the tower. Have they considered not using a glass façade but other cheaper finishes? Have they considered reducing the height to say 15 or even 12 stories? That would still provide the "wow" factor. The reduction in parking garage size also is questionable. Have they done any "Value Engineering" with there site plans yet?

If you were going to go buy a new car and the salesman shows you a picture of a nice 2015 Mercedes Benz with leather seats, navigation, and V6 engine! and you say "okay i'll order that one!". you then sign on the dotted line and the salesman says your car will custom ordered and ready for pickup in 3 months. You then go and pick up your new car 3 months later expecting the Mercedes benz in the picture and instead The salesman says "oh, yea sorry the cost of materials went up and we had trouble with our suppliers so we had to take out the leather seats, navigation, and used a 4-cylinder engine because the V6 us too much manufacture....."
What would you say to the salesman????

The high rise hotel was what made the project so unique. Now, their project looks like a few new restaurants, a two story parking garage, and a hotel that looks like any other suburban 6 story hotel in Massachusetts. Sounds alot like the Mercedes Benz you ordered without the leather seats, navigation, and V6! We voted on the concept that, barring minor changes to layout/materials/locations, would be expected to produce in similar scale.

This is an URBAN casino and was voted and approved as such.

You should require MGM to deliver it's committed concept Let the City of Springfield voters decide if the 14% reduction in size, hotel change, and housing change is okay.

Thanks,

N. Lapointe

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: anthony aubrey <masschef2003@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 1:28 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Categories: Green Category

Hello, as a Springfield resident and voter, who lives downtown one block from the casino. I voted on the casino and design that MGM presented us. Now the plan has completely changed and if the vote now we're to be taken I know myself and my neighbors would not have voted for it. if slight changes were made it would be one thing but to take the tower away the whole concept has changed.

Thank you.

Anthony Aubrey
235 state st
Springfield,ma. 01103

Sent from my iPhone

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 12:56 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Green Category

Name

Juan Vazquez

Email

ponceleon10565@aol.com

Questions or Comments

MGM should not be allow to change anything on the casino construction. The contract its clear, "no changes".

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Michael Home <mhealy100@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 12:35 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Let me start by saying I was/am a proponent of the Casino.

Still unclear of the construction estimates that were so badly flawed that they're causing a shrinking of the original plan & footprint of the casino? A twenty five foot tower versus a six story structure is a huge swing. The decrease in overall space of fourteen percent is significant. Why can't something be added to offset the footprint shrinkage and why can't a compromise of a fifteen or twenty story hotel be talked about? At least the hotel could be seen from highway at that point? Wasn't the point of the tower to help change the Springfield skyline and make it look more metropolitan and upscale? As for adding to the footprint, what about developing the old York Street jail site? Put a fun thing in, like a rock climbing attraction, like they have in Hadley or development of some trendy shops like you may find on Newberry Street in Boston.

This impactful change to the design of the Casino must be addressed and common ground found by having an open dialogue with the general public. All these changes and closed door politics don't set a very good tone heading into the largest project in the city's recent history.

Respectfully,
Mike Healy
Longmeadow, Ma

Sent from my iPad

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 12:27 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Categories: Green Category

Name

John Illig

Email

jeillig@verizon.net

Subject

MGM plan reduction

Questions or Comments

I hope that you do not lower the expectations we had with the original agreement struck between MGM and the host community of Springfield. and its neighbors and the state. This includes replacing the 25 story 4star hotel with a stretched out 6 floor bland hotel. We have hotels in town that are 10+storys. One new six floor hotel has just been built at a cost of \$9. Their 6 floor hotel will not be "4star" if it doesn't say it first on the skyline. What is MGM planning on doing, buying \$10,000 beds in order to sell us that a stretched out building is still going to cost \$70 or \$80 million. I would rather they cut the bowling alley out and the streetcars (which probably will be cut anyway).

No matter how they try to put a label and dress it, the iconic structure that would have advertised that this is a destination resort will be gone, and a sincerely believe few tourists will come into Springfield if they see nothing flamboyant to come in for. MGM may speak of their brand will draw them in--they have permanently tarnished that; and DO NOT allow them to put some gaudy sign over where they build their final

uninviting product. And study this project; they are saving lots of money with this revised plan in demolition costs of old structures they now won't have to take down and figure in the bland hotel is only replacing space where those apartments were going to be. Renovating some outside existing site for future apartments shouldn't even be factored in. Its an old building they bought to develop or sell to a developer at a later date!

I was for this project but now am against it because it is turning out to be a box casino, reflecting old run down buildings around most of which the SHC never bothered with until they saw this cash cow coming, instead of the "destination resort" we were evidently cohered into voting for. "Destination" spells new, not the same ol', same ol' .

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Cupero, Sue <SCupero@smith-wesson.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 11:02 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Categories: Green Category

I think it is unacceptable for MGM to now come forward with design changes of this magnitude. We voted on a very specific design and size.

I would not support approving this request. In my opinion this will be the first of many and we need to set a precedence with MGM.

Respectfully
Sue Cupero
Sent from my iPhone

This message, including all attachments: (i) May contain technical data as defined in the International Traffic In Arms Regulations (ITAR) 22 CFR 120.10. Export of this material is restricted by the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and may not be exported or transferred to non-U.S. persons without prior written approval from the U.S. Department of State; and (ii) Is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this communication in error, please delete it and notify the sender immediately. Thank you.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: langone@rcn <langone@rcn.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 9:46 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Cc: Pat Sullivan; Kennedy Kevin
Subject: Changes to Riverfront Park

Categories: Green Category

MGM Springfield

Can you show the original architectural drawings of the proposed Riverfront Park site and what changes are now planned?

James Langone

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: buckeyebros@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 9:22 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Changed plans

Categories: Green Category

Now that elections are over we can actually get this project started, this is by far is the largest economic development Springfield has ever seen, let's NOT squabble over a few feet of space, as for the hotel tower not being built I actually prefer it on Main street as opposed to State street location, you would have the dredge of criminals parading by 5 days a week going to the court house, I'm sure having a 4 star hotel across the street wouldn't be a good fit, please don't prolong the rebuilding of our downtown any longer, thanks, David Glantz resident and business owner of Springfield
Sent from my HTC

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: kari-lebeau@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:55 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Mgm project

Categories: Green Category

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a resident of Springfield so I have a particularly vested interest in this project. My opinion is that I demand what was originally promised by MGM. I consider any downsizing to its plans a breach of contract, and hopefully not an intended bait and switch. I may not have voted in favor of this project if I had known that MGM would be changing the plans, making the casino less appealing for tourism.

Thank you for asking for public opinion.

Sincerely,

Kari LeBeau

Sent by Outlook for Android

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Carl Abert <cabert@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:44 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Casino in Springfield

Categories: Green Category

The current revised design is totally unacceptable since it is NOT what was voted on and approved by the taxpayers. This situation is a classic bait and switch scam. The Commission and Springfield authorities must NOT approve any of these changes - MGM must honor the original agreement including the 25 story glass tower!

If the revised design were to be voted on there is a significant possibility that it would not be passed.

Regards,
Carl Abert
Mobile: 413-478-2245

Sent from my Tablet, please excuse my brevity.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Jacob <jacobwerbicki@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:13 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM changes

Categories: Green Category

If MGM is going to reduce the size of the casino and resort facilities they still need to have wow factor, I would like to see a full imax movie theatre in the planned movie theatre, since there is no imax theatre around within a hours drive it will still draw people to the resort and create foot traffic in the downtown area.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Kevin King <King@dennisgrp.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:13 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Gaming Commission,

I think the change in design is a big negative for the project. In my opinion the original design is why I and many others supported the project. MGM needs something to draw people in and off the highway. The tower does just that. Downtown can be seen from Route 91 as soon as you cross the state line from Connecticut. The new tower will catch people's eyes and help draw them in.

If they are concerned about wasted "common" spaces on the tower floors then reduce the tower height by a few floors and make each floor slightly larger. If cost is a concern then look at changing materials. Glass cladding is very expensive. Add other non-glass elements into the tower to reduce cost.

The residents of Springfield and the surrounding communities are not getting what was promised to them. If a vote were to be held today, I do not think they would have enough support for the project to move forward.

Please support Springfield and give us what we approved and were promised.

Thank you,

Kevin R. King

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Yamira Moreno-Escobar <yamira.moreno@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 7:29 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM changes

Categories: Green Category

Good morning,

I am not a math expert, but 22 floor down to 6 floors seems more than 16% decrease. The cuts vs the reason for the cuts do not make sense.

Why would I drive from far to come to a small, regular hotel. I leave here and I prefer to drive more than an hour to Mohegan Sun.

It is not just about the casino, it is about the whole experience, including the visual impression.

In general, I think they new what they were doing; impress the people and then present the real plan. The plan they knew about since the beginning, but did not disclose.

Thanks,
Yamira

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Jose Arce <raularce331@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 7:27 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)

Categories: Green Category

I don't think it's fair that we voted for a different casino that we will be getting.
We were told a glass building not a six story building.
They waited to get permission from the gaming commission and the voters to make a change in the plans

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: drewgonthier@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 7:15 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Regarding MGM Springfield

Categories: Green Category

I am writing this email to urge the gaming commission to make MGM Springfield live up to their commitment. As a resident of Springfield I am disgusted with the changes. They have taken away the 'Wow Factor' from their project. The glass tower that was originally proposed, and was used to sell the commission and residents of this city on their plan, magically gets scraped after they get the License? That is shady business.

Any company could have come in promising outlandish perks to win us over and then cancel them once they are awarded the license. To allow MGM to do this sets a bad precedent. This says to future investors in other projects to just lie to get the license and then edit the plan after. I believe MGM needs to be held fully responsible and made to go forward with the project they promised us.

Secondly, from a gamblers point of view, if you are a high roller and spending a lot of money at a casino... Would you rather stay in a glass tower, or a six story motel? I think that's a no brainer.

I'm urging the commission to hold MGM responsible. There are a lot of Springfield residents like me who feel lied to and cheated. Please make them accountable and provide the project they promised.

Thank you,
Andrew Gonthier

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Andrew Mirkin <abmw2@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 6:50 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Springfield MGM casino

Categories: Green Category

Springfield has not and will not be a destination city. The downsizing of the casino is win reaction to competition in Connecticut not previously known until after the springfield public voted. To possibly sandwich towns like Longmeadow, west Springfield, and east Longmeadow between casinos is detrimental to the areas future and its citizens that actually work and currently pay taxes. Hopefully MGM goes away and places it's development in someone else's state and backyard.

Andrew Mirkin

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: James Kashmanian <jkashmanian@aaapv.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 6:45 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Casino

Categories: Green Category

Please make sure that MGM does not short change the people and city of Springfield. If they are allowed to now what about the future ?

Happy Connecting. Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy S® 5

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: mdovell@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 11:02 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

Matthew P. Dovell, MPA

45 Willow St Apt 105, Springfield, Massachusetts 01103
PHONE: 508-561-3862 E-MAIL: mdovell@comcast.net

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

In March of this year I moved to the City of Springfield for a city position. As you can see above I reside in Stockbridge Court about a block away from the MGM site. To tell you a bit of my background I have as also shown above MPA from Bridgewater State University and some experience working for and serving on various towns, boards and a transit authority. Earlier I had the pleasure of having an internship with the late Anna Navalanko of Middleboro. Her work surrounded my cubical with binders filled with what was then a planned casino by the Wampanogs. Needless to say I never actually anticipated living near a casino. Having said that though there is a large difference between the process that was imposed on Middleboro and MGM. I believe the process of vetting the design though the MGC and local governments is the best way to ensure long term planning and viability. When MGM stated that it was delaying the casino for I-91 work I generally agreed as I also worked in retail and know there are differences between a soft and grand opening. When the design was changed from a tower of 25 stories to five or six I was skeptical a bit at first but I look at things from a number of different perspectives. If the number of rooms has not been changed and the spending is the same then frankly the tower might not be a big concern. In addition if a tower was made and if in another 15-20 years somehow the casino closes just how would a tower sell itself? The decline in the amount of space for retail for me is a bit of a concern. I am sure that there is some calculated price per square foot with revenue on the casino. If they make agreements with hotels maybe they might not have a hotel at all. However, they cannot because they did make an agreement on this. I work with contracts and right now change orders are not tolerated unless it is significant market changes (spike in oil etc).

My argument is not against the design in at itself but that the amount of space to me would indicate a lower operation. During my time in retail the amount of backroom space was vital in order to process inventory and deliveries. Less space means lower volume or at the very least a slower turnaround of the process. I would ask the MGC to consider what other casinos MGM has had and if they have reduced this same space. MGM made a deal with the community and surrounding community and to actually change the terms of the agreement unilaterally would not be sound business practices. For the record I do not consider myself to be a gambler. At the same point though contractual obligations should not be a gamble. I would argue that a fair amount of the people in Springfield are frustrated between the delay, change of the tower, change in size and closing of their pr office in the metro center area. Springfield is a city which has had significant hardships over the past five years. Prior to MGM there was the attempt from Ameristar which then dropped out. The people of the City of

Springfield have come too far to watch a project potentially shrink. I have watched a number of MGC meetings online and I believe your expertise in this manner is required to resolve these issues in a fair and equitable manner. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Matthew Dovell MPA

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: jerome whittington <jjw5120@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 10:19 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

I feel we have been played for fools. We were shown this grand beautiful casino/hotel only for them to dumb down the whole project once they secured the rights. The tower should stay!!! It's a beacon that Springfield is changing and moving forward. If we wanted something more in line with Springfield we would have never voted that casino in the first place.

I feel duped and betrayed and after the casino being pushed back a year then changed twice, I really feel they are looking for a way out of this project and really have no interest or faith in the revitalization of Springfield.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Jerry <jcignoli@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 9:10 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

The City of Springfield claims to be trying to attract more people to the downtown area of Springfield, which I believe is a GOOD thing. When the initial design was passed on, and voted upon, I, along with many others approved of the ballot question. I liked the idea of a highrise along the highway to really catch the eye of people passing. I know there were other people who didn't vote for the casino, because they didn't gamble. It only stands to reason that those same people might utilize the MGM property for other activities like shopping in the stores, eating in the restaurants, bowling in the bowling alley etc. these are the areas MGM plans to reduce in size by 37%, along with reducing parking by 300-400 cars. If they can cut down the garage by that many cars, since the size of the casino isn't going to change, all that eliminated parking would be cut from people using the other facilities of the project.(shopping, eating, bowling etc.) Springfield currently has a parking problem in the downtown area, and I think this would help by keeping the parking garage as initially planned. I believe MGM should honor their plans that we voted on in the original building plans of the casino and properties, with the highrise hotel, and all the other facilities. I'm not sure, if the casino plans came to a vote today, with all the new changes, that it would pass.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jerry Cignoli

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Eric Bascom <ericbascom2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 8:52 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Eric Bascom IV, Longmeadow, MA. "MGM SPRINGFIELD DESIGN" PUBLIC COMMENT

Categories: Green Category

Dear Massachusetts Gaming Commission,

As a concerned Western Massachusetts resident, I'm disappointed in the City of Springfield and MGM Springfield. I saw online you were looking for public comments.

I personally loved the original design with the 10 to 15 story glass tower. It brought about the "WOW" factor in the City of Springfield. It was vital to keep for economic development to bring the crowds of people in and it improves the greater Springfield city skyline as an image. The whole South End really would have benefited from that. There would have been more retail development, and it would have cleaned up Main Street from a major tornado since 2011.

This new design I feel "WILL NOT BENEFIT THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD." This new design changed drastically. It looks like what we already have in the City of Springfield just a bunch of buildings and hotels. It fails to bring about what the citizens originally voted on. The citizens WERE NEVER TOLD the original design will be subjected to change or be modified. This shows MGM is too cheap of a corporation. They want to take the easy way out! Right now, so far MGM hasn't done anything to remove these concrete barriers from the city main streets. Residents want to shop and now there is a shortage of parking spaces.

The City of Springfield residents had a vote prior to allowing MGM Casino to build and they agreed on the original model of design. This is what the city needs and wants. Let's get moving and get the job underway. IF MGM can't do their job properly, make this happen, well they shall just pack up and leave!

Sincerely,

Eric Bascom IV

59 Converse Street

Longmeadow, MA 01106

(413) 454-2588 (CELL)

(413) 567-5147 (HOME)

ericbascom2@gmail.com e-mail

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: John Zadworny <jzadworny@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 8:26 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

MGM should not be allowed too do these design and other changes.

1 - delay the opening - blame the highway construction - even thou they knew the highway was going too be done during the construction of the casino and the state thinks it would be done on time (disappointment)

2 - remove the beautiful eye catching glass tower (disheartening)

3 - reduction in total design of casino. (discouraging))

They pitched the WOW factor so they could get the license and then give us the LOW factor.

Please do not allow these changes.

Regards,

John

John P. Zadworny

236 No. Maple St.

Florence, Ma. 01062

Phone: 413-586-6370

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Rob - T&J Auto Body <tandj.autobody@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 8:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

My family lives over near the Wilbraham/Springfield line, in Springfield.
Completely in favor of the Casino project. Now the tower change isn't that big a game changer. However, reducing the overall plan by 14% after the design had been agreed on, I am not sure that is acceptable.
What would have happened had the other casino designs been allowed to compete with this new project design....? If the people were given the MGM design with the 14% reduction and no tower, would one of the other casino projects have won the bid...? Not sure this is fair to change AFTER everything is agreed on.
Again not so concerned with just the "tower" redesign. Thank you for your time.
Rob

Sent from Rob's iPad

www.tandjautobodyludlowma.com

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: vze33jqj@verizon.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 7:07 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Springfield Design

Categories: Green Category

I saw notice of your request for public input on a Mass Live.com article released Wednesday, 11/4/2015 at 5:05 p.m. so I hope your request is not just for the Thursday meeting. I'm rushing to get this out and I hope it gets my point across.

Like many of my relatives, neighbors, and friends, I feel that there has been a bait and switch pulled on us by MGM with the approval of the current Mayor. My initial vote of approval for the casino was very influenced and based on the many ads and pictures, and promises of a renaissance of the Downtown Tornado damaged area that would include a 25 story Glass tower and residential apartments.

Both items are now gone now and we are being given a bunch of seemingly poor excuses with few concrete facts as to why.

The tower is being replaced by a 6 story hotel and the city is now "selling" the old stately School Department Building on State Street to MGM for the residential apartments. The School Department Building is in an area that does not need rehab and has a lot going for it already, and certainly won't help the downtown area.

The non binding re-vote to gauge the public's feelings was also squashed.

Please make this Company deliver what they said they would.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Gibbs, resident, Springfield, Ma

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: T J Conway <tom@tjconway.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 5:39 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: MGM Spfld Design

Categories: Green Category

This city needs this project more than MGM needs them. My feeling is just let them build it the way they think is best for them, I am one who wants them to succeed, and be here for a long time. If this city's politicians keep pestering them as to the size of the project(remember, it's still a massive job), they are apt to say "see you later". Then what? There is no "Plan B". Where else is SPRINGFIELD going to find someone who wants to invest a billion dollars of private money in their city? Tom Conway

Sent from my iPhone

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:01 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Marcus Baker

Email

marcusedwardbaker@gmail.com

Subject

Hold MGM Springfield to its agreements!

Questions or Comments

I urge you to hold MGM Springfield to its original agreement. MGM Springfield CHOSE to make those agreements and should keep them. The removal of the hotel tower and downsizing of the overall facility is a slap in the face to Springfield residents. It shows that the MGM gives little value to the people and the city. The hotel tower would inspire a new generation of high-rises much needed in a downtown environment, where things need to be built up and not out. It would signal for miles around that Springfield is truly a city on the rise, economically, figuratively, and literally. MGM can obvious afford to do so considering it is not scaling back its Billion dollar investment in Maryland. We need to make sure they are making the as promised investments here, as that is why people agreed to have them come to Springfield and to Massachusetts.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 10:29 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Grant Wells

Email

mindburst7@yahoo.com

Phone

(413) 739-4345

Subject

Springfield Casino

Questions or Comments

Sirs:

As a resident of Springfield I am very concerned over MGM's change of plans for the casino now that they have won the proposal to build a casino in Springfield. They won this proposal based on the original plans submitted, the contribution to the city and the number of jobs that would be created. Now they not only are not going to build the glass tower hotel, they are downsizing by 14%. Was their original plan to put together an enticing proposal and then change it once they were selected? The possibility of another casino being built closeby had to have been considered at the time of the proposal. In my eyes, this looks like fraud! MGM should be held to the original proposal or the agreement should be deemed null and void. I implore you to hold MGM to the original proposal. The residents of Springfield backed the casino based on the original proposal.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Facebook <notification+zrdo=f1g66hz@facebookmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 1:29 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: [Massachusetts Gaming Commission] New message from Gerard La Fleur

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Conversation between Gerard La Fleur and Massachusetts Gaming Commission



Gerard La Fleur

12:58pm Oct 22

http://l.facebook.com/l/zAQEqxHd1AQEqMAL2LQR7UpVyg173P_geUKwkRpOSQZLGlg/www.springfield-ma.gov/cos/index.php?id=council-2015

This site will give you the Email address of all City Counselors and contact info for Mayor. I urge all Springfield residents to Email Phone and utilize Facebook messenger to let them all know we are against the continued downsizing of the casino facility. We must demand they all take public stand NOW before elections. Then we as citizens can vote out those who just may be on the MGM payroll.. I am sure you all realize the current down sizing is planned to xcut parking, Theatre, bowling alley as well as retail spac3e. All of which are really not the top money making aspects of casino. These are ancillary areas according to MGM and also the areas that you can enjoy with family. It is so very obvious that MGM is attempting to take advantage of us as citizens and we MUST NOT ALLOW THIS!!! So each and every one of us must contact any and all elected officials I have already e mailed all sitting counselors and you should do the same as and individual i have no strength but as a whole we the citizens have all the power of the voting booth!!!



City of Springfield, Mass.: City Council 2015

www.springfield-ma.gov

NEW: City Council Meeting Agendas, Minutes and Video - search or browse expanded documentation and c...



View Conversation on Facebook

This message was sent to mgccomments@state.ma.us. If you don't want to receive these emails from Facebook in the future, please unsubscribe.

Facebook, Inc., Attention: Department 415, PO Box 10005, Palo Alto, CA 94303

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 10:27 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

John Illig

Email

jeillig@verizon.net

Subject

MGM not investing same dollars as they tell you

Questions or Comments

MGM isn't still investing \$800m as they are claiming. Just consider the cost changes in their plan alterations. They took out \$80+m hotel highrise, claiming spending same amount on 6 level along main st. The space was already allotted for housing which they moved to state street. They are using same structural design for this lose rise hotel (we have the hampton suites down the road just built for around \$9m. The housing construction, guaranteed will be delayed and its cost to a renovated building, they probably bought for a dollar will be less than the new buildings that would have been built along main. Cutting size of garage (14% investment cut), downsizing bowling, movie, other resort and green space areas, leaving only the casino floor basically remaining the same. Figure revised design is not what we voted for and cost cuts (not shifting of same funds) to be about \$200m. They are swindling state and city because of a sudden they don't like their plans in the wake of competition. They had several years to plan and reserve cost funds for this project. This is a smoke screen they are giving you. We need to stand up to them or boot them out for not implementing what we agreed they would when they were selected in due process. If disqualifying them, yes give back their \$80m fee, but force them to pay for triple damages on what they have done to Springfield and revenue loss for the state as MA state law permits. Do what is right for all of us. If you keep them on contract make them adhere to their full original design, including a highrise resort destination hotel. Otherwise moving forward with this low profile, ordinary plan will attract no visitors or out of state tourists and the whole project will be dead in 5 years anyway because, as I predict, no one will come.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Johnny Gagnon Jr <johnny@tomekin.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2015 12:39 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: mgm springfield

this whole thing is beginning to be a joke. forgive me if i am wrong, but i assume there were a number of bids on the casino in springfield, correct? and i assuming you chose mgm for a reason? then you say, ok you can open a year late, that is fine. next you say, ok that beautiful glass tower you were going to build to give new life in a tired skyline, yeah you don;t have to do that. now they are applying to make the casino smaller? enough is enough. who do they think they are? they should be happy we gave the chance to build their lousy casino after all. a casino that many people here are still not happy about it, and few grow tired of every day and with every change. make them build that glass tower. say, no, we chose you for a reason, and part of that reason was the glass tower, so you have to build it, and no you can;t make your casino smaller, and no you can't have an extra year to build it. If the pequots and mohegans make theirs across the border, you better hope the mgm makes one big enough and nice enough to steal their cliental. there is not enough gamblers in this area to go around for everyone. and i mean what the hell is your job anyway, if you just let these casinos walk all over you?

johnny

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2015 12:22 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

John Illig

Email

jeilig@verizon.net

Subject

MGM doing it again

Questions or Comments

City and state officials are being bulldozed again by MGM. All this 'commitment' to a high quality resort casino is turning into just what you and we in the Springfield area did NOT want; a small, ordinary box that will house no amount of guests, provide few variety of activities, few quality shops, less jobs, and a positive profit and impact to this area and the state. Taking out the theater, shrinking the bowling alley, less stores; it seems logical following their reducing a luxury hotel to a motel 6. All under the guise of costs impacts. They could have started investing in materials and the like when the symbolic shovels first went in the ground.

You & we got hoodwinked. They should never have been permitted to alter the original plan they sold to you and to us, or we should get triple damages from the damage they have already done and let them be gone--that's what they want in the end anyway.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 12:22 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

John Illig

Email

jeillig@verizon.net

Subject

MGM

Questions or Comments

Now that its almost certain CT will not expand any casinos in Enfield and even Windsor, I don't see any reason why MGM can't continue with their original and approved project in Springfield. I urge you not to accept their downsizing plan. And we all know its a smaller footprint and will have less revenue to state and the city (a small ordinary hotel and less parking space says it all.) You need to hold them to what they sold to the state and community. This downsizing is a disappointment and several friends I have in Enfield and Tolland see no reason to even explore coming to MGM Springfield if the revised plan is enacted. A box casino disguised as an ordinary part of an unattractive city is not inviting to them

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 4:23 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

John Edwards

Email

jeillig@yahoo.com

Subject

keep MGM hotel highrise

Questions or Comments

I am hoping the MGC will stand firm on what MGM sold Springfield, the surrounding area and state including the design of the 25story hotel. Hoping you are as strong as the NYGC was when they faced a similar casino change demand in Schenectady. No high roller or tourist is going to come off the highway to "visit" this city & casino and no famous or rich people are going to put money on a low rise stone motel sitting on a half-dead main street because there are a few stores on it. This new plan will also dampen the entertainment prospects we were promised! The reasons MCG claims are very illogical since steel and glass costs are down!! Also, if they weren't downsizing why are they cutting a level off the parking garage and taking out most of the "plaza"? You wanted a resort. Just look at the revised renderings---it is now a box casino, and will in this configuration never be a resort. The people aren't fooled, and hopefully you won't be either. Our city leaders have failed, so please do the right thing and hold this Casino's foot to the fire. They say they are selling their brand not a attractive structure? What they are showing of their brand is--cheap & cheating !

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 6:46 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Name

Dennis Murphy

Email

dmurphy@faiagency.com

Phone

(413) 534-6309

Subject

MGM Original Design

Questions or Comments

I hope the Mass Gaming Commission will mandate that the original design for the casino in Springfield stay as planned. People voted for gambling after seeing the design. The hotel tower was the Main focus of the entire casino. The new plan looks like a slot parlor--NOT the design intended. What a disappointment should this new design be allowed.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: Eric I. Michelman, Esq. <ericmichelman@lawfirmofbusiness.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 1:13 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Fw: Objection to MGM-Springfield's Redesign Of Site Plan and Project

From: "Eric I. Michelman, Esq." <ericmichelman@lawfirmofbusiness.com>
To: "mgccoments@state.ma.us" <mgccoments@state.ma.us>
Cc: "john.ziembra@state.ma.us" <john.ziembra@state.ma.us>; Blue Catherine (MGC) <catherine.blue@state.ma.us>; Jay Michelman <michelmanlaw@hotmail.com>; Jeffrey Burstein <jeffreyburstein@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 10:08 PM
Subject: Objection to MGM-Springfield's Redesign Of Site Plan and Project

mgccoments@state.ma.us
Massachusetts Gaming Commission
101 Federal St., 23rd Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

September 23, 2015

Re: Objection to MGM-Springfield's Redesign Of Site Plan and Project

Dear Commissioners:

Yesterday, September 22, 2015, MGM-Springfield (Blue Tarp reDevelopment, LLC) announced that it is redesigning both the site plan for its Casino-Retail mixed-use commercial and residential casino resort real estate Development (the "Project"), and the components of the Project.

Included in these changes, among others, are:

- i. the elimination of the iconic 25-story glass tower,
- ii. the elimination of one level of the parking structure,
- iii. the removal of residential units to off-site locations,
- iv. the relocation of a hotel,
- v. changes to bus parking, travel patterns and accommodations; and
- vi. consequential material changes to local traffic patterns with regional effects.

These material changes trigger the requirements of regulatory review, and contractual, legal and zoning enforcement.

First, pursuant to Springfield Zoning Ordinance Section 8.5.80, the changes require approval of the voters of the City of Springfield, as such vote was part of the approval process of the original plans, and have thereby been pre-approved pursuant to Springfield Zoning Ordinance Section 8.5.33.

Second, the changes are not in conformity with the current approval of the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act ("MEPA"). Traffic patterns and parking have now been materially altered. Surrounding communities, and abutters, will now be materially affected without any mitigation.

The Mayor of the City of Springfield admits that such changes are material, but only will require the approval of the City Council.

Clearly, the Commissioners of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission must critically question why such material changes at this late date are being presented, and why they are necessary, and whether such changes are allowed under MGL c.23K, the Commission's Regulations (205 CMR et. seq.), MEPA, and the Springfield Zoning Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Eric I. Michelman, Esq.

LAW OFFICES OF ERIC I. MICHELMAN
2301 Dupont Dr., Ste. 530
Irvine, CA 92612
949-553-1800
949-553-1880 (fax)
ericmichelman@lawfirmofbusiness.com

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 12:12 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Lawrence Pellegrini

Email

eaglesbc97@yahoo.com

Subject

MGM in Springfield

Questions or Comments

As you are aware, MGM has decided to eliminate the proposed 30 story luxury hotel from its downtown Springfield design. When I voted in favor of casino gaming in Springfield, I was voting specifically for the proposed amenities proposed by MGM and these amenities included a 30 story 4-star luxury hotel, renovations to riverfront park, an outdoor ice skating rink, bowling alley, movie theater, retail shops and restaurants, and a trolley system. MGM is now eliminating the hallmark of those proposed amenities, and the presumed symbol of a revitalized downtown. While I understand the need to delay the project by one year due to concerns about I-91 traffic congestion, I am now deeply concerned over their choosing to alter what was the most significant symbol of their design concept, one that was heavily promoted to voters. I trust that the gaming commission will ensure that MGM holds true to the various elements of its design. Otherwise, the voters of the city of Springfield were duped. I myself would now rescind my vote in favor of this otherwise untrustworthy company.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 10:07 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

ron wamsher

Email

ronwamsher@aol.com

Subject

mgm springfield

Questions or Comments

MGM lied to the people of Springfield with the plans they presented to us in order to receive a positive vote for casino gambling in this city. We were duped! I hope you are not going to approve their new proposal - they should be forced to honor their original plans.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: David Hodge <shapechngr101@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 9:54 AM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Applicant Suitability', MGM change of design

Good Morning !!

I would like to start off by saying the Selection process has been great and the licenses that have been awarded to MGM, WYNN and Penn National was expected by me. And whom better to enter our market better than those 3 professionals whom know about Competition and how to Market ! Now for as RUSH st. Gaming I believe we should continue with the process until we hear from the courts concerning " Aquinnah" standing because if they are Granted permission then we would lose revenue from the Mashpee tribe, i believe which in case we would have to award Brockton. If Aquinnah will have no impact on Mashpee then Hold onto the 3rd license for future use if needed. Last I would like to add that the MGM deletion of the high rise Glass motel is UNNACCEPTABLE!! If anything they should just build it on the new property !! One of the reasons we selected WYNN was because of his hotel designs. It seems the City is not as Objectionable as you'll are and as a citizen of Springfield i Wish the MGC to use due dilligence and Make MGM design a hotel that will attract Attention. Thank you and Keep up the Good Work!!.....D.Hodge

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:27 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Marcus Baker

Email

marcusedwardbaker@gmail.com

Phone

(518) 744-1814

Subject

MGM Springfield's removal of the proposed hotel tower

Questions or Comments

MGM recently proposed the removal of the hotel tower from its Metro Center (Downtown) plan. This has resulted in an ugly, flat, white box consuming a multitude of blocks in the largest city in Western Mass, second largest metro area in Mass, and third largest city in the Commonwealth. MGM's new design looks improper for an urban environment. We must revitalize downtowns by building up, not spreading things out, like what will happen with MGM's proposal (read: apartments off main campus). MGM's tower would be a beacon for urban renewal and would showcase a city on the rise. I can only imagine that MGM has cut the tower to pump out a casino faster, if not uglier. They do not want to invest the money, time, and care that is needed now that they fear Conn. gaming. Please, I urge the MA Gaming Commission to make MGM Springfield build the tower it originally proposed and agreed to build. Without it the Springfield casino would send a shock wave of 'Springfield doesn't want any new added to its skyline' message out to countless potential developers. I urge you to support MGM's originally agreed to proposal. We must build UP in our cities and not OUT, unless we want to ruin the Downtown Environments we are striving to create!

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 1:20 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

John Illig

Email

jeillig@verizon.net

Subject

MGM changing investment in Springfield

Questions or Comments

You need to deny MGM this downsizing proposal they are trying to sell to you and to the people in western Mass. One of the key components of attracting people into a destination is its image, structure and "glitter". MGM appears to be taking this out of their project and from the comments I am reading and hearing, this is taking a lot away of interest from people who may not even come to Springfield if and when this project is ever completed. What we voted for was a renaissance to this city and region. It looks as if this will not happen. I do not think MGM has any investment interest in the city or state. I tried to comment to them on their website and tried to call and could not do either. It would not surprise me if they haven't pulled up stakes and heading out. You need to put their feet to the commitment they submitted which made them the choice for this region, or hold them accountable for the financial, economic and moral damage they have done to Springfield and this surrounding area.

MacLachlan, Amy (MGC)

From: MGC Website <website@massgaming.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 12:17 PM
To: MGCcomments (MGC)
Subject: Contact the Commissioner Form Submission

Name

Joshua Lopez

Email

joshualopez703@yahoo.com

Subject

MGM Springfield

Questions or Comments

MGM pushed the image of a shiny new skyscraper quite heavily, especially around election time. MGM SOLD us that skyscraper and we (the voters) bought it like fools. MGM used the notion of vertical construction, the first project since Monarch Place (three decades ago) to show how Springfield was on the rise. The people of Springfield were told one thing and now are being given another! Was this your plan from the beginning just to get the votes? -Dissapointed

Forwarded to John Z and copied Mary Thurlow.