1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	
4	OPEN MEETING
5	
6	CHAIRMAN
7	Stephen P. Crosby
8	COMMISSIONERS
9	Gayle Cameron (not present).
10	James F. McHugh
11	Bruce W. Stebbins
12	Enrique Zuniga
13	
14	
15	APRIL 17, 2012
16	1:57 p.m.
17	
18	1000 Washington Street, Conference Room E
19	Boston, Massachusetts
20	
21	Amanda Snell, CSR, RPR Court Approved Court Reporter and Transcriber
22	Office Solutions Plus LLC 50 Summer Street
23	Weston, Massachusetts 02493 617.471.3510
24	
25	

April 17, 2012

2.1

PROCEEDINGS:

MR. CROSBY: I think we will get started.

I am going to call the Commission meeting to order.

Just a few, kind of, organizational announcements. First of all, Commissioner Cameron, Gayle Cameron, has a family obligation this week that she was committed to prior to this -- I guess this is school vacation week -- that she was committed to prior to signing up as a commissioner, so she is not able to be with us today, but will be back next week.

There is a lot of stuff you'll see on the agenda that is kind of organizational catch up. As we've begun this process, I think we've talked a little bit about learning how to operate within the quite rigorous standards of the open meeting law, and we want to be absolutely -- theoretically, we can't pick a color of a rug without having it take place in an open meeting. So we're trying to learn how to organize ourselves to not come to a grinding halt, but on the other hand to comply with the full intention and spirit of the law because it is important. So we're going to be going over a bunch of, kind of, organizational issues that may seem pretty small, but they're important.

This is our regular meeting. We're www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

probably -- next week we probably will discuss and announce some kind of a regular schedule, so people can start to plan at our normal public meetings. This will just be us doing business with the public invited to watch. There won't be -- in these regular meetings there won't be an opportunity for public comment, as there isn't today. But as I mentioned last week, what we talked about last week, there is going to be a host of opportunities for public comment.

And there is on the web site a position -a contact point that's pretty easy to get to, and we're
encouraging anybody with questions, or complaints, or
suggestions, or anything, to use that as a communications
medium for now. And then as I said, we'll be announcing a
whole host of environments coming up where people can
comment.

This meeting is not being streamed on the web site. That is one of the reasons we wanted to get a regular schedule, is so we can find a place to set up an AV situation, or a streaming situation, where we can get it for a reasonable cost, and learn how to do it well. But our anticipation, and our hope, is we'll be streaming all of our meetings. We haven't really decided on that as a commission yet, but that's our predisposition.

We do have a stenographer team here today www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

1 and we will have the -- what's the word?

2 MR. MCHUGH: Transcript.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: Transcript with the minutes up on the web site set within two or three days, I think, so there will be a complete record of what's being undertaken.

Anything else? Any other kind of organizational or start things? Okay. So there is agendas --

MR. MCHUGH: We might be mention that because we did not have the contemporaneous stenographic record at the last meeting, the minutes of the last meeting are not up at the present time. They will be up within a day or two, and then hereafter this process will allow us to get the meeting minutes and the transcript up within a day or two of the meeting so that we can stay current with that.

MR. CROSBY: Can you all hear me back there? Is there any difficulty hearing? If there is, just speak up. That will also include the video. It turns out, apparently, that we couldn't put the video up until we had a -- what do you call it? The transcript which could be read by various kinds of -- closed caption. There you go, thank you. You can't have one up when it is not accessible to everybody, and we couldn't

make it accessible to everybody, so we had to hold everything back so we could get the full accessible resource, but that will be coming up very shortly.

2.1

2.2

Okay. Now let's get started. Start with administration. There is an agenda over here if anybody is interested.

The search for executive director. Bruce has been kind of taking the lead on this. If you want to just give us an update on kind of where we stand?

MR. STEBBINS: Sure. With the assistance of Commissioner Zuniga -- well, as you all know at the last meeting, we accepted procurement regs that closely follow the state guidelines. We have gone and drafted an RFR for services from a recruitment firm. And the RFR for services will be up to \$80,000. Hopefully issuing the RFR in the next week and hopefully being able to award a contract to a firm by the end of the month of May to, again, kind of move the process along of hiring a permanent full-time executive director.

MR. CROSBY: By the end of the month of May seems like a long time. What are the time elements?

MR. STEBBINS: Issuing the RFR, then we would have responses due the early part of May. We put some windows in there to allow ourselves time to interview potential firms, so it gives us a little bit of a window,

- but obviously we would like to move as aggressively as we can.
- 3 MR. CROSBY: When does the RFR close, two weeks?

2.1

MR. STEBBINS: The RFR bidder's response, if we keep to this time table, by May 11th.

MR. CROSBY: Well, from my standpoint, anything we can do to move it along, obviously, is important. We all feel that this is among the most, if not maybe the most significant decision we're going to make, and the hire we're certainly going to make. So while we do want to move it along, we also want to do it right.

But in the meantime, we talked last time also about the possibility of -- the legislation authorizes the commission to hire an acting director -- acting executive director in the absence of a full-time director, which would include now. And Bruce has kind of taken the lead on -- Commissioner Stebbins has kind of taken the lead on that as well. Do you want to give an update on that?

MR. STEBBINS: Sure. We have had a couple of resumes in interest that have come in. Again, I think we're seeing a volume of communication from people who are interested in working for the commission at some point.

2.1

But some of these resumes might be of people we would consider to fill the acting executive director's position while the full time search is being conducted. So we can reach out to some of those potentially interested parties in the next week or two. Hopefully, we can find a good qualified candidate. Again, I think we prefer somebody who potentially has had some public administration background and bring them on board in an interim basis.

MR. CROSBY: And this is, among other things, to try to keep us from having to do the staff work, you know. We don't want to tie ourselves up in trying to figure out, you know, what the IT systems are going to be so far. That is really not what we ought to be doing. We ought to be getting the process going, figuring out how to write the RFPs and the getting the process going, so that would be great.

I have heard from a guy who was the chair of the Nevada Gaming Commission, who is now a consultant, as well as a lawyer. And he is interested in maybe playing that role, so he is going to send in a proposal and resume, which I will shoot to you as soon as I get it. Anything else on that item?

We talked about bookkeeping, and I have talked with Janice, our chief of staff, about what do we need, and I'm not quite sure. We were going to check with

the comptroller to see how long they could take care of it for us. Do we need to do anything else on that?

2.1

MS. REILLY: No, not right now.

MR. CROSBY: So for the time being, they can handle whatever our record keeping is.

Okay. I guess the only thing is to make sure we got it plugged into the web site as soon as possible, so people know what we're doing, and what we'll be spending on what and so forth. HR process, Enrique you have been --

MR. ZUNIGA: Yes. Well, as we undertake, you know, some of the hiring processes that we are undertaking by virtue of thinking of an acting executive director, clearly a permanent executive director, but also book keepers and executive assistants and the like.

of a hiring policy that I'm familiar with, only because of my recent experience at the treasurer's office. I have a detailed one here. What I gave you was a one pager, and I submit that we should consider either drafting a similar policy or looking at the components of this policy and adopting a policy of our own, drafting our own hiring policy. The legislation does give us a lot of leeway in terms of the acting executive director, so it doesn't necessarily have to be in place, and that person could

1 certainly help us at that time.

2.1

But I see this policy as an important first step in what will become -- really should become our hiring policy for everyone else that follows. So we should -- you know, this policy deals with issues, for example, relative to internal candidates. These may not necessarily apply to us at the beginning, but there is a nexus to other government -- state government employees for example.

Also how to deal with referrals. I happen to believe that all referrals should be written, not just verbal, like the policy of the treasurer. So this articulates -- and how to deal with family members of commissioners or others. So I think we should discuss or think about, you know, adopting a written policy relative to hiring practices.

There are many other policies that we would eventually have to address; employee conduct, you know family act, et cetera. But the one that strikes me as being most relevant for us at this point is one with semblance of a hiring policy. Any questions on that?

MR. MCHUGH: I think we should have such a policy, and when I get to discussing the outside counsel's recommendations, we have now got a list of things from them, and that is included on that. So I think that is a

high priority and we need to do it.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: Commissioner McHugh and I were both members of the so-called Harshbarger Committee, which looked into hiring and promotion in the judiciary. And we did a lot of work coming up with best practices, informed by people from the private sector. So we were very much aware of, you know, best practices in the private sector as well as the public sector. A little culture shock for her was something when she sat in on our meetings. And I think we would want to contribute that to the process.

So we're in the midst of a couple of hiring things right now. The HR, we'll talk about communications director, maybe a few more clerical people, and whether we can move quickly enough to get a whole, you know, systematic process with an applicant tracking system and all of the things we want in place before those or not. I am not sure. But we ought to think about, maybe as soon as our next meeting, is there some kind of basic principles we want to adopt that will at least hit the highlights of transparency, and process, and so forth, that we might make use of even before we adopt the whole megillah, so I'm not sure.

So maybe you could take the ball on that.

Because I think we want to -- I want to hear what the

lawyers have to say. I think we're going to be doing a

lot of hiring. We want the systems to be really good.

There should be some IT backup, but I also don't want us

to get all hung up in the next 30 days while we're in such
an urgent start-up mode, so some combination there. So

you'll follow up on sort of short and long-term.

2.1

MR. ZUNIGA: Yup, short -- basic principles and short term.

MR. CROSBY: Right, okay. Great. As far as everything that we are doing now, I guess we haven't -- I guess we will have posted the minutes of last week's meeting, which will be up shortly, and this week's meeting probably soon thereafter.

I don't know if we even have a hiring spot on our web site yet, but it will at least be known, and it is now being known to the public, that we are recruiting for several positions and are anxious to get candidates from anywhere for executive director, communications director. I guess, that is it, that we're formally looking at so far.

We probably should try to get, you know, a jobs thing up on the web site as quick as we can somewhere, even in the "About us" or somewhere up quickly. Okay. Okay.

2D is public information officer. I can give you a quick update on that. As we mentioned last www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 61/-4/1-3510

week, Karen Schwartzman from Polaris PR felt like we had maxed out our ability -- maxed her out, and since she has other clients, she couldn't work for us full time, so we are searching for a full-time director of communications. Do we have that posted on the web site under the job description? No, it is posted in the state's HR system. I saw somebody nodding.

2.1

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I saw it up online at Indeed.com. It is out there somewhere.

MR. CROSBY: It is posted. I was just trying to think is it is posted on our web site. The HRD web site. Okay. Good. Again, as soon as we can part of the same hiring section we ought to get it up as quick as we can.

The search is being done by Karen
Schwartzman, along with someone else very senior in the
communications PR world, Hank Shafran, who just retired, I
think I mentioned before, from Bingham McCutchen, and we
hope to have that person on ASAP. I think there is a lot
of interviewing. We've asked Hank and Karen to vet the
candidates and then bring some finalists to us. And we
have put a very high priority on trying to find diverse
candidates for this position, as well as all of the other
positions that we're looking for. Anything else on the
communications? I think the job description pretty much

says what we're looking for, so I won't go into that now.

2.1

Okay. Outside counsel and gaming consultants. Let me give a quick update on the gaming consultants and then Jim -- Commissioner McHugh can do the law firms. We announced last time that we were prequalifying the proposal from both Michael and Carol, and from Spectrum Gaming, and we have gone back to them now -- or I have gone back to them as directed at the last meeting, and told them that we would like to get the best of both of what they both have to offer. We were particularly concerned about having an on-site project manager.

The only person who lives in Boston who was proposed by either of the teams was Kathleen O' Toole who was on the Michael and Carol team. Both teams agreed to kind of have her kind of be the point person for negotiating how they would work together. She has been in Ireland -- I saw her shortly after our meeting. She is now in Ireland for her last week on that other job, but has been coordinating her work. They hope to get a proposal to us, a work plan to us by possibly the end of this week. We'll have a chance to iterate on that, and then they will be meeting when she gets back, which is next week to try to hammer that out. So that is moving along quickly.

2.1

And I would say that we have a real good chance by two weeks from today to have at least a work plan in place. I don't know how long it will take us to process the paperwork, but I think that is coming along. So far she has been a terrific contact and terrific -- she really understands what we need by -- what we mean when we say we have a need for a project manager who can really get their arms around this, so we're not having to track the project so much.

Commissioner McHugh on outside counsel?

MR. MCHUGH: As we stated at the last
meeting, we asked Anderson & Kreiger to be the outside
counsel, and I have been in contact with them several
times since our last meeting to talk about a work plan as
well. And they have sent to us yesterday a draft -- a
work plan that has a number of different components to it,
and the next step in that is to assign priorities. There
is an awful lot to be done, and we need to assign
priorities to the various components of the work plan, and
we also need to divide up the work among ourselves to have
the person who will oversee the various elements of the
work.

We also have met with the attorney general because the attorney general has a vast amount of expertise on the regulations -- a lot of the regulations

2.1

that are going to effect us. And we want to have some coordination between what Anderson & Kreiger does, and take advantage of the attorney general's expertise as well. So we're going to coordinate between the two of them how they work together. And I talked to the attorney general's people this morning about that.

At the moment, I think we need to think about the priorities that are on this list, and I think we need to think about who is going to be the person primarily responsible for each of the areas, and whether we do that today, or whether we do that by having people take this sheet and send it back to me, and I put together a coordination plan for us to consider more fully at the next meeting. I leave to the three of you.

It might be more efficient to do it that way and then to come back with a plan that we're prepared to approve next week. But the plan that they envision is detailed. It has got timelines. It has got milestones, and it will get us moving quickly. The other benefit of it is that we will have them doing the -- taking the laboring aurora and drafting regulations, so to free us up to think about the policies that we want, and then having them reduce the policies to regulatory language, and allow us to function at a higher level then drafting the regulations.

1	So I propose that I put out for
2	discussion that we take this sheet, we fill in what areas
3	of interest or you, Mr. Chairman, make the designations
4	in some way, and then we come back here and have a final
5	plan approved next week.
6	MR. CROSBY: Yup.
7	MR. ZUNIGA: There is a couple on this list
8	that lend themselves to, you know, to deciding now for
9	instance, and others that we should think about some other
10	way. I volunteer to take on the fiscal policies and
11	controls in my capacity as treasurer, but you know, we can
12	talk about a couple of others, I suppose.
13	MR. CROSBY: Yeah, some of them are
14	obvious, like that is one you're already covering, that
15	and employment policies.
16	MR. MCHUGH: In the same place.
17	MR. ZUNIGA: Yes, yes.
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Steve, can you give
19	the public a range of the things that are on that list, a
20	general idea?
21	MR. CROSBY: Yeah, these are issues I think

assessment of the act, develop a policy on policies. What is that?

MR. MCHUGH: That is really to decide --

www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

pretty much came out of the legislation. Review and

22

23

24

25

2.1

there is a hierarchy of things that we do. We have statutory obligations. Those are the governing things. Then we have regulations and there is a whole process for passing regulations. The regulations can be emergency regulations that we pass for a short time to get us up and get us going, but they only last for a period of time.

Permanent regulations require notice and a hearing, and a series of formalities, so it takes some public comment, and make certain that we have everybody's input before we pass the regulations, so we draft regulations. We have hearings. There is a whole statutory procedure. Then there are policies that we can have that are more fluid, more easily adaptable, govern more minor things than regulations do.

And then there are bylaws and the bylaws fit somewhere between the statute and the regulation, and are sort of our own governing documents. So this item is really to help us think through what we want to have in bylaws, the kinds of things — not the content — the kind of things we want to have in bylaws, the kind of things we want to have in regulations, the kinds of things we want to have in policies, and then the kinds of things that are just spelled out in the statute that are there, and we have to execute without any further ado.

MR. CROSBY: Some of the other categories www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

are board governance, public records, open meeting law, advisory opinions, fiscal policies and controls, code of ethics, MOUs and other state, local agencies, procurement procedures, state racing commission transition, confidentiality, Internet security. You get the idea of the kind of stuff.

2.1

- Two things. One is pretty obvious, but other gaming commissions have done an awful lot of this stuff, and I hope that we can borrow from them as aggressively as possible and not have to rewrite everything from ground zero.
- MR. MCHUGH: Right. Other racing and gaming commissions have done it, but some of this is transubstantive. Some of it applies to any kind of commission and doesn't have that content, and a lot of that has been done as well. So they're going to search and import regulations wherever they can and just tinker with them and tailor them to our....
- MR. CROSBY: That's almost worth being a task. It is not really broken out as a task.
- MR. MCHUGH: It is inherent on each one,
 Mr. Chairman.
 - MR. CROSBY: Okay. Fine. Okay. Then the other point is when I was talking to the other teams, the gaming consultant teams, they're talking about writing the

19

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION

- regulations for regulating the gaming, which is not
 exactly within the purview of this. Probably there is
 going to be a grey area where one team breaks off and the
 other team breaks -- takes off -- takes up. But it is
 probably something we ought to have on the table so we're
 talking about it. Okay. Great. We did -- anything
 else?
 - MR. MCHUGH: So how should we leave this?

 Do you want to make an assignment? Do you want people to send things to me and I --
 - MR. CROSBY: Yeah, why don't you send this out and the people send it to you. Make sure that Commissioner Cameron gets it. Let people pick, and then maybe you and I can go over it --
 - MR. MCHUGH: All right.
- MR. CROSBY: -- and just fill in the blanks.
- MR. MCHUGH: All right.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

2.1

22

23

24

25

- MR. CROSBY: I don't think we need a motion for that.
 - MR. MCHUGH: No, I don't think so either.

 I think we can just do it and then bring the final plan back, and then announce what the plan is, and then discuss it further, final tinkering that we have to do, and then get it up and running.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: Great. The other point on the two consultants is that we do want to exercise background checks. Probably the two gaming consultants are as thoroughly checked as one can get, and the same with the law firm, but nevertheless. And Commissioner Cameron did talk with the colonel of the Mass. State Police and they are telling us what degree of background check they think is necessary for this -- for these kinds of procurements. So that is -- but that is a step that we want to have in the process.

Item 2G, record keeping. I think we're talking about two -- I'm sorry.

No, I skipped F. Briefings for commissioners. We mentioned this last week. There are a number of agencies that are being scheduled to come in to talk to us. I think that would come in under the training, training as in open-meeting law and public records, campaign finance. Not just the commissioners, but also staff, at least key staff should be involved in that. But I think those are beginning to be scheduled now, right, starting April 25th. Okay. Great.

Record keeping. Commissioner McHugh, you're sort of the point person on that, both I think internal in and external.

MR. MCHUGH: What that is aimed at is www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

trying to find and plan for a mechanism that will allow us to keep track of the records we're creating now, and keep track of them in a way that will allow us to respond to requests as they come, that will allow the maximum visibility for them, that will allow us to keep as much as we can electronically, so that we don't have to go searching through files, paper files and desks to get and retrieve material.

And that we can begin to do -- that we can begin to put into place right now to help us grow. We don't have a lot of stuff now, but it is going to begin to accumulate, and we want to be able to do this from the beginning, so that we can organize it in an effective way. And we want to organize it and create whatever record keeping system we start out with in a way that is scaleable, that will allow us to grow, that will allow us to add on components as we add more divisions and more employees, so we can maintain our transparency and reduce to an absolute minimum the amount of time we spend responding to legitimate requests that we're going to get for various records that we're going to generate as we go forward.

I have talked generally with Janice about that, and somehow we've got to come up with an organizational plan for doing it. There is a lot of stuff

going on at the minute, but this is something we have got to keep our eye on and that we both recognize.

2.1

MR. ZUNIGA: Are we envisioning requesting the services of -- or procuring a tool or a consultant for this -- for this kind of --

MR. MCHUGH: Probably both, Commissioner.

I envision some kind of a document management system that will allow us to share documents, and allow for central repository of documents, that will allow us to easily transfer documents, and that will be electronic in -- be electronic so we can scan things in and we don't have to have files that are different, and also perhaps a consultant to help us deal with the kind of issues we're likely to face as we go forward.

At the moment, though, I think we will be aided by going out and talking to some existing commissions that have obviously gone through the same kind of thing, seeing if we can find some commissions and organizations -- don't have to be commissions -- that have done this kind of thing, get what we can from them as to at least general themes that we ought to be working about, and then get on the business of trying to get something up into place.

So I would hope that we can do that quite quickly. It may take a while. The worst thing we can do www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

is start down a path with something that is easily implemented, but isn't going to scale and grow with us, and ultimately will require us to redo everything, recode everything, and waste a lot of time in the process, so it is worth taking a little time to get that right.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: As with a lot of these things, there are two sort of two tiers. There is our operations, the commissions work, the five of us, and then there is the operations of the guts of the organization, and that is true of the regulations, you know, it is true of everything.

And maybe it is worth thinking -- trying to keep those distinct, or maybe not, I am not sure. But the big one, the big IT system for all of the Gaming Commission, and all of the staff, and the regulations, and the financial controls is going to be a massive system.

And we -- we're just trying to figure out how to keep track of, you know, our HR applications and our minute notes and our schedule, so I don't know whether they ought to be two different systems or what.

MR. MCHUGH: It seems to me the ideal would be -- I think we need to keep our eye on it. We don't need to go out and design a system for an organization that doesn't exist. I mean, that doesn't make any sense. But what we need to do is create a system now for keeping

track of our own records, and that will integrate and grow with the organization as it grows, so that we take whatever we've got and allow it to expand as we grow, and have it open ended enough so that we can do that, or have it portable so it can be absorbed by another system when it comes, so that is the piece we want to work on right now.

MR. ZUNIGA: Should be an and perhaps not an or.

> MR. MCHUGH: Where?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. ZUNIGA: Scaleable, but also implementable into another system perhaps.

MR. CROSBY: Janice and I talked with a fellow who talked to us about knowledge management system, IT systems, knowledge management systems, and his expertise is in a particular area. But he has an ecosystem approach in mind that is interesting and maybe it is worth having Commissioner McHugh, I don't know, talk to him on the phone, have him come in again.

Maybe there is a million people who do this, I don't really know, but it is worth thinking about, you know, systems which are a little more organic than the standard kind of data that boxes into which words flow.

MR. MCHUGH: Yeah. There is a lot out there and there is a lot that's being developed now, so I www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

think we're in a position where we're not bound by anything. We're building from scratch and we ought to find the best thing that we can, and the best approach we can -- and the best approach we can. And one that will allow us to have something that is state of the art and looks as far down stream as we can onto something that is going to stay with us.

2.1

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah, at a very basic level we should think about indexing, attributes, search engines, whether it's key words. Any document that we produce or receive will have an attribute whether it is a staff-related issue or a time element or, you know, all of those attributes if you will. These systems will build on what we come up with in that arena.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Great. Next is 2H. Commissioner's area of responsibility. One of the things that we're working on in this early stage of the project is figuring out how five full-time commissioners can work efficiently. This is an unusual model. New Jersey has full-time commissioners, but almost nobody else does.

So as you can begin to see, we're talking about splitting up some of the work into areas of focus, areas of responsibility, and I have now talked with each commissioner, and I think that we've sort of got some broad brush areas of responsibility that I just want to

run through and make sure that this is the presumption of operating at this point, let us make sure that this is right.

2.1

Commissioner Crosby would be responsible for overall coordination and communication. Commissioner Cameron, law enforcement and compliance, and for the time being at least, the state racing commission. Commissioner Stebbins, economic development, municipal relations. Commissioner Zuniga, finance, real estate and HR, Commissioner McHugh, legal regulations, documentation and internal compliance as opposed to law enforcement or external compliance. Does that sound about right? And then each of us can ask the other for help where we need it, but as sort of general areas, that's the way we're trying to parcel things out.

Okay. The next item is public information, Item 3. We are announcing today, and I think have announced -- there is a press release over here that on May 3rd the Commission will host a session, an education and training session for ourselves from a host of experts mostly from New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but a few other places as well, to bring us up to speed on a lot of the basics of the work we have to do, start up process.

So basics of the law enforcement process, basics of the RFP, the licensing, et cetera, process and www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510
LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

we're going to invite the public to participate in that session with us. It will be a pretty much all-day conference, as I said, on May 3rd. It will be held at the Boston Convention Center. It will also be streamed on the web. We will have an opportunity for people to raise questions advance. It is a big agenda, and it is for the commissioners.

We are being briefed by this session and we will have an opportunity to interact with all of these panels, but there is a place on the web site -- by the way, I am told that across Massachusetts, across the Commonwealth, Mass.Gov's response mechanisms are broken down, so we're not sure whether our response mechanisms on the web site -- whether you're signing up to participate in this conference on May 3rd -- you're invited, but we want to you RSVP, so we have some idea -- or if you're using our contact site, we're not sure whether those are working right at this moment. It is not a Commission web site problem, it is a state web site problem, and if it is a problem, it will be resolved quickly.

So this is a very big deal. We're going to have a series of other such sessions. We'll talk actually about one or more of the ideas that we've been cooking on, but rather than having the commissioners fly out to a whole bunch of different places and talk to a bunch of

experts, we thought it made sense to have the experts come in and talk to us, a little more efficient.

2.1

And we can also combine that with a session with the public, and we'll be inviting other agencies -- at least for portions of it -- other agencies in the Commonwealth that are involved; the attorney general's office, maybe the governor's office, maybe legislature -- excuse me. Certainly the ABCC, the State Police, right. And they'll participate because it is new for all of them as well, just as it is for us, a lot of these different conventions. I think that is everything. But I hope we can get the word out on that. We really want wide participation in that event.

3B is the kind of what we referred to in quotes -- I put quotes around it in my agenda. Standard PowerPoint presentation. I have done a draft. People commented on the draft. I have now tried to pull that together within the next two or three days. I think it will be something that will give us all kind of standard talking points.

We're beginning to get requests to speak.

We think we ought to be speaking. We ought to be out
there as much as we possibly can trying to talk to
people. But I think it is important that we have sort of
standard points that we can then weave into whatever the

rest of our comments are. I should have a draft ready for everybody the next two or three days.

2.1

Contacts by interested parties. Partly, this is in the issue of the overall knowledge base management, right, and how we handle these contacts?

MR. MCHUGH: Well, it is more substantive than that, Mr. Chairman. We're beginning to get questions by people who in the various cities and towns have questions about process, and yeah, CND are really part of the same thing.

And the question is how do we respond to these inquiries in an arena where we have not yet formulated the policy that is global, that encompasses everything. And how do we provide, particularly the cities and towns who are facing questions about process, some guidance, and some help and assistance. And at the same time, maintain the kind of independence that we are going to need, ultimately, to act as adjudicators when we get -- judges, decision makers -- when we get the final requests, license applications. So we need to think about how we're going to do that. And we need to -- we need to do it.

Because a number of the cities and towns who are effected by this legislation, or who may be effected by the legislation, are beginning to raise

2.1

legitimate questions about that. So it seems to me we can come up with some ways of approaching this. We can put together, for example, some general guidelines on how all of this works. The standard PowerPoint presentation that you're talking about is one. Another one simply an outline of how the statute works sequentially, how various things go, so that people have a standard reference. We could work with various organizations who are -- address issues that cities and towns have, the municipal associations and the like.

We can find ways to have general meetings with to which all cities and towns are invited, and have general statements that everybody hears. We can, and should I think, post on the web site the answers to questions, the questions that are raised by various cities and towns, and even if they're frequently asked questions by individuals, and our answers to those, so everybody gets the same information. So we need to come up with some kind of an approach that is aimed at giving this information to the people that need it soon.

MR. STEBBINS: Commissioner Zuniga and I met last week with the leadership at Mass. Municipal Association to tell them we were attempting to go down this track, as well as looking at opportunities where we could partner with them either through regular

communications that they have with their members. They are certainly willing to make some resources available to help us get the message out about meetings and so forth.

2.1

The feedback they had was very positive at that initial phase in talking about how we wanted municipalities -- in answering the questions that they might have, legislation, so.

MR. CROSBY: And you're reaching out also to the Colin Center of Management at UMass to have the same kind of conversation, right?

MR. STEBBINS: Yes, that is happening this week.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Because what I said to Commissioner McHugh when I realized there are tradeoffs in this, but the potential host communities and potential surrounding communities are small, and they are really at seed (phonetic) as to how to handle this stuff.

And particularly, we'll talk about this a little bit, South Eastern, Massachusetts, because nobody knows who is coming or going in that situation. But in even the ones where it is more straight forward in Eastern Mass and Western Mass, these folks just don't have any idea with how to deal with some of these issues. And somebody ought to be proactive in reaching out and really helping deliver services and support.

2.1

And Commission McHugh raises the point that if it is we, does that somehow get us in the situation where somehow or other we appear not to be even handed, or we say one thing to one group -- so I think we need to be careful about that. So we might want to out source this role.

But somebody, I think, needs to do this and needs to do it soon, and if there needs -- theoretically, the bidders are supposed to pay the towns for the help they need in dealing with the proposal. But they even need help in knowing how to make that happen, and if moneys are required. It is something we should think about figuring out how to provide, I think. It will do us no good if the gestation period isn't really properly handled at these proposals.

They come to us and communities haven't been up to handling negotiations with the providers, and so forth. So from my standpoint, it is really important that we push hard to make sure that somebody -- if it isn't me, it is somebody is proactively out there supporting.

MR. MCHUGH: I fully agree with that, but I also think that without compromising our role as decision makers on various applications at some point, there are some things that we can do ourselves, and it is the

1 general information that we give everyone.

2.1

You know, here is the sequence of events that happens in this licensing process. Here is how you apply for assistance to get a gaming consultant. And as long as we say the same thing to everybody, then we haven't compromised our ability to be neutral and fair. And we don't run into the problem of having somebody rely on one thing we've said, or miss hearing something and relying on it, and then it turns out that's not what we said, or we said something slightly different to somebody else. So in addition to the outside stuff, I think we can do some things ourselves, put them on the web site and talk about it.

MR. ZUNIGA: I would like to bring up the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee that our legislation sets up, which is clearly for policy --

MR. CROSBY: Do you remember where it is?

MR. ZUNIGA: I don't have it written down.

It is in the first section. I was doing it on a word search when I did it.

But there is also -- so the Policy Advisory Committee has a number of subcommittees, one of which the legislation is very prescriptive on that committee, one of which is on the impact on cultural -- I'm sorry. On the community mitigation -- what is exactly called the

Community Mitigation Subcommittee. And my read is from what we're hearing from communities is really in the realm of impact. How is the potential development either on my community or around my community going to be dealt with in terms of how to mitigate the impact?

2.1

So as we think about this advisory committee, there is also -- the legislation also provides for each of the regions to establish a local Community Mitigation Advisory Committee. The legislation is very broad as to how the regions could establish that. It is not as prescriptive as it is on our own advisory committee. But this is one -- there is a nexus here in terms of information, of course, that we should think about.

MR. CROSBY: That raises several issues. I mean, one of them is specifically in response to this issue of how do we provide services to the cities and towns, the municipalities that are going to be affected. And we can -- and I am not quite sure what the sequencing of those local committees is. When do they start up? Do we help them start up? Do we fund them?

MR. ZUNIGA: It is unclear.

MR. CROSBY: Yeah, okay. I think we need to check into that pretty soon to see how it does fit into this. But the second point you raised, this is a really

2.1

good one, is this bigger gaming advisory -- gaming policy advisory board, membership of which is mandated in the legislation, some of which membership of that commission that's mandated in the legislation can't exist until after licenses are awarded. So I wasn't sure if that meant that by implication you are not supposed to do this until after licenses are awarded. If that is the case, fine. If that is not the case, we better get moving on trying to get that thing together.

MR. MCHUGH: I think it is aimed at an ongoing policy because it has got policy committee after the licenses are awarded, but that doesn't mean that we can't begin to build on it now, even in an informal basis, with an eye toward having it perform that function when the licenses are there. There is no reason why we can't take that model, even if it is not the official committee, and begin to try to assemble people who can provide that kind of service. In other words, borrowing from the structure of the legislation and just tailoring it to the pre-license period, and have some people who are going to provide advice. We can certainly look into another way to do this.

MR. ZUNIGA: Is this one of the tasks we can put Anderson & Kreiger -- it will nexus into what they --

MR. CROSBY: I agree. If they can just pull out for us as part of an assessment what are all these committees, when do we set them up and what's their role, that would be great.

2.1

And on the other -- Commissioner McHugh, what you were talking about is Commissioner Stebbins is kind of coordinating the possibility of affiliating with another firm. The stuff that we're going to do inside, do we need to get somebody to do that, or do we do it ourselves? The stuff we want to put up on our web site, what is the next step on that?

MR. MCHUGH: I think that we can -- there are some models around, and I think we can do some of that on our own. I think some of that flows from the statutory analysis, and we can get Anderson & Kreiger to help us with that as well. I think we can do a lot of that inside, and it will flow from the statutory analysis.

Because there is going to be some policy that -- at least informal policy -- that goes into it, even though it is largely explanatory and largely simply explains what the statute provides.

So we need to -- so I think we ought to ask them to finish as quickly as possible this review. We ought to take a look at the pieces that we can take out of it, and that we can use in graphic form and put up on the

web site, and then create some things promptly that we can put up for general public information.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: And maybe involve whoever you have decided, or you suggest that we ought to consider to be sort of our partner in this, maybe it all happens together to figure out who does what part.

And then in Item C of this, I think we were also talking about the contacts of interested parties. We are being contacted by people who have various kinds of substantive interest. We have not been contacted -- I don't think we have been contacted at all by any other people who are interested in proposals, at least of yet. But there are a lot of people who want to give us advice interested in gaming, interested in tourism, cultural, technology, et cetera.

And we have now begun -- I think our policy kind of is that we would not meet with any such person alone, but we would meet two commissioners with anybody, pretty much, that is interested in talking to us, and then keep little notes that would update us on what those are. But I think the points about never more than -- never less than two commissioners, and not more than two because that would get us into an open-meeting situation, A, and B to keep notes that are on the record for when those meetings take place. I think we're moving that way.

2.1

MR. MCHUGH: There is one more piece to the context of that. Because some of the context are from people who have questions about what's going on in their town, and how do I deal with X. Somebody in my town is doing X, how do I respond to that? Can they do that? We have gotten several questions like that and that poses a tricky problem as to how we answer those things.

Can we answer them or can we simply say
that we're -- you really have to check with the municipal
association or with the town counsel, or with the select
people, or with the mayor. Or can we provide some
answers, and how do we provide the answers without being
able to speak as a commission?

Some of these questions have rapid turn around times. It seems to me that at the very least, we can try to be helpful to the people in that category who contact us about potential resources and places to turn. And if they're unable to get an answer from those people, then it seems to me we have to bring the question to a meeting like this, discuss it, come up with an answer, and tell them what it is.

The only other way to do that is for one of us to take on the job of providing those kinds of answers, but we do that at the risk of the other commissioners disagreeing with whoever gives the answer. And some of

2.1

these are tricky questions, they all explore on territory. So I think I would prefer the giving -- trying to listen and understand and diagnose what the question is, trying to help the person figure out where to find the answer, and then if a satisfactory answer can't be found, then have the question be one that we decide here.

Now, that is not you know, what is the address of so-and-so, but it is a can -- the mayor is doing something, can the mayor do this? Town official, how do I deal with this request? I got somebody who wants to come to talk to the town and open negotiations with the town. Do I have to negotiate with them? Those are the kinds of questions I have been getting, and I think we have got to be prepared to do that.

MR. ZUNIGA: In a similar fashion of, you know, what you were articulating relative to the policy and policies. What constitutes regs? What constitutes policy? What is in a procedure or a bylaw? Is there a, you know, a grading maybe or different tiers of attributes that we can come up with as what constitutes clearly a local issue, and some good examples of what that is, that has to be ironed out with the city or town, and what begins to constitute a state issue, you know, given that we're a state agency or has -- then can we ask our lawyers as to whether we -- it would be at least a general

recognition of some demarcation. I know it is difficult, it is grey areas, et cetera. Is there a way to structure it in those terms?

2.1

MR. MCHUGH: We can certainly ask them if they could do it. The question still remains though, assume we make that break, and assume that we say some things are local issues, we just can't talk about them, and some issues are Commission issues, or state issues, then the question becomes how do we give them an answer. And we either give them an answer by pointing them in the direction of somebody who can provide the answer, or we give them an answer by having a commissioner answer the question, maybe, with some disclaimer that this is my opinion, not the opinion of the Commission. That is not terribly helpful. Or we bring the question -- if it is broad enough, to the Commission to answer, that takes a week or so.

So it seems to me that we could ask them to do that, but for while we're trying to make that line of demarcation, we also have to be able to think about the mechanism for delivering an answer once we have those categories. And for the moment, it seems to me there are some questions that have been asked, and for the moment, I would recommend that we adopt the -- try to find a place to get them some help. And if there isn't help available,

then bring the question here, come up with an answer, and give it to them, and then post what we've said. It will be part of this kind of discussion. That puts it out in the public domain, and everybody knows what we've said and everybody can hear the same thing.

2.1

MR. STEBBINS: How much assistance can our attorneys give in probably being a little more proactive so we can begin to think about questions even before we receive them from the community and post the general guideline or a general opinion, which then every community will have before the guestion comes to us?

MR. MCHUGH: I think that can be very helpful, and I think we ought to do that. I think we ought to, as we go through the analysis of the statute, create some of these standard PowerPoints, standard pieces of information, standard frequently asked questions -- although they haven't been asked yet, and post them -- they will be -- post them up there so that we have some information for people fairly quickly as to general themes. And as we get more experience, they have more information to that. I think we ought to proceed on both of those.

MR. CROSBY: I think this area is going get bigger and bigger, more and more complicated. I think combination talking to law firm, which you're going to be

doing, vetting these couple of folks who might be our agents, to some extent, then we have got to get together and figure out an approach.

2.1

I am inclined to think we might need somebody. I don't think we want to be the ones that are preparing this material. Maybe it can be done at one of these folks -- these firms, organizations you're talking to, lawyers can do it maybe. We just need to bring somebody in who can take the time to sit down, pull together all of the materials, and we would have that experience in being a community citizen, community organizer, community citizen to help fashion all of that material we're going to put on the web.

But in the meantime, thus far, I think we have made a decision, sort of informally, that any municipal inquiry should be referred to Commissioner McHugh because he has now done it a few times. And he is as reliable as any of us in making a distinction between what is appropriate to say and what is not. Then we'll get this larger group together as soon as we can to brain storm up how we're going to handle this in a much bigger way. Anything else on that? Okay.

Item Number 4 is an important one, the State Racing Commission. I think several of us have pieces on this. The big picture is that from the

2.1

beginning, even of just my appointment, before even the others were appointed, it was clear that the date for the Gaming Commission to take over the Racing Commission was very quick. And that there is a substance, the State Racing Commission is a real organization. It does real work. It involves real people. It involves complicated issues, and none of us on the Gaming Commission is expert in this.

And we all express some concern that if we take this on, it is going to seriously delay our ability to do the rest of our work, because it is not trivial.

There are licensing issues, there are legal issues, there are law enforcement issues, there are policy issues, and they will -- many of them would need to come to the commission to be resolved.

We can do it, we can learn it if we have to. We can get consultants to help, but I think we all felt that if it were possible to postpone the taking over of the Gaming Commission by the Racing Commission (sic), that that was the right way to go. In the meantime, that is the preferred way to go from the standpoint of the Commission, and there may be other people's opinions that matter as well, pro or con.

In the meantime, we're moving down a parallel track, which is to take it over May 20th, I think www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510
LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

the date is, and be prepared to do that. We're in constant contact with the leadership of the Racing Commission, the people in the various agencies, the Department of Public Licensure, its consultant who are managing this. Commission Cameron has played a major role. We started looking into the law enforcement side.

2.1

We do have an RFR that is here, that is going to be going out soon, that isn't already out, to help us find a consultant who really knows the racing business to help give us an objective view of what's going on, what the issues are. And that will be helpful to us whether we take it over on May 20th or some other later date.

We have had exploratory conversations with all of the relevant political players in the process of legislation, the house, the senate, and the governor's office. They all seem sympathetic to the point. And other than the poor people in the Department of Public Licensure and who work for the Racing Commission, who are in this limbo land about what is going to happen to them, other than them, which is nontrivial, we don't think that postponing this hurts anybody, and it helps a lot.

And we are under a lot of pressure, which we're trying to manage, to get moving on our main job which is the, you know, the licensing for casinos and

2.1

slots parlor, and we will not be able to meet that very effectively if we have to take on the Racing Commission burden as well. But if we were to postpone that for a year or a year and change, that would probably be the best way to go. So we are just telling everybody that we are working on these two tracks, and I think several of you have pieces of the status report. Commissioner McHugh, I know you've --

MR. MCHUGH: Well, I talked with the people at the Department of Public Licensure this morning to ask if we were to proceed on Track 1, the postponement track, would there be a time of year that was better than another for a takeover to occur. And their response was that it would be late November or early December because of a variety of structural considerations that are in place then.

term has been set by then. The various licenses, specific licenses that have to be awarded, don't have to be awarded until the spring. So there is time to do that, and that from an interruption of ongoing business standpoint would be in their best time. They did say, however, that they had a number of other pieces of business that were facing them. Specifically, a major piece of business we would inherit on August 1 of this year, and hope that we would

be able to proceed on the other track, but I told them we're sympathetic, and that they have difficulties, and we have difficulties, and -- but that was the substance of my conversation.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: And I think we should be respectful of that, and as a manager, you know, I fully appreciate that they've been operating on one set of assumptions for a long time now, and to change that the ninth hour is onerous. And if we do do this -- and we don't know whether it is a long shot. It is 50/50, I would say, that we'll be able to make this happen. But if we can, I think we should try to understand what their issues are, what the ramifications are for them, and try to mitigate those ramifications because those are completely legitimate.

And the people that I will say publicly -the people who are at this Racing Commission, and in the
Department of Public Licensure, and in the office of
Economic Affairs has -- these folks have been great,
really forthcoming with us. They've been helpful.
They've helped us understand a lot of the issues, a lot of
written memoranda, so we owe it to them to treat them as
well as they've treated us.

Having said that, it would be in the big picture interest, I think, of our work if we could make www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 61/-4/1-3510

this happen. So we are going to go ahead. We're just going to try to figure out whether there is a medium or whether requires legislative fix or some other medium, but we are going to pursue on that.

2.1

2.2

There is one specific issue you have been handling that will have a deadline sooner than May 20th.

MR. ZUNIGA: Right. April 11th or 12th, if I'm not mistaken, has to do with payments from the Racing Stabilization Fund from former dog owners and lessees and kennel owners. We have spoken to -- I have spoken to the comptroller's office to -- one of the -- how operating on their -- in order to make these payments, which need to start happening is --

MR. CROSBY: Explain what these payments are.

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah, I should

MR. CROSBY: Yeah.

MR. ZUNIGA: So when the legislature -- when the question as to the dog racing was passed in referendum, the legislature --

MR. CROSBY: Eliminating dog racing.

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah, eliminating dog racing from the state, the legislature passed a provision in the law to provide compensation for the kennel owners and dog owners who have had their livelihood eliminated, if you

will, at that time, and created something called the Racing Stabilization Fund.

2.1

Funding to this fund comes from the activities of the Racing Commission and the horse and simulcasting activities that still operate. But at that time, the office of -- the Department of Public Licensure and the Office of Consumer Affairs, who took over the disbursements of this fund, created or developed a methodology for the payment -- for the calculation of those payments.

One of the things before us that I think we should consider is whether we would want to replicate the methodology, which is my suggestion, or come up with a new methodology. I think the methodology at the time made sense, based on the number of races that had happened in 2009 when the -- when the dog racing ceased to exist. So in order for us to make the payments, the legislation transferred ownership of that fund to the Gaming Commission, to us.

MR. CROSBY: Which has happened.

MR. ZUNIGA: That has happened. The law has passed and that now -- we quote on quote own that. But one of the things we're contemplating, which was a reason for us to talk to the comptroller's office, is to enter into an interagency service agreement, short ISA,

with the Office of Consumer Affairs, or Public Licensure, in which we would use them as a conduit for the payments, because they have the infrastructure to -- because they have made those payments in the past. They know well the methodology I was explaining. They know who those people that are effected, or recipients of those payments, and they communicate with them sporadically.

2.1

So one of the things that I think we should consider is to essentially adopt that methodology and enter into the ISA -- that we don't have drafted yet, but we will soon -- in order to have those payments be made to those former dog owners and kennel owners.

MR. CROSBY: To my way of thinking, this is the perfect example to why we should postpone this transaction, because if there is one thing we don't know anything about is methodologies for allocating moneys to former kennel owners. We just don't need these kind of issues at this stage in the game. But we now -- at the moment we have this fund and we have to operate, so I would agree with your judgement, just take the methodology that's already been used and move forward.

MR. ZUNIGA: Yup. The comptroller by the way, the comptroller's office feedback was that this would be a very straight forward service agreement or interagency service agreement. Has to do with essentially

transfer of funds, which happens all of the time in many
other agencies.

2.1

We did have -- they had a good point and concern relative to the end of the fiscal year, which is June 30th, and that is another milestone that we should be sort of cognizant about because we could come to some agreement, another ISA if you will, relative to operations besides the payments to the -- but rather now the operations and the licensing of the people of the horse, you know, and --

MR. CROSBY: Tracks.

MR. ZUNIGA: -- the tracks, et cetera. And that milestone will be there only because there is the fiscal year, you know, cycle that we would have to kind of plan for.

MR. CROSBY: Right.

MR. ZUNIGA: So first things first. We're going to enter into the ISA for the payment. That could provide a template, if you will, for the operations, but that's, you know...

MR. CROSBY: Right. What is the time frame on the ISA? When would that be -- when would that have to be executed in order to make the payments on time?

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

MR. ZUNIGA: Soon. This week or next week. One of the -- as part of the methodology that www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION

Consumer Affairs came up with was an initial small payment
to make sure that the account and the entity the person
was still active and was correct information. Sort of
like, you know, when you get that advice that a payment is
coming. So that could be done very straight forward, but
then calculations.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: We probably should have a motion on this. It sounds like to execute an ISA is something -- do you want to frame that and then we'll discuss it further?

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah. No, I would frame it as a motion to adopt the methodology for payment for the former dog owners, lessees, and kennel owners previously developed by the Department of Public Licensure and the Office of Consumer Affairs, to continue making the payments from the Racing Stabilization Fund as scheduled.

MR. CROSBY: Could you amend that to add in -- to authorize the execution of an ISA?

MR. ZUNIGA: Yes. Subject to the drafting and authorization of an ISA with the Office of Consumer Affairs.

MR. CROSBY: Right. Do we have a second?

MR. MCHUGH: I'll second that.

MR. CROSBY: Anymore discussion on this

topic?

2.1

MR. STEBBINS: Yeah, I just wonder if there are people that have not been pleased with the methodology of payment and somehow inviting hearing process, comment process, where they may challenge the methodology that's been used. I don't know if everybody out there getting paid has been happy.

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah, let me speak about that.

What we understand from DPL and OSC is that this was -because the basis of the methodology relied on the last
years of activities, number of races, you know, that was
perceived to be as the fairest methodology that could be
drawn out. It is a percentage or it is also directly
related to the proceeds that are collected from the horse
track and simulcast.

MR. CROSBY: Do you know if anybody has complained, if anybody has objected to this?

MR. ZUNIGA: No. Actually, you know, here is an element. Actually, the legislation was very prescriptive in -- at the time for the Stabilization Fund, relative to payments had to be made on a bi-weekly basis, if I'm not mistaken. That was, you know, clumsy because there were payments of about a dollar or, you know, 50 cents, parceling it bi-weekly.

And so what they adopted, was also positively received by the people receiving the payments,

1	was a quarterly payment up front, if you will, before the
2	quarter, and then everybody is very happy. Also subject
3	to, you know, the receipts into this fund. So at this
4	point, what we understand is of most concern is when these
5	payments will renew. And everybody, again, as we
6	understand it, happy with us, no complaints.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Do you know how long this goes MR. CROSBY: on?

MR. ZUNIGA: Yes. There is in the legislation -- I think these payments cease on 2014, if I am not mistaken.

MR. CROSBY: Assuming it starts now, it ceases on 2014.

> Yeah, yeah. MR. ZUNIGA:

MR. CROSBY: I think you're doing the right thing. We don't want these people who are supposed to be getting these payments to be impaired if we're hung up in our transition process, so I think you're doing the right thing. It is something, if we do amend the takeover date, we'll have to unwind that process too, but we can do that.

MR. ZUNIGA: Not necessarily because with the legislation, we became the trustees, and we're just asking them to now make the payments on our behalf.

MR. CROSBY: Which could carry on as it is, and whereas the moneys that are generated will now drop

directly into our -- into the Racing Stabilization Fund
which we now hold?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. ZUNIGA: Yes, yes. The new moneys are always been doing that, but the fund changed ownership.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Great.

MR. ZUNIGA: Which is now disbursing...

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Good. This is sort of a subset of this, but I think you are taking the lead on trying to help us figure out what actual language would need to have to be doing the amended -- this is not relative to your motion, but just as an aside. If we do amend, and we're trying to -- the presumption is I think we're going to try to keep it as narrow as possible because nobody is interested in opening up the whole gaming law. We just want to focus on this very narrow issue.

MR. MCHUGH: Yeah, yeah.

MR. CROSBY: Any other discussion on Commissioner Zuniga's motion? All in favor indicate by saying I.

MR. MCHUGH: I.

MR. ZUNIGA: I.

MR. CROSBY: I

MR. STEBBINS: I.

MR. CROSBY: The motion carries. Thank

1 you.

2.1

Okay. Item 5 on our agenda, charitable gaming. And this is just a status report. We did -- I think I was authorized last week to write to the various legislative firms, the speaker, the senate president, the Ways and Means chair, and the economic development and technology chairs, I think, the committee is called, about our inability to meet the date, but our -- that we are going to go forward quickly and work on it.

There seemed to be a -- July 31st would be an appropriate time Commissioner McHugh felt by which time we would need to do this, so the letter is drafted. It will be on its way out the door pretty soon. I think we do -- it would be useful to understand a little more what the legislature was getting at in this, but we can do that informally as long as we've got some time together. We can do that informally, make sure we understand recommendations for what, talk about recommendations, but it wasn't exactly clear for what, unless you know more about this than I do.

MR. MCHUGH: Well, no, I don't. We began this morning. We talked to people in the attorney general's office who -- Division of Public Charities is the entity that's promulgated the regulations, but now it is governing this. One section of the General Laws

governs it. It is a small section, and we want to reach out to the others who are effected by the legislation and get their point of view, and then make some recommendations to the legislature.

2.1

There is some slight differences between the statute and the regulations that currently exist, and apparently some difference of opinion between what's truly charitable in gaming and what is something else. But those are the kind of things I think the legislature had in mind for us to take a look at. But I will reach out to everybody that has been effected, trying to help in some way...

MR. CROSBY: Is this something we can do ourselves? Have you -- not that you were supposed to, but have you thought through what the process will be for getting this issue assessed and report --

MR. MCHUGH: At a very high level, and the process is to -- and we have begun that process, really, meeting with the attorney general's folks today. They gave us the identities of others in the charitable community who were effected by this issues, the town clerks, others who were effected by this that we need to reach out to, talk to, probably the associations, and then solicit comments, in general, at some point from people who are interested in this subject, and then take all of

that information and formulate a proposal that we discuss here in one of our meetings.

2.1

I don't think it will take that long. It is a \$75 million gross industry, if you will, according to the annual report of the Lottery Commission to whom which is in charge of looking after the revenues, of which \$18 million goes to the charities, five percent goes to the state as a tax, and the rest goes to either prizes that are distributed or to the operators of these charities.

So it is a significant amount of money.

The charities wind up with a significant amount of money, although a relatively small percentage of the overall gross, but it is a significant amount of money to them and to some of them it means a great deal. So we have to take a real hard look at that and make whatever recommendations we're going to make, but I think we can get the information we need to make those recommendations.

MR. ZUNIGA: If I may, one of the parties they mentioned was the Massachusetts Non Profit Network, which we should take to -- the MMA as well. But I'll reach out -- I can reach out to the Lottery Commission. They can give us a lot more background on those. There is key people there that I think we should also meet with relative to how this...

MR. CROSBY: I just -- I have an instinct www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

that this is more work than might meet the eye, and you know, we absolutely should have one or more public hearings on this. This is a lot of conversation to be had. It is only -- did we say July 31st or June --

2.1

MR. MCHUGH: July 31st.

MR. CROSBY: So four months.

MR. MCHUGH: Three months away. Part of the issue, Mr. Chairman, is that we under the statute take over responsibility for this on July 31st.

MR. CROSBY: Right. That's the -- yeah, right.

MR. MCHUGH: That's the other piece we have got to prepare ourselves for. And we may not have any recommendation for change at all by that time, but it seems to me can gather some information and report to the legislature as to where we are, and what our general thinking is, even if we're not completely satisfied that we have the right answer.

So it seems to me it is a relatively small community. It is an important part of the revenues for the members of that community, and we need to begin to get some information, so we can make an intelligent assessment of it. Some work has been done by various groups who are interested in this, in thinking what an ideal policy would be, and I think we can build on that and either make

recommendations for change, or say with minor tweaks, or just leaving it alone, it works fine.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: Well, I am fine with all that. I just hate to have this buck stop on your desk. There is a lot of things going on, and if the buck is stopping on your desk, to pull this off, that's a lot of work. Maybe I am wrong. It feels to me like it would be. I think I would feel better if you -- maybe what we can do would be to authorize you to hire somebody. I am sure there would be somebody good out there we can find, not very much money, who would be the point person, but somebody you could direct to, say, schedule all these meetings, figure out when we have to have a public meeting, pull all the research together, whatever. And if you don't feel you need it, fine, but if you do, you could have the authority to do that.

MR. MCHUGH: Let's see. Let's see what we can pull together in the next week or so as to sort of a plan, and take a hard look at how much work this is really going to be and then that might be the way to go.

MR. CROSBY: So we'll talk about this again in the next meeting, or at most two, so we'll still have our three months to get it done. Okay. Great. Okay.

Item Number 6 is referred to as development, which really means the whole economic and www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510
LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

financial side of this, and as occurred earlier on, we have asked commissioner Stebbins to kind of take the lead on this. Do you want to give us sort of a status report on what's going on here?

2.1

MR. STEBBINS: Sure. In kind of the broader context, we're organizing the May 3rd meeting to be kind of an open-meeting primer on casino or Gaming Commission start up. We have thought of the next topic for a similar kind of open public education forum to focus on economic development. It is certainly our intention and hope that gaming legislation (inaudible) positive impact across Massachusetts.

We are in the very early stage of drafting an agenda. The Chairman has had some thoughts as well on a potential agenda. Some of the topics we have talked about are taking some of the research that's been done and maybe updating it. Some of the reports -- I know the initial spectrum report that was created, the legislature is now maybe three or four years old. Looking at kind of an update on some of the studies that have been done -- the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce did a study. There is another study out there as well. Inviting some resources that we have, I think in Massachusetts, some of those, UMass Dartmouth, UMass Amherst.

Commission Zuniga and I are going out there www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

to meet with some folks from the Donahue Institute. There is a professor on board at UMass Amherst who did some work for the State of Missouri with respect to the impact of their gaming. Also, looking at some other topics in terms of job development and training, the economic spin off potential we all hope to see in areas of tourism as well as small business. So those are some of the topics that we're organizing around. And, again, our goal is to have this meeting somewhat outside of the 128 beltway. We haven't necessarily identified a particular location, but hopefully we'll have that environment.

MR. CROSBY: I think there is several topics here. I think I have confused them. One is just, you know, how do we do economic development? How do we maximize economic development? What are the various issues in economic impact? But that's tourism is sort of a subset of that. We've talked about does -- is there a way that we could make this enhance tourism rather than cannibalize tourism and so forth. That's one set of issues.

But the one that I am increasingly feeing like we need to focus on, and which is intertwined in there, I think, is what data do we need to do our work that we don't yet have. You know, we have a whole bunch -- Commission Zuniga and I talked about this with

2.1

Mass Cultural Counsel today. Do we really have a good handle on what the likely revenues are supposed to be? Do we have a good handle on what kind of capital investment is plausible? Do we know anything about where these things ought to be located, the extent of which location of one is pro or con to another? Do we have any idea the kinds of jobs that might be generated? Do we have any idea how a slots parlor fits into the big picture of casinos? I don't know whether that data is out there.

I have heard people say, people whom I know and respect, people who worked against the casinos, people like Scott Harshbarger, say the reports are all in the tank. You know, I don't know. So I think that we should start out with -- it would help us, start out with a little slightly different focus, which is -- a sharper focus, which is do we have the information or what is the information we need and do we have it? And if we don't have it, set about the business of getting it PDQ, because I don't think we can do our work until we have this kind of baseline understanding of what the best we can possibly estimate it of what the facts are, what the data are, and what the consequences are. And that puts a slightly different spin on this.

And I realize, as I say, I think I've combined the two things, but as time has passed, I have www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

become more and more aware of what I am afraid we don't know. And having you, with the help of other commissioners, take the lead on reviewing all these reports, as you said all of these ones that are out there, bringing in people who think the methodologies are suspect and finding out the theory why they think the methodologies are suspect, et cetera. That seems to be the real specific focus of this next round. Does that make sense to you and others?

MR. STEBBINS: It does.

MR. CROSBY: Commissioner?

MR. ZUNIGA: Yeah. I was just thinking in terms of perhaps there is some scaleability to a lot of the assumptions. In other words, a casino comes in here and there is an economic benefit fundamentally. There is a number of jobs created and there is a number of revenues. A lot of what I started to read about these studies, part of the problem, chicken egg, if you will, is it all depends on the size, right. And so if we don't know the size of the investment, if we don't know, you know -- then the key variable is absent in how you predict many of the other variables.

So you know, there is assumptions in many of these studies, and clearly the legislation sets minimum thresholds, but I was reading about how the tax rates

influence -- not directly correlated, but correlated nonetheless -- the capital investment that might come up, and so which the Commission has discretion as to setting that tax rate.

2.1

And I suspect, just thinking out loud here, that there will be an element of "It depends." It depends on, you know -- we need to set those assumptions. We need to be cognizant about ranges perhaps, but you know, is not to disagree with anything you said by the way. We should still explore that. Any way.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. You're absolutely right. This is an art, not a science, I am sure. But nevertheless, we have got to do the best we can do. So if we use that -- you know, if we use, "What do we need to know to do our jobs, and do we know?" Is the first question. And then the second is, "If we don't, how do we get it?" And let that guide how we design this first panel as well as we design -- we'll be talking about this with gaming consultants.

We'll be talking about this with a lot of people, but I think this session is one that will really help this will bring it to the public too. We want people to know if we think we're missing a lot of really critical baseline data, that's going to slow things down. There are a lot of parties that are impatient to the fact that

this is taking a long time, they don't want to slow things down, and we've come to the conclusion we need to slow things down in order to get some more data, then we want to share with everybody why we've come to these conclusions and have them have a hand in talking about it.

2.1

2.2

MR. MCHUGH: I agree with all of that, but at the same time, I think part of this ought to be how do we keep ourselves attuned to the data that we need to have us move forward.

environment for what we're doing, and that the data we got two years ago, probably aren't fully accurate now, and the data that are going to exist in a couple of years are going to depend on factors that we don't know about now, and we're going to be making decisions against that data. So whatever we're doing, it seems to me we need to build in a process for constantly updating the information that we need to do our job.

MR. ZUNIGA: So what is the next step relative to viewing out these questions? A gaming consultant will be one resource. Have we identified others or we'll just cycle back with this?

MR. CROSBY: Well, Commissioner Stebbins and I both have had drafts of an agenda, and I think he and I ought to get together, and see whether we can -- if

we're on the same page as to what the objective is, see if we can workout a draft of that, and then bring it back to the Commission and talk about it, maybe as soon as next week.

2.1

Because I would like to -- to me this is so elemental. It may turn out we know enough. Maybe, you know, the studies that we've got are flexible enough that we can adapt to the times. I just don't know.

I know that I've talked to people about the spectrum report, people who have done the report, people in administration. They thought very highly of the spectrum report and thought it was real solid. So maybe it is not a big problem here, but I think it is elemental enough that we need to make that decision, and make it fast, because if the answer is we need more, then it is going to take sometime to get it. So I would hope that Commissioner Stebbins and I can come back with a suggestion about how to proceed on this as soon as our next meeting next week.

You know, I think we need to reach out, maybe now, I guess by having this conversation. I think we need to reach out to people too, pretty soon. There is a lot of people that fought about this a lot, and we need to get people's opinions pretty soon, substantive opinions, not just opinions, but data. What do we need to

know and do we know it. Anything else on that? Okay. So we'll try to have a -- something to talk about next week.

2.1

Expanding gaming and tourism. We have talked about this a little bit. Commissioner Stebbins and I, and we do -- I think we decided that we want to have conversations with people from the tourism and business from the three different regions, and I think -- to just talk to the people in the tourism business, for starters, just to get their sense of what expanding gaming means to their industries, you know, what the concerns are, are there ways to be synergistic. And I think you have already started that little bit, and you're going to set up some regional meetings, and I am going to focus on the Boston meeting.

MR. STEBBINS: Sure. I met with the executive director of the Mass. Office of Travel and Tourism. Again, mostly just an introductory meeting, but looking at what opportunities, avenues we have to talk to the various regional tourism around the Commonwealth, as well as what umbrella groups might exist, and we can go in, solicit their feedback or their input.

That (inaudible) getting back to me with a list of various upcoming dates when those groups might all be together in one room, as well as some different avenues for us to approach, again, to solicit their feedback.

2.1

MR. CROSBY: Okay. And certainly in the east where I was going to take the lead in setting up a conversation with folks, you know, people like the Convention Center and the Greater Boston Travel Tourism Office, so forth, they know they're thinking about this. They know a lot more about it than we do already, and I am sure they're either concerned that this is going to cannibalize certain kinds of business or hoping it will enhance business and getting them to think about it, and even at some point, have the industry involved in this too.

We're trying to figure out how the industry can be a success, and we need to figure out where the markets are, where we can grow, and at some point, we're going to want to coordinate with the casino industry too, because we have a common interest in trying to make this pie grow. And there is a question about how much it can build in Massachusetts, and if it has to grow largely outside Massachusetts, how do we work to make that happen. Okay.

Interagency relations. I think we gave a little bit of a misdirection to the media because I heard from some of the media today that we were going to be talking about Internet gaming and tribal gaming, which wasn't quite right. Might have suggested something more

1 than we had in mind.

2.1

The header is interagency relations, and that is really what we were talking about. On the Internet gaming, Internet gaming is one of the reasons why I'm so concerned about whether we really know what we need to know because none of these reports were done -- Internet gaming was, you know, still pretty much illegal and nobody was really thinking about it, or at least we weren't. So this is a variable in the mix that is really big.

There is legislation in the legislature that does address the Internet gaming that would assign it to the Gaming Commission. It is not going anywhere at the moment, but it is being talked about amongst, I think, Ways and Means, and the Committees on Economic Development and Technology, whatever that committee is called. And I think we probably need to talk a little bit with the legislature and see what their lines are.

the intention of the legislature was to put all gaming, except for lottery, under the Gaming Commission. That was their judgement of good public policy. I don't second guess that for the time being, but I don't know whether the folks from the lottery feel the same way about that.

We are trying to meet with Treasurer www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

Grossman, and some of the people from the lottery, to see if we can participate in their -- in that task force and just make sure we're at the table when these conversations are being had. And I do think getting some legislative intent here is important for us also.

2.1

On the tribal gaming situation,

Commissioner McHugh, do you want to give us an update a

little bit on that?

MR. MCHUGH: Yeah. We are the defendants, along with others, in a lawsuit that's brought by a developer named K.G. Urban who has a piece of property --which has a piece of property in Fall River that it is seeking to develop for a casino destination resort. And it has brought a lawsuit in the federal court claiming that the tribal set aside this whole compact arrangement in the south eastern sector, the Bedford, Fall River, Cape and Islands area, Plymouth area, is a violation of the equal protection clause because it is race based.

The response in the district court was it wasn't race based, it was politically based, it is a political judgement. It is an arrangement with a tribe, not a racial classification. And we and the state defendants prevailed at the one at the district court level. It has now been appealed to the first circuit. The briefs will be filed on our behalf by the attorney

general later this week, and the argument will take place sometime over the summer, early fall, and the question will be resolved.

2.1

But the litigation does raise a series of issues, that seems to me it is much too early to try to resolve. It needs to be kept in mind as we go forward with respect to gaming in that sector of the state. There are really three bags -- three pockets, three groups of issues that, you know -- one is whether or not the courts will ultimately agree that this is a political judgement, not a race-based judgement, because if they don't, then the whole set up for the compact of negotiations, and everything that has been prescribed for that sector of the state crumbles. It can't work. So that is the first piece, and that may take sometime to resolve, conceivably, if another appeal goes on beyond the first circuit.

The second has to do with the tribal itself. We have two tribes from news media accounts that have surfaced with an intention to seek some kind of gaming enterprise in that section. We have the Mashpee Wampanoags and Aquinnah Wampanoag and a whole series of the issues with respect to both of them. And then there is some report in the paper over the weekend that the Piqua tribe has made some suggestions with respect to the role of other tribes that may be in the area.

2.1

with all of those beginning with the so-called criteria decision, which was decided by the Supreme Court some years ago that defines who was a tribe eligible to take part in these kinds of negotiations. So those are another series of questions. And then there are questions as to the relationship of the various towns with which the tribal entities seek to pair in making negotiations and what their responsibilities and obligations are with respect to those overtures. So the Urban litigation is the piece that's going to be decided right now. It is the active piece right now.

The Governor's office is actively involved in negotiating compact with the Mashpee Wampanoags, but there are a number of other issues that I suggest are going to remain -- and we need to keep our eye on those issues as we go forward, and think about them, and think about ways to try to get questions that may help -- try to get questions that remain resolved as quickly as possible.

We have some responsibility in this area, I think, and there is other things we might be able to do.

It is too early to think about that right now in concrete terms, but we need to, in the big picture sense, keep that in mind as we move forward.

1 MR. ZUNIGA: The legislation sets the 2 October -- there is October date.

2.1

MR. MCHUGH: October 31.

MR. ZUNIGA: October 31st for a deadline for this Commission, relative to the compact not being negotiated.

MR. CROSBY: If there isn't a compact.

MR. ZUNIGA: If there isn't a compact, we are directed to issue a bid out, if you will, the third license. How does the litigation and its appeal, on its appeal, factor in terms of timing?

MR. MCHUGH: By itself the K.G. Urban litigation has nothing to do with the compact. It is simply an overlay, a background, if you will, that if decided in favor of K.G. Urban, would have the effect of saying that the set aside, the preference, the compact is not something that the law permits.

We'll know the answer to that. It may become moot if no compact is negotiated by July 31st. If it is negotiated by July 31st, it goes forward, then the litigation may be something that in the future upsets it. The October 31st deadline becomes moot if there is a compact by July 31st. If there is no compact by July 31st, the attorney general has taken the position, I believe, and it seems to me to be the right one.

2.1

But we have to decide as a Commission that that October 31st date is a directory date. It is a date that we can try to meet, but if we don't meet, that is something legislature has directed, and is not an integral part of the legislation, so we can issue the RFP later. And these are things we're going to have to think of, and think of them holistically as we move forward. That's the only reason I raise it now. It is a set of issues going on there that we have to keep in mind.

MR. CROSBY: How do we respond to the town's calls, under the same umbrella that we talked about before?

MR. MCHUGH: Yes, yes. I think that's one of the reasons that I raised this because one of the --some of the towns, one of the towns at least, does have questions about what their obligations are, what their rights are, where to get help. And it seems to me we try to direct them to places where they can get help. If we can't do that, they don't get satisfactory answers, they're still having difficulty, then we as a Commission have to figure out to the extent to which we can help them, and then give them the help, have to do that as a Commission.

I think the first step is to try to help them figure out where they get the answers that they need www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

2.1

and in a way that they can afford. This is going to cost those towns -- potentially going to cost the towns money just to get the answers, so it is a difficult dilemma for them, and we're going to try to be as helpful as we can. I think the only way to do that at this stage is to do it step by step, and see what we can do to help them find the solution, find the places where they can get advice on what the solutions are.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Well, this is a big, complicated one that could end up in our laps pretty soon, but I guess we -- is there anything other than just being alert to it?

MR. MCHUGH: No, I bring it up now because it is -- it is not directly tied to the Urban litigation. The Urban litigation is the piece that's going forward now. The brief is going to be filed this week, that will be resolved at least at the first circuit level sometime before the end of the year. But the resolution of that doesn't necessarily mean that all of the issues that are percolating in the south eastern corner of the state are going to be resolved at the same time, and we'll just have to continue to pay attention to them as we go forward.

MR. CROSBY: Now, we were asked by the attorney general whether we wanted to comment on her response to the -- on her whatever that is that filing

is. Having read it, do you think we want to do anything or say anything?

2.1

2.2

MR. MCHUGH: No. The brief basically takes the -- the brief, as I understand it, will take the position that has already been taken in the district court. It is a position that statute is a political statue, not a race-based statute, that there are other reasons why now is not the appropriate time to resolve the issues that the K.G. Urban developers have raised.

My overall suggestion was the sooner we can get a substantive answer to this, the better everybody is going to be, and I don't think there is any disagreement.

MR. CROSBY: Is there any point to considering urging the court to speak to the issue? You said that they may -- the court may be able to moot this lawsuit for a bunch of other issues, rightness and so forth.

MR. MCHUGH: Right.

MR. CROSBY: Then we would be left with this open question. Is this a race-based law, which could undue the whole compact concept. Is there a place for us to urge the court to resolve this?

MR. MCHUGH: I think it is premature to do that because in all likelihood, the argument is not going to take place until after July 31st, and by July 31st

we'll know that there is a compact and some of the other arguments may disappear. And if there is a compact, some of those arguments will disappear, and they will be -- the likelihood that they'll reach the merits is higher.

2.1

If there is no compact by July 31st, then that whole piece is moot, and there is no tribal based preference at that point. So time will help us with this to some extent.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. So watchful waiting is our strategy.

MR. MCHUGH: Right, right.

MR. CROSBY: All right. Anything else on the interagency relations? By saying interagency relations, that reminds me that we do -- for the May 3rd conference we do need to reach out to all related public agencies, and I think we have thought about that, but that is something we need to be doing. Okay.

Item 8, other business. There were, I guess, one thing that we didn't put on the agenda, that I have been thinking about, and I think I would like to raise. We adopted a mission statement, which I have here somewhere, last week that starts out with these words, "The Massachusetts Gaming Commission will create a fair, open and transparent process."

And it was kind of niggling in my mind when www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

we did it, but I didn't focus on it. Open and transparent are kind of the same thing, and one word is missing, which is participatory. So what I would like to discuss first of all is the proposition that we would change this to read "The Massachusetts Gaming Commission will create a fair, transparent and participatory process." As opposed to a fair, open, transparent process.

2.1

2.2

It is not a big deal, but it is a phrase that I use a lot, and I think when we talk to the media and talk to our constituents, we want to emphasize the fair, transparent and participatory, so to memorialize it in our mission would make sense, but any other --

MR. STEBBINS: I wholeheartedly agree with the change. It is great enough for us to be transparent and open as possible, but at some point we're soliciting feedback...and a number of (inaudible).

MR. ZUNIGA: I agree.

MR. MCHUGH: I agree as well.

MR. CROSBY: Great, great. Do you want to move to that effect?

MR. ZUNIGA: I will make a motion to amend our mission statement to read a fair, transparent and participatory process.

MR. STEBBINS: Second.

MR. CROSBY: All in favor?

1	MR. ZUNIGA: I.
2	MR. CROSBY: I.
3	MR. MCHUGH: I.
4	MR. STEBBINS: I.
5	MR. CROSBY: All opposed?
6	Thank you. And we need to put that into
7	our various documents.
8	MR. CROSBY: I think the only other thing
9	is to any other business that wasn't anticipated?
10	MR. STEBBINS: Quick question. Whether we
11	need to seek action or seek commission approval on issuing
12	the RFR for the recruiting firm?
13	MR. CROSBY: I think we already did. Does
14	anybody remember? Didn't we authorize well, just to be
15	on the safe side, let's do it. Commissioner McHugh?
16	MR. MCHUGH: I move that we issue an RFR to
17	be prepared. That we issue an RFR MGC 201242 for the
18	executive director of the Massachusetts
19	MR. CROSBY: For research firm.
20	MR. MCHUGH: Research firm executive
21	director.
22	MR. CROSBY: Second?
23	MR. ZUNIGA: Second.
24	MR. CROSBY: All in favor?
25	MR. MCHUGH: I.
	www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510

LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

MR. CROSBY: 1 I. MR. ZUNIGA: I. 2 3 MR. STEBBINS: I. 4 MR. CROSBY: Motion carries unanimously. 5 Okay. 6 Our next public meeting is scheduled for 7 April 24th, a week from today. As I said, we hope that at 8 that point we'll have a regular plan in mind, so this 9 isn't quite so ad hoc. We're at the Convention Center --10 so at the 24th, April 24th at two o'clock at the Boston 11 Convention Center. We'll have a pretty hefty agenda, 12 which we will let you all know about in advance. And I 13 quess that's it. 14 MR. ZUNIGA: Mr. Chairman, just one more 15 thing. In the same venue as issuing the RFR for research 16 firm, I want to make a motion to issue an RFR for ad hoc 17 audit and consulting review services relative for the 18 State Racing Commission, as I am pretty sure that that was 19 discussed, but you know. 20 MR. CROSBY: Okay. Good. Do I have a 2.1 second? 22 MR. STEBBINS: Second. 23 MR. CROSBY: Any discussion? All in favor? 24 MR. ZUNIGA: I.

> www.OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com 617-471-3510 LizTice@OfficeSolutionsPlusLLC.com

I.

MR. MCHUGH:

25

1	MR. CROSBY: I.
2	MR. STEBBINS: I.
3	MR. CROSBY: All opposed? No. The motion
4	carries unanimously. All right.
5	Do we have a motion to adjourn?
6	MR. ZUNIGA: So moved.
7	MR. CROSBY: All in favor?
8	MR. ZUNIGA: I.
9	MR. STEBBINS: I.
10	MR. CROSBY: I.
11	MR. MCHUGH: I.
12	MR. CROSBY: Great. Thank you.
13	(The proceedings were concluded at 3:57 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

I, Amanda Snell, an Approved Court Reporter, do hereby
certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
transcript from the record of the proceedings.
I, Amanda Snell, further certify that the foregoing is in
compliance with the Administrative Office of the Trial
Court Directive on Transcript Format.
I, Amanda Snell, further certify that I neither am
counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and
further that I am not financially nor otherwise interested
in the outcome of this action.
Proceedings recorded by stenographic means, and
Transcripts produced from computer.
/s/ Amanda Snell Date April 18, 2012
Amanda M. Snell, Transcriptionist for
Office Solutions Plus LLC My commission expires October 26, 2018
Data
<u> Date</u>