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
10	James F. McHugh
11	Bruce W. Stebbins
12	Enrique Zuniga
13	
14	
15	APRIL 24, 2012
16	1:00 p.m.
17	
18	The Boston Convention and Exhibition Center 415 Summer Street
19	Boston, Massachusetts
20	Amanda Snell, CSR, RPR
21	Court Approved Court Reporter and Transcriber
22	Office Solutions Plus LLC 50 Summer Street
23	Weston, Massachusetts 02493 617.471.3510.
24	017.471.3310.
25	

#### APRIL 24, 2012

#### PROCEEDINGS:

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. It is two o'clock -- I'm sorry one o'clock. Thank you. Amanda, is this working for you? Back in the back for the video, is that working?

Then I would like to call our third public meeting to order. The first item of business is approval of the minutes from at least April 10th, but I am going to suggest that we wait on the minutes until Commissioner McHugh gets here since that's been his responsibility, but we should know that Commissioner McHugh had a grandchild born at one o'clock in the morning last night and is busy (inaudible) with his grandchild, but he will be here shortly, I believe.

So let's move on to Item Number 3, and we have a whole bunch of items there starting out with the search for an executive director of the Gaming Commission, and within that we incorporated also the search for the -- or the idea of getting an acting ED which the legislation authorizes us to do. Commissioner Stebbins has been taking the lead on that. Commissioner, do you want to give us an update?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. Just a quick update. Obviously, at our last meeting we approved an RFR

2.1

for -- to solicit an executive search firm. The RFR is out. Just some key dates in the RFR, bidder's responses are due by May 11th. The team review that select the finalists in the following week, and hopefully interviews with the finalists the following week of May 21st through the 25th, and the anticipated contract award by May 29th. Obviously, any way we can speed that up, we will certainly try to do. Certainly the interview process is not necessary as we all have outlined in the RFR, so that is moving ahead.

Quickly moving over to the conversation about an acting executive director again, which as you've pointed out the Gaming Act does allow us to appoint. I shared with you just kind of a draft of background experience and skills kind of statement for an acting executive director. And certainly we'd open that up for anybody, conversation or discussion about that.

Again, I think it is our anticipation that this is not a permanent hire. This is an interim hire as we proceed ahead with a thorough search for the first full-time executive director of the new Gaming Commission.

We had a call with Kevin O'Toole from the Pennsylvania Gaming Commission back in the early part of April. We raised the question with him about key skills

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

that he thought somebody who would be coming in on an acting basis would have. And they were relatively -- I would say they were relatively simple. Possessing some good communication skills, possessing strong research skills, as well as some strategic and project management skills as well. So I've outlined background experience and skills we may wish to consider.

2.1

I think we're still eyeing somebody who has some municipal, state or federal government management experience, essentially, to really help the Commission run our day-to-day operations. And outlined below, you know, our candidate would closely work with the Commission for a limited period of time and outlined some of those responsibilities, assisting with some basic office operations, assisting with identifying critical positions and recruiting and hiring potentially some of those key spots, working closely with the Commission and the contracted consultants that we're going to hear about their progress later, as well as obviously assisting and attending Commission meetings.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if any of my colleagues have any comments on this one pager.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I actually have one comment, slash, question to think about. Actually, is told to come up in the context of conversation of how the

Commission is going to govern ourselves. And as part of the job description, would we need to clarify or think about any reporting --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me one second,
Commissioner.

2.1

How is the grandchild, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great. I am sorry to be late, but my only chance to see her.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sorry. Some things are more important than others.

executive director -- we have given any thought relative to the reporting of that person to the Commission as a whole, that is obvious, but whether for different functions that this interim would be conducting, would that person then report to a different commissioner? I guess, one of the things that we have to reconsider is how this Commission would act, oversee, supervise, whatever it would be even interim executive director.

I am just posing it as a question, open question, whether it is part of discussion now or later it is...

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And maybe it is something we need to clarify and add to this document.

Again, you know, I think because, you know, our chairman

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

has kind of assigned us individual silos or portfolios we're responsible for, we would do that to interact with this Commission, the executive director, even acting, on some of those issues, certainly some of our immediate needs as I see them. Budget, HR might be directed to you.

2.1

And, again, it is a person who really can help us keep the operation of the gaming commission going with respect to understanding state procurement, a lot of the operational issues that I think we're challenged by here in the early --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I hope this will become a little bit less clumsy when we have an executive director, acting or otherwise, because we're now doing a lot of the work that will compensate the director and his or her key staff people, so that will change a little bit and it will make it a little bit easier. Hopefully the executive director will just be kind of keeping the Commission up-to-date on how these projects are going.

It will still be some of us being involved in our vertical areas of focus, I think, but I think this will make life a lot simpler for us when that person is reporting to the Commission and doing most of the staff work, and we don't have to be doing the staff work ourselves. I also think this is going to be something

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

we're going to learn as we go. You know, when we talk with New Jersey commissioners next week, they're the only other full time commission. They'll have some ideas about how full time commissioners interact with staff. But still we're in a start-up mode, which is different, but I think we're going to sort of learn as we go on this a little bit.

Do you have anything that you wanted to add?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. I just wanted to mention that I -- rather than the gaming experience, which it may seem like that's what we need right away, but in assessing our needs, I do believe someone with experience in state government, understands the way procurement happens here in the Commonwealth, because things are different from state to state. So I think that in-state experience would be very useful for us right now, as opposed to someone with -- especially in an interim position with that gaming experience.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think, you know, we have certainly had a helping hand extended to us from a lot of other agencies, and I would get the sense that their timeline or interest in continuing to do that may be \*in their aid\*, but being able to have those resources and that experience would be a big help.

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

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But I would say I am not sure if I exactly agree with Commissioner Cameron on this because I would have added in gaming experience. If we can get somebody with gaming experience who also has these other skills, then I think that would be all to the good. We might as well try. We do what you're going to be talking about. We do have a candidate with gaming experience. I don't -- I think it is a trade off.

In a perfect world, you would have all of these things. We probably aren't going to get all of these things, so we're going to have to trade off what really matters the most, but I would at least have gaming experience on the list, and I would emphasize -- and it feels to me like if when we get our consultant on board and an ED with a little bit of staff, they would begin to take over the business of starting up the Commission and the business of constructing involving long-term organizational structure through the regulatory stuff, the licensing procedure, and free us up to be thinking about what criteria we want to use, and what process we want to use for selecting the licensees, which is as I see it as our biggest problem. That is one of the biggest tasks and that's something that's not delegated. So having the ED working with the consultant, getting this organization up and running with us in it only in a policy approval mode

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

would be the ideal from what I think as I am now thinking about it.

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. And you make a great point, and you know, I am happy to kind of move on to the --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let me add one other thing that we didn't talk about earlier on, but I think is important to agree on or not or I forget whether we've talked about this. But it seems to me the acting ED should not be prejudiced one way or the other as to whether he or she can be a candidate either for permanent ED or for some other position in the organization. It is going to be hard enough to get an interim with a very short term commitment. If we were to say and if you're the interim you can't be anything else, or in some way this is prejudicial, I think that would make it even harder for us to get good candidates.

On the other hand, we'd have to make sure we don't stack the deck in favor of this person and make sure, for example, if we write an RFP for the ED that the acting ED doesn't like the RFP and that kind of thing.

And maybe Commissioner did have some ideas on how we can do that, but my suggestion would be that as long as we did clear it with all the regulatory and ethical folks, that we be explicit that the acting ED is not barred from being

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 | an applicant for other positions.

2.1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Certainly one criteria, and one part of managing that is to ensure that all candidates for the permanent ED are -- go through the search process in the same fashion with the outside search consultant that we've -- that we're searching for now.

bypass. Nobody has the inside track, and it seems to me that that's what we ought to ensure for every permanent position that we're fulfilling, so if that person were to find another -- be an applicant for another position, not the full time ED position, that whatever the criteria for that other position, that that person have to go through that process as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That makes sense. I don't think we need a formal action on that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just I got a little bit -- also the notion of being in full start-up mode, I see, especially the acting ED, some of the initial tasks to really help us set up a back office, if you will. Just Commissioner Cameron split up into agency, set up agency experience, management, et cetera, but you know, very important is factors in experience.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We did receive a proposal essentially from an individual, he is the former chairman of the Nevada State Gaming control board, Dennis Neilander. He is now in private law practice. He did extend a proposal to us to assist the Commission on an interim basis. I think everybody received a copy of his information and his proposal.

I shared the proposal with Commissioner

Zuniga in terms of getting our hands around what the cost
of this individual's services would be, but I think it is
an interesting enough proposal that I'd at least like to
do some follow up, have a chance to talk to the
individual, perhaps, even if he was willing to come to

Boston. But at least initiate that --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Come to Boston for an interview you're talking about; is that what you meant?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What do other people think of this idea? I am not sure how much chance you have had to review this proposal. Is it prima fascia? Is this something that we ought to consider?

Just a little bit more background. This came about because several of us reached out to professionals in the gaming industry to see if they would

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

have suggestions for interims as well as for full times.

Kevin O'Toole was one that we talked to about it. I spoke to the chair of the gaming -- the present chair of the Gaming Commission, which is different from the control board.

2.1

- In Nevada they have a bifurcated system. They have the Gaming Commission, which is sort of the policy making body, and they have the Control Board, which runs everything. And I talked to the chair of the Commission, the present chair, and he recommended that I talk to this person for ideas. And when I talked to this person, he said he might be willing to do it, but this person comes very highly recommended by the present chair of the Commission, and I think he got a reference check also.
- So assume the guy for the sake of discussion is good. We don't know for sure. We don't know very much about him, except for his resume. Assume the guy is good, is this plausible, is this prima fascia something that we want to entertain or does this really not fit, his kind of part-time structure that we're thinking about?
- COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, my reaction to this is that -- I am looking at the things he would like to help us with, and those are exactly the things we've

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

hired consultants to do for us. So I would think there would be a lot of overlap there. And I am going to get back to my original point about knowing state government in Massachusetts and how critical that is to us at this point. I see this -- I see this as someone who could have helped us as a consultant, but not as an executive director.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As interim.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: As interim director.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, I think his structure, his location, you know, his billing structure, really lends itself a lot more for an advisory role, which may still, you know, be a phase here or not. We did talk about that.

I also see the need of the -- the back office, I want to term, you know, the boots on the ground, who needs to do any number of -- establishing procedures, manuals, our policies, hirings, et cetera, where we should draw on a lot of the expertise that I think is available here in Massachusetts.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the bottom line of that was?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Agreeing with

Commissioner Cameron that I think this person -- there may

be a role here, but I don't see it as you refer to as

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

prima fascia as an acting ED candidate. Not for what I have in mind of what we need on an interim.

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

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I agree. It seems to me that we have now the gaming consultants, we have the legal consultants. I want to talk about the latter in a minute. We're searching for an interim executive director, and I am not certain how -- we need to put the pieces together here. Have the legal consultant and the gaming consultant and the executive director interact with each other in a constructive way, so that we can build out the build-out. And I am not sure how this gentleman fits into that. And it seems to me there is a fair amount of redundancy. On the other hand, there is a great deal of expertise and it might well be worthwhile trying to figure out how we could take advantage of that expertise with a visit, a review of things that we're doing, a second set of eyes to look at how we're building things out, that would be invaluable. But not as an on-the-ground, operational component of our start-up process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Let me suggest this. I haven't had a conversation with this gentleman.

I am more than happy to participate with another member of this Commission in contacting him, and have a conference call, and layout where we are and what our thoughts are on the interim executive director, give him a broad overview

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

of the other things we have done to this point, including the consultants that we are bringing on board, and just kind of walk through with him, and see if it is something he is interested in.

2.1

Obviously, he has got Nevada experience,
Nevada state government experience, not Massachusetts
government experience. But give him an idea of kind of
what we're looking for to see if he wants to make any
adjustments, or he may tell us at that point, I am not
interested. That is really not where my line of interest
lies.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: May I also point out perhaps within the next couple of weeks, as well as after our forum of next week, and after additional conversations we'll have relative to, you know, looking at our consultants as they're developing the work plan that I know they are, we could revisit the notion of, you know, someone like him in a -- in whatever role, you know what I mean? We could be better informed in only a matter of a couple weeks after these two things start to come to fruition.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You know, I think my view has changed on this. I was pretty interested in this person, but I think I agree with the drift here. I think it might make sense -- I did have a preliminary

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 conversation with him. He knows what we're looking for.

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But maybe it makes sense to sort of have a presumption that it will not be this person for the reasons you all have said. Not anything about him, but because what we think are the higher priority of skills. But just for the record, you know, have you go ahead and have that conversation. You might learn something interesting anyway. I don't think I did emphasize the role the consultants would be playing, and that is a material input to the conversation.

I think my take away from this, which just leave informal I think, is the presumption is the idea of using somebody from the outside, which does not have Massachusetts experience is not a likely way to go, and that we should double our efforts on local people. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes.

who have been intimately involved in the evolution of this legislation, some number of them who also know a lot about state government, which I think is where we've sort of begun to focus on the local. I think we should really redouble our efforts on that. So I think we have got a

consensus on that. You will go ahead and have that call, but as sort of a last shot.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Then on the ED, I do -- on the acting ED, I think the reason the legislation put that clause in there specifically, said in the absence of permanent ED, we have the authority to appoint an acting ED precisely for this situation. There is invitation to us to truncate the process, which I think we should do, but we shouldn't eliminate the process.

So the line we have to walk -- we need somebody quickly, but we need to make sure that we're, you know, crossing our Is and dotting or Ts. Or the other way around, crossing our Ts and dotting our Is, in this process. If you come to us with a prima fascia case of someone you think can do it, great. If you think you can find it, great. If not, then we can open it up into a more formal search, but in the interest of time I think better if we can do that, but on the other hand check whoever you come up with pretty carefully.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Absolutely, I think we would kind of invest on this -- we've got to -- some of the other consultants, right, or anybody else?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Or communications people.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, right. Okay. And we certainly would -- ultimately we would do a serious background check too, but.

2.1

Okay. Commissioner McHugh, we skipped over the minutes while you were out. It says on the agenda 10, but we also have -- I think we have background information on 10 and 17.

April 17 minutes this morning. But let me first deal with the April 10 minutes which were posted. This is the form that we're going to use in the future. We're going to, after each of these meetings, post a transcript of the meetings. We did not -- we have done that for the first meeting. We have a stenographer present at this meeting and we did the last meeting. But the first one we had the transcript prepared from the videotape.

So we're going to post the transcript.

We're going to post the meeting minutes that refer to pages in the transcript so that people can have in effect a summary of the meeting, and then go look at the transcript pages if there are any matter they're particularly interested in. And then the documents that we used at the meeting. So all of that has been posted with respect to the April 10 meeting, and I would move that the minutes of the April 10 meeting be approved.

1	CHAIRMAN	CROSBY:	Second.

2.1

Where is the reference to where the topic is in the transcript?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You're looking at the agenda. And in the minutes themselves --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, so we don't have the minutes at this point.

commissioner mchugh: The minutes are not in this packet. The minutes were posted and distributed. The first set was distributed last week internally and the second set was distributed this morning. But the references in the minutes, I believe, at the end of each section.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will most of the time -- not last week, but most of the time, also have video posted as well as the second.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right. The video has to await the minutes being approved because we're required to have available, for those who need it, a written transcript, so we need to post them simultaneously. So that's -- every time we have a video, the video will be posted as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay. Any other discussion on the April 10 minutes? All in favor of adopting the minutes as posted say aye.

1	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye.
3	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.
4	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
	_
5	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
6	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? The motion
7	carries unanimously.
8	Now, what about April 17?
9	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The April 17 minutes
10	were posted this morning. I would move that they too be
11	approved. They are there. It is not on the agenda, but
12	they are there. The transcript is there and the I am
13	not sure the video is there yet, but we didn't have a
14	video. We didn't have a video, so that won't be there.
15	And the documents that we used at that meeting are there
16	as well. So I would move that those be approved as well.
17	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor? Any other
19	discussions? All in favor of adopting the April 17th
20	minutes indicate by saying aye.
21	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
22	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye.
23	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.
24	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
25	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The reason they're 3 not on the agenda, I should add, Mr. Chairman, is I didn't 4 really anticipate that they would be ready today. 5 This process that we're using now makes use 6 of the stenographer to prepare both a draft of the minutes 7 and the transcript, and that comes quickly, and we can speed up the entire process. We're in the process now of 8 9 working out a few little details, but it is going to lead 10 to a much faster turnaround of both the transcript and the minutes, and in fact, this set of minutes got turned 11 12 around faster than I anticipated it would. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you know, give or 14 take, what the cost of the transcript function is? 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The answer to that is 16 we have an approximation, but we're still working on that to try and work out those issues. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For a long-term 19 agreement. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: For a long-term 2.1 agreement, yeah. We need to have, I think -- we need to 22 have not only a simultaneous live stream of these minutes,

but a quick and accurate verbatim preservation of what we

the summary and serve as an index, so that we can get into

talk about here, as well as minutes which both serve as

23

24

25

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

the minutes quickly. All of that goes to a package of accessibility that I think does us and the public and those who are interested as well. So we're trying to work out a process to streamline that, make it as automatic as we can.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does anybody disagree with that? I mean, we'll now have minutes, transcript, and I think, we are committed to and it looks like we're going to do a full video. Does anybody disagree that that -- we're gilding the lily here?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, just coming from a budget and financial perspective, I know the streaming has an impact relative to where it is streaming from -- and where it is streaming from. So as soon as we can get our handle on just what the long-term cost is, I think would be a great --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree with that. You can't have this question in the abstract. I think sometimes it is very expensive and sometimes it seems not to be very expensive. But from my standpoint, it -- the symbolism of it, as well as the substance of it, that people across the Commonwealth can see this in real time, and participate as much as people who are here in person, that the symbolism as well as the realty of that, is a real and material thing.

2.1

If we have relatively modest viewership at the outset, hopefully it will grow as we market this better, if we start to do things. But I'm open, you know, I think you're right. We should wait until we really know for sure what the cost is, but my predisposition is this is really the right thing to do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Also the thought about especially hearings where we really are inviting the public's input for example, that is almost like a no-brainer, but if it is more administrative or procedural type of meeting, could we do away with them?

It's something we ought to talk about. Hopefully, if anybody is out there watching to send us your ideas, how significant is this. I agree with you. Hearings for sure we'll do it, but our regular non-public participation public meetings is a fair question.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That is a fair point.

more thing? We could -- also, we should just, for the record, say that -- there is an alternative to the live streaming, which could be just taping and posting within a couple of hours of the meeting. That could also be memorialized and then helping in participation. It is the live streaming component that gets a little expensive.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That will be something

else we'll be able to look at when we have specific proposals.

2.1

Say briefly that this is the time to be doing these things, even though the interest may be low, understandably, with some of the things that we're talking about to get it right and get it smooth, so that when there is interest, as there will be soon, we have got a smooth and efficient operation on this side, just as we do on the other side. So I think we should keep at it for a little while, at least until we have something that we're comfortable with, and that is as smooth and efficient that we can put in play whenever we need it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. Item 3B, HR process. I am not sure that there is really anything more. Commissioner Zuniga?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, a brief update. I started really compiling from those sources out there familiar with, and I'm becoming familiar with, different documents and language that could help us draft an HR hiring policy. I have -- you know, I continue to do that, and will have some more for the next meeting. Hopefully, we can, you know, have a working draft of those processes as we undertake major hirings.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anything else on

2.5

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

that? 3C, the search for director of communications, although we don't know for sure that is what the name is. I could just give you an update. Our interviewing team of Karen Schwartzman from our PR firm and Hank Shafran recently retired from Bigham McCutchen has identified 14 candidates -- I think that is right, right? -- who they felt were worthy of interviews. Each of these 14 people is going through one to two hour interview with the two of them, and they hope to winnow it down to probably three finalists that I and somehow or others, some others who will probably talk too.

At the moment, most of the names wish to be kept confidential, which is okay in this process. But I think we're looking to move by the end of next week, maybe, right, have all of the finalists. The interviews will all be done and they will be back. So we're close within another week or so we should be -- if the strong -- if the right candidate is in this existing pool, we should be ready to go within about a week and a half.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Could I suggest,

Mr. Chairman, or at least discuss the end game here. It

seems to me that like other things, we need to move both

with thoroughness and with expedition. It seems to me

that with respect to the public information officer,

whatever he or she is going to be called, that an

2.6

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

appropriate mechanism for making that selection would be to have you make the selection based on your interviews with the finalists, aided and assisted by whoever it is you choose, if you choose anybody.

2.1

You are the person who is the spokesperson by and large. You're the person who is interacting with the press and the public most frequently, and so that would be a logical place to place the decision.

But in addition, this gets back to sort of the we're both the staff and policy makers here. In keeping with the allocation of responsibilities that we made last week where everybody has a primary responsibility, it seems to me this is an efficient way to do this. And if we formally designated you as the decision maker, aided by whoever you wanted to use as a sounding board, but you have the final decision, that would be an appropriate and efficient way to go.

So I would just like to put that on the table for a discussion, and then an appropriate motion, if the discussion suggests that it would be appropriate to do it that way.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thoughts about that?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree with that thought process that you are, and have been, and will remain the spokesperson for the Commission in many ways,

and I think very appropriate to have you interview those finalists, however many, and come back supposedly for recommendations.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would be fine with that. I think with the help that because we're getting so much work out of Karen and Hank, and so much in-depth vetting with them I would be okay with that, with the option, if it is possible and/or necessary, of having a public meeting in which we interview some candidates, or maybe the final candidates.

That puts -- this public meeting stuff is really tough for people applying for jobs. We have to figure out how that works. But if there is going to be a motion, I would leave that as an option because I think that is the preferred way to go under the circumstances.

that -- I would move that the Commission designate you,
Mr. Chairman, as the person who makes the decision as to
who interviews the finalists, and makes the decision as to
the candidate, reserving to you the judgment that a
public -- public meeting, if it is in your judgement
necessary, be one of the options you use to make the
decision.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Second?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? All in favor.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'll abstain on that

one. It passed.

2.1

Okay. Gaming consultant status. As we talked about last week, we vetted, we approved two finalists, Michael & Carroll and the Spectrum Group. We asked the two of them working together with the coordination of Kathy O'Toole, who is on one of the teams, to talk about pooling their resources, and putting together a proposal where the team of them, would do the job, which would give us the opportunity to get the best of both of their packages.

They have met now at some length. They've talked a lot. They met at some length. I only got this proposal this morning, and you only got it shortly after I did. To my way of thinking, it lays out the scope pretty well. It is a very, very comprehensive 16-week idea -- 16-week plan that, you know, very nice buttoned up way discusses the range of issues that they would undertake during that period of time, with particular emphasis on

the strategic plan, which was critical in our RFP, and which is critical to us going forward.

2.1

We wouldn't be waiting on everything for 16 weeks. There would be a lot of stuff going on during the 16 weeks, but at the end of the 16 weeks, we would have a pretty comprehensive, basically, game chart and work plan for the next few years of our work, which would be great. They have not assigned who does what, but they have proposed this, and I would like to have your reactions to it to the extent that you have had a chance to see it. Anybody?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I read it this morning and I have, you know, a couple of questions. Is this the project proposal or are they developing an additional document to this?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, if we say yes to this --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yup.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- then they would provide, as they said in the last page, a flow chart that includes the division of labor among team members and specific weekly deliverables. So yes -- if we approve this, yes, there would be another staged column, yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And when -- do they have any idea as to when that start time would be, the

start of the 16-week period? In other words, do they go back, and you know, do a plan, if you will, and broad timeline, when would we anticipate whether an early start or a late start, you know. Do we have even a range of what that start --

2.1

that. I had the opportunity to meet with all of the consultants yesterday on a separate matter while they were working on this. And they're ready to start immediately. That was the conversation they had, that as soon as the Commission approves this work plan, they're ready to start immediately.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the issue would be whether they can start to work in advance of the execution of contract because it would take us a while to execute a contract, and in my prior experience that can be done, if it is done right.

So that is what we would try to do is get them going, meanwhile, the details of working out the contract. We can get going, we just have to make sure that works within the procurement rules, but that is what they would like to do too.

Any other thoughts, any reactions to the substance of this?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I thought

#### APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

it was important that they coordinate with the law firm and they have that mentioned in the plan. I also found it to be very comprehensive. In speaking to others who have had start-up operations, these were all of the things mentioned that we would need to get started on immediately, so.

this morning. I mean, obviously a lot of the things that they've mentioned in laying out their scope of work is consistent with what the RFP was looking for. However, I note that in their short-term activities, they do suggest, or list as potential action item, an RFQ process, which is obviously something, I think, that is allowed for in legislation, but is relatively new.

And they even say to assess the suitability of operators, but the team and the Commission will determine, so that is almost a -- almost sounds like a subject for a separate discussion, even though some of these other things they can begin to initiate on their own. That sounds like something that would still involve the five of us having a conversation with them about what that RFQ process would entail. I don't think its necessarily a bad step. I think it's --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In fact, this came up in our interviews with when we were interviewing the

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

finalists before we decided -- and I think it came up also at our public meeting.

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

I didn't know anything about this, but their suggestion was -- sort of in the legislation, I guess, but their suggestion was that you get a request for qualifications out there to anybody who says they're going to bid, and we do a preliminary, sort of, legal and financial vetting of these folks. Are you somebody who we can accept as a bidder? And once they're -- said yes or no, then everybody is saved a lot of trouble. It saves the towns trouble. It saves them trouble. It saves us trouble. So we would do a preliminary vetting, and then once they were approved for the RFQ process, if they were approved for the RFQ process, then they can go ahead and develop the proposal with the host community, have a referendum to us and so forth.

It speeds up the process. It shows the public and the participants that we're moving. When it came up, I didn't really understand what they were talking about because I hadn't thought about that, but it is clearly the best practice. It makes a lot of sense, I think, for everybody's sake and would get us rolling in a way that a lot of people would be pleased to see that we're moving. But having said that, yes, that is something we would have to approve. They wouldn't go off

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 on their own hook and do that.

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think on the last page they're offering assistance to not only come up with a hiring plan, but they're offering assistance to help draft the job descriptions, not only for the executive director, but some of the other immediate hires in providing recruiting assistance and vetting participation. I am interested in that. Obviously, it's a potential performance into the work that we may select from the recruiting firm to assist us.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Good point.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I concur. I found that of interest too and something we could utilize, their experience in that manner.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I also have a couple of other questions relative to how, you know, given this 16-week period, how this team, you know, for starters would report, update this Commission, and how would they interact with, solicit feedback or direction from one or more commissioners, whether it is by area, much like we have talked about, you know, whether it is a relation matter or a financial matter maybe, or hiring matter, you know, because you have taken the lead on some of the hiring practices. If nothing else, I would be interested in whether that has been communicated or talked about with

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 | the team.

2.1

and it is something I can ask them to address, how are they going to do that. It is going to be a lot up to us. We talked about earlier, I think we'll still keep our vertical areas of focus, at least to some extent, but it will be more that we'll have our weekly meetings and they'll be coming in and giving us an update on how things are going, and hopefully they'll be working with our acting ED. They'll be interacting much more with the acting ED than they will with us on a lot of stuff that they're doing, except to tell us that they're on track.

GOMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think this is a good -- an aggressive start and it looks comprehensive. I too am interested in the reporting piece, because we need to ensure -- and perhaps it belabors the obvious. We need to make sure that we remain in control of this process and that we don't get so much in a consultant reliant mode that we're giving up the kind of judgmental exercise that we ultimately have to make. And trying to figure out how to take the best of what they can provide us without, in a de facto sense, delegating decision-making responsibility is going to be tricky, particularly as we try to move this quickly.

Sixteen weeks sounds like a terrific

2.1

target. It ties in in a lot of ways with what I want to talk about in a minute with respect to the legal consultants; getting the organization up, getting it running, and taking advantage of the expertise for which we hired them. So I would endorse this approach, but I would also like to hear more and discuss more and go over with them more what the reporting and decision-making chain will look like as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I totally agree with that, but I think of this as being heavy on the custodial stuff, you know, the drafting of budget, you know, talking about what kinds of regulations are necessary, MOUs with interagency states, scope of licensing, you know, RFP process. You know, what I think of this as freeing us up to really focus to the maximum extent possible on the guts of the issues of who is going to do this and why.

with it as long as it stays there, and as long as we are not going so far in a direction of delegating structure that we are unthinkingly or unknowingly or accidentally making substantive decisions, and that I think with some vigilance it won't happen, but I do think we need to think about that as we move forward and understand what they're doing and why they're doing it, and the reporting piece, so I think a good reporting piece will take care of it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good.

2.1

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And on that note, how -- it strikes me as the, you know, consultants keeping, you know, go ahead digging stuff up very quickly, they're very scaleable, if you will. There is a nexus to how quickly we may be able to staff up to compliment that process. I'm also curious as to how, in other words, what demands that puts on these -- this Commission, in order to make that process -- to the extent that a lot of it falls on them, if you will, then we run that risk of delegating also -- does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't quite get that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I am curious as to how -- what assumptions may be behind this 16-week plan, relative of resources needed from this commission. Because if they have not assumed any resources are needed, they could wholesale, you know, assume they will do most of it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If I can add to that point, something that is always what I'm thinking about are the operations pieces, and I like what they've said here, that there are many options they will present to us, so I feel like we're going to have total control of understanding the options and then making the decisions on what makes most sense for us and the other stakeholders

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

involved, so they point that out in Page 3 on ongoing operations.

2.1

I look at that as present the options, we'll explore the options and make the decisions that are best for us. When we're talking about staffing, that means outsourcing and/or hiring quickly, so I think those are the options that we'll be deciding on.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think all of these things kind of relate, your point about reporting, your point about not over-delegating, your point about what they need from us, what resources. I think that all sort of fits the category. I think clarifying all of that is important, and I will do that. Anything else on this?

I think I was authorized at our last meeting to go ahead and negotiate with the consultants to bring either or both of them to a contractual obligation, so I don't think we need to do that again. As long as you feel like we're on the right track, then I will follow up with them and ask for help as needed, and see how quickly we can get this turned into the second phase of this proposal, which is the timeline, and get the work going, and I'll report back at latest next week. Okay.

 $\label{eq:commissioner McHugh, we are on to 3E,} outside counsel.$ 

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. This fits into

2.1

the discussion we just concluded, Mr. Chairman. Included in the packet is a set of priorities from the outside counsel of Anderson & Kreiger based on my meeting with them the other day. At our last meeting we had a series of priorities, and we left that meeting with an understanding that I would circulate to you all that list again, and you would indicate which of the areas you were responsible for -- you were interested in primarily responsible for.

The idea here is to be able to proceed on a number of fronts at the same time, so that we can condense the amount of time that it takes to get the basic legal structure in place for us to operate the commission, so this is a second iteration of that.

Now, all of you have indicated the areas that you're interested in being primarily responsible for. I think I have assigned one or two, but otherwise those are the areas that you're interested in. The next step is to think about an overall timeline, at least for Phase 1. And then to have you -- those of you who are responsible for specific areas find a time to meet with Anderson & Kreiger, and I'll facilitate that so that you can get started with whatever it is that you need to do.

The Phase 1 activities are essentially as they were in the last iteration of this list: Review an

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

assessment of the act, develop policy and policies. When are we going have regulations? When are we going to have policies? When are we going to have in other forms, governance, documents, and how are we going to deal with public records and the like.

2.1

All of that is subject to what happens with respect to the State Racing Commission, and that as a priority that is yet to be determined based on the direction that we go. And some of these Phase 1 priorities may have to give way if we assume responsibility for State Racing Commission activities on April 20th.

But the overall date for Phase 1 completion in my discussions with the lawyers is between 30 and 45 days. These are the kinds of things that we need to do to get us up and running, to think about what the structure, the remaining things looks like, and so we would like to really move on that. And within the Phase 1 activities, each of those parts would have a separate target date that we can work out with them in individual conversations.

So at the moment -- and now the overlay on that is to assure that they work harmoniously with gaming experts, so that we have a consolidated plan going forward, and that these timelines are consistent with those that the gaming consultants are aiming at as well,

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 so we can move those things forward.

2.1

So I would -- I am not sure a formal motion is required at this point. I would like to use this as our action plan for the legal work that we're developing. I would like to assume that we can have a target date for the Phase 1 activities of about 30 to 45 days, and I would like to assume that we can move forward and communicate with the gaming consultants as part of their plan the way they interact with the lawyers. And that's basically the way I would like to proceed.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's been your reaction to these folks so far?

thorough, very competent. They are thoroughly familiar with all of the kind of nitty-gritty detail that we need to know about, the public record law requirements, the open meeting law requirements. They're practical as well in devising strategies to deal with them, and I think they're doing a good job.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just one suggestion in looking at the assignments. I know I offered to work on the segment entitled MOUs with other state agencies and local agencies, but I think with respect to some of the law enforcement pieces, Commissioner Cameron would also join me on kind of that subgroup.

1		COMMISSIONER	MCHUGH:	Where	is	that,
2	Commissioner?					

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Down at the bottom of Phase 2, kind of carries over to the next page, MOUs with other state --

agencies. Yeah, to the extent that involves law enforcement agencies, I think that's right. I thought that the commissioner -- some of these things do not have easy boundaries, but I think that is right. I think that is right. So let -- Commissioner Cameron, your commission in there as well?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. Great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I had a bunch of notes on things I just wanted to make sure were included, but I don't think there's any need for me -- I can just run through with you one-on-one. I don't think there is any need to take this here. I think this is moving along great. If we can get gaming consultants in the same mode, moving about this quickly, and with the same kind of a plan, we'll be in great shape.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: At the risk of over simplifying it, could the gaming consultants also produce

1 | a matrix of similar fashion?

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I have sent this to the gaming consultants as a model that we would like to have something similar. Great minds work alike. Anything else on the law firms or anything? Gaming consultants?

Oh, just as a sort of for the record, we got -- or I got letters from the Standardbred Owners of Massachusetts and the Harness Horseman's Association of New England volunteering or nominating people to serve on one of our multitude of advisory committees. This is in my list of things, but we've got all of these advisory committees that we're supposed to either set up or work with, and giving the law firm a heads up as quickly as possible, so we can respond to these folks as what are all of these committees and what's our role in setting them up and what's our role in interacting with them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. We are on what? Briefings for Commissioners. I don't know that there is much really to talk to. I think we do have it scheduled soon, tomorrow, the series of briefings of the commissioners on ethics and freedom of information, and public records, et cetera.

We have had meetings with the Problem Gaming people. Commissioner Stebbins and I met with them. We met with the Mass. Cultural Counsel.

Commissioner Zuniga and I met with them, mostly just kind of introductory, get to know each other, not anything very substantive. We do have brief reports we're sort of waiting on instructions on how should we process these reports. We're now accepting if people want to come talk to us, give us advice, if they seem reasonable, we are talking with them with at least two commissioners, no more than two, but not less than two commissioners. But we're collecting these little reports. We're not quite sure what to do with them. That's another piece we're looking to launch off of from. But I don't think we need to have those reported orally at this meeting, do we?

really to report. We have begun to collect them, preferably electronically. That's the overall goal so that we can have a single electronic repository where all of this stuff is categorized, indexed as we talked about the last time. We have not got to that point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. We'll get there.

Okay. Record keeping update. I guess that is just about reviewed --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just had it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, nice job. That

25 was good.

2.1

2.1

Permanent meeting date. For the public's sake we're pretty sure we're going to hone in on one o'clock on Tuesdays. We are still working on a permanent site where we can work out some of these logistical issues. I guess -- is May 3rd, is that a Tuesday? No. So it will be another meeting May 1st, okay. But for everybody's sake we want to find one standard format where this is -- always appear but will definitely give you a down relative case to the expense of mode and so forth, but we're working on that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can I just interject here. Are we going to have a meeting on the first -- that is a week from today? The public meeting that we're going to talk about is the third, that's two days later, so I just ask if we want to have a meeting on the first, and then another meeting two days later? They're not mutually exclusive, but just throw that out.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If I could speak to that? I think the third is really the educational forum and will not be the appropriate location to be handling Commission business.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Oh no, I understand that. I understand that. I just wonder if we're not biting off more than we can chew by having two --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we ought to

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

presume, we can always cancel it. We ought to presume we're going to have it. I think there will be some decisions -- I hope that there will be some decisions that will need talking about, personnel consultants -- excuse me, the Racing Commission, so I think we should presume it, and then we can make a decision 48 hours, 49 hours before the time actually rolls around.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Item Number 4, finance and budget update. Commissioner Zuniga?

included in the packet this very rough draft of what I see as the budget for Fiscal Year 13, and I know that, you know, our consultants and lawyers will need to help us develop a lot more the details, here especially as we talk about timeline, staffing, et cetera. But in anticipation to June 30th, I started to draft this template to start thinking about the major categories in terms of budget for this agency.

I will start reporting as hopefully as early as next week on current expenditures as we incur them. Start getting the reports out of MARS (phonetic) from the -- the comptroller's office is helping us generate and they've been helping us do the payments, and you know, part of that is I'll soon be -- report.

But I welcome feedback or discussion about the assumptions behind this, or I can use for your information at this point. This would not require any kind of motion at this time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For the public's sake, this agenda is for Fiscal Year 13 starting July 1st of next year.

2.1

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: July first.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, of 2012.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 2012.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It is totally a draft, but it comes to about \$7 million for totality of our operations. Now that could change by orders of magnitude, but that's what we're talking about, a very rough draft. I think the Spectrum and Michael & Carroll we have a \$500,000 cap on that contract. I think the two together can be above that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I assumed a worst-case scenario -- which each proposal, just adding them up because we have both of them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am not sure we can do that, but, maybe, but in any case see how that can be extended.

So what is the assumption just roughly behind the new salaries? What have you assumed for

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 personnel?

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

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I assumed -currently, we have eight FTEs, yes. And I assumed -CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Five commissioners and
three staff.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Five commissioners, three staff. We would have two more certainly by the beginning of the next fiscal year, you know, whether that is some staff and some communications director, et cetera. And so that is 10 permanent, sort of like a \*day\* one. An additional 10 and a half just the way that, you know, came up, relative to people that start to come in sometime during the year, perhaps a permanent ED for 60 percent of the time because it takes us between now, and you know, four months into the new fiscal year to hire And there is a couple of other key positions. management level general counsel, CFO, IT director that, you know, all added them up, added up to 10-and-a-half additional FTEs, so just to give a range. We could do sometime in the middle of next fiscal year. Say January of 2013, with 20, 21 people working full time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. And we had gotten office space for one-year lease for up to 30 people, 20 full time, plus a few consultants so forth so that sort of matches.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right, right.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And this is something our consultant will probably know more about than we do. It will be interesting to talk about this with them, but order of magnitude, this has got to be somewhere close to right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Any other questions about budget or financial stuff?

Okay. Moving on to public information educational outreach activities.

Oh, sorry. Yes. Number 5 procurement.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just briefly,

Commissioner Stebbins already mentioned the highlights

about procurement of the executive search firm. We need

to start at least thinking about evaluation committee or

group whether there is one or two or more commissioners

and some staff. The way the RFR writes or reads rather,

staff will help us do the compliance review, just to make

sure that every respondent has the forms that were

required.

I can facilitate an evaluation or criteria score sheet that can then be distributed to the evaluation committee. So we still have time because responses are due by May 11th, but we should have that committee in

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

place, group or team, whatever that may be, designated prior to that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, definitely. So we ought to think about who should be -- can you do the evaluation form?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That will be great.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, I'll distribute

that.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And as to the evaluation team, maybe two commissioners and one of our staff or there could be staff from the governor's office, or from the Economic Development Secretary of Economic Development who helped us earlier. Does anybody have any other ideas?

What's the right kind of evaluation -- this is now to look at a research firm. We have someone who used to work at a search firm who works for us, Janice Reilly. We could put her on. Any other ideas?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just have the suggestion of having a team of three people is ideal. It creates a healthy group, but it is not unyielding large group. So you know, I would recommend Janice to be part of that, and very helpful. Certainly recommend at least one commissioner be there as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we have sort of

### APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

given you this role. How about you, and you pick another commissioner, you and another commissioner and Janice, and set up evaluation form and process?

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

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Let me -- can I just offer a modification of that? Certainly Commissioner Zuniga, but wouldn't it be helpful if we could find somebody from outside the commission to help with that? One commissioner, Janice, and somebody from outside the That solves two -- that addresses two issues. Commission. One, the composition and the point of view brought to the selection process, and secondly, it avoids the possibility of creating a subcommittee that has to do all this work and evaluation and other when it's a public meeting. particularly in its early stages I think it is important to move quickly and to bring the finalists to the public arena, so we can see them, but the screening process would benefit from an outsider, I think, as well as inside the Commission.

So if we could find somebody who would be willing, perhaps on a pro bono basis, to grab somebody with some HR expertise that would be willing to help us. That would be an asset I think.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I could reach out to the governor's office, you know, conduct E-mail procurement for us, or some of the other appointing

1	authorities, frankly, we're part of that.					
2	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Might be somebody in HRD					
3	that has a particular view in this area.					
4	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.					
5	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.					
6	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or even, you know,					
7	there is a lot of great academia here who, you know, offer					
8	lend some help as well.					
9	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we need a motion to					
10	empower the Commissioner to put together a task force and					
11	evaluation committee to come up with a recommendation?					
12	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that would be					
13	appropriate, and I would so move.					
14	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?					
15	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.					
16	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any more discussion? All					
17	in favor say aye.					
18	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.					
19	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.					
20	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye.					
21	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.					
22	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.					
23	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Now, we're to					
24	public information and we are to our May 3rd conference					

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: One last brief

25

1 update.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

the procurement card. We now have -- we will have what is effectively a state purchasing credit card of sorts that the comptroller's office has, so we'll have the ability to use that card. It is very convenient. It complies with all of the controls around purchasing, including tax exemption from sales tax, and you know, a lot of other financial controls embedded in that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is this something each of us will have one of?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That is a question we have not -- you know, we can if we want it. It is not necessary. There is -- the comptroller's recommend redundancy. Certainly Janice as chief of staff could have a card. Certainly a CFO should have a card, whenever we have that person. And we should at some point also designate an auditor type to look at the statements and do the reconciliation with the expenditures once we get to regular spending or, you know, steady state. But we don't have those people yet, so we'll cross that bridge.

In the meantime, or in addition, we could designate any other people. Really mostly from a redundancy. Somebody is away, you need an expenditure.

- don't think it is necessary everybody carries a card, but from a controlling perspective.
- COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, who has a card now?
- 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I will have one.
- 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. And Janice?
- 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Janice, remind me,
- 8 did you fill out an application? No, not at this point.
- 9 But we should think of redundancy, someone else at this
- 10 point.
- 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I was just going to 12 suggest that Commissioner Zuniga and Janice Reilly have
- 13 the credit cards.
- CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sometimes there is a

  benefit if a lot of travel or, you know, but I think this

  stage of the game we definitely don't want to be doing

  that, but okay, great. Okay.
- Now, can I do it now? All right. Now,

  the -- our May 3rd conference, Commissioner Cameron has

  been on showing this project.
- 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you,
- 22 Mr. Chair. I have included a draft agenda, and our
- educational forum, conference is next Thursday, the third
- of May. We're having it here at the convention center.
- 25 Public and RSVP on the web site is also a link on our web

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 site.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So we do want the public to attend, but we would like to know that you're coming so we have some idea how many people.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That is always helpful for planning to know how many people will be attending. There is also a link when you come on to our web site about questions in advance, so if there are questions that anyone may have in advance, they can be submitted, and we can address those at the forum that day.

Just a brief overview of what we have planned. This all started as bringing in subject matters to us rather than us, the Commissioners, travel to many jurisdictions. We have assembled a team of subject matter experts mostly from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. We relied heavily, as the Chair pointed out earlier, on New Jersey because they are a full-time commission, and that is a model we would like to take a close look at since we also are a full-time commission.

We are starting it out with the president of the American Gaming Association. He is coming in to speak to us to give some opening remarks, and then we launch into panel discussions with our subject matter experts. If you follow along, we have two panels before

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

lunch and we're dealing with the start-up issues. There are so many issues that are important with regard to casino gaming, but these are the actual start-up issues that we're dealing with as we speak.

2.1

Determining priorities in launching a new commission. We have subject matter experts from New Jersey and Pennsylvania, also someone now working in New York. The second panel gets into the lessons learned, what we really can find out from former commissioners and present folks, you know, things that have worked in other jurisdictions, things that we may want to try to avoid that may have been problematic.

And then we will have a lunch here. The interior dining here at the convention center will be open for anyone who chooses to stay, and then two other panels after lunch.

After lunch we get into the nuts and bolts of issues that we have to deal with right away, background checks, the bidding process, financial oversites, smart regulations. So we have experts to tell us about those issues.

And then we end the day with our operations piece, the coordinated law enforcement efforts that will be needed here in order to regulate and have full compliance. And we have brought in a team of experts,

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

many of whom I worked with in the past, frankly, to come in and really talk to us about New Jersey and Pennsylvania compliance and regulation, the teams that work together.

2.1

And so I think we have a good panel, a good day planned on Thursday, and I think it will be informative to not only all of us, but to the public as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think this is great.

It has really come together nicely. I hope any of the media who is here or watching or hears about this -
Thank you very much for your help, sir, welcome. Mr. Rooney, head of the convention center.

Thank you for being courteous to us. I hope you're going to introduce Mr. Rooney to Jamie. I want to say hello.

Thank you, Jim.

There have been two criticisms that have come in through our web site. One not exactly a criticism, just a question, about why did we focus so heavily on New Jersey and Pennsylvania as the source of the references. Obviously, to some extent it has to do because you're from there and you know people and you could access people easily and vet them easily, but also as you said relative to New Jersey, it is a full-time commission, and we wanted to get expertise from full-time commissioners because it is an unusual situation.

2.1

And we also wanted the most recent start-up experience, and Pennsylvania is the only other case in point out there, and they did have some serious troubles. So using New Jersey and Pennsylvania as the focal point for our learning experience was important.

Nevada is really its almost own -- its own phenomenon. It is so mature, and so big, and so sophisticated, that we'll use their expertise, but it will be in a little different stage of our development. So that was one thing that came up through our web site.

A second, was raising the question about
Frank Fahrenkopf as the kick-off speaker. He is the head
of the American Gaming Association, which is the principal
association for this industry. I think it is entirely
appropriate to have him be a person who speaks about the
industry early in the game in our and the public's
learning process. He is also an advocate of the industry
and lobbyist for the industry, which makes perfectly good
sense. But why I think it's also encompassed to make ure
that we have -- incumbent upon us to make sure that we
have all perspectives as we are learning, and that you'll
hear a little bit about, later on, we are reaching out to
people who may have other perspectives on the industry.

So as I said the last time, this is the first of many of such sessions. And we are going out of

2.1

our way to make sure that perspectives of all types -we're not going to refight the battle of should we be
doing this. That one, we're not going to spend a lot of
time with, but everything else, we're very open minded and
we're very, hopefully, inclusive on getting all
perspectives to the table.

Any more comments on this? Anything else we need to think about on the third? I think it looks great. Hopefully we'll have a good audience, thank you very much for doing this. Okay.

The next one referring to economic development forum. We talked about this a little bit. At the last meeting we tried to frame up the question of issues. There has been a lot of studies out there. Do we know what we need to know? What do we need to know? If we don't know what we need to know, what do we need to know and how can we find it out, and as well as some other issues potentially. And Commissioner Stebbins has been pursuing this. Do you want to give us an update?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure, absolutely.

I can tell you we've narrowed in on two dates. I think I may have checked everybody's calendar for June 21st, but I think we may even try to do more aggressive than that.

The Chairman and I talked about trying to move this up and checking out various schedules of people

2.1

we wanted to invite. The month of June seems pretty open, so we're now looking at either June 7th or June 14th. I have confirmed that our friends out at Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester would like to host us for this. The community colleges have been partnering together to follow the developments of the gaming industry in terms of being able to provide training for potential gaming employees, so they have -- are acutely interested in this.

We're looking at dividing up the panels into two sessions. One of the first being updates to recent Mass. gaming studies, ongoing economic research. A number of the surveys, and research, and studies that were done that were an impetus for the passage of the bill are anywhere from two to three years outdated. Obviously, the economy has kind of pitched and there's some roller coaster up and downs. I think we're inviting those people back that did do a study. I haven't connected with everybody yet, but we do have a couple of confirmations from folks that were behind some of the principal studies that were done, give us an update on that.

The second discussion being some folks that we may not have talked to or may not have been involved in that first process, but assessing and reviewing the information that we need to make smart decisions as

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

application licenses begin to come in. We've reached out to Doctor Martin Romitti at the UMass Donahue Institute who did a lot of research work on gaming in Missouri.

2.1

Commissioner Zuniga and I are actually meeting with the folks from the Donahue Institute on Thursday. Steven Norton from New Hampshire Center for Public Policy. New Hampshire just went through, obviously, a very vigorous debate and study of gaming opportunities and potential. And New Hampshire has offered to come down and share some thoughts, again, about what tools, what information, what resources should we be aware of that assess the economic impact from the license applications that we expect to receive, and Mr. Chairman, as you pointed out, making sure we have all of the tools that we need.

So, not as complete a day as our event on the third, but again, I think it will be a good conversation, a good public forum discussion on what's been done, any changes since the bill has been passed, or any changes since -- with renewed available economic data, as well as looking at what should be some of the tools that we need to have on hand to make a thoughtful decision process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thoughts or reactions?

We had talked about maybe doing the issues of mitigation

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

and problem gambling at the same time if we had time. What's your thought on that at this point?

2.1

think that my viewpoint is there could be a strong session. I think there are so many pieces of so many components of people interested in the mitigation efforts. You know, we had some new information come in from another UMass entity about mitigation issues. I would actually suggest setting that aside, doing a separate forum on that. You know, we did have a meeting with the Compulsive Gambling Alliance. We know there are other groups and individuals out there who we're just getting around to talking to, but I would think that that would precipitate being a public education forum in its own right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The two of them, those two topics together, they're sort of related.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, maybe we ought to think about -- I would hate to wait until -- if we do it after -- if we use your date, well, the seventh or the 14th or the 21st, anywhere in there, I would hate to wait for another month, you know, to get to the next one, then we get into July and August, which is a tough time. I think we ought to think about -- it seems to me -- I am

2.1

not sure I'm right about this, but it seems to me off the top of my head, it seems to me the issues of community mitigation -- broad-based community mitigation, saving the local venues, the entertainment venus, never mind traffic and all of that, and the issues of compulsive gambling are very much on a lot of people's minds.

They are topics that we want to know more than we already know about, and we want heads up as we're putting together the RFPs and license applications and so forth, so it seems to me it would be important that we pay attention to those issues as soon as we possibly can.

That would lead me to suggest we're going to find somebody to pull that one together, do it as soon as we can, whenever we can, as soon as we can. What do you all think? Do you agree with that? Can we do it later? Do you have a reaction to that, anybody?

and there may be others that are allied -- are critically important, and that we really do need to spend a day dealing with them, and that we ought to do it soon. I wonder how much we did -- how much we can take on how quickly in that venue and do it just -- we may be able to do another one by the end of the year, by the end of June. It might also be worthwhile to do that right at the beginning of the fall.

But I do think -- I do agree that they're very important, and they're very -- they're very nuanced, and there are other -- there are other areas that fit in with them as well, so I think we really need to think through what's associated and make sure we've covered the entire lot.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To me, to wait until the fall would be a pity. It just feels the public needs to know we're thinking about these issues. I think we need to know about these issues. I want to get energy going, get organized. Think about how to crystallize the best possible strategies. We can find somebody -- maybe we don't have the capacity yet, have one of us pick this up and organize it like Commissioner Cameron has done and Commissioner Stebbins is doing.

But we can find somebody, I am sure, who would be willing to take this on, subject to our oversite. It is really just a matter of finding -- it is articulating the mission of the meeting, of the day, A, and B getting the right people there who can help us accomplish that mission. That takes some work, but beyond that, it is just logistics. We can definitely pull logistics off, so.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, if we did this, the forum I'm going to have on May 3rd is a forum that

2.1

basically has an agenda that we designed, and panels that we have selected. The -- it is going to be a fascinating day and one that Commissioner Stebbins is putting together following the same format. If we had an approach to these other two topics that was more of us and the public listening to groups present to us ideas and concerns and issues and reached out to people who could put together a potpourri of a range of ideas that they thought were important for us to know, with our help and activity and planning the agenda, that's a different kind of a format. I think that would be an easier, and yet a very important way, to get the kinds of information that we need in order to consider these issues.

One of the things about the May 3rd issue is that we know who the people are from whom we want to hear. We generally know the things we need to learn about. Some of that is true with respect to the economic development point. I am not sure we're surefooted in these other areas, and therefor might find some experts who are and have them present to us what they'd like us to know.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I suspect and hope that part of the questions that start to come in as part of the May 3rd forum, or even beyond, could also inform just to your point relative to what the public may be

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

interested in either listening in terms of content, or formally, so hoping that, you know, we'll get some of that in questions solicited.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, if you're okay with it, I'll take a step or two to see whether we can get our arms around this and get something going, and you know, see if we can find a few people, find a person or two who could be point people, coordinate it, and get some ideas and talk as quickly as we can in the next week or so about whether we think we can pull something together and when, and see what everybody thinks. Is that all right? Okay.

Where are we? Raising Commission Item
Number 7. We are back to Commissioner Cameron.

Mr. Chair. We are continuing to take steps towards a smooth transition for the Gaming Commission to incorporate racing oversite. As was mentioned in an earlier meeting, we do have an RFR for raising expert to assess the operations and that has gone out to four qualified vendors, and we expect responses by the end of this week. We didn't give an exact date, but we do expect responses this week.

We continue to have conversations with responsible parties from state -- the licensure, state licensure folks. We're making transition plans as

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner McHugh pointed out. The unknown is exactly when this transition will take place, but we should know shortly when that will occur.

2.1

We have an ISA for payments. We're working on that. We have a draft at this point. We're working on those payments that we're obligated to make from the racing stabilization fund. That's being reviewed. We anticipate finalizing that in the near future. I had an enthusiastic meeting with the kennel owners this week to talk about some of the unresolved financial issues, and I need to conduct some further research before I have a recommendation on how to proceed with that matter.

So there continue to be new issues that come to our attention that we're handling in a manner that -- the quickest manner we possibly can. So at this point, we don't have any definite resolutions, but we continue to work toward those resolutions, and that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is by way of going down two tracks simultaneously. One is to be prepared to take the Racing Commission over as we have been mandated thus far to do, and still are on the record that we will do. And to see whether or not the legislator and the governor are willing to or interested in moving the takeover date.

2.1

And as we talked about last time, we're doing these two things simultaneously. There does continue to be interest on the part of the legislature and the governor in not having the Commission's work slowed down -- its primary work slowed down by something which is probably nonessential in the near term.

There was concern about opening up the commission and gaming legislation for other amendments.

Nobody wants to start that ball rolling, so it is a delicate process, but everybody understands issues, and I think for the most part -- I think for the most part, the powers to be appreciate that they would like to see our main work, that is the licensing of the expanded facilities, and move forward as expeditiously as possible, but it is easier to say than it is to do.

And mostly Commissioner McHugh and I have been talking with legislative and gubernatorial leadership to try to make that happen and if that is what they want, and it appears that that would be their preference, but it is not an easy case. It is not a black and white case, and we'll continue working on that.

I have said that we are beginning to get into it. We are expending resources, which we don't have much of, particularly time, already now, to make that transition, and if it is going to get postponed, it would

be nice to know that so we could stop doing all the work. Never mind there is all the poor folks at the Commission, the Racing Commission, trying to figure out what's going to happen with their lives. So we're doing the best we can, but going down both tracks for as long as we have to. Anything else on that, Commissioner?

2.1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The only thing I could add to that, is I think we need to do something as soon as possible about the Commission employees who really are in a state of limbo, and with each passing day we get closer and closer to something, but we don't know exactly what it is and they don't either.

And from our standpoint, it is difficult for planning purposes, for their standpoint that the planning has acute problems, I think. And so I would like to by next week have something that we're prepared to say about that. And I don't know what the something will be, but at least something that will help them think through what the next step is likely to be for them. It is necessarily vague, and I wish I could be more concrete, but we need to be able to say something soon, I think.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, the employees -there are full time employees and there are part-time
consultant employees who work for the Racing Commission,
and hopefully, they're aware of the fact that we've been

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

wrestling with this, trying to figure out what do we do on their behalf. Doug, you're familiar with this.

2.1

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But I think if the takeover is postponed, then things will continue for those employees as it has. There won't be any changes.

Everything will continue as is. So whatever state that is, good, bad or indifferent for them, it will continue.

If we take it over, I think it has been our sense that one of our concerns here is that we don't know very much about it. We don't know the substance. We don't know the people. We don't have a sense whether we have too many, too few. We clearly are short on the leadership. There is no executive director.

take responsibility, we would want to know about what we're dealing with. We would have to have an opportunity to get to know the personnel, and make decisions, whether these are the right people for carrying forward. But that is really not an exercise that we want to go through at this point. So I would think if we do take it over, the least that we would want, would be some kind of provisional agreement to have the existing people continue to do their work, for the most part, through this racing season.

2.1

There is just almost no possibility that we're going to make any kind of a change through this racing season if we do end up taking over. So it may be that we can make some kind of commitment that doesn't tie our hands forever, but does give people at least some comfort that for at least X period of time, their lives would continue as they have. Is that --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that is exactly the kind of thing we need to do.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: If we think about that, perhaps, for a week and then do it, I think we both do something that's logical and give some people some assurance on the planning front.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there any employee from the Racing Commission out here? I know Doug.

Anyway, please tell folks -- it is a modest help, I understand, but we are trying to figure this out. But maybe you would be the best person, Commissioner, if you would be willing to talk with whoever you need to talk to, to see if we do take it over, what kind of assurances can we give to people for at least a period of time certain.

Because the law as it stands now, they lose their jobs, as I understand it. And they have the opportunity to be rehired with us, and they get a sort of

preference, but they don't have any guarantees. And if we're pretty much clear, that if this happens, we would want them to stay in at least some provisional position.

2.1

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: When you're done, I'll speak to this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry if you already know this. Well, why don't you jump right in. Maybe you've already talked about it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: In the meetings I've had, those are the exact conversations we have had.

Everyone knows we're going to bring in a consultant, take a look at the operation. That's going to take some time. For this racing season, the discussions I have had with those in charge now, are hey, if you keep it -- obviously, your operations remain the same, and if it comes to us, we will do what we have to do at the very top to take over the oversite piece, but the day-to-day operations will remain the same with those employees. So we have had those conversations.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we need to figure out a way to bring them on board in a way that doesn't eliminate our flexibility downstream, but does give them some certainty for some period of time.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We have the ability to do that. We've talked about how we put that together

also. We have the ability to phrase it in a way that talks about this racing season.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.

minor point, which goes right along those points. There are contract employees currently and those I venture that is very straight forward to extend contracts for a very -- period of time.

Really, what we should explore and continue -- ensure that the permanent employees, who as you say technically lose their job and may be rehired with some preference, whether anything interim can be devised or not.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. I apologize. You are on top of this. You guys can figure that out in a formal way, so that we can actually get our arms around it. We will know what we're buying into and these folks will know what they're getting. In specific, that would be great.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We have a meeting on Friday and we'll address that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. Anything else on the Racing Commission issues?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is there any operational challenges we're coming up with, with respect

to commissioners themselves of the Mass. Racing

Commission, I guess, in their responsibility for doing any

of the hearings, et cetera?

2.1

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, what we're talking about is using the folks now from licensure to continue doing hearings until we can hire the appropriate staff to do so. So we're making those contingency plans now.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, let me just draw the distinction between people run at the licensure, the department and the OSE, and the Racing Commission, that ceases to exist. And that --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If we take over.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Well, and then there is a couple of commissioners who are already leaving, so whether we take it over or not, there will be some question there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if we don't take it over, the governor would need to appoint at least one more commissioner, so there was a viable commission, right?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Perhaps. But also the way the current statute reads, we could delegate the oversite, you know, the licensing, but it is a lot more difficult to delegate the hearings or the decision making that the Racing Commission had -- and I know there is the

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

- 1 track, if you will, but that is crux of what we're --
- 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I thought your point was
- 3 even if we don't take it over, then the governor will have
- 4 to reconstitute the Racing Commission.
- 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right. My question
- 6 is more the commissioners themselves, knowing that I think
- 7 | there was one vacancy and one person leaving, how do they
- 8 continue to function or not function, either scenario.
- 9 Whether we get a delay or whether we are able to
- 10 | incorporate an agreement with them, how do they continue
- 11 | to function? I guess, just more just general question.
- 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, the original
- 13 | thought was with the Gaming Commission taking it over,
- 14 | they would not continue to function. We would take those
- 15 | oversite functions, which would mean the appropriate staff
- 16 to assist us in doing that.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. What's the
- 18 | timeline on the RFP for the consultant, the Racing
- 19 | Consultant?
- 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We expect them by
- 21 | the end of this week, the responses, and we should be
- 22 prepared to make a decision on that by next week.
- CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Okay. Okay.
- 24 | Charitable gaming. Oh, you know what? I wanted to go
- 25 | back to one thing. In the -- I think this relates to the

1 law firm issue, Commissioner McHugh.

2.1

We have talked about this issue of what support, if any, do we provide to the communities. The papers are constantly filled with stories about communities trying to wrestle with these issues, particularly the smaller ones. If I remember correctly, were you going to talk to the lawyers about what role we might play, or how you -- you're going to think about were we going to pick somebody else to help us pull together a package for the communities and do the outreach and so forth.

Was, and remains, to build on the analysis of the statute that the law firm is doing, that's already been done independently by several of us, and pulled together with their help, at least some kind of general guidance and descriptions of the process, so that they can understand more about that than I think they generally do, and then try to reach out to the association, Mass. Municipal Association, try and see if they can provide some assistance as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You talked to MMA and the Collins Center, right; is there anything more of that?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I talked to the MMA in an initial conversation, Mass. Municipal Association,

2.1

in terms of us sharing information about our meetings and our activities. I think there is some reference to questions municipalities concerning us and interpreting the gaming bill. You know, at this point they have shared with their member communities information on the May 3rd forum --

Also had a conversation with folks from UMass Boston, Steve Colburn (phonetic) in terms of you have different communities with different internal capacities working on this issue. Some communities have part-time boards of selectman, other have full time planning staffs. I mean, how can we try to fill a void or offer some level of assistance. Kind of an open-ended question, and waiting, anxious to see what they may come back and suggest, but I think our initial work of working with MMA to get information out about our meetings and topics that we're covering as well as being a resource for particular questions as they may come up in interpretation of something in the bill. I think one or two great ways to start, until we kind of move along through the process, certainly that might be an issue.

Another question to add to the list to talk about with gaming commissions from the other states is how have they supported local communities. Probably Pennsylvania more since, obviously, mostly New Jersey's is

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

all concentrated in one location, but what's been their experience in helping communities -- (inaudible).

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. All right. I still feel a little bit like we're not quite proactive enough on this, but I guess we're working our way towards a variety --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, I think we have to be proactive, but we have to be proactive in a way that we know where we're going, and that's the problem. It is the problem of taking the inquiries and getting an answer that both represents the consensus of the Commission.

answer, except in the most vague and general terms, that binds the Commission, and if it doesn't bind the Commission, it is not a good answer if people are going to rely on it, without having a discussion in this kind of a forum to provide the substance for the answer that people can rely on. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is we have to be careful so that we're not deciding some matter that's going to come back in part of a contested application package between two different towns, and we've already blessed something that we may want to think about in a more critical fashion once we're faced with it concretely. That doesn't mean we can't do this, and we shouldn't do

2.1

it, we shouldn't be proactive. We should be all those things. It is trying to figure out how to be constructively proactive without misleading -- giving out misleading advice and without tying our hands in a way that we don't anticipate, don't know, up front. If we can figure that out, but it is not an easy thing to do, so.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Item 8,
Charitable Gaming. I did write, as we discussed last
week, a letter to the speaker, the president, the Ways and
Means Chair, Economic Development Technology Chairs that
we -- we're not going to be able to do our report, we're
getting going on this, and this is a report about
recommendations and review of the status of charitable
gaming, how it is overseen now, should it be overseen
differently.

The legislatures kind of operating presumption is that that would be brought under the Gaming Commission and wanted us to make recommendations about that. And we have told the legislative leadership that we will have an answer to them -- have our report to them by the end of July. And you were going to think about that a little bit and see whether we can do it ourselves, do we need help, or.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And we're still in the process of thinking about that. Commissioner Zuniga

and I are going to meet with some folks from the treasury and the lottery, which is the depository moneys, in early May. Then I think shortly thereafter we'll figure out who else we need to meet with, figure out whether we can do this or whether we'll need some help, and within a week or so, couple of weeks have a plan, either a plan to get some outside help and do it, or a plan to do it ourselves, and what we need to do to do it.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is obvious, but in a couple weeks from now -- there is only two-and-a-half months left then the report has to be done.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah, I understand that. The dimensions of the report -- I think we have a fair idea of what the parameters are, so I think we can do this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What are they as long as we're talking about it?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We have got \$75 million in total gaming revenues. We have got a group of --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is in gaming revenues like this is a whole or this --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: General gaming whole.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's the gross

charitable gaming revenues from this -- from these charity

2.1

and casino nights under 271, 7A. Chapter 271 of the General Laws, Section 7A, is where all of this is written. \$75 million gross gaming revenues. The Commonwealth's take is 5 percent of that. \$18 million of that winds up in the hands of the charities themselves. The rest goes for prizes and operating expenses. There are a number of operators, a small number of operators, who perform operations for the charities that would like to hold these events when they don't do it themselves, and many of them do not do it themselves, but they hire these operators to do it.

The licenses are given by the clerks of cities and towns where the operation is going to be held. The local police authorities are notified. The charitable division, the charitable -- public charities division of the Attorney General's Office has some oversite responsibility and treasurer of the lottery gets the money, then distributes it, and fashion kind of figure out more would be talk. And then there is a group -- the precise name of which escapes me, that represents the interest of or is an (inaudible) of the interest of those who conduct these kinds of charitable gaming events.

So the pool is relatively small. The amount of money that the charities get from the pool, the \$18 million is important, but it is not a huge amount, and

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

the system may be running just fine right now. It may be that there are -- each of them have some recommendations for changes that we need to think about, and that's what we need to explore.

2.1

But I think by talking -- we've already talked to the attorney general's folks, public charities folks, and they're going to send us some information that they've accumulated. We'll talk to the lottery folks, and we'll talk to the association that represents these charitable groups, and we'll talk to the association -- an association that represents the town clerks, and have at that point, a pretty good idea of what the dimensions of the problem and issue are, but it doesn't seem to me that they're going to be unmanageably complex.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There is a question that, you know, now with the creation of the Commission in this context whether, you know -- in my mind the enforcement piece or section of these permits that currently reside with the local clerks and the local chiefs of police, they issue those permits for those as well they have a role, whether there is any reason to change that, now that the existence of the Mass. Gaming Commission in anticipation of casinos and slot parlors, if you will.

I think that is something that we need to

2.1

think about as part of this. There is also presumption that not everybody who is currently obtaining a permit -- sorry, not everybody who is currently conducting a raffle or bingo or a game for charity purposes is doing it according to all of the -- what's stipulated in the current statute of obtaining permit from local clerk and the chief of police. But you know, there is at least in my mind that could exist a threshold for that because, you know, a bake sale doesn't need to be sanctioned or a raffle on plants could be not --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is most of the church bingo stuff, is that apparently under the official umbrella, does everybody understand that?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it is pretty de minimus -- if there is something outside the official managed system, it is pretty de minimus.

But it also presents, I mean, a different kind of problem. The law says -- the existing law says you can do certain things and you can't do other things. Within the you-can-do-certain-things pool, the parameters are fairly clear, and those are the ones I've described. We understand that there are some outlayers that -- there are some people out there who are simply breaking the law, and

that is not so much a policy issue as it is an enforcement issue, and whether there is an appetite for enforcement is a different question.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am going to leave this with the AG.

I think it could be most efficiently handled, that piece, the pure enforcement. Because no matter what we suggest about changing the law, we're still going to have -- we're still going to be creating a potential pool of people who are operating within the law, and there will be people who are operating without the law, and I don't think that we ought to take on the -- at least presumptively the task of rooting out evil doers and making people informed of the laws that exist. Others are better equipped to do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you have any experience in this with organized crime in New Jersey?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, one of the things we had dealings with was the illegal slot machines that are somewhat rampant, at least in New Jersey, in private clubs, gaming machines within private clubs. And it actually got to be problematic with some public officials who had to step aside or not be considered for positions because they were members of those clubs. So that's an area that I know there is a lot of illegal

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

gambling going on in lots of jurisdictions. We didn't really keep track of illegal bingo or those kinds of events, but the gambling we did.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a different issue. Just church bingo type of thing was a big deal. All right. Great.

Nine is Interagency Relations and the first of that is the Internet Gaming Status. Commissioner Zuniga?

with the treasurer's office Friday. There is an online products task force that will meet sometime in May to which I will be attending to participate in terms of listening and seeing the developments that that task force is looking at. Essentially, there has been a recent decision by Department of Justice where that could open the door for state sanctioned online products. There is a lottery component and then there is also a, you know, online gaming or poker, if you will.

Now, there is a real recognition that, you know, if that came to Massachusetts, that would have to require legislative action, clearly, but our own statute speaks to the need for this commission, and the treasurer's office to coordinate and monitor these developments as Internet or online products come to

8.5

#### APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

fruition. So the update is that we will be doing those -- combination of those moneys of those developments.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, I think the most interesting part of the conversation is, that is going to be something we're going to need to think about a lot, is we have two gambling supervisory agencies in

Massachusetts. We have the Gaming Commission who is doing nothing at the moment, and we have the lottery that is doing four-and-a-half billion dollars, and is netting a billion dollars for local aid. And the legislation said we're going to have two of us. You could put them all together, you could argue they ought to all be together, but they aren't, they're two separate ones.

What we don't want to get into is a turf fight between us about, we want to do that, and we want to do the other thing. And -- but there is only one big gaming pie and nobody knows how big the gaming pie is.

Nobody knows what the impact of casino gambling will be on the lottery, on what the slots will be -- the lottery will be on the slots and vice versa, or what Internet gaming will do to any of this.

So the principle that we went in there thinking it was a really important principle is that the people on this task force and the leadership of the Gaming Commission and the leadership of the lottery, look at this

2.1

as one big industry, you know, initiative within the Commonwealth. Which has, as one of its principle objectives to generate revenue for the Commonwealth. We need to think about what our position was. We need to think about what is the optimal way to take this amount of gaming dollars, whatever that turns out to be, and have it have an optimal impact for the Commonwealth, which means the most least negative, and most revenue, and the most jobs and so forth.

If we're looking at it that way, then we're not going to be worried. We won't care if the lottery cannibalizes the slots, if it turns out that the lottery returns more money to the public than the slots do. Or vice versa. The lottery shouldn't care if we cannibalize the lottery — if the slots and casinos cannibalize the lottery, if our pay out as the percent of gaming dollar to the public is higher, or whatever value systems you want to bring to bear. And it will make it much easier for us if we can all look at from that standpoint.

And Treasurer Grossman bought right into that, you know, and jumped right to -- and I said it is easy for us to say because you have got a billion dollar business to trying to protect, sort of protect, and we don't have any business, it's only coming. But I think he really got that.

2.1

I think -- and that will be Commissioner

Zuniga's responsibility is to sort of make sure that that
really is the way that we all look at this. And the way
the task force looks at it. This idea of measuring the
marginal utility of a gambled dollar to the public good is
something I have never heard talked about, but it is
really important. For every dollar that's gambled in the
lottery, for every dollar that's gambled in slots, for
every dollar that's gambled in a casino, for every dollar
that's gambled in a horse race, what percent goes to the
public, and should that be what drives the favorite, you
know, the predisposition. Or are there other values, the
marginal impact of each dollar.

And it was -- I think, I'm not sure they had been thinking about this, but the treasurer jumped right on it. He's really committed to taking that kind of micro view, which I think is really important.

also very important points relative to the potential presence of online products. There is a real recognition that online products could come to Massachusetts if legislature passes it very quickly, because there is, just by its very nature, it is very easy if somebody develops a game, that it is just now eventually going to, you know, deliver via Internet.

2.1

But also it may be a very different, by its own nature, type of game. They talk about how -- because there is so many options online, pay out ratios are naturally very different from, you know, anything else, lottery and slots. So there is a lot to think about and a lot of interesting things that the task force is looking at, but fundamentally it was a good first meeting, I think.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The other thing we talked about is it seemed logical to have Commissioner Zuniga to be our representative on the task force. There is theoretically a sort of a conflict because he comes from the treasurer's office, he knows those people and was appointed by the treasurer, and if there does become a debate about something, you know, where the Gaming Commission has a view which is different from the view of the lottery, which could certainly happen, is Commissioner Zuniga comfortable being in that hot spot, and are we comfortable that he will, in fact, not be swayed by having been appointed by the treasurer and so forth.

I don't think there is any issue there, but just like we did with Commissioner Cameron, you know, she made the judgement that she could be objective relative to our gaming consultants, but she also made the judgement that the appearance of a relationship made it worthwhile

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

she was recusing herself. I wanted to put this on the table and think about it.

2.1

I think my reaction is that this is not an issue, but it could turn out that there are conflicts of interest. We may view things differently from the way the lottery views things. I don't know. There is no such issues yet, but it might happen, and we just need to be sure that we're comfortable that our primary representative there will represent our view. I am, but I wanted to put it on the table.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, if your looking for an affirmation, I am too. Commissioner Zuniga is not easily swayable on a number of issues. I have complete confidence in his ability. Plus, the fact that it seems to me if we look at -- if we look at what we're about in the way you just described it, as the transfer of certain amounts of money to the public, really being the interest of both the treasurer's office, and us, it sees to me that the likelihood of a conflict, deep conflict, is going to be remote. That doesn't guarantee it won't arise, but that kind of joint approach to what this is all about, is likely to keep that kind of deep conflict from arising, I think.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I totally agree in terms of us, but also there are interest groups. The profit --

2.1

so to speak, the profit from the lottery goes to local aid. Not very much of our so-called profit goes to local aid. So if you're receiving you might very well have an issue there, even the lottery director might not care about. So it is just something that -- I mean, it is clearly going to become political. It is going to become contentious, it's just going to.

And I think if we can establish this principal, and if we can act that way ourselves, we don't want to get turfy about our own work, we have a good shot at this. But I don't think it is anything we should suggest isn't going to be an issue. I think it will be, so it is in our interest to be really up front about it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For whatever it is worth, I don't believe there would be a conflict on my standpoint, even on the public perception, but certainly if discussions rise to that -- to the point where that becomes a consideration, I will certainly bring that up.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I think it is a tiny issue, but it's appropriate to talk about, okay.

All right. Anything else on charitable gaming? I am sorry, Internet gaming.

And we're now to Tribal Gaming. I don't think there is much really to talk about here, other than to say that this is being handled almost exclusively by

2.1

the governor's office, who we all know is negotiating a compact with one or more tribes. We have made it clear that we need to be involved and briefed in an appropriate way because we may well end up owning whatever the outcome is, and that will take place appropriately, but we're really not involved in this as yet.

You're going to have, I guess, you're going to have a law enforcement meeting to talk about this, but, mostly I think we're sort of in a watchful, waiting mode to see what happens here. Anything else about tribal?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No.

and this is something we talked a little bit about prior to this meeting, and it just -- trying to think about some of the bigger strategic issues that we all are anxious to get into, structural issues. I thought maybe Commissioner McHugh would start this off. I am not sure where all to go with it.

either, so I'll start it off. We're deeply involved right now in the sort of nitty-gritty business of standing up the Commission. But as we talked about before, some of the cities and towns, and others, are involved in the broader, more cosmic issues, and it seems to me that we ought to be thinking about those as well.

2.1

Part of that is going to -- part of that thinking is going to be reflected in the structure we give to the commission itself. I mean, what kinds of things ultimately are we going to have to do, and what kind of a structure do we need to support those things. That probably will emerge over the next 16 weeks as we move forward with the plan that the gaming consultants are putting forth, those major areas are going to be identified.

But then there are a number of issues that are imbedded in the statute that we need to begin thinking about in a broader sense, even if it is premature to begin making conclusions about. There are two that come to mind, and they are these. There has been a great and -- not a great deal, but there has been a significant amount of interest about the role that the so-called surrounding communities will play in putting together a package that the developer host community team presents to the Commission.

There have been some real concerns
expressed about the role that the surrounding communities
have, and the concern about their inability to have the
kind of town vote, and the kind of sway that the host
community is going to have sometimes, even though the
proposed development may be right on the border between

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

two of the towns and impact one as greatly as another.

2.1

There is a great deal, it seems to me, of discretion that the Commission has about the kinds of things it is going to be looking for, the kinds of considerations it is going to take into account in deciding what the relationship between the proponent of a casino and surrounding communities ought to have. So that's one area that strategically it seems to me we need to think about in some way, and begin to formulate either proposals or to listen to people and have some outreach, so that we can get the information that we need in order to think about that.

Another one that occurred to me is there is going to be a great deal of permitting that goes along with whatever needs to be done to put up one of these casinos, Class 1 Casinos and the Class 2 licenses as well. And how do we begin to think about the kind of coordination that's necessary in order to make certain that a path from approval of an application, to development, actual proceeds as smoothly. That has often been a place where projects of all kinds die because they are buffeted by conflicting requirements temporal and substantive of various permitting authorities that have responsibility for part of some project. Is there a way that we can think about coordinating that kind of thing,

so that by the time we get to the point of actually taking applications, and listening to presentations, and awarding these licenses, a structure is in place to make a movement from license to reality as smooth as possible.

2.1

So those are two kinds of strategic considerations that I would like to hope to begin to get to as we think about where we're going to be downstream, and begin to spend some time thinking about and planning for who we need to talk to, what kind of provisions we need to put in place, so that we'll be ready when we get there. We can't ignore the requirement to do what we're doing right now carefully, put the Commission together carefully, but at the same time I think we need to begin to think about these broader issues as well.

I've thought about too, and have mentioned a time or two, you know, what, if any, role should we have in encouraging competition and encouraging sites. I mean, to what extent should we be proactive in saying, hey, what about the idea of doing something over here, what about the idea of doing something over here, what about the idea of doing something over there. Similarly, we've talked about, and I in particular have talked about trying to figure out, you know, creative ways to leverage the capital investment that is going to be made to enhance or relate to other industries, for sure tourism, working on that a little

bit, for sure infrastructure, physical infrastructure, but is there other ways to leverage this -- other synergies.

2.1

So, it's somewhat the same kinds of issues to sort of, fun stuff, interesting stuff to talk about, but I am not quite sure should we have -- as we begin to get out of the muck of the standing up the agency, and begin to think about these or should we just have these on the agenda to brain storm, or should we have a series of conferences where we invite people to help us think through these kinds of issues. I think that is the solution of some sort, but let's do think about this a little bit.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think the latter would be very helpful. I actually thought about, you know, in the spirit of what we've talked about, which is this first prequalification that we could have, you know, a background check, a financial, you know, et cetera. If either -- maybe too early at that juncture, but maybe soon after we could start thinking about certain prerequisites, certain thresholds that we would want to see, and I can give examples, but that's not the point. Maybe that could, you know, address issues of permitting, or issues of energy efficiency, or issues of how proposals may protect the lottery, which is also in our statute.

But before we get to an actual bid, slash,

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

proposal, in other words there may be some hearing in the middle there, and shouldn't be so lengthy, where some of that comes in, where again given the structure, you know, potential bidders can commit to certain, you know, minimum thresholds upon criteria or prerequisites, if you will, that can better be presented in the form of a proposal; just thinking out loud.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: One way to approach this along those lines, is that the statute sets out a whole host of things that one is required -- that this Commission is required to consider in the application -it would have to be in the application -- things they're required to consider in awarding the license and then a number of other things that are required for the operating permit. One way to begin to think about that discussion might be to take a look at those -- some of which are pretty clear, some of which are pretty \*growth\* -including the kinds of benefits that cities and towns kind of benefits to -- perhaps to the region. We're talking about cities and towns, but perhaps those are broad enough to encompass benefits to the region, and not to get beyond the town boarders -- but whatever. And put together a sort of list of things that we'd like to hear more about. Put that out on the web for people to comment and then, having developed the things we'd like to hear more about,

2.1

reach out to the various regional city, town groups and invite them to think -- to help us think about, in the broadest sense, what we ought to be doing about those various criteria, how far can we think out of box, what kinds of ideas would be must helpful, what is the role for considering regional benefit, as opposed to simply the benefit to the town and the surrounding area. So to help us think about what questions to ask and what considerations to take into account in a strategic sense before we get there. That way we would begin an interactive process and arm ourselves with a number of questions that we could then pursue, and have in mind by the time it comes to hearings and issuing the RFPs themselves.

I know that kind of discussion is going on now. We all do, and if we could channel it, and use it -- use it in the development of our thought, I think we would all benefit. And, you know, and just a -- that is real enormous, but maybe one of the first things we could do out of this analysis of the statute, and it doesn't take a lot, is to go into those sections and begin to simply write down what the criteria are and look at the ones that are the most ambiguous, and begin to formulate a way to reach out to get some ideas about that and it is going to tie in, I think -- that effort is going to tie in with the

2.1

economic development piece and particularly the updating the statistical data about how much is available to do this. And it is going to tie into the -- to the sort of holistic view of the available disposable dollars that can be turned toward gambling that we need to have in mind when we answer the tough questions about how much is it realistic to expect the casino applicants to devote to these various exercises. Where should we -- how much is it realistic to expect to devote, and where is it realistic to expect it to devote? I mean, it seems to me we need to think about all those things, this is a way we can put that together.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree, and had a thought relative to process that would also inform or help as we think about these issues. I don't have the answer, but if we were to bid out one license first, as opposed to three licenses, or up to three licenses. In other words, the timing and format for the process could also help this Commission inform on the subsequent processes, if you will.

Meaning, if we go down the road where as many licenses are bid out at the same time, then that begs a lot of the up-front thinking of the issues in anticipation to that. Whereas were we able to issue, perhaps, temporary recommendations or bid out the license

that is easiest, and then inform subsequent procurement processes after that. Again, it's -- from a strategic standpoint, it is something we could start thinking about as we solicit those conversations, I believe, as we solicit that input because that could also inform the process.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't know if I want to make the first person the guinea pig, first license the guinea pig.

mean? I am thinking of Pennsylvania, which as far as I understand they benefited from these staggered or latter process. Hoping to ask those questions next week, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the nature of their legislation authorizing statute allowed them that quote-on-quote luxury allowed them to do that. What we have now, I guess, is incumbent upon us to decide at some point what could be the most beneficial or what would be the way to go. And there in lies some things to think about.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just picking up on two points. I think Commissioner McHugh hit on one that

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

2.1

perhaps we haven't thought through, and that is the whole environmental permitting process. I mean, there are overarching statutes in Massachusetts. In Massachusetts the policy -- I mean, depending on the proposals that come forward, some of these may or may not trigger a review process, kind of where we connect ourselves in that process.

You know, the second point is -- is pointed out there is some pretty specific detailed information that's required in an application, which has already been laid out in the legislation, but that's going to have different impacts, obviously, regionally. But there is some questions, and as I was beginning to formulate the economic impact was, you know, can we solicit best practices from other states, other communities.

In brief conversation I had with the folks from Spectrum, Massachusetts is very unique. This is not a model that is implicated to many other places, so when we look at job impact or business impact, trying to find comparative models is going to be a big challenge for us.

But you know, taking some of that initial information that we're looking for in an application, beginning to get people's feedback as to what that actually means to them, so it's not just strictly a licensing or the application, but they're filling it out

with their own mind set. But soliciting some public opinion, get variations on that and how would that be and vary by each of our three regions, I think would be extremely helpful.

2.1

think we could frame -- we could start some conversations. We can put some stuff out on the web within the next few weeks and then see what comes back. Try to frame some questions along the lines of what we talked about and maybe have a series of hearings, something or other. We're going to do that, I think, any way.

So I think -- I have been thinking that maybe our public information officer, director of communications, would be a big enough picture person to help us, kind of, think about this and strategize about this.

But let me just ask you one specific thing. What do you think at this point about whether we have a role to play in encouraging competition and encouraging developers and communities to think about the possibility of considering other locations. From a public interest standpoint, we wouldn't want the industry to feel like this is locked up. You know, there is only X possibilities in the east or Y possibilities in the west.

## APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

It is in the interest of the public that what get as broad competition as possible, and as many options as possible to pick among.

2.1

But there are also a lot of other interesting -- I got a very interesting E-mail -- we got an interesting E-mail the other day from somebody saying why isn't anybody talking about Lawrence, and puts through some really interesting thoughts about Lawrence. I have no idea whether Lawrence is a good idea or not. But is there a role for us to play in trying to encourage developers in communities to think about getting involved?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: May I ask by competition you mean competition among those who might be bidding for license?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. I mean, it's clearly in the public interest to have more proposals than fewer proposals. That's clearly in the public interest, so that's one thing. Just for purposes of encouraging competition, it's in our interest that that's the appropriate thing to do.

But in addition to that -- and we are trying to make it plain that this is a wide open process. You know, there is nothing decided -- you know, the process is all of this stuff we've been talking about. It is going to be a fair, transparent, participatory

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

process. And that will tell the bidder community that, you know, it is wide open. It is a level playing field. Take your best shot. That's the important thing to do. think we're doing that.

2.1

But should we go even further than that and talk about encouraging people to think of specific ideas that we think about, or should we encourage other groups to think of other ideas, and should we play a role in gestating a conversation about where the best locations, where the best economic impact, where the best cultural social fit would be and so forth.

real hurdle with real estate development in Massachusetts in the sense that by its very nature, real estate is very bulky. We're not -- you know, clearly in Texas where it is wide open. There is a lot of parcels to -- there is little issues with, you know, green fields or contamination, et cetera.

So because of our geography, there is any number of positions that a developer has to weigh relative to where a good site may be. And that's -- then there is the whole market, you know, what good the market there and what could be the best access. So I think -- plus the legislation delineated clearly the three areas. So in a way, there is quite a bit of a framework already.

2.1

But I think your question is very relevant, and there is no easy answer relative to whether -- maybe by incentives, maybe by the scoring criteria, whether a particular proposal makes use of, I don't know, existing construction because that brings -- because somehow we judge that that brings greater economic benefit to a region as opposed to something, you know, new. You know, the jury is still out on that one, but still that could be part of how we could structure by way of incentives, you know, developers -- you know, proponents to study different areas or alternatives.

about the real estate and the footprint, but I also -- the legislature divided the states into three regions. That means there is going to be at most three Class 1 licenses, one in a region. There was a reason for doing the region.

And it seems to me that one thing we could stimulate, and should stimulate, is some thinking about the regional impact regardless of where the casino is sited, and what --- and encourage cities and towns that perhaps don't want a casino, to help us think about what regional benefit would flow from where the casino is and existence of the casino, even though they don't want one, so that we could have that in mind as another piece of the

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

environment in which we're considering application of the licenses.

2.1

The fact that a casino is going to go in a region, it's obviously going to have a benefit -- well, is intended to have a benefit for the region. And it seems to me that regional piece, regardless of where the casino is sited, is not something that's being talked about a lot today. And it seems to me we ought to stimulate that kind of talk and thinking at a minimum.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You know, my initial thought is, you know, how much do we leave it the liberty of the market to really determine where these locations are to be. And I think you make fine point about it, because of Massachusetts and how developed our state is, I think that limits itself when it comes to suitable locations, suitable infrastructure for those locations. And that's one of the applicants -- make a big investment in trying to correct whatever infrastructure obstacles are.

I think what will be interesting is a license is granted and others need additional review or work, you know, how does that weigh on. One great proposal comes in and it's right in the middle of particular community and Region 2. What will that do to

impact the markets that the -- the other gaming interests that they'll need to find, either pushing their location out, or maybe deciding not to apply at all.

2.1

I still believe that even though we've hard of some potential proposals, that others will surface, and it will be interesting. Having a conversation about extra credits or scoring I think is a worthwhile discussion.

Certainly will add it to the list of questions to talk to our incoming guests -- from New Jersey as well as to our consultants who have obviously had the experience of the municipalities.

about this. I think it's interesting. I one thing, for a variety of reasons, we talked about the idea of inviting comment from really thoughtful, interesting people. You know, getting an opportunity to hear from city planners, and architects, and economic specialists, and leaders of the tourism industry, leaders of the high tech.

I don't know, but encouraging other people to help us think about it and by virtue -- the virtue of helping us think about it, we'll also be helping the industry think about it. Maybe create -- help the industry create. I mean, they know their business. There is lot of parameters that they're going to know a thousand times better than we ever are, but I think also there is

room for new thought about everything. And there has got to be a way that without biasing the process at all, we can induce creative thinking about locations, structure, architecture, et cetera. So I think we'll just keep working on it.

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would look to our new communications person, trying to figure out a way to do a lot of that through social, in group discussions, et cetera, questions that help.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, good. Anything else?

On the Item Number 10, I thew out -- I think I wrote everybody an E-mail about the Commonwealth Compact. This is an organization that is state wide diversity initiative to approve the diversity and inclusion within employment practices.

It is something I obviously care about and involved in. Institutions are asked to join the assignor of the Compact. I have removed myself from anything involving the Compact, which was fund raising, anything like that. But I can bring the idea up with the Commission about whether we ought to join the Compact. Is this something you thought about? It is something that you're ready to think about now? Should we do it at a later date? Do you not want to talk about it? Any

APRIL 24, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION MEETING

1 thoughts?

2.1

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I am not clear about what your state -- wide diversity compact? I am not clear about the organization.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I may have sent this around when you were away, so which that might be a good reason to put this off. It is a non-profit organization, which gets employers of all types, not-for profit, for profit, et cetera, to commit to work towards diversity and inclusion goals in their hiring force, in their boards of directors, in their promotional practices, in their supplier relationships, et cetera.

Everybody who signs agrees to, you know, to aspire to these kind of goals, TO collect data about how well they are doing, and to work together to try to improve their data on diversity, including affirmative action, diversity in the state (inaudible) board of legislation.

But it's something we don't have to deal with.

It is something I think we ought to think about, be involved with this important agency. It doesn't have to happen now, but I just wanted to see what you all thought about it.

Anyone else have a chance look at, think about it?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I think it would be very positive for this commission to join the Compact or join goals in Compact.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I love the goals too, but I haven't seen all the documents.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did you have any reaction?

2.1

activities of Compact for quite a while. I know some people involved in it. The mission is entirely worthwhile and the success it has had is worthwhile. I would be in favor of having us all take a good look and concrete look at the goals and what signing up means, and then discuss it at another meeting, which frankly I would be prepared support us joining.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's take look at it and think about it next time. Any other new business on the table? Anything else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just a minor point that we -- as part of the procurement, we should start thinking about another -- I have templates for an RFP for auditors. Our partial end of fiscal year will be June 30th and because this procurement can take, you know, a better part of a month, we should start thinking about procuring that.

1	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do state agencies like
2	us, like we are, get outside audits?
3	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I know the trust
4	where I was did, especially around all the financial
5	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Trust is like an
6	authority, right?
7	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It is a hybrid. It
8	is, you know, part of the treasurer's office, but it is
9	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just don't know what's
10	required. If we were an authority, clearly we would. I
11	just am not sure what is required. We certainly are going
12	to want some kind of very transparent, very buttoned up
13	review of our financial situation. Whether that means,
14	hiring an outside audit firm or not, I don't know.
15	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, maybe
16	clearly we need more research. I assumed that we would.
17	I can do that
18	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maybe talk to the
19	comptroller, you know, Marty Benison's folks to figure out
20	if, yes, it is fine, we should definitely proceed on it.
21	I just don't know whether need to do it or not, so let's
22	do pursue that.
23	Anybody else? Anything else?
24	All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So moved.

25

1	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
2	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
3	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?
5	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
6	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye.
7	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
8	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.
9	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
10	(The proceedings were concluded at 3:43 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E
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 25, 2012
Amanda M. Snell, Transcriptionist for Office Solutions Plus LLC
My commission expires October 26, 2018
Date
Elizabeth Tice, Notary Public
Office Solutions Plus LLC My commission expires: August 26, 2016
my commission expires. magase 20, 2010