

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST FUND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**CHAIRMAN- MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION**

Stephen P. Crosby

**COMMISSIONER- MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION**

Enrique Zuniga

**ACTING COMMISSIONER- Massachusetts Department of Public Health**

Eileen Sullivan

**Under Secretary for Law Enforcement, OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY**

Anne Powers

**DE FACTO MEMBERS**

Stefano Keel, Director of Problem Gambling Services (DPH)  
Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and Problem Gambling  
(MGC)

-----  
January 23, 2015  
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Massachusetts Gaming Commission  
101 Federal Street, 23<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

**Call to Order**

Chairman Crosby called the meeting to order at 10:00.

Orientation to the Public Health Trust Fund and Executive  
Committee functions

What we want to cover is the current research agenda, which includes what we're calling the cornerstone research projects, SEIGMA and MAGIC. And then we wanted to talk about or bring

back up the 2015 research agenda, which we discussed at the October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. There have been some very minor changes and just wanted to brief you on what those changes were and what we're doing moving forward with the research agenda.

So the first cornerstone of the research agenda is SEIGMA. This study follows very closely with what we are required to do by law statutes section 71, which says that we need to do a study of what are the impacts of gaming in Massachusetts and specifically defines the social and economic impacts.

There are four main components to SEIGMA: the social impacts, the economic impacts, it's a review and evaluation of current treatment systems, and the fourth piece ties it all together, which is the data warehouse. So the first, social health impacts/variables, are broken down into two pieces, primary data collection, secondary data collection. Secondary data collection goes back to some very close work that our research team at the University of Massachusetts Amherst has been doing with the Department of Public Health to get access to a whole host of secondary data measures. That's the **Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)** a number of health variables/measures within the BRFSS. So the goal is that we get a five year trend on all of them.

RESEARCH AGENDA- SEIGMA (Social and Economic Impacts of Gaming in Massachusetts)

In doing the general population survey of 10,000 adults in Massachusetts, there's an additional 5,000 online samples and there are targeted surveys in each of the communities where the casinos will be located. We've already done a targeted sample in the Plainville area. A 10,000 person sample specifically at the host and surrounding communities. It's A replication of the general population survey just so that we have a clear understanding of what's happening there. We'll do that again in Springfield in the coming months. We will not need to do one in the Everett area, because from the 10,000 general population survey, the sample size is large enough that we do have a clear picture of what's happening in that specific area. The results of the general population survey will be ready and distributed on April 30.

There will be a presentation at the Mass Council on Compulsive Gambling's (MCCG) annual conference on April 17th. There's going to be a presentation of the data that is specifically relevant to the primary target audience of that conference, which are clinicians, human service and health workers. There's also probably going to be a fair amount of media from that event. The

biggest piece of information we will have the greatest attention from the media is the prevalence of problem gambling in Massachusetts. And that number will be first revealed at the Mass Council on Compulsive Gambling's annual conference.

Another major piece is the economic and fiscal impacts. That too is broken down by secondary and primary data. The UMass Amherst Donahue Institute is overseeing the economic and fiscal impacts. They are in the process much similar to the social side of assembling a five-year matrix of a number of different measures that explore what are the economic and fiscal impacts of gaming in Massachusetts. That is being collected primarily through secondary data. There is some primary data collection that's being done through our licensees at this point. The final baseline report on the fiscal impacts won't be ready until May 31st. The meeting on the 29th and on the 30th will not have information on the economic impacts, only the baseline survey.

The third component is problem gambling services evaluation. The MCCG is looking at a helpline data. Next month they plan to launch some online focus groups for clinicians that are out-of-state. They plan on doing a review of case files to find out how people are entering into problem gambling services system, what other systems are they perhaps coming through. There is a lot of

work to be done here to increase the capacity of the services system. This will help DPH increase their capacity for the services system.

The last piece I'm not going to spend too much time on, but it's building the capacity to take all this data, put it into one space, and making it accessible for anybody who wants to see it. SEIGMA is working with a program called "Shiny" that uses a lot of mapping to take a look at where the impacts over time.

#### RESEARCH AGENDA- MAGIC (Massachusetts Gambling Impacts Cohort)

The UMass team, our current researchers on SEIGMA, are also the researchers that will be conducting MAGIC. It's a longitudinal cohort study. It provides kind of a moving picture of what is happening regarding problem gambling. The idea is that they will be collecting data from the same group of people at designated points in time over time. So once again, they can look at a set period of time each year for a while. They can actually look at some of the changes that have taken place. While SEIGMA gives a prevalence or the number of existing problem cases in the population, MAGIC gives a number of new cases in the population.

In January 2015, the research team recommended a change on the sampling strategy. The rationale for this change was that it

will allow the research team to achieve two goals of the Magic study, which are establish the raw number of new problem gamblers each year or the incidence necessary for research allocation and identify the variables of greatest etiological importance in the development and remission of problem gambling. The number of people that will be involved in this study will essentially be the same. It was 26 100 people in the original sampling methodology, It will now be 26 73. The new methodology actually breaks down high risk strata more finely, in terms of problem gamblers, as you can see in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 5 of the *Report on the Research Agenda of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission*: Problem gamblers, at-risk gamblers, and gamblers who spend \$1200 or more annually, those who gamble weekly, and people who served in the military since September 2001. The change was approved by the Commission.

The first report on Magic is actually not due for a while, because it was just approved on November 6th. They'll be using the SEIGMA baseline survey data to draw their samples, but there'll be a lot of work that they have to do. They'll use the SEIGMA baseline data as wave one. They hope to have two waves before a casino is open (before Plainridge opens up). So they have wave one and it's drawn entirely from the SEIGMA data. Wave

two will take a smaller subset of that and they hope to be out in the field mid-February and out of the field by mid-May.

#### 2015 RESEARCH AGENDA

It draws back to section 71 of the statute of chapter 23K, which directs us to develop an annual research agenda to understand the social and economic impacts of expand gaming in Massachusetts, which is the SEIGMA, and obtain scientific information relative to neuroscience, psychology, sociology, epidemiology, and etiology. It incorporates Magic and anticipates additional research projects over time as well.

You have a memo that says 2015 Annual Gaming Research Agenda. If you recall on October 6th, Steve and I presented to you a proposal for three activities the research agenda, which enhance the research agenda. On October 21st, we brought those three recommendations that were approved by the Public Health Trust Fund Executive Committee to a Gaming Research Advisory Committee (GRAC). They gave us some minor recommendations and advice to make some changes specifically to the evaluation of the responsible gaming activities.

On November 20th, it was the recommendation that was presented to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. They reviewed, but did not have any additional recommendations at that time.

On December 16th, it was brought to the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC). (The Gaming Policy Advisory Committee is mandated under section 71 to advise the research agenda.) So we brought those three recommendations to the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee for their recommendation. They approved it, but again there are some very minor revisions to the evaluation section, which I'll review in a second.

On the 18th, with those other revisions, the Commission approved the agenda for 2015.

The second relates back to evaluating activities that are captured in the Responsible Gaming Framework (RGF). The framework really is intended to provide guidance to the Commission, to the operators on responsible gaming activities. It focuses primarily on activities, policies, regulations within the casinos, but it does spread outside the casinos.

There are three specific areas within the Responsible Gaming Framework. Three initiatives that we're moving forward right now

and we are really interested in getting feedback on. One is the play management system, which I'll present more to you in a moment. The second is the self exclusion program required by statute. Self exclusion is basically individuals who want to be banned from the casinos, because they have, for the most part, encountered problems with gambling and feel that they want to be banned from the casinos. And the third one is the responsible gaming information centers. This doesn't exist anywhere else in the United States that I know of where it basically requires operators to provide on-site space use for problem and responsible gaming activities, to be staffed by an outside entity.

In this case, we're working closely with the Massachusetts Council on Compulsive Gambling, not to just staff it, but to develop the training requirements for the staff that will be there. The only recommendations that were really made dealt with this number two piece. The Gaming Research Advisory Committee recommended, instead of on procuring the services, to establishing the actual measures themselves. So the wording was changed to reflect that. The Gaming Policy Advisory Committee, is focusing on the effectiveness of responsible gaming initiatives. They recommended that we have the word "benefit". So it would be "...the effectiveness and benefit of responsible

gaming initiatives outlined in the Responsible Gaming Framework..." That would be more qualitative type of data collection and will focus on the benefit from these types of specific initiatives.

The third recommendation of the research agenda goes back to section 97, chapter 194, which would require us to work with a nonprofit entity that would be able to capture all the data that would come in from player cards and rewards cards.

Approximately, give or take, 70% of patrons who go to casinos will involve the player card system. This will take their player behavior, every push of the button on the slot machine. It will be anonymized, but connected to their profile and be used for research purposes.

In terms of some of the data elements, we're looking to set up a time with the researchers to give a broader presentation about both studies. We'll provide further notice at this point. We're obviously looking at the end of February. When that happens it's important for us to invite everyone we can think of, to invite the GRAC, this group, and everybody else we can think of. They might be interested in getting to know more about this. So that is the 2015 research agenda.

This was not voted on at the last Public Health Trust Fund Executive Committee. Is this something that can be voted on at this meeting for us to continue to advance?

Well, the commitment that everybody has made is that everybody in the Gaming Commission and Health and Human Services/DPH is that no policy decisions or funding decisions will be made by the Public Health Trust Fund without the approval of both the Commissioner and the Secretary or their designees. Now, because we're still on the side of catching up and because there is no Public Health Trust Fund yet, this is all coming out of the Gaming Commission money, technically. Each of us conceded some authority that we have under the law to join our authority to make this. So it does make sense just as a matter of pro forma. But think it does, as a matter of principle, make sense to have a motion. So we're the Chairs, so we can make the motion.

I (Anne Powers) move to accept the proposed 2015 annual research agenda as you just described to us.

And I'll (Eileen Sullivan) second it.

Any further discussion?

All in favor?

Aye.

Opposed?

The Ayes have it unanimously.

RESPONSIBLE GAMING MEDIA CAMPAIGN - GAMESENSE

GameSense has evolved from the last Public Health Trust Fund Executive Committee meeting. We looked at what's happening in other jurisdictions and came to specifically the British Columbia Lottery Corporation. They basically discovered that it wasn't working, so they engaged a marketing firm to develop the GameSense brand.

Steve, Marlene, and I actually went out to the Plainridge facility earlier this week. We have approximately 270 feet at the entrance where 75% of the patrons will be coming in. You can communicate messages about responsible gaming in a way that you don't talk about gambling at all.

The BCLC in our agreement with them have given us license to use all of their GameSense brand, any of their 15 - 30 second video clips, they've given Massachusetts permission to use that and the ability to change out the BCLC logo with our own logo. So that user agreement was signed last week.

GameSense is free; British Columbia gave us license to use it all for nothing. It advances our priority of promoting responsible gaming. It advances us so far down the road from where we would have started if we wanted to develop our own brand. It puts us in collaboration with the British Columbia Lottery Corporation.

There are three other provinces in Canada that use the GameSense brand. What this does is it creates sort of collaborative information that they've developed. We can use GameSense information and materials that have been developed by those other provinces in Canada. We will in turn develop our own materials and make those available for the other GameSense jurisdictions. One of the things we're really specific about here, in Massachusetts, is not using any gaming paraphernalia in any of our work. That's not true in other places. For one thing, there's no other state that has a relationship between their Department of Public Health and the gaming industry like this.

GameSense doesn't put gambling in a pro or con light. It's just talking about gambling responsibly. We're working right now to procure a marketing company. When we procure that marketing company, we have a brand at hand, we have branding standards, we come armed with a number of brochures, we come armed with this

type of material, we can use this outright, we can roll this out as part of the gaming campaign with very little change other than changing the logos there.

#### PLAY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

GameSense is being presented before the play management systems, because when we talk about play management, it doesn't talk about responsible gaming or problem gambling. But what we're going to do is, we're going to apply GameSense. So when we talk about play management, they will become GameSense tools. When we talk about the onsite responsible gaming information centers, that's not what they are. They're going to be talking about GameSense information centers. And the people that staff of those centers are going to become GameSense advisors. It's something we want to apply throughout the operations when we talk about responsible gaming and problem gambling.

#### MCCG- State Helpline

One of the pieces that we can all agree to is that you want the individual who's pre-contemplative, wanting to ask questions about gambling, but not really sure why, down to the person who's in a real crisis to be greeted by someone on the phone, at the GameSense center, on the website, by a plethora of information and someone who can address it all kind of equally.

It seems like whether you're walking into that GameSense center or you're calling the helpline, you're going to have that GameSense advisor. The helpline would really be more like a GameSense advisor helpline where that person's going to be able to meet you where you're at. Whatever that means for you. It makes sense that they're all trained similarly in using some of the same language, because it would be unfortunate if we're doing something more crisis here, but in the early stages of responsible gaming over here. It would make sense for everyone to look at the process of continuum and really address it that way however you're engaging with someone who's been trained.

As we're in the process of procuring a marketing firm we will be looking at developing the website and probably using some of the material that's been developed by GameSense British Columbia. It's going to roll out in stages. We will have all the basic material that we need to open up the GameSense information centers to roll it out in limited capacity and to customize it for Massachusetts. We will be looking at vendors on the statewide contracts and there certainly are vendors out there that have a lot of experience with adapting materials for cultural and literacy purposes.

We have the user agreement. It has been fully executed by the Commission with the British Columbia Lottery Corporation. We're in the process of getting those materials from British Columbia and procuring a marketing firm. The goal is to have a limited roll out of this by June 30<sup>th</sup>. The idea that this becomes the dominant brand for responsible gaming in Massachusetts.

Play management systems is really one GameSense tool out of what we will see as a whole toolbox of different ways to access information and tools. Again, we're calling it the play management systems, but it really is a GameSense tool. Within the Responsible Gaming Framework, there's a section on supporting informed player choice. This is just another way to give people information about their gambling behavior in real time feedback. This is a way to give people that information, tools to manage their gambling at casinos.

#### EVIDENCE-BASED APPROACH AND PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH

Also as the framework was adopted, we said it's really important for us to adopt evidence-based practices in Massachusetts wherever possible. So in the absence of evidence-based approach, we've also said if there is some element of risk out there, we will use a precautionary approach. The precautionary approach says, if there is some market risk out there, there is some

inclination or evidence that we can't respond to that, then we may choose to use that, but will continue to evaluate that over time and will evaluate that more stringently than anything else that we do to really get a handle on whether or not this is an effective tool that does accomplish our goal. So with that understanding that we have these two approaches, evidence-based approach and precautionary approach, which is still really within the direction of where and priorities of the Commission and the statute.

So specifically one of the play management tools is the limit setting tool. The limit setting tool allows people to determine and enhance their gaming session with the amount of money they're willing to lose. In either the gaming session or in the gaming month in a calendar year.

Where it was mandatory in Missouri and Nova Scotia, it is completely voluntary in Massachusetts. But probably the second most important piece beyond that it's voluntary, is that we're going to evaluate it. It's a precautionary approach, if we don't have the evidence to back it up to make it a best practice, we're going to evaluate it to determine whether or not if it's something worthwhile for us to continue with. So it's going to be required with our category two licensee, which is Penn. Two

years after that, we will have two very large casinos that will be coming on line, which will be MGM and Wynn.

#### NEXT STEPS

So our next steps, were brought back to the Commission yesterday as a first draft. We also need to procure qualified institutions to advise placement and configuration, establish evaluation measures and processes, collect and analyze data, and report findings. We have been collaborating closely with Penn, with Bally, who is kind of their casino operating system and an evaluator, to implement the requirements. Our goal is when Penn opens its doors in June that this will be ready to go. This is much like trying to decide whether if this is successful in a two-year time.

#### PROBLEM GAMBLING SERVICES- STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

I'd (Steve Keel) like to start by pointing out that it is a strategic planning process for the problem gambling services of the Public Health Trust Fund. The idea is to use the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) from the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

The SPf is a framework using assessment capacity, planning implementation, and evaluation as the overall process. Also we

have a consultant, with problem gambling service expertise, available to us through the Mass Gaming Commission. We have a vendor that we met with recently on January 7<sup>th</sup> who will actually conduct the strategic planning process for us. The idea is to have a strategic plan for problem gambling services available to us by the end of June. This would be a relatively brief strategic plan that we could use as an operational guide, that we could update on a regular basis, so that we could tweak it as we get more information from both the MGC research and other problem gambling research that's going on out there, so that it can be data driven as we go forward. Most of the information here (handout) is the description of the Strategic Prevention Framework and there's a scope of work from the Educational Development Center (EDC (contractor doing the strategic plan)).

The consultant we've been talking about is Jeff Marotta. He's done this type of strategic planning process in a number of states in the U.S. He's also done it internationally as well.

Attorney General Healey came to our meeting yesterday. Would it be a good idea to see whether the AG wanted to be represented on this Committee? It's a little bit different from the public safety role. They're in more the prosecutor role. I'm definitely going to invite them all to the meeting in April. Definitely

their people will want to know what we're doing in terms of the research stuff. What do you think about that? Is that a logical fit and idea? Is that a good idea or not?

It's a fantastic idea. They've been actively involved in advising, providing feedback on our credit regulations. They've also been very interested on the play management issue. They've been interested in sort of other consumer protection types of issues that have come up. It makes absolute perfect sense. For one thing, it would be very helpful for them to know what we're doing.

Maybe a designee from that unit, so that information could be shared even with us when they talk about trends or patterns. Our investigations bureau is closely working with them. They're talking all the time.

Are these meant to be the minutes for the meeting? If so, do we get them in advance so that we vote to approve the minutes? Or is this for our record? I'm not suggesting we need to do either, but...

This is a public meeting. We are mandated to keep minutes. And since we're doing that, we should distribute them just like we

do for the Gaming Commission meetings. We should distribute them early and we should adopt them. So Cheryl, Rebekah, and Beth would have to vote to approve these minutes, not the designee. We'll have Beth and Bekah at our next meeting. Let's plan to distribute them in advance. Mark and I will look at them first and then distribute them to the Committee. That should always be the first item on the agenda. We'll do both sets next time in advance.

NATIONAL PROBLEM GAMBLING AWARENESS MONTH (Marlene Warner, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Council on Compulsive Gambling and audience member invited to make an announcement)

Problem gambling awareness month is in March and there are national events going on. We meet with some of the other councils, public health entities, gaming industry, some individual clinicians... We typically meet twice a year and we recently met in the end of last year together the Northeast Consortium on Problem Gambling, which makes up all those entities from the six New England states (five plus New York) would do a problem gambling awareness month collaborative effort.

So what we're going to do, to kick off that, is on March 2<sup>nd</sup> have a press conference. And the intention was to have it in a place

where we could get as many folks from all the states coming together. The theme is "Gambling Disorders Know No Borders" and that we're all in this together. As we're expanding gaming here in Massachusetts that we understand we also have some responsibility for who the folks that are coming into our state end up with a problem. So the sub theme or the tag line is to Have The Conversation. The concept there is that whether you're a lawyer or clinician, a parent, or a child, you can have the conversations. This is March 2<sup>nd</sup> at 10 a.m., at Springfield where we're doing the press conference.

What if the leadership group was made up of the representatives of whatever council, but also the gaming commissions? We could reach out to all of the other gaming commissions and announce the collaboration of all the gaming commissions and of all the responsible gaming councils to work on developing regional strategies. It should be the heads of the gaming commissions, the lotteries, and the councils together, because different states do it different ways. Maybe Beth and I (Steve Crosby) could collaborate on reaching out to our counterparts in the other states.

Could you (Marlene Warner) unilaterally invite the heads of gaming commissions and lotteries to become members of that? Can you say, "Yes, Steve, you can join the leadership group."

I (Marlene Warener) think I would have to reach out to the other council directors and ask if that's ok. Again, we don't necessarily have membership.

If you (Marlene Warner) get authority and we move quick enough, I'd (Steve Crosby) be happy to talk with Beth and see whether she and I would take responsibility for reaching out to our counterparts. So let's make it the heads of the councils, the heads of the department of public health or designees, heads of the commissions, and heads of the lotteries all joining together. This Northeast Problem Gambling Consortium will be a working group on regional collaboration on addressing problem gambling.

Everybody in favor? I (Steve Crosby) think we should make that a vote.

Are you talking about the Public Health Trust Fund? In other words, why would a vote be taken on separate agencies? I'm not

suggesting it's a bad thing. It's just saying it doesn't seem like something that has to come through the Trust Fund.

Well, it's coming out of this group and the Public Health Trust Fund has authority over policy and financial decisions concerning research and problem gambling. I think as long as we brought it up here, we have the imprimatur and two of the agencies are in fact involved. It demonstrates a level of authority for the Trust Fund.

We move to adopt the coordination of the different lottery and gaming commission leadership together in public health or substance abuse related leadership in each of the New England states to become part of the Northeast Consortium on Problem Gambling.

So moved?

Second.

Okay.

For the record, there are two Commissioners here who cannot bind the Commission. It is something our Commission will want to talk about and I expect would be willing to, but just for the record, but any further discussion?

All in favor?

Aye.

Opposed?

The ayes have it unanimously. We should put this on the agenda for the next public meeting.